

TNPA/2024/01/0003/53053/RFP - PROVISION FOR DETAILED DESIGN (FEASIBILITY) INCLUDING PROCUREMENT SUPPORT AND CONSTRUCTION MONITORING FOR NEW ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

CLARIFICATION REGISTER NO 2

No	Tenderer Query	Transnet Response
1	It is noted from the Contract Data that the Completion of Services is due August 2027. By deduction therefore the allowed duration of TO#2 and TO#3 is 28 months. Is this a correct interpretation of the presented information? As the two task orders have disparate cost profiles what should the relative durations of the two tasks orders be individually? The duration is not listed as a Employers Risk please elaborate on the understanding around this issue as the preamble to the Rates Table infers a measurable/renegotiable activity based on Construction Contractor feedback but this will only occur after confirmation on completion of TO#2?	The 28 months also includes TNPA's internal processes and approvals. The duration of the task orders are as follows: * Task Order 1 - 10 months * Task Order 2 - 6 months * Task Order 3 - 20 months The duration of TO#2 and TO#3 shall be listed as a Employers Risk.
2	(Part C3 – Section 2.1 para 1) Please elaborate on the scope and extent of Traffic management services during construction. Is this the production and management of the TMP for implementation by the Contractor, or are the provision and line management of site based traffic control workers also to be provided? If so in what quantity?	The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) will be done by the Consultant which will include the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for implementation during construction. The TMP will be implemented by the Contractor during construction, therefore site based traffic control workers will be the Contractor's employees.
3	(Part C3- Section 2.2) Section 2.2.1 The scope specifies "This information shall be studied, validated, and used to determine the gap and extent site survey investigations that need to be undertaken to provide a basis for the design for the new administration building. Would it be correct to assume that any investigations not specified (in 2.2.4) and discovered as being required shall be additional services and reimbursed as a CO, being that "further tests, surveys, and studies to be conducted" should be stated as an Employers Risk?	The additional investigations that may result after the Consultant studies and validates the existing information provided by the Employer shall be included in the tenderers cost for the Task Order. The tenderer needs to assume that you may need to do further tests, surveys and studies as per the Scope of Services document, therefore there will be no compensation event (CE) for that task.
4	(Part C3- Section 2.2.4) Please elaborate on the Employers expected extent of manual excavations required for identification of underground services for relocation? Or please confirm Part C4 Section 1.4 is correct in that it states Manual excavation OR ground penetrating radar as acceptable?	Manual excavation or ground penetrating radar are acceptable for the identification of underground services.
5	(Part C3- Section 2.2.4) The scope states "Obtain relevant permits and licences for relocation of services, demolition of existing structures and to start construction works." Please advise •Are Permit/license costs (including municipal submission fees) reimbursable Employer costs or considered part of the Task Order Cost as an expense? •Are any structures of an age to be classified as heritage and under the protection of AMAFA? And if so what and what processes have already been initiated?	Permits/licenses costs are part of the Task Order cost as an expense. There are no structures on the site that are of an age to be classified as heritage and under the protection of AMAFA.
6	Part C3- Section 7.3.2 The section is silent as to who provides the site facilities for the consultant. Is it provided by the Contractor (eg traditionally as per SANS 1200 Part AB)?	The Contractor shall provide site facilities for the Consultant.
7	Addendum No 1 specifies Specific B-BBEE goals of 30% participation by Type I or Type II categorised companies. The Type II is defined as 51% EME/QSE. This requirement is missing from the new pages at C3.11 but included in the Addendum notification. Please confirm that Type II (51% Black owned EME/QSE) companies are also acceptable as per the table in the Addendum?	Type II (51% Black owned EME/QSE) companies are acceptable; The Specific goals is as below The promotion of supplier development through subcontracting or JV for a minimum of 30% of the value of a contract to South African Companies which are: I. 30% Black Women owned, 51% Black Youth and 51% Black people with disabilities. II. FMEs and/or QSEs who are 51% black owned.
8	Please could you send us the sections and elevations, as they were not included in the drawings circulated.	Attached

Signed

BMachi

Bongi Machi

Regional Procurement Manager

Date: 16 April 2024