**7 October 2026**

# KNP Six Lodge Concessions Bidder's Conference

# Meeting Transcript Notes

## 1. Meeting details

| Item | Details |
|---|---|
| **Meeting** | KNP Six Lodge Concessions Bidder's Conference |
| **Date** | 7 October 2026 |
| **Recording start time** | 09h10 |
| **Recorded duration** | 1 hour 52 minutes 43 seconds |
| **Format** | Hybrid meeting, with participants attending physically and through Microsoft Teams |
| **Meeting purpose** | To brief prospective bidders on the six Kruger National Park lodge concession opportunities, explain the procurement requirements and evaluation process, clarify selected RFP provisions, and set out how questions and further information would be handled. |
| **Transcription** | Started and stopped by Jabulile Galane |

## 2. Opening and purpose of the conference

| Speaker | Detailed record of what was said |
|---|---|
| **Jabulile Galane** | Welcomed participants and asked them to be patient while the team admitted virtual attendees and accommodated participants in the physical room. She explained that, because the group was large, general introductions would not be necessary and that the presenters would introduce themselves. She also acknowledged that the team was experiencing technical and screen-related issues. |
| **Wendy Davids** | Introduced herself as the Acting Head of Business Development for SANParks and welcomed participants to Groenkloof and the bidder's conference for the six Kruger National Park projects. She asked virtual participants to mute their microphones to avoid an echo. |
| **SANParks/project team** | Apologised for the technical delay and thanked both physical and online participants for attending. Participants were advised that Jabulile Galane could assist where representatives from a bidder's firm still required the meeting link. |
| **SANParks/project team** | Explained that the conference was intended to help bidders submit comprehensive, high-quality bids. The team would outline the bid requirements, evaluation process and committees' expectations. The separate governance stages identified were the Bid Specification Committee, Bid Evaluation Committee, Bid Adjudication Committee and Board approval. |

## 3. Rules of engagement and bidder communications

| Topic | Speaker | Detailed discussion |
|---|---|---|
| **Written questions** | Wendy Davids / SANParks project team | Explained that questions must be submitted in writing to ensure consistent and transparent communication. The team had found that verbal answers could be heard or interpreted differently, particularly in a hybrid meeting. Written questions would allow the multidisciplinary team to prepare complete and consistent answers. |
| **Multidisciplinary input** | SANParks/project team | Explained that answers could require inputs from bid specification, environmental, park operational, socioeconomic transformation and other specialists. For this reason, the project team could not necessarily provide immediate verbal answers to every question during the conference. |
| **Questions already received** | SANParks/project team | Stated that approximately 101 to 105 questions had been received, with 45 answered at that stage. The difference appears in the transcript itself, so the exact total should be confirmed from the formal Q&A register. Further responses would be issued in subsequent written Q&A documents. |
| **Official communication** | Jabulile Galane | Confirmed that the SANParks website folder for each concession opportunity was the official platform for |

| Topic | Speaker | Detailed discussion |
|---|---|---|
| | | tender communications. Bidders were instructed to check the website regularly for errata, revised tender documents, clarifications and other changes. |
| **Authority to clarify RFP** | Jabulile Galane | Emphasised that verbal discussions with SANParks staff or advisers could not change, add to or clarify the RFP. Bidders should rely only on written changes, additions or clarifications issued by the duly authorised project officer. She discouraged bidders from approaching other KNP staff directly for clarification. |
| **Bidder conference format** | SANParks/project team | Asked bidders to allow the presentation to proceed and to submit questions in writing. The team explained that this was necessary because not all online participants could hear every question, sound quality was inconsistent, and verbal answers could later be alleged to have disadvantaged participants. |
| **Follow-up questions** | SANParks/project team | Advised bidders that if they considered an answer incomplete or incorrect, they should refer to their original question and clearly state what remained unanswered. The matter would then be referred back to the relevant multidisciplinary specialists. Bidders were also asked to frame questions briefly and reasonably rather than submitting essay-length questions. |
| **Presentation and minutes** | SANParks/project team | Confirmed that the presentation and minutes recording what had been said would be shared with bidders. |

