

PRE-BID CLARIFICATION QUERIES

Bid Number: GNP-012-25 — Immersive XR Experiences for SANParks

Clarification Queries #	Tender Ref.	Query	Rationale	Response
A. SCOPE & QUANTITIES — Defining What Is "Minimum"				
1	Section 4.8.1	The tender specifies "minimum" quantities per deliverable category (e.g., 2 mobile app integrations per year). Is there a maximum or cap on deliverables SANParks may request per year at the tendered unit rates? If no cap exists, can SANParks confirm indicative upper bounds for each category to enable realistic capacity and resource planning?	<i>Unit rates locked at bid stage apply to all orders. Without volume caps, a low unit rate creates uncapped financial exposure over 5 years.</i>	<p>The minimum quantities specified per deliverable category are aligned to SANParks’ current priorities and form the basis of the allocated budget for this pilot project.</p> <p>This tender is therefore primarily intended to deliver against these defined minimums. While there may be limited additional requirements within certain categories, these are expected to be minimal and not significantly exceed the indicative scope reflected in the tender.</p>

				<p>Should requirements arise that materially exceed the scope and intent of this pilot, SANParks reserves the right to procure such additional deliverables through a separate supply chain process, rather than through this contract at the tendered unit rates.</p> <p>Accordingly, bidders should base their capacity, resourcing, and pricing assumptions primarily on the minimum quantities specified, with only limited variability anticipated.</p>
2	Section 4.8.1	The pricing schedule requests unit prices by content type (3D VR, AR, 360°, etc.) but does not specify the expected ratio of Simple, Standard, and Complex deliverables. Can SANParks provide an indicative percentage split across the three complexity	<i>A Simple AR overlay costs 3-5 days; a Complex one costs 15-25 days. Without a tier mix, bidders must guess, leading to either overpriced or unsustainable bids.</i>	As this project is positioned as a pilot, the detailed content scope and deployment plans have not yet been finalised and will be developed in collaboration with the appointed service provider. As such, it is not possible at this stage to define an indicative percentage split across Simple,

		tiers for pricing evaluation purposes?		<p>Standard, and Complex deliverables.</p> <p>For this reason, the pricing schedule requires unit rates by content type and complexity tier, enabling fair and consistent comparison of bids across a range of potential scenarios.</p> <p>It is, however, envisaged that the majority of deliverables are likely to fall within the Simple and Standard tiers, with fewer requirements anticipated at the Complex level.</p> <p>Bidders should therefore ensure that their pricing across all tiers is realistic, balanced, and sustainable, taking into account the variability inherent in a pilot project of this nature.</p>
3	Section 4.8.1	For the 20 interpretation boards per annum with QR-triggered AR — does each board represent one unique	<i>100 unique AR experiences over 5 years vs. 20-30 core experiences reused across</i>	A degree of unique content per interpretation board is expected, particularly where site-specific or

		<p>piece of digital content, or can multiple boards at the same site share a common AR experience with localised variations?</p>	<p><i>boards has a 3-4x cost difference.</i></p>	<p>park-specific interpretation is required.</p> <p>However, it is also anticipated that a significant portion of content will be designed for reuse across multiple interpretation boards and potentially across different formats, including QR-linked AR experiences, web-based content, and video platforms (e.g. YouTube). This approach is intended to support consistency, efficiency, and scalability of content development.</p> <p>Accordingly, bidders should assume a hybrid model where some experiences are unique, while others are shared or adapted across multiple boards and delivery channels, depending on interpretive needs and contextual relevance.</p>
4	Section 4.8.1	The tender indicates 12 immersive social	<i>Production effort for a 60-second social reel vs. a 10-</i>	The format will be determined by the nature of the story being told

		<p>media/YouTube content pieces per year. What is the expected average duration per content piece? Is this short-form (30-90 seconds for social) or long-form (5-15 minutes for YouTube)?</p>	<p><i>minute documentary-style YouTube piece differs by 5-8x.</i></p>	<p>and the most appropriate platform for its delivery.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the content mix will include both short-form and longer-form outputs. A significant portion of content will be short-form in nature, suitable for social media distribution (e.g. approximately 30–90 seconds). This will likely form the bulk of the annual outputs.</p> <p>However, longer-form content (e.g. more narrative-driven or interpretive pieces for YouTube) will also form part of the deliverables, depending on the subject matter and storytelling requirements.</p> <p>Bidders should therefore assume a predominantly short-form content mix, with limited long-form outputs with opportunities for content reuse across delivery channels where appropriate.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

