

RFP 36/2016 - Appointment of Consultants to Conduct Building Condition Assessments at Specified Properties:

Feedback on questions received by the Tender office from prospective bidders;

PART 1

COMPULSORY BRIEFING QUESTIONS:

No.	Question	Answer
1.	Will SARS complete Part 1 – of the CIDB Standard Professional services contract on page 18?	This will be negotiated with the winning bidder, no need for the bidders to populate
2.	Is there going to be a Standard Contingency on the Pricing for all the prospective?	Zero across board, this will only be negotiated with the winning bidder
3.	Is the clause 5.3.1.1 of the Main RFP about the Joint Ventures (JV) applicable?	Clause 5.3.1.1 of the Main RFP is not applicable

PART 2

PRICING RELATED:

No.	Question	Answer
1.	Is the bidder expected to submit a separate MS Excel spreadsheet for the tender pricing?	Yes – Bidders are required to submit signed hardcopy of their pricing submission including Excel version.
2.	How are the bidders required to price for various assessments?	Bidders must note and read the notes on the pricing template which were issued. Bidders' price for each assessment must be inclusive off all relevant tests in line with the scope of works as issued in the tender. Any further cost

		for tests which will be required post issuing initial report, the bidder will be required to provide a separate quotation which will be approved by SARS.
3.	The pricing template has sub-totals for the work to be done in each Province but no provision has been made for a sub-total for the work in the Western Cape - please clarify.	The pricing template which is issued on SARS website doesn't have sub-totals.
4.	During the Briefing Session it was stated that a unit tariff per square meter needs to be entered into the pricing template - please clarify.	Statement correction: The bidders are to input total bid price per assessment.

MAIN RFP RELATED:

No.	Question	Answer
1.	<p>Page 3 of 19 paragraph 1.1 item 5 in table refers to Response Templates i.e. plural. Kindly confirm that the following templates are involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for the organisation of a Tender response as defined in paragraph 8.1 on page 19 of 19. • A separate MS Excel spreadsheet for the tender pricing. • CIDB contract. 	Yes but not limited to
2.	<p>Page 3 of 19, paragraph 1.2, confirm that the following key date can be added to the table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses to questions will be 	No, this date cannot be added on the table however the date to respond to the prospective bidders will be 10 January as discussed in the Compulsory briefing session

	posted by SARS on their web-site by 10 January 2017.	
3.	<p>Page 4 of 19, paragraph 4.1 states that <i>the primary objective of this RFP is to conclude one or more service agreements with successful Bidders...</i> Also paragraph 8.1 on page 19 of 19 states <i>...whether the Bidder is responding to portions of the Tender, or the Tender as a whole, ...</i></p> <p>Kindly confirm the information provided at the Briefing Session that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bidders must respond to the entire Tender and cannot submit a proposal for a portion of the work. 	We hereby confirm that the bid must be all inclusive
4.	SARS will appoint only one successful Bidder for the implementation of the entire project	Yes , however Joint ventures and subcontracting will be allowed
5.	Page 5 of 19, paragraph 5.3.1.1 states that ... the warranties of performance required. Kindly define the performance warranties that must be provided.	This clause is not applicable for this project and will be retracted
5.	Page 9 of 19, paragraph 6.2.1 defines the SBD documents that should be completed and paragraph 8.1 on page 19 of 19 shows that these should be include in Section 1 of File 1. However, since this tender follows the two envelope process, we feel that all SBD documentation related to price or BBEE-status should be included in the financial submission. Therefore kindly confirm that the following forms should be included in Section 1 of File 2 :	Please stick to the 8.1 Organisation of a Tender response due to the fact that all SBDs must be evaluated before the technical gate

SCOPE OF WORK RELATED:

No.	Question	Answer
1.	The tender calls for different specialist consultants (engineering services such as mechanical, electrical, structural, civil etc.) and also makes reference to a lot of architectural matters that require attention. Please confirm whether the tender is a comprehensive or whether we can choose to only tender on all engineering related services (Electrical, Mechanical, Wet, Fire, Electronic (incl. BMS), Lifts, Sustainability, Structural and Civil)?	The Consultants to provide a full end to end comprehensive building condition assessment, provision must be made to include all related services.
2.	Please explain which assessments specified for the consultants in building condition for tender No: RFP36/2016. On the bulletin it written only building condition assessments.	A full end to end comprehensive building condition assessment
3.	Must we price all building listed on the pricing schedule or can we only price the buildings that are covered by our branch offices?	Bidders are expected to price all buildings listed in the pricing schedule.
4.	Page 2, paragraph 3.1 refers to the required liaison with the property owner. Kindly confirm that SARS has a person at each building that can form a channel for liaison with the property owner.	Communication has been sent to all Landlords whose buildings are part of the scope for this assessment. Further to that, the following regional managers can be contacted for assistance for access to the buildings. Please refer to the table below
5.	The aspects to be addressed under architectural work need to be defined. Kindly note that during the Briefing Session, landscaping work was referred to as an	Architectural aspects please see definition I don't think it should form part "appears that some concerns, even at the architectural design level, cannot be easily localized and specified in individual architectural components. Similar to the notion of aspect at the programming level, we say that these

	<p>architectural item but it is listed as a Civil item in the section 5.2.</p>	<p>concerns are crosscutting and denote so-called architectural aspects. Since the crosscutting property of architectural aspects is inherent we claim that these cannot be undone simply by redefining the software architecture using conventional architectural abstractions. In fact, we believe that like various aspect-oriented programming abstractions we need explicit mechanisms to identify, specify and evaluate aspects at the architecture design level.</p> <p>Current software architecture design methods do not make an explicit distinction between conventional architectural concerns that can be localized using current architectural abstractions and architectural concerns that crosscut multiple architectural components. The risk is that potential aspects might be easily overlooked during the software architecture design and remains unsolved at the design and programming level. This may lead to tangled code in the system and consequently the quality factors that the architecture analysis methods attempt to verify will still be impeded.”</p>
6.	<p>Page 3, contains various references to assessments where the briefing session made it clear that these must be more than visual assessments. The exact tests to be used are going to be dependent on the findings on site and the availability of detailed as-built drawings. There are a couple of options available from a pricing perspective:</p> <p>The suggestion was made at the Briefing Session that this should be a lump-sum as a prime cost or contingency item that enables all Bidders to submit equivalent financial proposals. The actual tests required will need to be motivated and quotes submitted prior for approval prior to execution. This gives uniformity amongst the Bidder’s financial</p>	<p>This will be negotiated with the winning bidder.</p>

	<p>proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatively, SARS can define the tests that they would require to be done with an estimated number of times that the test will be done and the Bidders can submit a unit tariff for conducting the test with an estimated cost based on the pre-defined number of tests. This gives transparency and uniformity amongst the Bidders' financial proposals. Worst option is to ask the Bidders to estimate the cost for testing since this will be a variable in the Bidders' proposals causing non-uniformity in the scope of work. 	
--	---	--

REGIONAL MANAGERS CONTACT (ONLY FOR LIASON WITH THE LANDLORD)

Name	Province	Email address	Contacts
Anton Senekal	FS,NC, GP (South)	asenekal@sars.gov.za	011- 8626067 / 0828480629
Chris Mogale	LP, MP, NW, GP	cmogale@sars.gov.za	0833871307
Rakshen Naidoo	KZN	rnaidoo@sars.gov.za	031-3287588 / 0798869339
Jude Sam	EC	jsam@sars.gov.za	041-5057507
Zulfa Naicker	WC	znaicker@sars.gov.za	021 – 4171490 / 0763113235