



17 April 2026

CLARIFICATION NO 5

APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER TO IMPLEMENT A CLOUD-BASED PRIVILEGE ACCESS MANAGEMENT (PAM) SOLUTION; RFB NO: RFB No:105/2025/EWSS/CLOUDBASE/RFB

Herewith please find clarification No 5 which forms an integral part of the above-mentioned RFQ.

PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS CLARIFICATION AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Complete the section below and **without delay** email a copy of this page to TCTA, email address tenders09@tcta.co.za; for the attention of The Receiving Officer to confirm that you have received this clarification.

Regards

Tina Mkhulise
MANAGER: SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT

I/We herewith acknowledge receipt of CLARIFICATION NO 5 for
RFQ NO. RFB NO: 105/2025/EWSS/CLOUDBASE/RFB

SIGNATURE: DATE:

ON BEHALF OF:

QUESTION 1

MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

Q1.1: Can TCTA confirm that both ISO/IEC 27001 certification AND OEM/reseller accreditation are independently mandatory, such that failure to submit either one individually would result in disqualification?

- **Reference:** Section 5, Table 1 Item 2 (Page 11). The item lists both "ISO/IEC 27001 — Information Security Management" and "Letter of accreditation from OEM, reseller, or evidence of accreditation as a partner of the solution" under a single mandatory item.
- **Reason:** It is ambiguous whether both documents are independently required for compliance, or whether they are listed as alternatives within a single mandatory category. The use of a single item number (Item 2) with two bullet points could be interpreted either way. Clarification is needed to ensure bidders do not inadvertently fail the mandatory check by submitting only one of the two.
- **Priority:** [CRITICAL]

RESPONSE :

Yes. Both **ISO/IEC 27001 certification** and **OEM/reseller accreditation** are independently required under the mandatory returnables. Failure to submit either requirement may render the bid non-responsive during Stage 1 evaluation.

Q1.2: The Annexure B CV template (Page 33) states "Failure to submit the certificate will result in disqualification." Does this disqualification apply to both the Technical Lead (Item 3) and the Project Team Lead (Item 4), or only to the Technical Lead?

- **Reference:** Section 5, Table 1 Items 3 and 4 (Pages 11, 14); Annexure B (Page 33).
- **Reason:** The statement on Annexure B is a general note and does not specify which role it applies to. Both Items 3 and 4 are marked as "Mandatory" in Table 1, but the Annexure B note could be interpreted as applying only to the CV template it accompanies. Confirmation is needed on whether certification copies for both the Technical Lead and Project Team Lead must be physically attached to avoid disqualification.
- **Priority:** [CRITICAL]

RESPONSE :

The requirement to submit supporting certification evidence applies to all personnel where certifications are claimed as part of mandatory compliance or functionality scoring. Accordingly,

bidders must attach copies of relevant certifications for both the **Technical Lead** and any proposed **Project Team Lead**, where applicable.

Q1.3: Table 1 Item 1 (Page 11) lists company experience (Annexure A or reference letters) as "Non-Mandatory," yet Evaluation Criteria A (Page 15) requires a minimum of 5 cloud-based enterprise PAM implementations in the last 5 years and awards 0 points for less than 5 years' experience. Can TCTA confirm that a bidder who does not submit company experience documentation will receive 0 points for Criteria A but will not be disqualified at Stage 1?

- **Reference:** Section 5, Table 1 Item 1 (Page 11) — marked "Non-Mandatory"; Section 6, Evaluation Criteria A (Page 15).
- **Reason:** There is a tension between the non-mandatory status of the returnable and the critical scoring weight (30 points out of 70) in the functionality evaluation, where achieving the 50-point threshold is mandatory. A bidder with strong Technical Lead scores (up to 40 points) but no company experience submission (0 points) would score exactly 40 — below the 50-point threshold. This effectively makes company experience a de facto mandatory requirement despite its non-mandatory classification.
- **Priority: [HIGH]**

RESPONSE:

- Correct. Company experience documentation under Item 1 is classified as non-mandatory for Stage 1 compliance purposes. However, failure to submit such evidence will result in **0 points** under Evaluation Criteria A, which may negatively affect the bidder's ability to meet the minimum functionality threshold.

Q1.4: Can TCTA clarify whether the Technical Lead's certifications listed in Table 1 Item 3 (Page 11) must be from the same certification domains as those listed in Section 4.3.1 (Page 7), or whether additional cybersecurity certifications not explicitly listed (e.g., CompTIA Security+, CEH, OSCP) would also qualify?