5	Section 4.8.1, Note	The tender encourages bidders to "exceed minimums where it adds demonstrable value." Will exceeding minimums in the bid affect price evaluation, or is price evaluated strictly on the tendered minimum quantities?	The tender encourages bidders to "exceed minimums where it adds demonstrable value." Will exceeding minimums in the bid affect price evaluation, or is price evaluated strictly on the tendered minimum quantities?	<p>Where bidders choose to exceed the minimum quantities, this will be considered as part of the qualitative assessment of their understanding of the project, sector experience, and ability to add value within a SANParks operational environment. It may therefore contribute positively to the evaluation of the bidder's proposed approach and methodology.</p> <p>However, pricing evaluation will be based on the tendered minimum quantities as specified in the pricing schedule. Any additional quantities proposed beyond the minimums will not be included in the financial evaluation of bids.</p> <p>Bidders should therefore ensure that any proposed enhancements are clearly motivated in terms of value-add and implementation relevance,</p>
---	---------------------	---	---	--

				rather than as a basis for pricing comparison.
B. CONTENT PLAN & APPROVAL PROCESS				
6	Section 1.8	The Content Plan is to be finalised within 3 months of contract award. If the agreed Content Plan materially exceeds the tender minimum quantities or introduces deliverable types not priced in the bid, what pricing mechanism applies? Will variations be negotiated at that stage?	<i>The Content Plan is binding once approved but is developed post-award. This creates pricing uncertainty for both parties.</i>	<p>The Content Plan will be developed within three months of contract award and will define the agreed scope of content and deployments for this project, based on the tendered minimum requirements and the successful bidder's proposed approach.</p> <p>The intent of this process is to align deliverables within the scope of the approved project, while also identifying any additional gaps, opportunities, or enhancements that may fall outside the agreed baseline.</p> <p>Should the final Content Plan identify requirements that materially exceed the tender minimum quantities or introduce deliverable types not included in the pricing schedule, such items</p>

				<p>will not automatically form part of this contract. In such cases, they will be addressed through a separate procurement and supply chain management process, rather than through variation at tendered unit rates.</p> <p>Accordingly, bidders should assume that the contract will be implemented within the framework of the tendered minimum scope, with the Content Plan serving to refine and prioritise delivery rather than fundamentally expand the contracted scope.</p>
7	Section 7.3	<p>Can SANParks clarify the boundary for AI-assisted post-production enhancement? Specifically: (a) Is AI upscaling of real 360° footage from 4K to 8K resolution permissible? (b) Is AI-assisted removal of temporary objects (e.g., vehicles, construction</p>	<p><i>Section 7.3.2 allows "enhancement and post-production" but 7.3.3 restricts "manipulated footage." The boundary between enhancement and manipulation needs clarification for production workflow planning.</i></p>	<p>The intent of the content standards is to ensure that all outputs accurately reflect the fauna, flora, landscapes, and cultural heritage within SANParks, and are grounded in authentic captured footage.</p> <p>The restriction on AI-generated content is primarily aimed at fully</p>

		equipment) from real footage permissible?		<p>synthetic or AI-created visuals that replace real-world footage or materially alter the authenticity of the subject matter. While there may be limited exceptions where AI is used for illustrative purposes (e.g. extinct species or conceptual reconstructions), the overall approach is that AI-generated content should be avoided where it substitutes real-world representation.</p> <p>With regard to post-production, AI-assisted tools may be used where they support enhancement of real captured footage, provided they do not replace, distort, or substantially change the original content.</p> <p>In this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (a) AI upscaling of real 360° footage (e.g. from 4K to 8K) is permissible, as it is considered a technical
--	--	---	--	---

