

The B-Network Lines for Phase 1 advertised 21 May 2026 for Ceres Wolseley – Port Alfred Helmet, Rosemead Klipplaat - Uitenhage and Harties Hercules to Magaliesburg

Questions from the bidders

1. We refer to the Request for Proposal for the Concessioneering of the Transnet Rail Infrastructure Manager (TRIM) B-Network Line: Wolseley to Port Alfred Hamlet Branch Line (RFP/W-PAHBL/202605/WC).
 - The RFP defines the "Draft Rail Operator Agreement" as the agreement attached as Section 15 of the RFP and the "Rail Concession Agreement" as being substantially in the form of the Draft Concession Agreement contained in Section 15. However, Section 7 refers to the Standard Concession Agreement as Section 17.
 - The Table of Contents provided to Bidders includes only Sections 1–12, and no Draft Concession Agreement, Draft Rail Operator Agreement, or Standard Concession Agreement has been included in the RFP documentation. Furthermore, the list of Annexures (A–Q) does not include any of these agreements.
 - Accordingly, we kindly request that TRIM:
 - Confirm whether the Draft Concession Agreement / Draft Rail Operator Agreement / Standard Concession Agreement forms part of this RFP.
 - If so, issue the agreement, identifying the correct Section or Annexure.

Response from TRIM

1. The reference to Sections 15 and 17 in the RFP is incorrect and resulted from an inadvertent cross-reference error during the compilation of the RFP documentation.

The correct reference in each instance should be Section 12. Accordingly:

 - The reference to the "Draft Rail Operator Agreement" as Section 15 should be read as Section 12.

- The reference to the "Rail Concession Agreement" as being substantially in the form of the Draft Concession Agreement contained in Section 15 should be read as Section 12.
- The reference in Section 7 to the "Standard Concession Agreement" as Section 17 should likewise be read as Section 12.
- The Table of Contents and RFP documentation correctly concludes at Section 12, and there are no Sections 15 or 17 forming part of the issued RFP documentation. The references to Sections 15 and 17 are therefore cross-reference errors and should not be interpreted as additional or missing sections of the RFP.

Bidders are requested to take this clarification into account when preparing their submissions even in the absence of the amendment.