MINUTES OF THE BID SPECIFICATION COMMITTEE MEETING 003 FY26/27
HELD ON THE 26th OF MAY 2026
AT FOSKOR VIA MS TEAMS AT 11:00

1. ATTENDANCE:

1.1 Present

Vivek Sharma, VS – Chairperson
Letjatji Nkoana, LN – Alternate Chairperson
Gerhard Steenkamp, GS – Member
Jeffrey Segokodi, JS – Member
Jacky Manuel, JKM – Member *(non-voting)*
Jack Mollo, JMo – Member *(non-voting)*

1.2 Officials

Ben Thobejane, BT – Category Specialist
Ntwanano Mabulani, NM – Scribe
Sheila Bopoto, SB – Scribe *(FCS External Scribe)*

1.3 End-Users

Sanny Sehoana, SS – Pit Superintendent

1.4 Apologies

Joseph Mathebula, JM – Member
Richard Rammupudu, RR – Member *(non-voting)*
Audrit Mayenetja, AM – Member

1.0 OPENING AND WELCOME BY CHAIRMAN:

The Chairperson, VS, welcomed all present and declared the meeting duly constituted and open at 11h00.

2.0 CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA:

The agenda was approved, subject to the removal of item 7.2, "Supply of Copiers," due to the unavailability of the end-user, who was off sick and therefore unable to present the scope of work.

3.0 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Members, officials, and invitees were asked to declare any conflicts of interest in accordance with the approved agenda. GS indicated that he would present item 7.1, "Civil Minor Works," and the Committee agreed that, while he would present the item, he would not participate in the voting on it.

4.0 SAFETY TALK:

Members were encouraged to uphold honesty, which was described as the glue that holds the team together. It was highlighted that when each member fulfils their responsibilities with honesty and integrity, the team is able to function effectively as a well-oiled machine, built on trust and mutual respect.

5.0 MATTERS ARISING: None.

6.0 PENDING SCOPE OF WORK: None.

7.0 SCOPES OF WORK SUPPORTED ON A ROUND ROBIN BASIS:

7.1 SHUTDOWN WORK

The Committee noted that the electrical shutdown work had been approved on a round-robin basis during the previous week.

8.0 SCOPES OF WORK FOR APPROVAL:

8.1 CIVIL MINOR WORKS

GS presented the revised scope of work for civil minor works and building maintenance and repair work for a period of three (3) years, highlighting the following salient points:

a) The scope had previously been presented, during which RR had raised questions regarding the contracting strategy, and the possibility of separating the minor works. Consideration was also given to CIDB grading requirements, with the anticipated annual expenditure being used as the basis for determining the appropriate grading.

b) The total estimated cost over the three-year contract period would ordinarily require a CIDB grading of 5CE or 5GB. However, based on guidance from RR, the grading may be reduced to Level 3 when based on annual expenditure rather than the total contract value.

c) Each department and section would have its own suborder/order line (OL) number to manage and control budget allocations independently. Any additional funding requirements would need to be formally motivated.

d) No penalties were included as the work would be undertaken on a piece-job basis. A 5% retention amount would be withheld and released after three months, subject to there being no comebacks or defects.

e) The technical evaluation criteria would require bidders to demonstrate experience in civil building, plumbing, masonry, and related works, supported by relevant documentation. Evaluation would also consider the availability of equipment and tools, submission of at least three signed Quality Control Plans (QCPs) for similar work, the

company's organogram, and pricing of the complete Bill of Quantities (BOQ) in accordance with the tender instructions.

f) The BOQ used was based on the previous minor works contract, which had also been evaluated by PricewaterhouseCoopers, with only minor adjustments made to quantities. The BOQ covered various work categories, including artisans, excavations, backfilling, carpentry, plumbing, and equipment hire such as TLBs, concrete mixers, and electrical hammers, with equipment hire subject to approval by the 2.6.1.