				<p>enhancement of existing captured material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (b) AI-assisted removal of temporary, non-representative objects (e.g. vehicles, construction equipment) may be permissible where it does not alter the integrity or reality of the scene, and where the resulting output still accurately reflects the natural environment. <p>All such enhancements should be applied with care to ensure that the final content remains an authentic and truthful representation of SANParks environments.</p>
C. HARDWARE & DEPLOYMENT				
8	Section 4.8.2	For the 24 gate/reception sites — does SANParks have a preferred phasing for	<i>Deploying all 24 sites in Year 1 vs. 6 per year over 4 years has fundamentally</i>	The phasing of the 24 gate/reception sites will be defined through a detailed

		<p>deployments (e.g., all Phase 1 sites in Year 1), or is phasing to be proposed by the service provider?</p>	<p><i>different resource and cash flow implications.</i></p>	<p>deployment plan to be co-developed between SANParks and the appointed service provider.</p> <p>The expectation is that deployment will be guided by identified priorities and logical implementation groupings. For example, where appropriate, multiple deployment components within a park or region may be implemented together, rather than aligning rollout strictly to a specific project year.</p> <p>Bidders should reflect a high-level rollout approach within their proposals to demonstrate how sequencing, prioritisation, and implementation efficiencies will be addressed.</p> <p>As a result, deployments are likely to be spread across the project period. Final phasing will be confirmed during the planning</p>
--	--	---	--	--

				phase in collaboration with SANParks.
9	Annexure B	Can SANParks confirm whether site electrical infrastructure (power outlets, circuit capacity) at the deployment locations listed in Annexure B is sufficient for the proposed hardware, or should bidders budget for electrical upgrades?	<i>Remote sites may lack adequate power infrastructure. Electrical upgrades can add R20-50K per site and require coordination with SANParks facilities management.</i>	<p>SANParks remains responsible for the provision of fixed site infrastructure, including existing electrical connections and associated built facilities at deployment locations.</p> <p>Where upgrades or enhancements to existing electrical infrastructure are required, these will need to be identified during the initial content and rollout planning phase and approved by SANParks prior to implementation.</p> <p>Bidders should therefore not assume wholesale electrical upgrades across sites. Instead, the solution design should take into account varying levels of site readiness.</p> <p>At remote sites where electrical infrastructure is limited or</p>

				<p>unavailable, bidders are expected to prioritise low-power or non-hardware-dependent solutions where appropriate (for example, QR-enabled content access via mobile devices).</p> <p>Where hardware deployment is required, the use of self-contained or alternative power solutions (such as solar-powered units for digital displays) may be considered as part of the proposed equipment solution. Larger-scale infrastructure interventions (such as full site electrical upgrades or solar plants) would be regarded as exceptional and subject to prior approval and separate consideration by SANParks.</p> <p>Bidders should therefore design their solutions with flexibility for mixed infrastructure conditions across sites, and clearly reflect</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				any assumptions in their implementation approach.
10	Section 4.2	The tender references "active digital signage" for gates and receptions. Does SANParks have existing digital signage infrastructure at any of the 24 sites, or should bidders assume all hardware is new?	<i>Existing infrastructure could reduce hardware quantities and cost significantly.</i>	<p>Some gate and reception sites do currently have existing digital display infrastructure (for example, TV screens), particularly within reception areas, which may be suitable for displaying certain types of content where compatible.</p> <p>However, bidders should not assume a standardised or uniform digital signage environment across all 24 sites.</p> <p>Where specialised hardware is required to support the intended functionality (including AR-triggered or immersive content experiences), bidders should assume that such infrastructure is not currently in place and should be included as part of the proposed solution.</p>

				Bidders should therefore design their approach on the basis of a mixed environment, leveraging existing infrastructure where appropriate, while clearly accounting for new hardware requirements where needed to ensure full functionality of the solution.
11	Annexure D	Annexure D shows bandwidth for each site. Have the planned bandwidth upgrades (listed at the bottom of Annexure D) been completed? Can SANParks confirm current actual bandwidth at Phase 1 priority sites?	<i>Several Phase 1 sites show only 2-5 Mbps. Actual current bandwidth determines whether local content servers are required at every site or only selected sites.</i>	<p>The bandwidth figures reflected in Annexure D represent the current known connectivity conditions at each site and should be used as the basis for solution design and deployment planning.</p> <p>Planned bandwidth upgrades referenced in Annexure D are ongoing and may be implemented prior to or during the commencement of the project. However, these upgrades are not guaranteed to be completed at the time of deployment, and bidders should</p>

