

Compulsory Tender Briefing – Q&A

CLIENT	:	Airports Company South Africa
PROJECT	:	CTIA Construction GSE Workshops
REF NO	:	CTIA7374/2023/RFP
DATE	:	5 July 2024
TIME	:	10h00 – 12h00
PLACE	:	SOB – Executive Boardroom, 3rd Floor

The below are Questions and Answers to the Tender Briefing Meeting Presentation and subsequent emails from Bidders.

1.	<p>Q: Building C is to be converted into a Catering Facility - pg 10 of bid Document. When and how will the scope of this revision be clarified so Bidders can determine the extent of work required for bid purposes? This revised use for Building A is not mentioned in the NEC Contract Scope of Work pg 45 of 115 - which one is correct?</p> <p>A: The following has been removed from the Bid Document: Construction of the 3rd building as a Catering Facility (Building A) including its associated infrastructure. Replaced with: Construction of the 3rd building (Building A) including its associated infrastructure. Refer to Addendum No.1 & the Updated Bid Document.</p>
2.	<p>Q: How will Bidders prove they attended the Briefing and Site Inspection? What documents are to be used - or could you send copies of the attendance sheets so we can include those?</p> <p>A: The Tender Briefing & Site Inspection Registers have been uploaded on etender.</p>
3.	<p>Q: 11.2(9) in the NEC document does not mention Architecture Services. Is this a deliberate omission?</p> <p>A: Clause 11.2(9) in the NEC3 PSC document has been amended accordingly to reflect all the required Professional Services. Refer to Addendum No.1 & the Updated NEC PSC document.</p>
4.	<p>Q: 22.2 in the NEC document - Architect is excluded from the list of Consultants. Is this correct?</p> <p>A: Clause 22.1 under C1.2 Contract Data – Part 2 has been amended to reflect the required Consultants’ key persons. Refer to Addendum No.1 & the Updated Bid Document.</p>
5.	<p>Q: Are Architects expected to tender full scope fees for each of Stage 3, 4, 5 & 6 or only the amount we think is required for that Stage on the assumption that Stages 3 & 4 were completed by the previous team and no changes are required? This is partly dependent on the answer to Question 1 above regarding reference to the catering facility in Building A. On the Architect pricing Schedule pg 29 of 115 no qualification of scope on any stage from 3 to 6 is recorded although it was stated in the Briefing that only a Stage 3 Design Review and Stage 4 Documentation Review and updated Tender documents and Process would be required. The main variable here is whether ACSA wishes to change any aspect of the previously approved and tendered design and the proportion of that change as re-design, council approval, etc. would then be required.</p> <p>A: Refer to the Consultants’ scope of work under Part C3 in the NEC3 Professional Services Contract.</p>

6.	<p>Q: Without some definition of any reduced scope for each stage it appears that we should tender for full scope of work for Stages 3 to 6 based on R30m Capex. Is this correct? The implications are that some tenderers may reduce fees on an assumption of a reduced scope of work while others may tender on full scope. The latter would be at a disadvantage for competitive tender pricing but the former may find themselves having tendered too low if the scope is not as reduced as they assumed!!</p> <p>A: This tender is for the completion of the remaining works, refer to Part C3 under 1.1 Project Scope for the Remaining Works in the NEC3 PSC which states the following: The consultant team will be appointed to assess the works completed, analyse the material on site, evaluate the required effort to complete the remaining works and compile a construction tender taking into account the site conditions. The fee proposal per discipline except for the ECO, must be a percentage fee based on the estimated cost of works.</p>
7.	<p>Q: Based on below Table 1 (image below) Please confirm if a discipline e.g. Architect can submit a BID for architectural services ONLY. With NO team / Consortium.</p> <p>A: Yes, Bidders can tender for any of the discipline(s) and to indicate which service/s they are submitting for by ticking the box provided on the table found on page 2 in the Bid Document. Note: Each discipline will be evaluated separately.</p>
8.	<p>Q: Can a specific discipline submit a bid under a Consortium (as a Team) and submit individual price for a specific discipline separately.</p> <p>A: Yes.</p>
9.	<p>Q: What is the PI Insurance requirement for Architects.</p> <p>A: Refer to the ACSA Insurances Clauses on Annexure 5.3 in the NEC3 Professional Services Contract document.</p>
10.	<p>Q: Must the PI Insurance amount be current in place or would a letter from insurance stating should the tender be awarded that the PI insurance can be increased, suffice.</p> <p>A: Refer to Annexure J in the Bid Document, the bidder must acknowledge that, in the event of their bid being successful, the necessary insurance requirements shall be met prior to signing of the contract.</p>
11.	<p>Q: Experience on Similar Projects: In the functionality table, the bidder's experience on similar projects is based on the construction value of the project. How will you assess a project that is based on a framework running over several years with multiple work packages of varying construction values? Will such a framework project be assessed as one project with its cumulative value, or will each work package be assessed separately? While the cumulative value of the framework project exceeds the values stated in the bid document, individual work packages may not meet the required values. If they do meet the values, will they be considered as separate projects? Please note that for framework projects, only one reference letter or contact detail is available, and it is regarded as one project by the City of Cape Town and the Western Cape Government.</p> <p>A: Individual work package from a framework project will be accepted for evaluation on condition that it complies with the requirements in the functionality criteria. One reference letter should suffice and list all relevant work packages with applicable construction values.</p>

