

REF NO: *R-003/2025/PMID/FEASIBILITY/RFB NOTICE #2*

2 December 2025

***CONSULTING SERVICES FOR PROVISION OF GENERAL MODELLING AND WATER RESOURCE  
EVALUATION SERVICES FOR ALLOCABLE WATER QUANTIFICATION AND TO SUPPORT  
INTEGRATED WATER RESOURCE PLANNING OF NWAMITWA DAM***

Dear Bidder,

TCTA acknowledges receipt of the requests for clarification listed in the attached table. The response to each request for clarification is provided in the attached table.

Yours faithfully

---

Azwi Nelwamondo

Senior Manager: Supply Chain Management

NO.	REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION	TCTA RESPONSES
1	<p>Several components are mentioned in one place and not another:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the background text (Document 1) there is a sentence about wetlands and groundwater, however, there is no mention of either in the SoW but there is a Groundwater Quality Sub-Report deliverable.</li> <li>The same document states that sedimentation in the dams needs to be assessed. However, this is only 'background in the text' and does not appear to be included in the SoW nor in the deliverables.</li> <li>One of the deliverables is a Climate Change Sub-Report; however, climate change is not mentioned in the SoW.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The background text is giving background text to the project and does not form part of the deliverables. But the consultant will be required to review all aspects that are addressed in the feasibility report.</li> <li>Refer to the issued Notice #1</li> <li>Refer to the issued Notice #1</li> </ul>
2	<p>Regarding the specialists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Specialist: the only environmental aspect touched on is the Reserve (which has already been done) and therefore will be included in the yield/planning modelling. Only a person with knowledge on the Reserve is required</li> <li>Geohydrologist: included in the description of the background is geotechnical experience (specifically experience in dams higher than 25 meters). Geotech is not in the SoW, nor would it be required in this project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultant must review the environmental aspects as captured in the feasibility study and update them where necessary as stipulated in paragraph 4.1 of the RFB.</li> <li>We agree that no new Geotech is required, however the consultant must review the Geotech aspects as captured in the feasibility study and update them where necessary as stipulated in paragraph 4.1 of the RFB</li> </ul>
3	<p>In Doc 3 pg 13/16 lists report deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the difference between #2 to #9 which include "Middle Letaba, Klein Letaba and Groot Letaba sub reports on" and the 'latter' reports?</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to the issued Addendum 3.</p>
4	<p>Sub-Reports which are the same:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>#2 "Hydrology" and #3 "Assessment of rainfall and river flow gauging stations".</li> <li>#4 "Systems Operations" and #12 "Water Availability Assessment" overlap</li> <li>#5 = "WRYM &amp; WRPM" but #10 is "WRYM"</li> <li>#8 "Water Quality" but #10b "Groundwater Quality". In addition - how are there 2 water quality reports when the scope on quality is not defined.</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to the issued Addendum 3.</p>

NO.	REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION	TCTA RESPONSES
5	<p>Additional queries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is “Alien Vegetation” a separate report?</li> <li>• “Ecological Requirements” or Reserve; will be using the already determined Reserve; why is there a separate report?</li> <li>• #11 “Climate Change” but not mentioned anywhere else (including scope).</li> <li>• #4 “Systems Operations” and #5 “Systems analysis report – updated WRYM and WRPM” – how is #4 different – current proposed operations as opposed to updated? Why is #4 there?</li> <li>• There are aspects which are not covered in the scope such as climate change (not mentioned once but there is a “sub-report” on it. Same goes for environmental, wetlands, groundwater, water quality, and geotech. What is required of these?</li> <li>• The geohydrologist requires 15 years (max points) with experience on 25+ meter dam wall heights (that’s geotech, not groundwater...).</li> <li>• Cost to company salaries and cost rates without mark-up is required. Our legal opinion is that this should not be part of a tender, and we should not provide it</li> <li>• Regarding training: how does the TCTA decide what sufficient training is (this is subjective), so that we do not get a R450k fine for each person not trained sufficiently.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to the issued Addendum 3</li> <li>• Refer to the issued Addendum 3</li> <li>• Refer to the issued Notice #1</li> <li>• Refer to the issued Addendum 3</li> <li>• Refer to the issued Notice #1</li> <li>• We agree with you. In our opinion both Geotech and ground water specialists are required for the project we have, however, only allocated points for Geotech work.</li> <li>• We refer you to Appendix 3 paragraph 1.2.3</li> <li>• Refer to the issued Notice #1</li> </ul>