8.1.1 Issues raised by the Committee:

a) The Chairperson highlighted that the CIDB grading should be determined based on the estimated annual expenditure rather than the total value of the three-year contract. The Chairperson enquired whether there would be a central administrator responsible for monitoring departmental expenditure and whether sufficient controls had been implemented within the system to prevent overspending. In response, GS explained that each department would have its own OL number and would only be able to spend within its allocated budget, without access to other departments' allocations. GS also highlighted that AM would perform an oversight role by monitoring expenditure, issuing job cards, and tracking recurring repairs to improve control and strategic management of maintenance activities.

b) The Chairperson recommended that the oversight role of AM and his department in centrally monitoring the contract budget be communicated to all departments to ensure awareness and alignment. He also recommended that departmental budget allocations be spread across the months of the contract period to prevent departments from exhausting their allocations prematurely and to ensure controlled monthly expenditure throughout the duration of the contract.

c) The Chairperson recommended that the team consider introducing appropriate penalties to strengthen contract management and provide leverage in instances of poor service delivery. In response, GS explained that contractor performance would be monitored through monthly progress reports covering matters such as incidents, manpower, completed and outstanding job cards, claims, expenditure, and escalations, with concerns being referred to procurement for the issuing of formal contractual letters. The Chairperson highlighted that reporting alone would not be sufficient without contractual penalty clauses and recommended further engagement to identify suitable penalty measures.

d) The Chairperson recommended that the job card template be reviewed to include a delivery period for each quoted job, as this would enable the service provider to be held accountable to its own proposed timelines and support the application of penalties in cases of non-performance. The Chairperson sought clarity on the retention provision of 5% retention after three months. GS clarified that the retention would apply to individual job cards or work orders rather than the overall contract value and would serve as security against comebacks or defects on completed work. The Chairperson suggested that the wording be clarified to avoid ambiguity and suggested that consideration also be given to applying a 5% retention on the annual contract value, to be released three months after completion of each contract year. GS confirmed that further discussions would be held with procurement to determine the most practical and effective approach.

e) The Chairperson recommended that the technical evaluation criteria relating to QCPs be clarified to specify that bidders are required to submit QCPs from previous similar work completed.

f) On the technical evaluation criteria, item (e) relating to the BOQ, the Chairperson highlighted that the requirement for bidders to fully complete and price the BOQ should not form part of the technical evaluation criteria as failure to do so already constituted a commercial disqualification. JMo confirmed this and explained that the fully completed BOQ is included as a compulsory or mandatory submission requirement within the tender documents, with bidders being disqualified should they fail to fully complete the BOQ.

g) The Chairperson raised concerns that the BOQ quantities had remained unchanged from the previous contract, despite the previous contract value having been depleted before the expiry of the contract term. He enquired whether the quantities should be adjusted to avoid a recurrence. In response, GS explained that the BOQ had

been benchmarked against the available minor works budget in JD Edwards, estimated at about R2.3 million to R2.5 million per year, and that expenditure controls linked to OL allocations and approved budgets within the system would assist in managing costs over the contract period. GS indicated that, based on these controls and available budgets, he was satisfied that the BOQ quantities were appropriate.

h) On page 6, bullet 2, LN recommended the removal of the word “hours”.

i) On page 6, JS recommended rephrasing bullet 3 to indicate that the service provider must arrive within 3 hours to attend to repair work. On the last bullet, he recommended specifying where the monthly progress report would be submitted. On page 7, he also recommended inserting a brief explanation or summary regarding the minor works form. JS also indicated that the scope should clearly specify whether the service provider would be required to supply their own PDS or whether it would be provided by Foskor.

j) JS proposed that consideration be given to including a mechanism within the technical evaluation criteria to provide some preference or advantage to local service providers, noting that minor works did not constitute a highly specialised service. JMo advised that previous practice notes relating to local content had been withdrawn and indicated uncertainty regarding whether local preference criteria could currently be applied. JKM highlighted that the issue had been raised previously in engagements with local forums and that the inclusion of local preference measures was understood to be under consideration in the latest policy. JMo was requested to check on the policy provisions on local content and provide feedback to the Committee.

k) JS sought clarity on the requirement for bidders to demonstrate civil building, plumbing, and minor works experience within the last four years, specifically whether companies with older experience but no recent activity would be excluded from scoring. GS confirmed that bidders without relevant work undertaken within the past four years would not score for experience, as there would be no proof of their current operational capacity, workforce, or available equipment.

l) On the technical evaluation criteria, item (e), JS sought clarity on whether bidder experience would be evaluated based on the number of projects completed or the total value of the work undertaken. GS explained that the submitted information would be used to determine an overall score against the evaluation criteria. JS suggested that the criteria be clarified by separately assessing the quantity of projects completed and the value of the work undertaken. It was agreed that JS and GS would discuss this matter further outside of this meeting.

