

Tender Number: T52/09/26

Tender description: APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER TO UNDERTAKE A COMPREHENSIVE BANKABLE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND DEVELOP COMPLIANT BUSINESS CASE FOR ALTERNATIVE WASTE TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES – GAUTENG LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES

Question and Answers version 1

No.	Question	Type	Answer
1	Must all six municipalities ultimately have a preferred AWTT solution, or may the study conclude that some municipalities are not viable?	Technical	As part of Option analysis, the Service Provider is expected to objectively assess AWTT solutions from individual municipality perspective and if its not viable at individual municipality level then need to assess best AWTT solution from aggregation perspective (integrated district facility).
2	Will SACNASP registration for the Environmental Resource be acceptable as an alternate to EAPASA registration?	Technical	The RFP specifically requires the resource to be registered with EAPASA. This requirement is consistent with the Environmental Screening and EIA Scoping responsibilities included in the scope of work.
3	What existing waste, energy, infrastructure, contractual and financial data will IDC/CoGTA/municipalities provide, and what new data collection is expected from the consultant?	Technical	The Service Provide will be responsible for validating, updating and supplementing the available information, including waste characterisation (winter and summer), institutional information, site/GIS assessments, and addressing identified data gaps. Documents to be furnished to the appointed service provider will be the outcomes of the 2014 Pre-Feasibility Study for the Sedibeng and West Rand District; and the ISA Greenbook Business Case Guideline.
4	For the concept designs, does that refer to the development of a concept plan and what is expected to be included in that?	Technical	The concept design refers to the development of concept-level plans and technical layouts for the preferred solution(s) identified through the technology and site assessment. At a minimum, the concept design should illustrate the proposed facility configuration and layout, major process/technology components, indicative capacities, key infrastructure requirements, site interfaces, grid/energy connection requirements, access and utilities, and other enabling infrastructure necessary to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposed solution.
5	In terms of the concept design, is it just for determining CAPEX and OPEX or it must be detailed for development?	Technical	The level of design should be sufficient to support the feasibility assessment, preliminary costing, environmental assessment, financial modelling and development of the business case, and is not intended to constitute detailed engineering or construction design.
6	Can the 2014 study be shared with all potential bidders rather than only sharing it with the successful bidder?	Technical	As stipulated in the RFP, the study will only be shared with successful bidder.
7	Is 12 months achievable with the key personnel listed? Can additional personnel be added?	Technical	The resources specified in the RFP are provided as minimum key personnel for the project. Bidders are expected to determine the full resource requirements necessary to successfully deliver the scope within the 12-month programme. Bidders may therefore propose additional personnel and specialist resources as required and must clearly identify and cost these resources accordingly in their proposals.
8	Can an environmental practioner be paired with the team lead due to their chemical experience?	Technical	This is up to the service provider to propose and justify in accordance with their fit and alignment with the RFP requirements.
9	Waste characterisation and hierarchy - what if there is not enough waste for energy generation, can other opportunities be considered?	Technical	The feasibility study should apply the waste hierarchy and assess the quantity, composition and characteristics of the available waste streams. Where the assessment determines that there is insufficient suitable waste to support viable energy generation, the study should consider other technically and commercially viable waste treatment, recovery and beneficiation opportunities consistent with the waste hierarchy. The objective is therefore not to predetermine a solution, but to identify the most appropriate and feasible alternative waste treatment solution(s) based on the available waste streams and market opportunities.
10	Is the intended outcome one integrated AWTT programme or potentially six separate bankable municipal projects?	Technical	As part of Option analysis, the Service Provider is expected to objectively assess AWTT solutions from individual municipality perspective and if its not viable at individual municipality level then need to assess best AWTT solution from aggregation perspective (integrated district facility).
11	How technology-neutral is the study expected to be, given the reference to both AWTT and specifically Waste-to-Energy technologies?	Technical	The study is expected to be technology-neutral at the options assessment stage. While the programme has a strong Waste-to-Energy and energy-security focus, the consultant should assess the full range of suitable Alternative Waste Treatment Technologies (AWTT) against the available waste streams, waste hierarchy, technical feasibility, environmental impacts and commercial viability.
12	Who is responsible for the cost of waste characterisation, specialist studies, site investigations and other fieldwork required to make the feasibility study genuinely bankable?	Technical	The bidder/service provider is responsible for providing and costing all investigations and fieldwork necessary to complete the required feasibility study, including waste characterisation, site investigations and other data collection required by the scope.
