

Tender 69S/2026/2027- Supply and Delivery, Placement and Moving of 3 m and 6 m Steel Shipping Containers

Date: 12 October 2026
Time: 10:00 am – 11:00 am
Venue: Microsoft Teams

CHAIRPERSON		
Name and Surname	Designation	Initials
Suhail Fortuin	Senior Professional Officer	SF

1	<u>Opening and Welcome</u> - The chair (SF) opened the meeting and welcomed the prospective tenderers to the clarification meeting for Tender 69S/2026/27. NS introduced himself and indicated that he would be working with SF in relation to the tender. PL introduced herself and indicated that he would be working with SF as well. MG introduced himself and indicated that she would be working with SF as well. RG introduced herself and indicated that she is from Community Based Refuse Removal Unit (CBRRU).
2	<u>Discussion</u> SF explained that - The purpose of the briefing was to clarify tender submission requirements and give participants an opportunity to raise questions about aspects of the tender documentation that required further explanation. - The meeting was a clarification briefing and not an opportunity to negotiate requirements, informally amend specifications, or provide any tenderer with an advantage over another. - Would not review the entire specification verbatim, as tenderers were expected to have familiarized themselves with the complete tender document. Tender Notice and Amendments SF explained that - A tender notice amending the functionality requirements and minimum thresholds. - The amendments related specifically to the number of years of company experience and the minimum vehicle requirements, and that these matters would affect the functionality evaluation and the determination of whether a tender was responsive. - Tenderers to review the amended requirements carefully and ensure that their submissions reflected the latest tender notice or addendum, rather than relying solely on the original wording in the tender document.

- Any clarification requiring a formal interpretation or amendment, or any question that could not be answered conclusively during the meeting, would be dealt with through the City's authorized written communication process.
- Verbal statements made during the briefing would not, by themselves, constitute binding amendments to the tender document.
- The briefing was non-compulsory but strongly recommended, as stated in the tender document.

Tender Background, Contract Period and Appointment

SF explained that

- Tender 69S/2026/27 as a term tender for the supply, delivery, placement, movement and relocation of 3-metre and 6-metre steel shipping containers to meet the City's operational requirements.
- The contract period would be 36 months from the commencement date.
- Two principal components of the tender: Section A, covering the supply, delivery, movement and placement of shipping containers, including applicable placement work; and Section B, covering transportation costs associated with delivery, movement and relocation.
- The City intended to appoint three tenderers: the highest-ranked acceptable tenderer as the main tenderer and two alternative tenderers, subject to the tender conditions.
- Orders would ordinarily be offered to the main tenderer first.
- However, the City could allocate work to an alternative tenderer if the main tenderer refused an instruction, could not respond within the prescribed response times, lacked operational capacity, repeatedly failed to meet contractual obligations, failed to maintain required accreditation, or if an alternative appointment was needed to maintain continuity of service delivery.
- That appointment as an alternative tenderer did not guarantee receipt of orders or any specific volume of work. Tenderers were reminded to review the full document, including conditions, compliance requirements, specifications, the price schedule and returnable schedules.

Scope of Work and Technical Requirements

Container type and dimensions

SF explained that

- The tender covered 3-metre containers described as 10-foot full-height general-purpose dry containers and 6-metre containers described as 20-foot full-height general-purpose dry containers.
- Tenderers to the dimensions set out in the tender document and acknowledged that dimensions could vary between containers.
- The dimensions cited in the transcript were approximately 2.991 meters in length, 2.438 meters in width and 2.59 meters in height for the 3-metre container. For the 6-metre container, the principal difference was the length, stated in the transcript as approximately 6.058 meters.
- A tolerance of plus or minus 100 millimeters was allowed for the listed dimensions. Tenderers were required to ensure that the containers offered met the specified requirements and were advised that containers failing the dimensional or inspection requirements could be rejected.
- The dimensions in the official tender document were to be treated as authoritative.

Age, condition and certification

SF stated that

- Containers had to be cargo-worthy, wind-tight and water-tight, and could not be more than 10 years old from the date of manufacture.
- Each container was required to have a valid International Convention for Safe Containers (CSC) Safety Approval Plate issued under the authority of the South African Maritime Safety Authority in accordance with the applicable convention.
- The CSC plate was required to show either a next examination date at least 12 months after the proposed delivery date or an approved Continuous Examination Programme, supported by written confirmation from the container owner that the container remained valid under that programme.
- That these certificates and related documentary evidence were to be provided before delivery and were not mandatory at initial bid submission.
- Once an order has been placed and before delivery, the City will require the relevant evidence, including container codes, manufacturing dates and inspection reports.