- **Reference:** Section 5, Table 1 Item 3 (Page 11) lists: CISSP, CISM, CIAM, Microsoft Identity & Access Admin, vendor-specific PAM certs. Section 4.3.1 (Page 7) states certifications must be in "cybersecurity, identity, or access governance."

- **Reason:** Table 1 provides a specific list of five certification types, while Section 4.3.1 uses broader language ("cybersecurity, identity, or access governance"). It is unclear whether the Table 1 list is exhaustive for mandatory compliance or illustrative, and whether broader cybersecurity certifications qualify for the mandatory requirement and/or the scoring in Evaluation Criteria C.
- **Priority: [HIGH]**

RESPONSE:

The certifications listed in the RFB are not exhaustive. Equivalent recognised certifications in the domains of cybersecurity, identity management, access governance, or PAM administration may be considered, subject to relevance and sufficient supporting evidence. TCTA reserves the right to assess equivalency.

2. TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

Q2.1: Can TCTA provide details of its current Identity and Access Management (IAM) infrastructure, including the specific IAM, SIEM, and MFA platforms currently in use, to enable accurate solution design and integration planning?

- **Reference:** Section 4.1.7 (Page 5) requires "Integration with Active Directory, Azure AD, and other directory services" and "API-based integration with enterprise identity platforms and SIEM solution." Section 4.1.8 (Page 6) references "Microsoft 365, Azure, and other cloud platforms."
- **Reason:** The tender references integration with "other directory services," "SIEM solution," and "other cloud platforms" without specifying what these are. Bidders need to know the specific platforms to accurately scope integration effort and pricing.
- **Priority: [HIGH]**

RESPONSE :

TCTA will not disclose detailed internal security architecture, specific toolsets, or operational configurations at the clarification stage for security reasons. Relevant technical integration details will be shared with the successful bidder during project initiation under appropriate confidentiality controls. The bidder must price based on standard integration with Active Directory, Azure AD, IAM, MFA, SIEM, and hybrid environments as stated in the RFB.

Q2.2: Can TCTA clarify the expected number and types of privileged accounts to be managed, beyond the 100 privileged user licences? Specifically, how many service accounts, shared accounts, and vendor accounts are currently in the environment?

- **Reference:** Section 4.1.1 (Page 4) requires "Discovery and inventory of all privileged accounts across systems and platforms" and "Management of shared, service, and emergency (break-glass) accounts." Annexure G Item 1 specifies "100 Privileged User Licenses."
- **Reason:** The 100 licences in Annexure G appear to cover user licences only, but the scope of work includes discovery and management of service accounts, shared accounts, break-glass accounts, and vendor accounts, which may require additional licensing. It is ambiguous whether the 100 licences must cover all account types or only interactive user accounts.
- **Priority: [HIGH]**

RESPONSE

- : For estimation purposes, bidders may note the current environment includes approximately:
- **52 servers in total** (35 Windows Servers & 12 Linux Servers (including database workloads))
- **15 privileged users** (including administrators and service providers)
- **25 service accounts** (including shared accounts)
- The base pricing requirement remains 100 licenses as stated in the RFB.

Q2.3: Section 4.1.5 (Page 5) requires "Secure remote privileged access without exposing internal systems." Can TCTA clarify whether there is a requirement for a dedicated jump server/bastion host capability, or whether browser-based session isolation via the PAM solution would be acceptable?

- **Reference:** Section 4.1.5 (Page 5) — "Secure remote privileged access without exposing internal systems."
- **Reason:** Different PAM solutions provide remote access isolation through different architectures (dedicated jump servers, browser-based HTML5 gateways, agent-based approaches). The tender does not specify a preference, and the architectural choice has significant implications for infrastructure requirements and pricing (Annexure G Item 2 — Hosting/Infrastructure).
- **Priority: [MEDIUM]**

RESPONSE:

TCTA does not prescribe a specific architecture. Bidders may propose a jump server/bastion model, browser-based session isolation, or another secure architecture, provided the proposed solution meets the RFB requirement for secure remote privileged access without exposing internal systems.

Q2.4: Can TCTA confirm whether the PAM solution must support management of privileged access to network devices (routers, switches, firewalls) in addition to servers, databases, and cloud workloads?