13	Have potential sites already been identified, and what level of site due diligence is expected within the 12-month assignment?	Technical	The RFP requires the service provider to identify suitable sites and develop concept designs as part of the feasibility study.
14	Who are the anticipated electricity/energy off-takers, and are there existing discussions or commitments with potential off-takers?	Technical	The identification and assessment of potential off-takers forms part of the feasibility study and market assessment. Any existing discussions or information available to ISA/GIFA/CoGTA/municipalities will be made available where applicable, while the consultant must validate and develop the off-take strategy through the study.

No.	Question	Type	Answer
15	What level of financial modelling and cost-estimate accuracy does IDC regard as sufficient for a "bankable" feasibility study, and are there prescribed financial assumptions?	Technical	The financial modelling should be of a standard sufficient to support informed investment, funding, procurement and implementation decisions by the participating municipalities and potential funding partners, and should demonstrate the commercial and financial viability of the preferred Alternative Waste Treatment Technology solution. As outlined in Section 3.2, Workstream 7 of the RFP, the scope includes the development of a 20-25 year financial model incorporating revenues, costs, sensitivity and scenario analyses, affordability and fiscal impact assessments, funding and financing options analysis, and a funding strategy. There are no prescribed financial assumptions provided in the RFP. Bidders are expected to apply assumptions that are reasonable, evidence-based, market-tested, and appropriate to the selected technology, municipal operating environment, and South African infrastructure financing context. Bidders should ensure that the financial model and supporting analysis are sufficiently robust to support the evaluation of financial viability, affordability, funding requirements, value-for-money considerations, and potential investment readiness. Refer to Section 3.2, Workstream 7: Financial Modelling & Economic Assessment for the detailed scope and deliverables.
16	What exactly is expected in relation to environmental assessment—screening and EIA scoping only, or progressing actual environmental authorisation processes?	Technical	The current scope is limited to Environmental Screening and EIA Scoping activities only, as outlined in Section 3.2, Workstream 6 of the RFP. The required outputs are the Environmental Screening Report, EIA Terms of Reference, Specialist Studies ToR, Environmental & Social Risk Register, and Permits & Licences Register. The scope does not include undertaking a full Environmental Impact Assessment, progressing environmental authorisation processes, preparing licence applications, or obtaining statutory approvals. However, the service provider is expected to identify the environmental approvals, permits, licences, and regulatory processes that may be required for implementation of the preferred option and document these in the applicable deliverables.
17	Who has final decision-making authority over the preferred technology, site, business case and delivery model, and how will differences between the six municipalities be resolved?	Technical	Final decisions will be made through the programme governance structures. A Project Working Committee comprising representatives from COGTA, GIFA, ISA, and other relevant stakeholders will provide strategic guidance and oversight. Differences between municipalities will be addressed through the options analysis and stakeholder engagement process, allowing for municipality-specific, clustered or integrated solutions where justified.
18	With respect to the above-mentioned tender, kindly clarify whether bidders may submit references for Transaction Advisory Services in either renewable energy or waste management or waste treatment - in other words, are you giving bidders a choice of references from 1 category or a mix of the 3 categories?	Technical	Bidders may submit references from any one of the listed categories, or a combination of the categories: renewable energy facilities, waste management projects and/or waste treatment initiatives.
19	How does the WTE programme reconcile with the principles of the waste hierarchy, i.e. to prevent, reduce, re-use, recycle and recover waste before landfill or incineration?	Technical	The programme is intended to complement, rather than replace, the waste hierarchy. Waste prevention, reduction, re-use and recycling should be considered before determining the residual waste streams suitable for energy recovery or other alternative treatment. The feasibility study must validate the quantity and composition of available waste and assess technology options, including mass and energy balances, lifecycle costs, emissions, climate impacts and technology risks. The preferred solution should therefore be based on the appropriate residual waste stream after higher-order waste-management opportunities have been considered, with the objective of reducing reliance on landfill disposal.
