

Clarification questions for the NLCC Bids

Name	NBI / RMF/ NLCC-ENG-24-1005
Date	2024/01/12

1. Question related to the Scope of Work

Question	Response
1.1) Kindly confirm that the scope of work entails Workstream 1 only (since Table 3, road map activity indicates that project delivery plans are required for each workstream).	Yes, it is just workstream 1. The other tables etc in the document are designed to provide broader context on how NLCC works.
1.2) What is the port/maritime battery limit in principle? It is assumed that the corridors start/end at the terminal berths but exclude e.g. marine services?	This would be the kind of issue that the service provider would need to advise on after appointment in discussion with NLCC.
1.3) Kindly confirm that for the Coal Corridor, only the RBCT terminal is considered (not e.g. MPT and RBTG).	Advice may be sought by NLCC on any other elements of the logistics system, ports or rail in workstream 1 through the life of NLCC. The list given in the RFP is indicative of the initial focus.
1.4) The description of the tasks of Workstream 1 refers to infrastructure, rolling stock/equipment and operations. The Purpose (section 3) indicates that the ultimate objective is planning and implementation of infrastructure projects (only). Kindly confirm that the scope includes all three aspects (infrastructure, equipment, and operations).	Assume an expansive definition of infrastructure including all elements.

1.5) Workstream 1 requires the service provider to build on work already done. Kindly confirm at what point of the delivery cycle the assignment commences. It is our understanding that corridor recovery plans with identified projects are already available.	Some work by some stakeholders has already occurred and this work is being taken up into NLCC. NLCC will need advice on the credibility and completeness of these plans and how they can be implemented. Bidders should assume work is at an early stage so far though successful bidders will be fully briefed during onboarding as to status.
1.5.1) Is the Logistics Action Plan (LAP) something different from these plans? Is the service provider expected to further develop or update the Plan before assessing the component interdependencies and developing the implementation plan?	The action plan is an overarching Transnet framework and whilst it may flex slightly in response to consultations and input from successful bidders and other stakeholders, at the bidding stage bidders should largely assume it is final.
1.5.2) Does the service provider scope potentially include any design work?	Yes, additional advice and insight might be required by NLCC for them to implement action plans.
1.6) Kindly confirm that the focus of the assignment is the projects in the LAP that can be substantially progressed within the one year of the assignment, i.e. excluding long-term capacity enhancing projects (except to the extent that front-end actions for these projects need to be carried out in the one year).	This is a substantial part of the work yes.
1.7) What is the distinction between the “detailed delivery plan on allocated projects” and the “detailed project plan” (section 4.2). Is the second an overall plan/programme where individual projects are identified/prioritised, and these individual projects are then each presented in a detailed delivery plan?	One should be considered the firm deliverables to expect and the other more detailed on how it will happen and the KPIs to monitor.
1.8) If our understanding in question 0 is correct, should the overall plan not be approved (month 1) before individual projects are unpacked (maybe month 2)?	NLCC will require some sense of all of this together albeit clearly there will be some iterative process.

2. Questions related to Team Composition.

Question	Response
2.2) Successful implementation of short-term solutions that can rectify the logistics crisis are heavily influenced by environmental approval processes. We furthermore believe that solutions (even if short-term) must still be in line with the country's sustainable development goals and NDP for 2030 so that they don't become quick-fixes that are redundant after a certain period of time and don't contribute to the sustainability of the county's logistics system. Lastly, infrastructure not only impacts on the environment but is also impacted on by the environment or natural elements as evident from recent floods in KZN. We have therefore identified a team member with a HONS B.Sc. in Environmental Science to provide support. Will his qualification be regarded as "relevant"?	We cannot give this kind of adjudication in advance the bidder should use best judgement in structuring the team and explain rational in the bid.
2.3) Similar to 2.2, we have identified a Infrastructure Economist with a Master's Degree in Economics. He focuses on integrating economics, engineering, financial and legal aspects of public and private infrastructure projects. Will his qualification be regarded as "relevant"?	We cannot give this kind of adjudication in advance the bidder should use best judgement in structuring the team and explain rational in the bid.