- **Reference:** Section 4.1.8 (Page 6) mentions "Compatibility with Windows, Linux, network devices, and enterprise applications."
- **Reason:** Network device management is mentioned in the compatibility requirement but is not elaborated upon in the detailed scope items (Sections 4.1.1–4.1.9). The inclusion or exclusion of network devices affects the scope of privileged account discovery, session management configuration, and credential rotation policies, with associated pricing implications.
- **Priority:** [MEDIUM]

RESPONSE:

Yes. The PAM solution is expected to support privileged access management across network devices, where applicable, as well as servers, databases, enterprise applications, and cloud workloads.

Q2.5: The tender requires the solution architecture to be "presented and approved by TCTA Enterprise Architecture Committee" (Deliverable 1, Page 9). Can TCTA advise on the expected frequency of Enterprise Architecture Committee meetings and the typical review/approval turnaround time?

- **Reference:** Section 4, Page 4; Deliverable 1, Page 9.
- **Reason:** Implementation timelines and project planning depend on how quickly the architecture can be approved. If the committee meets infrequently, this creates a potential bottleneck that bidders need to factor into their project plans and timelines.
- **Priority:** [MEDIUM]

RESPONSE:

Enterprise Architecture governance processes will be coordinated during implementation. Formal committee timelines may vary based on internal scheduling. However, the assumption is that 1 – 2 weeks hence, bidders should factor reasonable governance review cycles into their project plans.

3. COMMERCIAL AND PRICING

Q3.1: Annexure G requires pricing to be split across Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3 for each line item. For Item 3 (Solution Design, Installation, Configuration and Deployment) and Item 5 (Training, Skills Transfer and Documentation), can TCTA confirm whether these once-off implementation costs should be placed entirely in Year 1, or whether they expect these to be distributed across all three years?

- **Reference:** Annexure G (XLSX pricing schedule) — Items 3 and 5 have columns for Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3.
- **Reason:** Items 3 and 5 are typically once-off implementation activities completed in Year 1. The pricing schedule structure with three annual columns for these items is ambiguous — it could imply TCTA expects ongoing configuration/training services across all three years, or it could be a standard template applied uniformly. The interpretation significantly affects pricing presentation and could impact price evaluation if bidders treat it differently.
- **Priority: [HIGH]**

RESPONSE:

Once-off implementation activities such as design, installation, configuration, deployment, and initial training should generally be priced in **Year 1**. Where bidders propose recurring services across Years 2 and 3, these must be clearly described and justified.

Q3.2: Can TCTA confirm whether the 80 hours per year post-implementation support (Annexure G Item 6, Section 4.1.11 Page 6) is a minimum allocation that must be included in pricing, and whether unused hours may be carried forward to subsequent years or are forfeited?

- **Reference:** Section 4.1.11 (Page 6) states "A minimum allocation of 80 support hours per year"; Annexure G Item 6 — "Post-Implementation Support and Maintenance (80 Hours Yearly)."
- **Reason:** The tender describes 80 hours as a "minimum allocation" but the pricing schedule presents it as a fixed annual quantity. It is unclear whether bidders should price exactly 80 hours or whether additional hours should be quoted, and whether there is a mechanism for unused hour carryover or additional hours beyond the allocation.
- **Priority: [HIGH]**

RESPONSE:

Bidders are required to price based on the **minimum allocation of 80 support hours per year** as stipulated in the RFB. The 80 hours should be treated as the baseline annual support commitment for post-implementation support and maintenance.

Where bidders believe that additional support hours may be necessary to adequately support the solution, they are encouraged to separately indicate optional additional support hour rates or enhanced support packages in their proposal.

Payment will be based on **actual hours consumed**, up to the approved allocation or any additional approved hours. Unused hours within a given year will not automatically carry forward to subsequent years unless otherwise agreed in writing between TCTA and the appointed service provider.

This approach ensures a minimum support commitment while allowing flexibility for TCTA to scale support requirements based on operational needs.

Q3.3: Can TCTA confirm whether disbursements (e.g., travel to TCTA premises for on-site implementation, training, and support) should be included as a fixed amount within the Annexure G line items, or whether they will be claimed separately on an as-incurred basis?

- **Reference:** Annexure G notes (Page 44) state "All prices must include disbursements." Section 8.3 (Page 15) states "All prices must include all costs applicable."
- **Reason:** The requirement to include all disbursements in the fixed line items means bidders must estimate travel and subsistence costs upfront. However, the frequency and location of on-site activities (e.g., training sessions, implementation visits, support calls) are not specified in the tender, making it difficult to accurately estimate these costs.
- **Priority: [MEDIUM]**

RESPONSE:

We are not anticipating any travelling as all the work will be done remotely, and all costs required to deliver the scope. Separate reimbursement of disbursements after the award is not envisaged unless specifically agreed in writing.