## 4. Concession opportunities and procurement timetable

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Concession period** | Jabulile Galane stated that the advertised concession opportunities were for a term of **25 years**. |
| **Advertisement date** | The opportunities were advertised on **7 July 2026**. |
| **Due diligence** | Due-diligence activities were conducted between **6 and 13 August 2026**. The due-diligence site visits were for bidders' purposes, and no further site visits would be allowed. |
| **Bidder's conference** | The bidder's conference was held on **7 October 2026**, following a postponement of the originally planned conference. |
| **Questions closing date** | The timetable indicated that questions were to be submitted to SANParks by **20 October 2026**. The team indicated that this might be extended depending on the volume and complexity of questions, but no revised date was formally confirmed during the conference. |
| **Intended final Q&A timing** | The project team hoped to finalise the question-and-answer process by the end of October so bidders would still have sufficient time to complete their |

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| | bids. It was suggested that approximately five days might be needed after closure of questions to finalise responses, subject to the nature and volume of questions. |
| **Bid submission date** | Bid submissions were stated to close at **12:00 on 13 November 2026**. |
| **Electronic submission instructions** | The project team was engaging on bidders' electronic submission requirements. Further instructions were to be issued regarding use of the GTAC portal, including bidder-specific codes and passwords. |

## 5. Procurement governance and amendments to the RFP

| Speaker | Detailed record of what was said |
|---|---|
| **Wendy Davids / SANParks project team** | Explained that the KNP lodge concessions were unique in their context and structure. Bidders should not assume that provisions or practices applicable to tenders in other regions would automatically apply. The RFP had been developed through a rigorous Bid Specification Committee process and supporting tender-governance structures intended to meet PPP requirements. |
| **Jabulile Galane** | Confirmed that SANParks reserved the right to amend the timetable, supplement or clarify the RFP, cancel the bid without prior notice and disqualify bidders as provided for in the RFP. |
| **Jabulile Galane** | Confirmed that the RFP and Information Memorandum had already been revised and published on the website. The draft PPP Agreement remained under review and would be uploaded once the amendments had been completed. |

## 6. Bidder structure and authorised representative

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Authorised representative** | Each bidder was required to appoint one or more duly authorised representatives, supported by the appropriate executive mandate and legal authority. The representative's name was to be clearly identified in the bid documents, potentially in the covering letter. |
| **Role of authorised representative** | The project team clarified that the representative did not mean a legal adviser. It referred to the person authorised to sign bid documents on behalf of the bidder and to receive requests for additional information during evaluation. SANParks would communicate with that person during the bid process. |
| **Number of opportunities** | A bidder could submit responses for up to **four opportunities but** could be awarded no more than **two concessions**. SANParks would retain the right to select or award the same preferred bidder in accordance with the tender provisions. |
| **Permitted bidder structures** | A bidder could be a single company, an incorporated joint venture or a trust, subject to the RFP requirements. |

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Technical operator equity** | The technical operator and PPP Agreement partner was required to hold at least **30% of the bidder's equity**. |
| **Qualification criteria** | Bidders were required to satisfy the operational and financial criteria contained in the RFP. Failure to meet the qualification requirements would prevent the bid from proceeding to further evaluation. |

## 7. Bid delivery and packaging requirements

| Requirement | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Physical delivery** | Bids were to be submitted to Jabulile Galane, as project administrator, at SANParks Head Office. The team intended to establish a receiving table on the morning of submission and encouraged bidders to bring their bids directly to the designated reception point rather than leaving them with security at the gate. |
| **Submission deadline** | Bids were required by **12:00 on 13 November 2026**. |
| **Envelope 1, Part A** | This section was to contain the mandatory documentation. Bidders were instructed to use the relevant yes/no checklist and ensure that all compulsory information was included. |
| **Envelope 1, functionality** | The functionality submission included the prescribed bid information, business, operations and design plan, financing and capital plan, environmental plan and risk matrix. |
| **Envelope 2** | Envelope 2 was to contain the financial offer. The financial proposal was to be separated from the functionality submission. |
| **Pricing prohibition** | Bidders were expressly warned not to include the PPP financial offer or BEE offer in the functionality submission. Inclusion of the financial proposal in Envelope 1 could lead to disqualification. |
| **Financial proposal copies** | The project team stated that only **one hard-copy financial proposal** was required and undertook to confirm this again in writing. |
| **Labelling and structure** | Bidders were instructed to follow the prescribed envelope labels and RFP structure so that evaluators could locate information consistently and efficiently. |