3. Questions related to level of effort

Question	Response
3.1) Although the initial tasks (road map and risks) can be reasonably projected by bidders, the subsequent level of effort will be influenced by the number, types and locations of projects proposed.	This is what the bidders have to outline in the bid.
3.2) Must the "160 hours" reference in Table be understood to be just an example, or is this indicative of the effort level anticipated?	This is an example only and not indicative.
3.3) Otherwise, can an indicative estimate of effort be provided to all bidders up-front?	We are unfortunately not in a position to provide cost estimates.

3.4) It is assumed that the quantum of work (hours proposed by the bidders) will be standardised in the financial evaluation.	General comment on these question - the bids are adjudicated cognisant of this uncertainty in providing a bid on this type of RFP and the uncertainty around the project.
---	---

4. Question related to available information

Question	Response
4.1) Kindly avail the latest Freight Logistics Roadmap (as approved in December 2023) and the Logistics Action Plan.	The final version of the roadmap is not yet public, a draft that is substantially similar to the final version is available on the DOT website.
4.2) Kindly list the “available materials and plans developed by the NLCC” (refer Table 3, road map activity) together with a brief description (Executive Summary or Table of Contents).	This is confidential and not available to bidders. Bidders should assume there are a broad range of plans and documentation from a range of stakeholders involved.

5. Questions related to Project Governance

Question	Response
5.1) The delivery timeline is short, and fast turn-around of material will be essential. Kindly confirm that the service providers’ outputs will be approved by the NLCC Secretariat only. If also the NLCC itself, or other organisations, kindly indicate what turn-around times should be expected.	The relationship is with the secretariat who will sign off produced work from an RMF perspective. That said the secretariat may well layer in various consultations with stakeholders inside and outside NLCC as appropriate within work.
5.2) Will recommendations made by RCE preclude RCE or individuals forming part of its team from participation in future tenders based on the recommendations?	RMF cannot answer this question from the perspective of NLCC, government or Transnet etc – it would not prevent successful bidders from applying for any future RMF work.
5.3) The NLCC Terms of Reference nominates “Work stream members” for every workstream. In the case of Workstream 1, these are DoT, DPE, Operation Vulindlela (all part of the NLCC	We believe the RFP is self-explanatory here.

Secretariat) as well as Transnet, rail network users, port users and private sector experts. Kindly confirm through which structure these key decision-makers will participate?

5.4) Does the Project Management Office (PMO) already exist? Or will the service provider establish this office? If the service provider, kindly confirm that it will be a virtual office and specific to Workstream 1 only?	Per the other RFP for the PMO, it will cover all workstreams.
5.5) Kindly point out the role in this assignment of the Joint Strategic Operations Committee (JSOC) referred to in the NLCC Terms of Reference?	The JSOC is an oversight body of the collaboration between government and business on priority reform areas. It is likely not relevant for this RFP and work.
5.6) Kindly point out the role in this assignment of the NLCC Corridor Recovery Teams (CRTs). What will the relationship be between PMO and CRTs?	The PMO and secretariat will take in work and advice from the CRTs and from this set of advisory roles in this RFP in question. There will likely need to be discussion with CRTs as key stakeholders in the process.
5.7) What is the “business donated transport engineering and/or transport planning specialists’ team” referred to in the last row of Table 3? Kindly indicate its status and role in this assignment.	See the other RFPs published.
5.8) Kindly confirm that the PMO will monitor and report progress, but will not have executive authority over the parties (assumed to be mostly Transnet) that actually carry out the projects?	The PMO will not have executive authority but others in NLCC do have political, executive, shareholder, corporate and other sorts of authority.