				<p>therefore not rely on them as a baseline assumption.</p> <p>SANParks confirms that actual bandwidth conditions may vary across sites, including within Phase 1 priority locations. The Annexure D values should therefore be treated as indicative of current operating conditions.</p> <p>Given the remote nature of many SANParks sites, bandwidth constraints are a known and persistent challenge. Bidders are expected to prioritise low-bandwidth, resilient, and offline-capable design approaches where appropriate, ensuring that solutions remain functional under limited or intermittent connectivity conditions.</p>
12	Section 5.7	For outdoor and semi-outdoor deployments at park gates — does SANParks have preferred mounting locations identified (e.g., existing structures,	<i>Outdoor enclosures with IP55+ rating and thermal management are R25-40K each. Whether SANParks provides covered mounting</i>	The majority of park gates already have existing infrastructure that can accommodate digital displays or related hardware. However, the suitability of these

		<p>purpose-built shelters), or will the service provider need to propose and fund protective enclosures?</p>	<p><i>locations significantly affects hardware cost.</i></p>	<p>locations in terms of user flow, visibility, and overall visitor experience will need to be assessed during the detailed design and rollout planning phase.</p> <p>SANParks remains responsible for the provision of fixed site infrastructure at deployment locations. Where upgrades or enhancements to existing infrastructure are required, these will need to be identified during the initial content and rollout planning phase and approved by SANParks prior to implementation.</p> <p>Where possible, bidders should prioritise the use of existing infrastructure. However, where outdoor or semi-outdoor deployments are required as standalone installations, bidders must include all associated requirements for movable</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>infrastructure in their bid. This includes weatherproofing, housing, and protective casings to ensure reliable operation in park conditions.</p> <p>Bidders should therefore design and price their solution on the basis of a mixed environment, combining reuse of existing infrastructure where suitable, with fully self-contained outdoor-ready deployments where necessary.</p>
D. INTEGRATION & TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS				
13	Section 5.2	Does SANParks have existing IT security standards documentation that the service provider must comply with? If so, can these be shared before bid submission to allow accurate security compliance planning?	<i>Authentication and authorisation protocols "must comply with SANParks IT security standards" but these standards are not included in the tender.</i>	The IT security standards document is kept with the IT Security Department and will be shared with the successful bidder.
14	Section 5.4	The minimum VR resolution specified is stereoscopic	<i>Mastering at 7680x7680 stereoscopic generates 8-</i>	See it as a Minimum requirement

		7680x7680 at 100 Mbps bitrate. Current consumer headsets (Meta Quest 3) have display resolution of 2064x2208 per eye. Can SANParks confirm whether content should be mastered at the higher resolution for future-proofing, or delivered at current headset-native resolution?	<i>15GB per 10-minute experience. This materially affects storage costs, offline delivery strategy, and field capture equipment requirements.</i>	
15	Section 4.3	The tender requires a cross-platform content delivery application (web, iOS, Android, VR). Is this envisaged as a single unified application, or can the requirement be met through platform-specific implementations sharing a common backend?	<i>A single cross-platform app is significantly more complex than purpose-built apps per platform sharing APIs.</i>	The intent is to enhance and extend existing SANParks digital platforms (e.g. website and mobile app) with immersive and interactive content, rather than introduce standalone applications. Solutions should avoid requiring users to download additional apps or access external platforms. Platform-specific implementations are acceptable, provided they are supported by an integrated backend and

				<p>deliver a consistent, SANParks-aligned user experience.</p> <p>VR components are considered part of hardware-linked experiences and should integrate accordingly.</p>
E. SUPPORT, MAINTENANCE & SLAs				
16	Section 4.8.2	The tender states SLAs will be "finalised during contract negotiations." Can SANParks provide indicative SLA parameters for pricing purposes — specifically: target response times for critical/major/minor incidents, required support hours (business hours vs. 24/7), and expected preventive maintenance visit frequency?	<i>Support cost can vary 3-5x depending on SLA stringency. Without indicative parameters, bidders cannot price support accurately.</i>	At this stage, SANParks is not able to provide indicative SLA parameters. These will be defined and agreed during contract finalisation, based on the agreed solution and its operational complexity.
17	Section 4.8.2	For sites with VSAT connectivity (2 Mbps) — Mata Mata, Nossob, Skilpad, Richtersveld — is remote monitoring of hardware	<i>Remote monitoring over 2 Mbps VSAT is technically feasible but unreliable. Physical-only maintenance at these extremely remote</i>	For sites with VSAT connectivity (approximately 2 Mbps), a hybrid operational model is expected. Remote monitoring of hardware is generally anticipated where