Q3.4: Section 11.4.1 (Page 27) states no price adjustments within 6 months from award. Can TCTA confirm whether annual escalation provisions apply from Year 2 onwards, and if so, what index or mechanism should be used (e.g., CPI, contractual CPA)?

- **Reference:** Section 11.4 (Pages 27); Section 10.5.4 (Page 18) references CPI for validity period extensions.
- **Reason:** For a 3-year contract, the absence of clear escalation provisions creates uncertainty for Year 2 and Year 3 pricing. Bidders need to know whether to build escalation into annual pricing or whether a separate contractual mechanism will apply.
- **Priority: [MEDIUM]**

RESPONSE

The contract will be adjusted on year 2 and year 3 based on CPA as outlined on clause 11.4 of the bid document.

4. SUBMISSION AND PROCESS

Q4.1: The bid requires "1 physical original copy in English and 1 electronic copy on an unencrypted USB in pdf format" (Section 2.3, Page 3). The front page (Page 1) states "1 original hard copy and 1 soft copy in a USB." Can TCTA confirm whether each evaluation stage should be tabbed/separated within a single bound document, or whether each stage should be submitted as a separate document/section on the USB?

- **Reference:** Section 2.3 (Page 3) and Section 2.4 (Page 3) — "Each stage must be clearly marked."
- **Reason:** Section 2.4 requires bid submissions to be "prepared in the same order as the stages of evaluation" with "each stage clearly marked." It is unclear whether this means physical tab dividers in the hard copy and separate PDF files on the USB, or a single sequential document with section headers.
- **Priority: [HIGH]**

RESPONSE :

Bidders should submit a single structured proposal prepared in the order of the evaluation stages, with each stage clearly marked and separated by dividers or section headings. The same structure should be mirrored on the USB submission.

Q4.2: The tender front page (Page 1) references "Envelope System — Technical & Financial Proposal." Can TCTA confirm whether the technical and financial proposals should be submitted in separate sealed envelopes within a single outer package, or as a single combined document?

- **Reference:** Page 1 — "Envelope System — Technical & Financial Proposal: 1 original hard copy and 1 soft copy in a USB."
- **Reason:** The reference to "Envelope System" typically implies two-envelope submission (technical separate from financial) to allow independent evaluation. However, the description that follows suggests a single submission package. This ambiguity could lead to disqualification if the wrong format is used.
- **Priority:** [HIGH]

RESPONSE

Submission should be Technical & Financial Proposal: 1 original hard copy and 1 soft copy in a USB.in one sealed envelope as per RFB document

5. COMPLIANCE AND REGULATORY

Q5.1: Can TCTA confirm whether the B-BBEE certificate must be valid on the closing date (30 April 2026) or on the date of evaluation/award?

- **Reference:** Section 7 (Page 14); Table 1 Item 7 (Page 14).
- **Reason:** The tender does not specify the validity date for B-BBEE certificates. If a certificate expires between the closing date and the evaluation date, it is unclear whether points will still be awarded.

- **Priority: [MEDIUM]**

RESPONSE

The BBEE certificate must be valid on closing date

Q5.2: Section 9.1.4 (Page 16) states that tax non-compliance at "time of award" may lead to disqualification. Can TCTA confirm whether bidders must submit a valid TCS PIN or printed TCS certificate with the bid, or whether tax compliance will only be verified at the award stage?

- **Reference:** Section 9.1.4 (Page 16); SBD1 Part B, Section 2 (Page 35).
- **Reason:** SBD1 requires submission of a TCS PIN or CSD number (Page 35), but Section 9.1.4 references verification "at the time of award." It is unclear whether failure to submit a TCS PIN with the bid would result in disqualification at Stage 1 (returnables) or only trigger a check at Stage 5 (supplier vetting).
- **Priority: [MEDIUM]**

RESPONSE

Tax compliance will be verified on award stage

6. TIMELINES AND LOGISTICS

Q6.1: Can TCTA advise on the expected project commencement date following contract award and the expected overall implementation timeline for the PAM solution?

- **Reference:** Section 4.5, Deliverable 1 (Page 9) references planning artefacts including "timelines, milestones." Section 4.4 (Page 8) states 3-year contract duration.
- **Reason:** The tender does not specify an expected start date or implementation timeline. This information is needed to plan resource allocation, phased rollout, and to ensure pricing accurately reflects the implementation period versus the support period within the 3-year contract.
- **Priority: [HIGH]**

RESPONSE:

The anticipated commencement date will be as soon as practicable following completion of the procurement process and contract finalisation. The detailed implementation schedule will be agreed during project initiation.