Name	NBI / RMF/ 12012024
Date	2024/01/12

1. Question related to the Scope of Work

Question	Response
1.1) Kindly confirm that the scope of work entails Workstream 1 only (since Table 3, road map activity indicates that project delivery plans are required for each workstream).	Yes, it is just workstream 1. The other tables etc in the document are designed to provide broader context on how NLCC works.
1.2) What is the port/maritime battery limit in principle? It is assumed that the corridors start/end at the terminal berths but exclude e.g. marine services?	This would be the kind of issue that the service provider would need to advise on after appointment in discussion with NLCC.
1.3) Kindly confirm that for the Coal Corridor, only the RBCT terminal is considered (not e.g. MPT and RBTG).	Advice may be sought by NLCC on any other elements of the logistics system, ports or rail in workstream 1 through the life of NLCC. The list given in the RFP is indicative of the initial focus.
1.4) The description of the tasks of Workstream 1 refers to infrastructure, rolling stock/equipment and operations. The Purpose (section 3) indicates that the ultimate objective is planning and implementation of infrastructure projects (only). Kindly confirm that the scope includes all three aspects (infrastructure, equipment, and operations).	Assume an expansive definition of infrastructure including all elements.
1.5) Workstream 1 requires the service provider to build on work already done. Kindly confirm at what point of the delivery cycle the assignment commences. It is our understanding that corridor recovery plans with identified projects are already available.	Some work by some stakeholders has already occurred and this work is being taken up into NLCC. NLCC will need advice on the credibility and completeness of these plans and how they can be implemented. Bidders should assume work is at an early stage so far though successful bidders will be fully briefed during onboarding as to status.
1.6) Is the Logistics Action Plan (LAP) something different from these plans? Is the service provider expected to further develop or update the Plan before assessing the component interdependencies and developing the implementation plan?	The action plan is an overarching Transnet framework and whilst it may flex slightly in response to consultations and input from successful bidders and other stakeholders, at

	the bidding stage bidders should largely assume it is final.
1.6.1) Does the service provider scope potentially include any design work?	Yes, additional advice and insight might be required by NLCC for them to implement action plans.
1.6.2) Kindly confirm that the focus of the assignment is the projects in the LAP that can be substantially progressed within the one year of the assignment, i.e. excluding long-term capacity enhancing projects (except to the extent that front-end actions for these projects need to be carried out in the one year).	This is a substantial part of the work yes.
1.6.3) What is the distinction between the “detailed delivery plan on allocated projects” and the “detailed project plan” (section 4.2). Is the second an overall plan/programme where individual projects are identified/prioritised, and these individual projects are then each presented in a detailed delivery plan?	One should be considered the firm deliverables to expect and the other more detailed on how it will happen and the KPIs to monitor.
1.8) If our understanding in question 0 is correct, should the overall plan not be approved (month 1) before individual projects are unpacked (maybe month 2)?	NLCC will require some sense of all of this together albeit clearly there will be some iterative process.

2. Questions related to Team Composition.

Question	Response
2.1) What are the anticipated designations (titles) of the 9 team members? I.e. how is a team of this size anticipated to be structured?	Bidders can define this themselves as they see fit.
2.2) Successful implementation of short-term solutions that can rectify the logistics crisis are heavily influenced by environmental approval processes. We furthermore believe that solutions (even if short-term) must still be in line with the country's sustainable development goals and NDP for 2030 so that they don't become quick-fixes that are redundant after a certain period of time and don't contribute to	We cannot give this kind of adjudication in advance the bidder should use best judgement in structuring the team and explain rational in the bid.

the sustainability of the county's logistics system. Lastly, infrastructure not only impacts on the environment but is also impacted on by the environment or natural elements as evident from recent floods in KZN. We have therefore identified a team member with a HONS B.Sc. in Environmental Science to provide support. Will his qualification be regarded as "relevant"?	
--	--

3. Questions related to level of effort

Question	Response
3.1) Although the initial tasks (road map and risks) can be reasonably projected by bidders, the subsequent level of effort will be influenced by the number, types and locations of projects proposed.	This is what the bidders have to outline in the bid.
3.2) Must the “160 hours” reference in Table be understood to be just an example, or is this indicative of the effort level anticipated?	This is an example only and not indicative.
3.3) Otherwise, can an indicative estimate of effort be provided to all bidders up-front?	We are unfortunately not in a position to provide cost estimates.
3.4) It is assumed that the quantum of work (hours proposed by the bidders) will be standardised in the financial evaluation.	General comment on these question - the bids are adjudicated cognisant of this uncertainty in providing a bid on this type of RFP and the uncertainty around the project.

4. Question related to available information

Question	Response
4.1) Kindly avail the latest Freight Logistics Roadmap (as approved in December 2023) and the Logistics Action Plan.	The final version of the roadmap is not yet public, a draft that is substantially similar to the final version is available on the DOT website.
4.2) Kindly list the “available materials and plans developed by the NLCC” (refer Table 3, road map activity) together with a brief description (Executive Summary or Table of Contents).	This is confidential and not available to bidders. Bidders should assume there are a broad range of plans and documentation from a range of stakeholders involved.