Photographic evidence and inspection**SF referred to**

- The photographs included in the tender document as examples of acceptable and unacceptable container conditions.
- Colour photographs of the exterior were required before or upon delivery, clearly showing the CSC plates, BIC codes and overall condition of the containers.
- The City reserved the right to inspect containers and reject those that did not comply with the specifications.
- Minor dents and abrasions might be acceptable, while major dents, distortions and rust would not be acceptable.

Painting, locking and numbering**SF explained that**

- Specified preparation and coating requirements. Interior walls and roofs were to receive one coat of suitable rust-inhibiting undercoat and one coat of suitable white topcoat.
- The floor was to be primed and coated with an abrasion-resistant, non-slip polyethylene coating.
- Externally, containers were to receive suitable surface preparation, one coat of rust-inhibiting undercoat and two coats of suitable topcoat, with the final coat in dark green in accordance with the sample referenced in the specification.
- Each container was also required to have a concealed lock box and a 75-millimetre SABS-approved security lock.
- The specification referred to the provision of three keys.
- Tenderers must include the costs of preparation, painting, security, identification, numbering and delivery in the applicable price items.
- Tenderers not to submit quotations that later claimed these required elements had not been priced.

Delivery, placement and concrete pads**SF explained that**

- Containers would be delivered and placed at locations identified by the City.

- Placement would be arranged in consultation with the relevant City area representative, the contractor servicing the area and the contractor responsible for clearing the container.
- The positioning would take account of terrain slope, drainage and access for waste collection trucks.
- Depending on the site assessment, containers would be placed on reinforced concrete pads constructed using Class 30/20 concrete.
- The pricing schedule provided for two pad sizes: 300 × 300 × 100 millimeters and 500 × 500 × 100 millimeters. Both required Ref. 1617 mesh, positioned 50 millimeters from the top and with 50 millimeters of side cover, as described in the briefing.
- Tenderers were instructed to review the technical details and price the applicable items.

Movement and relocation

SF advised that

- Successful tenderers would also be required to move and relocate containers on an ad hoc basis within the municipal boundaries of the City of Cape Town.
- Relocation could arise from operational needs or unforeseen circumstances, including urgent movements in emergencies.
- Tenderers were therefore expected to consider their operational capacity, vehicle availability and ability to respond to City instructions.
- The pricing schedule is distinguished between charges for moving or relocating containers and the associated transportation costs.
- Tenderers were instructed to price these separately in accordance with the prescribed schedule.

Vehicle Requirements and Functionality Amendments

Mr Fortuin explained that

- The original tender document had required a minimum of two crane vehicles with an 8-tonne capacity to obtain the full vehicle-related functionality score.
- A subsequent tender notice reduced the minimum requirement to one vehicle.
- Under the amended scoring explained at the meeting, one qualifying vehicle would receive 30 points, while two vehicles would receive 50 points.
- The functionality threshold had been reduced from 70 to 60 points out of 100, and that company experience scoring had been amended.
- Vehicles had to be suitable for transporting 3-metre and 6-metre steel shipping containers and had to be listed in Annexure F3.
- Where vehicles were owned, the relevant vehicle registration certificates had to be in the tenderer's name.
- Where vehicles were hired or leased, tenderers had to submit ownership evidence in the hiring or leasing company's name, together with a draft lease agreement signed by both parties.
- Lease documentation had to identify the vehicle model and type, number of vehicles to be leased, lease duration and lead time for acquiring the vehicles.
- Valid roadworthy certificates for all vehicles to be used were required before commencement of the contract.
- Incomplete or incorrect supporting documentation could affect the functionality assessment.
- Clarification would not be used to introduce new information that had not been included in the original tender submission.
- Tenderers were reminded to review their documents and prices before submission and to ensure that all required costs and evidence were included.

Pricing Schedule and Transportation Costs

SF advised that

- Tenderers follow all pricing instructions, check their arithmetic and ensure that figures are legible.
- The evaluation committee would perform its own calculations and that the committee's determination would be binding.
- After arithmetic corrections or calculations, the tenderer would be given the opportunity to accept the changes or withdraw the tender in its entirety.
- All listed items were required to be priced.
- Prices had to be said in South African Rand and exclude VAT in the designated unit-price fields.
- The pricing components included supply and delivery of 3-metre and 6-metre containers; movement and relocation of both container sizes; reinforced concrete pads; and transportation costs calculated per kilometer.
- Tenderers were reminded to allow for all relevant costs and obligations, including preparation, painting, loading, offloading, positioning, labour, equipment, overheads and other costs required under the relevant items.
- Successful tenderers would manage safekeeping and security of certain containers from acquisition from the manufacturer until delivery to the designated delivery site.
- For transportation reimbursement, successful tenderers would have to provide verified vehicle-tracker reports or detailed log sheets showing the kilometers travelled by the crane truck.
- The reimbursable distance would be measured using the shortest one-way distance from the container yard or contractor's premises to the required delivery point.
- Transportation costs would be invoiced separately from other charges and reimbursed in accordance with the rates submitted under Section B, subject to the tender conditions and possible adjustment associated with fuel-price volatility.
- Any assessment of such volatility would take place during contract management and that the matter was not fixed in advance.
- If a pricing item was left blank or entered as a null rate under the tender conditions, it would be treated as having no charge.
- The City could seek clarification on null rates to determine whether they were reasonable.
- Tenderers were urged to scrutinize calculations, units, rates and totals before submitting their offers.