Q6.2: Can TCTA confirm whether site visits or physical access to TCTA's data centre and ICT environment will be provided during the implementation phase for on-premises integration activities?

- **Reference:** Section 4.1.8 (Page 6) requires "Support for hybrid ICT environments (on-premises and cloud)" and integration with on-premises infrastructure.
- **Reason:** The scope includes on-premises integration (AD, servers, network devices), which typically requires physical or VPN access to the client environment. The tender does not specify the access arrangements, which affects implementation planning and pricing for travel/on-site activities.
- **Priority: [MEDIUM] :**

RESPONSE

Where necessary, controlled remote or on-site access arrangements will be facilitated during implementation, subject to TCTA security policies, approvals, and operational requirements.

7. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Q7.1: Evaluation Criteria A (Page 15) scores company experience based on "Years of relevant enterprise PAM implementation experience." Can TCTA clarify whether the scoring measures (a) the number of calendar years the company has been providing PAM services, or (b) the total number of PAM implementation projects completed within the last 5 years as referenced in the preceding paragraph?

- **Reference:** Section 6, Evaluation Criteria A (Page 15). The introductory paragraph requires "a minimum of five (5) cloud-based enterprise PAM solutions within the last five (5) years." The scoring matrix then uses "Years of relevant enterprise PAM implementation experience" as the scoring metric.
- **Reason:** There is a disconnect between the introductory requirement (number of implementations in a time period) and the scoring matrix (years of experience). A company with 10 years of

experience but only 3 implementations would score 30 points on the matrix but may not meet the "minimum of five" implementation requirement in the preamble. Conversely, a company with 4 years of experience but 10 implementations scores 0 on the matrix. The relationship between the minimum implementation count and the years-of-experience scoring is ambiguous.

- **Priority: [CRITICAL]**

RESPONSE:

Where necessary, controlled remote or on-site access arrangements will be facilitated during implementation, subject to TCTA security policies, approvals, and operational requirements.

Q7.2: Evaluation Criteria C (Pages 15–16) awards points for the Technical Lead's certifications. Can TCTA confirm whether the certification count for scoring includes the same certifications used to meet the mandatory minimum of 2 certifications (Table 1 Item 3, Page 11), or whether the mandatory certifications are excluded from the scoring count?

- **Reference:** Table 1 Item 3 (Page 11) — mandatory 2 certifications; Evaluation Criteria C (Pages 15–16) — scoring by number of certifications.
- **Reason:** It is unclear whether a Technical Lead with exactly 2 certifications would score 10 points (if the same 2 count towards both mandatory compliance and scoring) or 0 points (if the mandatory 2 are excluded from the scoring count). This ambiguity affects the interpretation of the scoring thresholds and the total achievable functionality score.
- **Priority: [HIGH]**

RESPONSE:

Yes. Certifications used to meet the minimum mandatory requirement may also be counted for functionality scoring, provided they are valid and relevant.

Q7.3: Will there be a presentation or demonstration phase as part of the evaluation process? The tender does not mention presentations, but this is common practice for technical ICT solutions of this nature.

- **Reference:** Sections 5–9 (Pages 11–16) describe 5 evaluation stages; none mentions presentations or demonstrations.
- **Reason:** Bidders need to know whether to prepare for oral presentations or solution demonstrations, as this affects resource planning and bid preparation timelines.

- **Priority: [LOW]**

RESPONSE:

The current RFB does not provide for a mandatory presentation or demonstration stage. However, TCTA reserves the right to request clarification meetings, where necessary.

Q7.4: Can TCTA confirm the minimum functionality threshold is 50 points out of 70? Section 6 (Page 12–13) states bidders "who do not meet the threshold of 50 points out of the 70 points will be disqualified." Is this an absolute threshold (50 points required) or a percentage threshold (approximately 71.4%)?

- **Reference:** Section 6 (Page 12–13).
- **Reason:** While the wording appears clear (50 out of 70), confirmation is sought to ensure the threshold is an absolute point value and not subject to adjustment based on the number of qualified bidders or other factors.
- **Priority: [LOW]**

| ---Category | Questions | Critical | High | Medium | Low |
|------------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| 1. Mandatory Requirements | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Technical Specifications | 5 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 3. Commercial and Pricing | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 4. Submission and Process | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Compliance and Regulatory | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 6. Timelines and Logistics | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 7. Evaluation Criteria | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 24 | 3 | 11 | 8 | 2 |