5. Questions related to Project Governance

Question	Response
5.1) The delivery timeline is short, and fast turn-around of material will be essential. Kindly confirm that the service providers' outputs will be approved by the NLCC Secretariat only. If also the NLCC itself, or other organisations, kindly indicate what turn-around times should be expected.	The relationship is with the secretariat who will sign off produced work from an RMF perspective. That said the secretariat may well layer in various consultations with stakeholders inside and outside NLCC as appropriate within work.
5.2) Will recommendations made by RCE preclude RCE or individuals forming part of its team from participation in future tenders based on the recommendations?	RMF cannot answer this question from the perspective of NLCC, government or Transnet etc – it would not prevent successful bidders from applying for any future RMF work.
5.3) The NLCC Terms of Reference nominates "Work stream members" for every workstream. In the case of Workstream 1, these are DoT, DPE, Operation Vulindlela (all part of the NLCC Secretariat) as well as Transnet, rail network users, port users and private sector experts. Kindly confirm through which structure these key decision-makers will participate?	We believe the RFP is self-explanatory here.
5.4) Does the Project Management Office (PMO) already exist? Or will the service provider establish this office? If the service provider, kindly confirm that it will be a virtual office and specific to Workstream 1 only?	Per the other RFP for the PMO, it will cover all workstreams.
5.5) Kindly point out the role in this assignment of the Joint Strategic Operations Committee (JSOC) referred to in the NLCC Terms of Reference?	The JSOC is an oversight body of the collaboration between government and business on priority reform areas. It is likely not relevant for this RFP and work.
5.6) Kindly point out the role in this assignment of the NLCC Corridor Recovery Teams (CRTs). What will the relationship be between PMO and CRTs?	The PMO and secretariat will take in work and advice from the CRTs and from this set of advisory roles in this RFP in question. There will likely need to be discussion with CRTs as key stakeholders in the process.

Name	NBI / RMF/ NLCC-PMO 24-1001
------	-----------------------------

Date	2024/01/12
-------------	------------

Questions	Response
1)Please could you confirm the electronic submission dates and times as follows	NLCC-PMO 24-1001 is due 16th January @ 14H00 NLCC-POL 24-1004 is 16th January @ 14H00 NLCC-Strat ADV 24-1006 is 17th January @ 12h00
2)The RFPs refers to the DPSA Consultant (L 13-L15) as a guideline.	
2.1) The most recent published rates are for 2020	https://www.dpsa.gov.za/dpsa2g/documents/gics/Fees%20July%202020.pdf
2.2) Should these be used, or can they be adjusted to reflect inflation over the last four years?	An inflation rate will be considered
3) The RFPs requests Client Reference Letters as per ANNEXURE A to the RFP documents.	
4) We have noted the considerable inter-dependency across all the RFP's. Given this, would the NBI / NLCC be open to a single submission from a consortium addressing several of the RFP's? Not only would this enhance coordination but is likely to introduce cost savings and efficiencies.	A single submission for the company will be allowed. Please ensure that the Methodology, Budgets and Resource Teams for each bid are clearly referenced for ease of evaluation.
5) Line 6 of page 10 specifies that all copies (of a B-BBEE certificate or affidavit) must be authenticated by a registered Commissioner of Oaths. Blue Planet Consulting has an original B-BBEE certificate from the CIPC which was retrieved digitally. Please confirm whether we need to print this certificate and have it certified by a commissioner of oaths, or whether the original digital copy will suffice.	The original digital copy will suffice.
6) Line 12 of page 10 of the bid document specifies the requirement of 'Registration and Good standing with Compensation Fund, Department of Labour, or private insurance'.	COID Act requires that all employers register with the Dept of Labour even if they have 1 employee. This is a legal requirement.

Can you confirm whether, given the online nature of the work, this requirement is necessary for administrative compliance with the bid?	Only the Public Sector is exempt and industries that have their own Insurance Funds such as Mining and certain Building Industries
7) Line 13 of page 10 of the bid document specifies the requirement of a Professional Liability Insurance Certificate. We want to confirm whether such insurance is a mandatory requirement for this bid?	<p>Given that this is a supporting role to the Project Management Office of the NLCC, it will be acceptable to have this as an optional requirement.</p> <p>The performance and possible risks will be covered in the contractual arrangements with the successful bidder.</p>

M Rambharos, P Modise, S Mojapelo, S Naidoo, T Unser, Z
Mariani.F Koor (ex-officio) **Company Secretary:** G Hutchings