12.	<p>Q: Professional Bodies: Are international professional bodies such as RICS accepted if an individual can demonstrate experience working in South Africa, or if they are in the process of registering with the South African council?</p> <p>A: The only professional bodies which are acceptable as per the tender are those mentioned in the functionality criteria.</p>
13.	<p>Q: Client references attached to Appendix C – as per projects listed Appendix B We've done several projects for the same anchor client, will it be acceptable to have 1 (one) reference letter speaking to all projects listed on Appendix B?</p> <p>A: Yes, Bidders are to ensure that contactable reference details such as a telephone number and email address are included the Bid Document.</p>
14.	<p>Q: Pricing schedule refers to Estimated Cost of Works – R 45 000 000 – Project Management Fee schedule only has cost reference of R 30 000 000 Is there a reason PM services are not being priced on full estimated cost of works?</p> <p>A: Estimated Cost of Works per discipline has been updated, refer to Addendum No.1 & the Updated NEC Professional Services Contract document.</p>
15.	<p>Q: Annexure G – Transformation Framework & Specification - Document references CPG is 50% Clarification required that even QSE tendering must also achieve CPG of 50%, thus if QSE is not at least 55% Black Owned and sub-contracts 70% of the work to a 100% Black Owned EME/QSE – tenderer is unable to achieve the 50% CPG target? Is that then deemed as non-responsive tenderer?</p> <p>A: To facilitate achievement of CPG targets, and transfer of skills, the tenderer may subcontract up to 30% of the contract value. The Transformation annexure in the Bid document is to be signed by Bidders for commitment to the above.</p>
16.	<p>Q: We are interested in tendering for the above-mentioned tender, we realised when we download the forms that there is no C2 and C3, can you kindly add them in the website for download please.</p> <p>A: Refer to the NEC3 Professional Services Contract document.</p>
17.	<p>Q: The tenders will be evaluated on an individual basis.</p> <p>A: Yes.</p>
18.	<p>Q: If the tenders are submitted as a multi – disciplinary tender, can it be done as a sub consultant agreement or must it be a JV</p> <p>A: Both are acceptable, there are no restrictions – supporting documents are to be submitted such as sub-consultancy agreement/ JV agreement.</p>
19.	<p>Q: We are interested in forming a JV / Consortium and would like to enquire if it would pose any issues that our Quantity Surveyor (QS) did not attend the briefing.</p> <p>A: This should not pose any issues if those attended the briefing & site inspection becomes Lead JV/ those who did not attend the briefing session decides to form part of subconsultants.</p>
20.	<p>Q: We note the functionality requirement on page 52, item 1.7 which states that the Environment Control Officer (ECO) must be “professionally registered with the SACNSP in environmental management field” (sic). We interpret this as requiring the ECO to be a registered Professional Natural Scientist with the South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions (SACNASP).</p> <p>A: The interpretation is correct.</p>

21.	<p>Q: Since there is no 'environmental management' field of practice in terms of the Natural Scientific Professions Act of 2003, we further assume that this is intended to refer to registration in the Environmental Science field of practice.</p> <p>A: Registration in the Environmental Science field of practice is correct.</p>
22.	<p>Q: Leaving aside the legal and technical inaccuracies of the specification, there is a significant problem with requiring the ECO to be a professional natural scientist. The identification of work for the field of practice Environmental Science in terms of Section 27 of Act 27 of 2003, issued by SACNASP, does not identify the monitoring of construction activities as a type of work which may be performed only by registered persons. In practice, as any ECO with experience of the industry will attest, ECOs do not require professional registration.</p> <p>A: The requirement for SACNASP professional registration is ACSA's requirement, not a legal requirement, and in the absence of a professional registration body recognising ECOs, we are entitled to include whatever hurdle we deem appropriate. This particular SACNASP hurdle is included to ensure the person appointed to this role has a credible level of expertise.</p>
23.	<p>Q: Environmental Assessment Practitioners Association of South Africa (EAPASA) are the only registration authority for Environmental Assessment Practitioners, and although as mentioned ECO's do not require professional registration, EAPASA registration would be more appropriate or relevant.</p> <p>A: ACSA has in the past included EAPASA registration requirement in the functionality criteria, and there was an outcry that this was far too stringent (EAPASA does not regulate ECOs, but rather Environmental Assessment Practitioners, who do EIAs). And so, we have historically settled on the more moderate, middle-ground SACNASP professional registration.</p>
24.	<p>Q: Of far more value is a suitable qualification in the natural sciences, together with at least five years of similar experience.</p> <p>A: Yes, this is true, and if a Bidder's resource has such qualifications and experience, they can merely register with SACNASP to vet their qualifications and experience. A Bidder should have no trouble in registering their resources if they indeed have the requisite experience and qualifications.</p>
25.	<p>Q: Do we have to list all the listed professionals on the "The Consultant's key persons", page 19 – 20 of the contract document, or just on the categories tendered for?</p> <p>A: Bidders are to list only the categories they are tendering for.</p>