		<p>expected, or will these sites rely on periodic physical maintenance visits only?</p>	<p><i>sites costs significantly more in travel.</i></p>	<p>technically feasible, however the limitations of low-bandwidth and variable VSAT connectivity must be taken into account in the solution design. Systems should therefore be designed to be highly robust, with minimal reliance on continuous connectivity for core functionality.</p> <p>A key expectation is that SANParks onsite staff at these remote locations will be trained to perform basic troubleshooting, monitoring, and first-line operational support to enable day-to-day continuity without over-reliance on remote technical intervention.</p> <p>Given the remoteness of these sites, it is also recognised that operational uptime requirements may be less stringent than in high-traffic locations, provided</p>
--	--	---	---	--

				<p>essential functionality is maintained.</p> <p>However, periodic physical maintenance and support visits by the service provider will still be required for preventative maintenance and issues that cannot be resolved remotely or locally.</p> <p>Bidders should therefore design their solutions to balance remote monitoring capability, local staff enablement, and planned on-site support.</p>
F. PRICING & COMMERCIAL				
18	Pricing, p66	The pricing schedule states quantities are "for evaluation purposes only." Can SANParks confirm that the total bid price will be calculated as the sum of (unit price × evaluation quantity) for each line item, and that all bidders will be	<i>Need to confirm a level playing field where all bidders are compared on the same assumed volumes.</i>	<p>SANParks can confirm that the pricing schedule quantities are provided for evaluation purposes, and all bidders will be evaluated on the same standardised quantities across each line item.</p> <p>The total bid price will be calculated on a like-for-like basis as the sum of (unit rate ×</p>

		evaluated on identical quantities?		evaluation quantity) for each priced item, ensuring consistency and comparability across all submissions. This approach ensures that all bidders are assessed on a common, fixed set of assumed volumes, and that differences in pricing reflect unit rates rather than variations in proposed quantities.
19	Pricing, p66	The tender states travel must follow AA rates and SANParks subsistence policy. Can SANParks provide the current SANParks subsistence policy document and confirm current daily allowance rates?	<i>Without seeing the actual subsistence rates, bidders cannot accurately cost field capture trips and site visits to remote parks.</i>	<i>SANParks subsistence is R341.00</i>
G. EVALUATION PROCESS & DEMONSTRATION				
20	Phase 3, p60	What is the expected timeframe between announcement of Phase 2 results and the scheduled	<i>Demo preparation requires 4-8 weeks. Insufficient lead time between shortlisting notification and demo date</i>	At this stage, it is not possible to confirm the exact timeframe between Phase 2 results and the Phase 3 demonstration, as this

		Phase 3 demonstration site visit? How much advance notice will shortlisted bidders receive?	<i>could disadvantage bidders.</i>	<p>will depend on the number of responses received and the availability of evaluation panel members.</p> <p>However, SANParks will take into consideration the preparation requirements outlined and will aim to provide shortlisted bidders with reasonable advance notice.</p>
21	Phase 3, p64	For the original SANParks concept proposal (Criterion E) — does SANParks prefer the concept to target a specific park or site from Annexure B, or is the bidder free to choose any SANParks context?	<i>Targeting a specific park allows us to demonstrate deeper research and understanding. A preferred site would help bidders prepare more relevant concepts.</i>	<p>Bidders are free to choose any SANParks context for the original concept proposal under Criterion E.</p> <p>Annexure B is provided to indicate SANParks’ broader priorities and operational environments, and may be used as a reference or guideline to inform the concept. However, it does not prescribe or restrict the selection of a specific park or site for this exercise, and is not a mandatory basis for the concept development.</p>

				<p>This criterion is intended to assess the bidder's creativity, interpretive approach, and ability to translate the SANParks context into a compelling concept. Bidders should therefore select the setting that best demonstrates their capability and approach.</p>
--	--	--	--	--