m) The Chairperson highlighted that the evaluation criteria appeared inconsistent, as the heading referred to experience within the last four years, thereby setting a threshold, while the scoring criteria focused on the duration of experience rather than the defined threshold period. The Chairperson highlighted that this could create confusion for bidders and recommended that the criteria be reviewed and aligned accordingly. He suggested that, following the removal of the BOQ completion criterion, 20 points had become available and could potentially be reallocated to a separate evaluation criterion as suggested by JS.

n) The Committee deliberated on the requirement for bidders to demonstrate relevant experience within the last four years, particularly whether the criterion could unfairly disadvantage companies with prior experience but no recent work history. Key considerations included the intention behind the requirement, the need to ensure that bidders had current operational capacity and resources, the potential exclusion of previously competent contractors due to the duration of the contract cycle, and the need for the criteria to be clearly worded and unambiguous for bidders. GS clarified that, as currently worded, a bidder would still score if they provided dates showing relevant work undertaken within the four-year period, even if the work was not continuous. The Chairperson recommended that the wording of the criteria be simplified and clarified to ensure that bidders could easily understand the evaluation requirements.

o) The Chairperson enquired whether the new MIE/qualification verification requirement would be addressed within the RFP documentation or whether the requirement should be included in the scope of work by the end user. JMo was requested to check on this requirement and provide feedback to the Committee.

8.1.2 Resolution:

The BSC **did not support** the scope of work for civil minor works and building maintenance and repair work. GS was requested to effect the following changes and resubmit the scope for consideration at the next meeting:

i) Consider introducing suitable penalty clauses to strengthen contract management and address poor service delivery.
ii) Include a delivery period/timeline on the job card template for each quoted job.
iii) The wording regarding the 5% retention provision should be clarified to avoid ambiguity.
iv) Consideration should be given to applying a 5% retention on the annual contract value, to be released three months after completion of each contract year.
v) The technical evaluation criteria should specify that bidders must submit QCPs from previous similar work completed and remove item (e) as the completion of the full BOQ should not be part of the evaluation criteria.
vi) On page 6, bullet 2, remove the word "hours" and on bullet 3, the wording should state that the service provider must arrive within 3 hours to attend to repair work.
vii) On page 6, the document should indicate where the monthly progress reports must be submitted.
viii) A brief explanation or summary regarding the minor works form should be added on page 7.
ix) The scope should clearly specify whether the service provider must supply its own PDS or whether Foskor will provide it.
x) The experience evaluation criteria should be reviewed and aligned to eliminate inconsistencies between threshold requirements and scoring methodology. The wording should also be simplified and clarified to ensure bidders can easily understand the requirements.

At this point, the Committee agreed to consider the scope of work for the Inpit Dewatering and Shovel Cable Movement despite it not having been circulated to the Committee beforehand, to avoid delays in the process. SS was accordingly requested to join the meeting.

8.2 INPIT DEWATERING AND SHOVEL CABLE MOVEMENT

SS presented the revised scope of work for in-pit dewatering and shovel cable movement management in the North and South pits for a contract duration of three years. The revisions included additional detail regarding training requirements and clarification of transportation responsibilities for moving cables to the workshops. The revisions also clarified that certain responsibilities, including sump excavation, cranes, transportation, scaffolding, and COP training, would be provided by Foskor. Clarification was also added regarding the contractor's scope, specifically that their work would be hoisting the mass port onto the cable mass poles. In addition, amendments were made to the pricing schedule to provide clearer detail on hours and durations for pricing purposes, and cascading of points was incorporated into the technical evaluation criteria.

8.2.1 Issues raised by the Committee:

a) On the pricing schedule, the Chairperson recommended changing the wording "Total 36 Months" to "Total Amount for 36 Months" and "Duration Months" to "Contract Duration (Months)" to clearly indicate that the 36 months referred to the contract duration. The Chairperson also recommended combining the main pricing schedule and the table with the "site establishment and disestablishment" to make it one table.

b) JS recommended the removal of the term "LAC" under item 4.1 and correcting the spelling of "reeler" on item 4.2. On the BOQ total, he recommended that the pricing summary be clearly structured to indicate the amount excluding VAT, the VAT portion, and the total amount inclusive of VAT.

