

20 November 2025

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

***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

TABLE 1: REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION

TCTA RESPONSES

NO .	REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION	TCTA RESPONSES
1	<p>Please can you clarify the scope of work for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. In addition, experience required for the Geohydrologist (groundwater element) is geotechnical, which is not in the scope (nor we believe part of this project). • In the background text (Document 1) it states that sedimentation in the dams needs to be assessed. However, there is no mention of it in the SoW nor in the deliverables. • One of the deliverables is a Climate Change Sub-Report; however, climate change is not mentioned in the SoW. The scope - and role - is therefore unclear, especially as climate change experience comes under the Water Quality Specialist. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intention is not to introduce a new groundwater study but to review, update and align the existing feasibility-stage groundwater assessment with the Bridging Study requirements. This information is to also indicate that with the Dam in place there is also conjunctive use (surface and groundwater) that must be assessed. • We agree that no new sedimentation modelling is expected, however the consultant must review the sedimentation aspects as captured in the feasibility study and update them where necessary. • Agreed, but nowadays funders require a specialist to comment on the effects of climate change on major projects, as such we require the specialist to review the feasibility report and comment on any changes

NO .	REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION	TCTA RESPONSES
2	<p>We were able to find the Aurecon 2010 reports listed on pages 3&4 of Appendix 1 of the RFB. However, we have been unable to find the following documents on the DWS website. We are hoping that you could provide us with these documents?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa. 1990a. Water Resources Planning of the Letaba River Basin. Study of Development Potential and Management of the Water Resources. Basin Study Report. DWA Report No. P B800/00/0290. 2. Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa. 1990b. Water Resources Planning of the Letaba River Basin. Study of Development Potential and Management of the Water Resources. Basin Study Report : Annexure 16 : Sediment. DWA Report No. P B800/00/1890. 3. Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa. 1994. Main Report. Prepared for the Directorate of Project Planning by Steffen, Robertson & Kirsten Ltd Consulting Engineers as part of the Letaba Water Resource Development: Pre-feasibility Study. DWA Report No. P B000/00/0294. 4. Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa. 1998a. The 	<p>We are looking into the matter, and the requested reports will be availed to the potential bidders in the next notice/s</p>

NO .	REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION	TCTA RESPONSES
	<p>Groot Letaba Water Resource Development: Volume 1 : Feasibility Study Main Report. Prepared by BKS Consultburo for the Directorate of Project Planning. DWA report no PB810/00/0298.</p> <p>5. Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa. 1998b. The Groot Letaba Water Resource Development: Volume 2: Water requirements and system analyses Report. Prepared as part of the Feasibility Study by BKS Consultburo for the Directorate of Project Planning. DWA report no PB810/00/0398.</p> <p>6. Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa. 2006. Surface Water Resources. Prepared by J R Hansford and A K Bailey as part of the Olifants River Water Resources Development Project. DWA Report No. WMA 04/B50/00/1704.</p>	
3	<p>Please can you clarify/elaborate on the following regarding the training of TCTA staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do we assess whether the existing skills of the trainees will be sufficient to learn the models? - Do the trainees have to learn all models which will be used in this project (i.e., Pitman, WRYM, & WRPM)? Or can they also learn theory and/or other useful models even if they 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue is dependent on the need (gap) analysis that you would have conducted with the proposed candidate. • Given that this RFB is only 12 months, the proposed trainees can also learn theory and/or other useful models even if they aren't being used for this project .

NO .	REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION	TCTA RESPONSES
	<p>aren't being used for this project (e.g., HEC-RAS for floodlines)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How many trainees will there be? - The ToR states that the penalty for non-conformance will be “R450,000.00 for each person not registered as a professional”. This implies that the trainees must be registered as a result of our training. The CIDB document you have included with the Bid documents lists the 4 types of registration and says “which culminate or lead to” those registrations, which implies the training would only contribute to the trainee’s overall experience. Furthermore, of the document’s 4 methods of training, method 4 is the only category which this project would be relevant to and it says “towards registration” and not actually being registered. The CIDB document and ToR contradict one another. Please clarify. - Related to the above, how will the TCTA deem if someone has been adequately trained? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum one Trainee should be proposed. An addendum will be issued in this respect. • Given the short contract period and in the context of your question, “towards registration” will be used instead of “actually being registered” and such will be applied for penalty determination. An Addendum will be issued accordingly in this respect. • As alluded to above, the trainees’ needs (gap) analysis will be used as a measure.

NO .	REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION	TCTA RESPONSES
4	<p>1) The bid is complex with a number of specialist skills required, please could we request a 2-week extension of time for the bid?</p> <p>2) The scope has no mention of revising the construction cost estimate, is this required? And if so, to what level of detail has the previous estimate been prepared? May we see a copy if a revised cost estimate is required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are looking into the matter, and a response will be issued accordingly. • The consultant will only be required to review the construction cost, estimate as captured in the feasibility study and update them where necessary.