Functionality Evaluation: Company Experience and References

Mr Fortuin reiterated that

- The amended minimum functionality threshold was 60 out of 100 points, with 50 points allocated to relevant previous company experience and 50 points to vehicles.
- The experience criterion assessed previous work involving the supply, delivery, movement, placement and transportation of containers.
- Tenderers were required to complete Annexure F1 and provide supporting client reference letters, ensuring that the referees could be contacted.
- The City would verify references and that non-verifiable references could result in the tender being considered non-responsive or could prevent the tenderer from being scored appropriately.

- Reference letters were required to be descriptive and relevant to similar work, on the client's official letterhead, dated and signed or officially stamped.
- They were to include the contract duration, contract value and a clear description of the scope of work undertaken.
- The reference documentation had to fall within the specified 10-year period measured from the date of advertisement.
- Where the original client or company was no longer operating, tenderers were responsible for obtaining updated documentation endorsed by the relevant client, where applicable, to support and verify the work.
- The number of qualifying vehicles affected the vehicle score: one qualifying vehicle would receive fewer points, while two or more would receive the full vehicle score described in the briefing.

Price and Preference Points; Risk Assessment

Mr Fortuin stated that

- An 80/20 preference-point system applied to the tender.
- Specific goals identified in the briefing included SMME participation, enterprise and supplier development, and socioeconomic development and skills-development employee schemes.
- Tenderers claiming preference points were required to submit sufficient, relevant and verifiable documentary evidence.
- Failure to provide the required evidence could result in the relevant preference points not being awarded.
- The City would evaluate responsive tenders in accordance with the tender document, including functionality, price, preference points and risk-assessment requirements.
- The lowest-priced offer would not automatically guarantee an award.
- The City reserved its rights to accept or reject tender offers in accordance with the tender conditions.

Tender Compliance and Returnable Schedules

SF explained that

- The importance of completing the tender document and all returnable schedules in full.
- Depending on the tenderer's circumstances, the documentation could include tenderer details, authority to sign, joint-venture documentation where applicable, declarations of interest, conflict-of-interest declarations and supply-chain-management declarations and information.
- Tenderers were instructed to complete the schedules, sign where required and initial each page as prescribed.
- They were also reminded to ensure that their tax affairs were in order and that they complied with supplier-registration requirements when requested by the City.
- All required signatures had to be provided by duly authorized persons. Incomplete submissions, missing information or material deviations could affect responsiveness and could lead to rejection in accordance with the tender conditions.

Submission Deadline and Method

SF stated that

- The closing date was Wednesday, 21 October 2026, at 10:00.

	• Tender submissions were to be placed in the designated tender box, which he identified in the briefing as Tender Box 243 on the second floor of the relevant service center at South Boulevard. • Tenderers were instructed to verify the precise submission instructions in the official tender document. • Submissions had to be placed in a sealed envelope clearly displaying the tenderer's name and address, tender number, tender description, tender-box details and closing date, as required by the tender document. • Late submissions would not be considered. • Offers submitted by fax or email would be rejected unless the tender conditions expressly provided otherwise. • If a submission was too large to fit into the tender box or the box was full, the tenderer was to enquire at the public counter for alternative instructions. • However, responsibility for ensuring that the submission was properly deposited before the deadline remained tender. • SF advised against leaving submissions until the last minute. Clarification Queries and Official Communication Mr Fortuin advised that • Tenderers to submit any further clarification questions through the City's Supply Chain Management (SCM) Distribution Portal or the email address indicated in the tender document. • To submit outstanding questions as soon as possible, preferably within the following 24 hours, so that responses could be communicated consistently to all prospective tenderers. In closing, SF reminded tenderers to submit before the deadline; ensure that their offers complied with the technical specifications; provide the required references and supporting evidence; meet all compliance requirements; complete every pricing schedule; and monitor official communication channels for written notices issued before closing.
3	<u>Questions</u> There were no questions.
4	<u>Action Item</u> There were no action items.
5	<u>Meeting Closure</u> The Chair (SF) thanked all colleagues for their time and contributions to the meeting. The meeting was adjourned.  Suhail Fortuin Digitally signed by Suhail Fortuin Date: 2026.10.15 10:25:40 +02'00' Signature of Chairperson: Suhail Fortuin Senior Professional Officer: OPMU