20	The bid was issued on 17 September 2026 and closes on 5 October 2026, meaning it will be in the market for approximately 2.5 weeks. This period includes a heritage public holiday, which further compresses the effective working time available. We believe the time allowed is insufficient for an RFP of this nature and would therefore like to request an extension.	Technical	Extension granted. New Closing Date: 14 October 2026 @ 11:00 (New date)
21	Please confirm whether the feasibility study must assess each of the six municipalities as a standalone project and also develop an aggregated regional/district programme option.	Technical	As part of Option analysis, the Service Provider is expected to objectively assess AWTT solutions from individual municipality perspective and if its not viable at individual municipality level then need to assess best AWTT solution from aggregation perspective (integrated district facility).
22	Will the relevant baseline studies, over and above the 2014 prefeasibility study for the two districts, including supporting datasets, models, maps, waste-characterisation results and updates, be provided to the successful bidder?	Technical	Only the (1) outcomes of the 2014 Pre-Feasibility Study for the Sedibeng and West Rand District and (2) ISA Greenbook Business Case Guideline will be shared with the successful bidder.
23	Must bidders price seasonal waste-characterisation studies as part of the assignment? Please confirm the required number, duration and seasonal timing of campaigns for each municipality, including whether laboratory testing such as proximate, ultimate or Bio Methane Potential testing is required, or whether desktop theoretical values may be used.	Technical	The bidder must incorporate all required waste-characterisation studies in their pricing. The project duration of 12 months is expected to cover all seasons of the year.
24	Does the environmental scope require screening and EIA scoping only, or must the service provider initiate or complete environmental authorisation, waste-licence, water-use or atmospheric-emission licence applications?	Technical	The current scope is limited to Environmental Screening and EIA Scoping activities only, as set out under Section 3.2, Workstream 6 of the RFP. The required outputs are limited to the preparation of an Environmental Screening Report, EIA Terms of Reference, Specialist Studies Terms of Reference, Environmental & Social Risk Register, and Permits & Licences Register. The scope does not include undertaking a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), obtaining Environmental Authorisation, or preparing and submitting applications for Waste Management Licences, Water Use Licences, Atmospheric Emission Licences, or other statutory approvals. However, bidders are expected to identify the approvals and permitting requirements applicable to the preferred solution and provide an approvals pathway as part of the assessment.
25	Please confirm whether specialist studies, public-participation events, sampling, laboratory analysis and regulator application fees must be included in the fixed bid price or treated as provisional sums.	Technical	Must be included in the fixed bid price. Note that detailed EIA studies do not form part of the current scope.

No.	Question	Type	Answer
26	Is the preferred-option design limited to process flow diagrams and concept layouts, or must it include preliminary designs, bills of quantities and discipline-specific specifications?	Technical	The concept design refers to the development of concept-level plans and technical layouts for the preferred solution(s) identified through the technology and site assessment. At a minimum, the concept design should illustrate the proposed facility configuration and layout, major process/technology components, indicative capacities, key infrastructure requirements, site interfaces, grid/energy connection requirements, access and utilities, and other enabling infrastructure necessary to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposed solution.
27	Please clarify the required accuracy class and base date for CAPEX and OPEX estimates, including escalation, contingency, foreign exchange and lifecycle replacement costs.	Technical	For the purposes of this feasibility study, bidders should prepare CAPEX and OPEX estimates to a minimum Class 3 estimate standard, with an expected accuracy level (approximately -20% to +30%) consistent with industry feasibility-study practice expected at this stage. The base date for all cost estimates shall be the date of estimate preparation, clearly stated in the report. Estimates should be provided in real terms using a clearly stated base date and should include assumptions relating to escalation, contingency, foreign exchange exposure, and lifecycle replacement costs.
28	Please provide the required deliverable schedule and confirm whether separate municipal reports are required in addition to consolidated programme-level reports, models and the Intermediate Business Case.	Technical	The required deliverables should be submitted in accordance with the workstreams and compliance outputs outlined in Section 3.2 of the RFP, culminating in a consolidated programme-level Feasibility Study, Financial Model, Cost-Benefit Analysis, and Intermediate Business Case. Please note that separate standalone municipal reports are not required. However, the analysis and assessments undertaken should adequately consider and reflect the circumstances, data, and requirements of each participating municipality where relevant. The final deliverables are expected to be consolidated at programme level and presented as integrated outputs for the AWTT Programme.
29	Please confirm ownership of the reports, models, calculations, drawings and datasets produced under the assignment, and whether the appointed service provider may reuse non-confidential methodologies, templates and know-how.	SCM	All reports, business cases, financial models, calculations, technical outputs, drawings and datasets developed specifically for this assignment shall become the property of the contracting authority and participating public-sector stakeholders upon completion and payment. The PSP may retain and reuse general material provided that project-specific deliverables / outputs are not reused in a manner that compromises confidentiality.
