

Meeting		Tender 111S/2024/25 Non-Compulsory Clarification Meeting		
Meeting Date & Time	08.11.2024	Meeting Location Chair	DHL Stadium, Fritz Sonnenberg Road, Cape Town	
Start Time	10H00			
MINUTES OF NON-COMPULSORY CLARIFICATION MEETING				
1.	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION		Action	Due date
1.1	RJ opened the meeting and welcomed all attendees. An introduction of the City of Cape Town and DHL Stadium officials was done.		Info	
2.	NON-COMPULSORY CLARIFICATION MEETING PRESENTATION			
2.1	RJ provided a project overview.		Info	
2.2	RJ provided details around the general tender information – tender advertising date, tender closing date, contract period and tender query address.		Info	
2.3	Conditions of tender related to functionality criteria was presented. Details around the evaluation criteria and value points were explained. Detail around the definition of a 'relevant project' was provided.		Info	
2.4	The details around Clause 2.2.1.15 Compliance with Specification was provided by RJ.		Info	
2.5	Returnable schedule requirements were explained, related to: - F.13A Technical Data Sheets - F.13B Tenderer Relevant Experience - F.13C Technicians Relevant Experience		Info	
2.6	RJ provided details around Contract Data: - Contract duration 3 months - Guarantee is not applicable - Contract CPA is not applicable - Tender validity is 120 days after closing date		Info	
2.7	Technical information was provided around the existing design, problems with the existing design and the scope of works for this tender.		Info	
3.	TENDERER QUESTIONS / CLARIFICATIONS			
3.1	Tenderer from Axxess advised that he had sent clarifications via the Finance.Tenders@capetown.gov.za email address, and awaited a response. RJ advised that SCM would check to see if the email was received. Post Meeting Note: the clarification was received and responded to by SCM.		Info	
3.2	Tenderer from Axxess enquired about the submission of an alternative tender. LdP reference to clause 2.2.11 Alternative tender offers.		Info	
3.3	Tenderer from Axxess enquired about the Supplier Database registration requirements (CSD registration). LdP provided reference to clause 2.1.7 CCT Supplier Database Registration and 2.1.8 National Treasury Web Based Central Supplier Database (CSD)		Info	

	registration – links to register for both are provided within the tender document.		
3.4	Tenderer from Axess enquired about the possibility of proposing a cloud-based solution for this tender. DG advised that this would need to be clarified and confirmed in line with City of Cape Town requirements and that a clarification in this regard would be issued to all Tenderers.	RJ/LdP	15.11.2024
3.5	LdP raised awareness around Schedule F.4: Preferential Points Claim Form in Terms of the Preferential Procurement Regulations 2022, and requested that the Tenderers ensure completion of the table in section 5.		
4.	Meeting was closed by RJ, Tenderer sign in on attendance register was confirmed.		

Questions and Answered:

Question: Tenderer from Axess enquired about the possibility of proposing a cloud-based solution for this tender. DG advised that this would need to be clarified and confirmed in line with City of Cape Town requirements and that a clarification in this regard would be issued to all Tenderers.

Answer: Thank you for your inquiry regarding the proposed cloud-based solution for this tender.

We have carefully considered the opinion of our Information Systems and Technology (IS&T) Department and in house Engineering Team on this matter. Here are some key points we would like you to consider:

1. Cloud Policy and Business Requirements: The City of Cape Town currently does not have a formal policy mandating the use of cloud services. Instead, our approach is guided by specific business requirements and risk assessments for each project. For high-demand services, particularly with events or activities that attract a significant number of users, our existing on-premise capabilities have been effective, especially during peak usage periods.

2. Risk of Additional Failure Points: Shifting from on-site servers to a cloud-based model could introduce new points of potential failure, which is a particular concern when service continuity is crucial. The current infrastructure has proven reliable for high-traffic scenarios (such as those with 60,000 visitors), and moving to a cloud environment may elevate operational risk rather than reduce it.

3. Asset Ownership and Long-Term Control: It's important to note that a cloud-based solution functions more as a rental model, where infrastructure and service assets are not owned by the City. This can create dependency on the service provider for ongoing access and continuity, potentially making it challenging to regain control over key infrastructure if needed in the future.

4. Precedent and Cautionary Note: To date, large-scale use of cloud services is still limited within the City, apart from specific cases such as our current Microsoft upgrade. This limited precedent reflects a cautious approach to cloud adoption, especially for critical services.

Given these factors, if your solution can meet the technical and business requirements using on-site servers, this may align better with our operational needs and continuity goals. A cloud solution will not be considered until it is fully assessed in relation to risk mitigation, data control, and long-term sustainability.