6.2.2 Resolution:

The BSC **supported** the scope of work for in-pit dewatering and shovel cable movement management in the North and South pits, subject to the following amendments:

i. Changing the wording "Total 36 Months" to "Total Amount for 36 Months" and "Duration Months" to "Contract Duration (Months)" to clearly indicate that the 36 months referred to the contract duration. In addition,

combining the main pricing schedule and the table with the "site establishment and disestablishment" to make it one table.

ii. Removing the term "LAC" under item 4.1 and correcting the spelling of "reeler" on item 4.2.

iii. Structure the BOQ total to indicate the amount excluding VAT, the VAT portion, and the total amount inclusive of VAT.

9.0. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES OF MEETING:

9.1 Minutes of 30 April 2026

The minutes of the BSC Meeting No 001 FY 26/27, held on 30 April 2026, were approved, subject to spacing being inserted between the points. The Chairperson was authorised to sign them as a correct record of the proceedings.

9.2 Minutes of 5 May 2026

The minutes of the BSC Meeting No 002 FY 26/27, held on 5 May 2026, were approved, subject to spacing being inserted between the points. The Chairperson was authorised to sign them as a correct record of the proceedings.

10.0 GENERAL ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

a) The Committee deliberated on the management and follow-up of scopes of work that had been presented but not supported. Key considerations included whether reminders should be issued to end-users, the responsibility for monitoring outstanding scopes, the need to allocate return dates for revised submissions, and the importance of improving accountability. The Committee agreed to adopt a process whereby presenters would commit to return dates for revised scopes, subject to agreement by the Committee.

b) The Committee also discussed the need for improved recordkeeping and traceability of scopes presented to the BSC, including the ability to easily identify when scopes were presented, approved, rejected, or returned for amendments, particularly for audit and governance purposes. Suggestions included the introduction of a tracking table or spreadsheet reflecting the status of all scopes and their return dates. It was agreed that a tracking table would be developed to monitor the status of scopes considered by the BSC.

11.0 CLOSURE AND NEXT MEETING

There being no further matters for discussion, the Chairperson closed the meeting at 12:26.

Approved by: ..... **Date:** 4 June 2026

Vivek Sharma
Chairperson

Compiled by: Sheila Bopoto (FCS External Scribe)
The BSC "Phalaborwa" meetings will be held weekly on Tuesdays at 11:00.

Signed with Impression - Chain of Custody

Signature Request			
Signature Request ID:	d62a407d-ffd9-4493-b4ef-588163af1840	Timestamp:	2026-06-04 11:02:45 GMT
Signee Name:	Vivek Sharma	Sender Name:	Ntwanano Mabulani
Request Type:	WebSigning	Request Status:	WEBVIEWER SIGNED
Original Document			
Document Name:	MINUTES OF THE BID SPECIFICATION COMMITTEE MEETING 004 FY 2627.docx	Document Size:	226.4 KB
Email Evidence			
Signee Email:	viveks@foskor.co.za	Email Subject:	A document from Ntwanano Mabulani is ready for signature
Email Sent Timestamp:	2026-06-04T07:54:14.541948	Email Opened Timestamp:	Not available in Silent Mode
Web Evidence			
Signee IP Address:	41.21.226.206	Request Timestamp:	2026-06-04 10:46:43 GMT
Signee GPS (if shared):	ZA: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; x64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/148.0.0.0 Safari/537.36 Edg/148.0.0.0	Terms Accepted Timestamp:	2026-06-04 10:46:52 GMT
Annotations and Modifications			
Signature Count:	1	Form Fields Filled Count:	0
Text Annotation Count:	1	Initial All Pages Count:	0
Single Initial Count:	0		
Signing Evidence			
Signee Mobile:	+27768885255	Sign Type:	WebSigning
Security Challenge:	NONE	Part of Workflow:	c0648e4a-b911-4912-ab8a-dda840506f7f
Chain Of Custody Generation			
Attached Document Name:	20260604T110245.323300Z MINUTES OF THE BID SPECIFICATION COMMITTEE MEETING 004 FY 2627.docx	Attached Timestamp:	2026-06-04 11:02:45 GMT



Copyright © 2026 Impression Signatures (Pty) Ltd