30	Will the twelve-month period commence on contract signature, purchase-order issue or formal kick-off, and are municipal and IDC review periods included?	Technical	The 12-month period will commence on formal kick-off and yes IDC and Municipal review periods are included.
31	Must the model present separate municipal project companies, a single aggregated special-purpose vehicle or both, and what model-review or audit standard is required?	Technical	The Financial Model will be informed by the outcomes of technical options analysis. Depending on whether the feasible solution is municipal-specific or regional, the model should be developed in tandem with the feasible solution.
32	What assumptions should bidders apply for electricity sales, municipal gate fees, recovered-material revenues, carbon finance, grants, debt terms, inflation and discount rates where verified inputs are unavailable?	Technical	These assumptions will be jointly defined and agreed during the study.
33	Please confirm minimum on-site attendance and municipal visit requirements, and whether travel, accommodation, subsistence and venue costs must be fixed amounts or reimbursable disbursements.	Technical	Bidders are expected to determine the extent and frequency of site visits and stakeholder engagements required to successfully deliver the scope of work and should price accordingly. There is no prescribed minimum number of on-site meetings or municipal visits. Bidders should propose an approach that they consider appropriate based on their methodology and understanding of the project requirements. Travel, accommodation, subsistence, venue hire, and other project-related expenses should be included under Section 7 of the RFP (Disbursements) and priced by the bidder as part of their proposal.
34	What waste, landfill, collection, tariff, energy-consumption, grid-capacity and contractual data will be available at inception, and in what formats?	Technical	As stipulated in the RFP, the study will only be shared with successful bidder.
35	Are any technologies prescribed, preferred or excluded, and should the assessment include materials recovery, composting, anaerobic digestion and refuse-derived fuel?	Technical	The feasibility study should apply the waste hierarchy and assess the quantity, composition and characteristics of the available waste streams. Where the assessment determines that there is insufficient suitable waste to support viable energy generation, the study should consider other technically and commercially viable waste treatment, recovery and beneficiation opportunities consistent with the waste hierarchy. The objective is therefore not to predetermine a solution, but to identify the most appropriate and feasible alternative waste treatment solution(s) based on the available waste streams and market opportunities.
36	Must existing private-sector waste-treatment initiatives be assessed as interfaces, competitors, off-takers or aggregation partners?	Technical	Yes. Please refer to Section 3.2 point #3 of the RFP, which requires the undertaking of market, waste supply, off-taker and options analyses as part of the broader assessment. For clarity, the existing scope is intended to encompass consideration of relevant market participants and prevailing market conditions where these are material to the analysis. This may include existing private-sector waste treatment initiatives to the extent necessary to inform the market assessment, waste supply assessment, off-taker analysis, and evaluation of feasible options. Bidders are expected to exercise professional judgement in addressing the prescribed analyses and assessments within the existing scope of work and deliverables.
37	Have candidate sites been identified, and will land-ownership, zoning, servitude and geotechnical information be provided?	Technical	The RFP requires the service provider to identify suitable sites and develop concept designs as part of the feasibility study.
38	Which entity will lead coordination and secure access to municipal officials, facilities, records, communities, regulators, Eskom and prospective off-takers?	Technical	Gauteng Department of CoGTA
39	Please confirm the governance structure, reporting templates, approval authorities and turnaround times for review and acceptance of deliverables.	Technical	Final decisions will be made through the programme governance structures. A Project Working Committee comprising representatives from COGTA, GIFA, ISA, and other relevant stakeholders will provide strategic guidance and oversight.
40	Please clarify the expected extent of market sounding and whether the service provider may engage technology suppliers, funders, operators and off-takers directly.	Technical	The Service Provider will be expected to contact the applicable stakeholders for market sounding

No.	Question	Type	Answer
41	May one suitably qualified individual fulfil more than one key-personnel role, and what substitution or availability conditions apply after award?	Technical	No. Each key personnel role must be assigned to a separate individual. Bidders may, however, propose additional support personnel as part of the project team. Post-award substitution of key personnel is generally not preferred. Should a substitution become necessary, the bidder must submit a written request to the IDC for approval. Any proposed replacement must possess qualifications, professional registration, and experience that are equivalent to or exceed those of the originally proposed individual. Additionally, the bidder must ensure that all proposed key personnel remain available to perform their designated roles throughout the contract period.
42	Must professional-registration certificates and SAQA evaluations be valid at bid closing, or may they be supplied before contract award?	Technical	Must be valid at bid closing date.
43	Please clarify how consortium and subcontractor work-value percentages will be evaluated and whether the prime contractor must perform the largest individual share.	SCM	Prime Contractor with Subcontractor(s) As stated in section 5.6 on page 5, where the bidding structure comprises a Prime Contractor and Subcontractor(s), the Prime Contractor then the Prime Contractor must not hold lower % of the contract value than any of the subcontractors. The percentage allocation must be supported by a signed agreement between the parties, clearly indicating the respective percentage share of the contract value and the portion of the scope of work to be undertaken by each party. Consortiums or Joint Ventures (JVs) Where the bidding structure is a Consortium or Joint Venture (JV), the IDC does not prescribe the percentage split between the parties. The participating parties may agree on the allocation of the contract value among themselves. Such arrangement must be supported by a signed Consortium or JV Agreement, clearly indicating the percentage participation of each party and the portion of the scope of work to be undertaken by each party.
44	Must Schedule 4 pricing be submitted as a separate encrypted or access-restricted file, and may any pricing information appear in the technical proposal?	SCM	For ease of screening and evaluation, bidders are requested to submit Schedule 4 (Pricing Schedule) as a separate file from the technical proposal. The pricing information should not be included in the technical proposal, as the technical and financial evaluations are conducted separately. While the file does not need to be encrypted or access-restricted unless specifically required in the bid documents, it should be clearly marked as "Pricing Proposal – Schedule 4" and submitted as a standalone document. Any pricing information contained within the technical proposal may result in the bidder's submission being treated as non-compliant with the bid submission requirements.
45	Please confirm page limits, file-size limits, naming conventions, electronic-signature requirements and whether appendices and CVs are excluded from page limits.	SCM	There are no prescribed page limits for submissions. However, bidders are strongly encouraged to submit their proposals well in advance of the closing date and time to avoid any last-minute system issues, upload delays, or other technical glitches that may prevent successful submission. In addition, bidders are requested to: Ensure that file names are clear and concise and are not excessively long. Structure and label submission documents appropriately to facilitate the evaluation process. Submit all required documentation in accordance with the bid requirements. No specific file-size limits, naming conventions, or electronic-signature requirements have been prescribed beyond the requirements contained in the bid documents. As there are no page limits, the question regarding the exclusion of appendices and CVs from page counts is not applicable.
46	If IDC issues addenda or clarification responses that materially affect scope, staffing, programme or pricing, will the closing date be extended?	SCM	The IDC reserves the right to extend the closing date, where deemed necessary, to ensure that all bidders have sufficient time to consider and respond to any material clarifications, amendments, or addenda issued during the bidding process. Any decision to extend the closing date will be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the nature and impact of the information provided. Should an extension be approved, all bidders will be notified through the same communication channels used for the bid process. Bidders are therefore encouraged to monitor all bid communications regularly and prepare their submissions in accordance with the published closing date unless formally advised otherwise.
47	The RFP provides functionality weightings but does not appear to specify the detailed scoring methodology. Kindly provide the detailed functionality scoring matrix and rating scale for each criterion, including how the allocated points of 30 for Relevant Experience, 30 for Methodology, 10 for Project Plan and 30 for Qualifications, Skills and Experience of the Team will be awarded, and the thresholds applicable to each scoring band.	SCM	The functionality criteria and associated weightings applicable to this tender are as set out in the RFP. Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the criteria and weightings published in the bid document. The IDC will assess submissions against the stated functionality requirements using its approved evaluation methodology and rating scale. No further scoring matrix or evaluation thresholds will be issued outside of the bid documentation. Bidders are encouraged to ensure that their submissions clearly demonstrate their capability, experience, methodology, project approach, and team qualifications against all functionality criteria contained in the RFP.
48	The RFP references multiple stakeholders, including IDC, Infrastructure South Africa, Gauteng Provincial Government, GIFA, participating municipalities and National Treasury. Kindly clarify the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder, including governance arrangements, stakeholder coordination, deliverable review responsibilities, approval authority, milestone-payment approval, and the final decision-making and sign-off authority for the feasibility study, Intermediate Business Case, funding application summary, preferred technology, preferred site and programme delivery model.	Technical	Please refer to Section 2.1 of the RFP and the project governance provisions under the General section of the RFP. The Project Working Group will serve as the primary forum for stakeholder engagement, coordination, and the review of project deliverables during the course of the assignment. All other provisions will form part of the Service Level Agreement (SLA), with the successful bidder.

No.	Question	Type	Answer
49	Should the Cost-Benefit Analysis assess each shortlisted technical option against the "Do Minimum" baseline, or should the detailed CBA only be undertaken for the preferred technical option once the technology options assessment has been completed?	Technical	The Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) should compare the preferred technical option against the "Do Minimum" (without-project) baseline scenario. The objective is to assess the incremental economic and social benefits attributable to the preferred option relative to maintaining the minimum level of service and continuing with the status quo. Accordingly, bidders are required to: 1. Define and quantify the "Do Minimum" scenario as the baseline case; 2. Develop and assess the preferred technical option; and 3. Undertake a detailed Cost-Benefit Analysis comparing the preferred option to the baseline scenario, including all relevant costs, benefits, externalities, risks, and sensitivity analyses. The focus of the feasibility study is to demonstrate the economic viability and value for money of the preferred technical option relative to the "Do Minimum" scenario.
50	For the economic Cost-Benefit Analysis, should the Transaction Advisor apply the relevant National Treasury economic appraisal guidelines and assumptions, or are there any project-specific assumptions or parameters prescribed by IDC/ISA that should be applied?	Technical	The Transaction Advisor should undertake the Economic Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) in accordance with the applicable National Treasury economic appraisal framework, methodologies, assumptions, and guidance. This should include the use of recognised economic appraisal principles, appropriate discount rates, shadow pricing methodologies (where applicable), and other parameters prescribed by National Treasury. At this stage, no project-specific economic appraisal assumptions or parameters are prescribed by IDC/ISA. However, bidders should clearly document all assumptions applied and ensure that these are appropriate to the project context. Should any project-specific requirements or assumptions emerge during the course of the study, these will be discussed and agreed with Project Working Committee as part of the project governance and review process. Accordingly, bidders should base the Economic CBA on the prevailing National Treasury guidance and best-practice economic appraisal methodologies while ensuring transparency and justification of all key assumptions.
51	Should the Value-for-Money assessment be undertaken in accordance with a specific National Treasury methodology, and should the assessment be undertaken quantitatively, qualitatively or using both approaches?	Technical	The Value-for-Money (VfM) assessment should be undertaken in accordance with applicable National Treasury guidelines and best-practice appraisal methodologies. The assessment should incorporate both quantitative and qualitative analyses. Quantitatively, the assessment should compare the costs, benefits, risks and expected outcomes of the preferred option against an appropriate baseline, and where applicable, make use of Public Sector Comparator (PSC) principles to assess whether the proposed solution delivers superior value relative to conventional public sector delivery. Qualitatively, the assessment should consider factors such as service delivery improvements, affordability, implementability, risk allocation, and broader socio-economic benefits. Accordingly, the VfM assessment should apply a combined quantitative and qualitative approach to demonstrate that the preferred option represents the most efficient, effective and economical use of public resources.
52	The RFP places much emphasis on Energy rather than the waste hierarchy. Is our interpretation correct that the project's emphasis should be on energy generation from waste rather than the full waste hierarchy.	Technical	The feasibility study should apply the waste hierarchy and assess the quantity, composition and characteristics of the available waste streams. Where the assessment determines that there is insufficient suitable waste to support viable energy generation, the study should consider other technically and commercially viable waste treatment, recovery and beneficiation opportunities consistent with the waste hierarchy. The objective is therefore not to predetermine a solution, but to identify the most appropriate and feasible alternative waste treatment solution(s) based on the available waste streams and market opportunities.
53	2.3 Project Objectives of the RFP states: "Assessing opportunities, where applicable, to integrate and interface with waste management projects within Gauteng metropolitan municipalities as part of the options analysis." It is common knowledge that the three metropolitan municipalities in Gauteng undertook waste-to-energy feasibility studies around 2014/2015/2016. Will these reports be made available and will the progress made by each metropolitan municipality towards the implementation of the recommendations be made available? Will the IDC arrange the interaction with these metropolitan municipalities since they are not directly part of the project?	Technical	The Gauteng Department of CoGTA will arrange interactions with the Metros.