## 8. Electronic submission

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Submission platform** | The electronic copies would be submitted through the **GTAC portal**, rather than on USB drives. GTAC was identified as the National Treasury unit associated with the PPP process. |
| **Access details** | Each bidding entity would receive its own code and password for the electronic submission. Detailed instructions would be issued separately. |
| **Upload timing** | Bidders were advised to start uploading documents several days before the deadline because the submissions could contain numerous and very large files. |

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| | They were warned not to wait until the morning of 13 November to begin uploading. |
| **Consistency of versions** | The electronic and physical versions had to be identical. The team warned that discrepancies between the versions could be regarded as fraudulent. |
| **Evaluation copy** | The evaluation team would evaluate the documents contained in the electronic submission, while the hard copy would become part of the contractual record and PPP Agreement process. |

## 9. Functionality evaluation

| Topic | Detailed explanation |
|---|---|
| **Mandatory compliance** | Mandatory documentation would be checked first, normally on the first day of evaluation. Failure to provide compulsory information could lead to disqualification. |
| **Separate evaluation streams** | Functionality would be assessed by different specialist streams, including financial, operational, environmental and risk-related evaluators. The streams would work separately and then consolidate and discuss their scores through the Bid Evaluation Committee. |
| **Overall threshold** | Bidders needed to achieve at least **80 points out of 100** for functionality before Envelope 2 would be opened. A score of 79 would not qualify. |
| **Subcategory threshold** | Bidders were also required to achieve at least **50% in each subcategory**. A bid could therefore fail even if certain sections were strong but another subcategory fell below the minimum threshold. |
| **Environmental submission** | The project team cautioned bidders not to treat the environmental component lightly. Past submissions had sometimes provided insufficient environmental information, even though the section was material to the evaluation. |
| **Evaluation method** | The RFP provided relatively detailed scoring descriptors. Information could be scored according to whether it was fully provided, partially provided, weak or absent. Outlier scores and material issues would be considered by the full Bid Evaluation Committee. |
| **Opening of Envelope 2** | Financial proposals were to be separated and stored securely from the first day. Only the financial proposals of bidders achieving the functionality threshold would be opened. |

## 10. PPP fee offer

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Formula correction** | The project team confirmed that an error had been identified in the PPP fee formula and that a plus sign was required. The correction had been addressed in the errata and written Q&A. |
| **Structure of fee** | The PPP fee payable would be the higher of the stated minimum PPP fee or the flat percentage-based fee calculated on aggregate gross revenue. |

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Minimum fee escalation** | Separate minimum fees had been indicated for each concession for years one and two. Thereafter the amount would escalate by CPIX, with bidders advised in the Q&A to use **5%**. |
| **Percentage offer** | Each bidder was required to submit a **flat percentage of aggregate gross revenue** that would apply throughout the 25-year concession. The percentage was to remain constant even as projected revenue changed from year to year. |
| **Reason for approach** | The project team explained that SANParks required income consistency and predictability. For this procurement, SANParks was therefore not evaluating bids on an NPV basis. |
| **Operating model** | Bidders could determine how they intended to position and operate the lodge. However, the bid should demonstrate the best use of the asset over the concession period within the RFP requirements. |

## 11. B-BBEE and transformation requirements

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Project-specific scorecard** | The presenter explained that PPP rules allowed an institution to develop a project-specific scorecard reflecting its transformation objectives, provided it remained within the broader B-BBEE framework. |
| **Basis of scorecard** | SANParks considered the generic scorecard, the scorecard generally used by SANParks and the tourism scorecard and then consolidated these into a project-specific scorecard reflecting SANParks' transformation priorities. |
| **Bid-stage assessment** | At bid stage, consortium members were required to submit a **consolidated B-BBEE scorecard** for the bidding entity. SANParks did not want separate certificates from each consortium member as the bid-stage submission. |
| **Minimum bid-stage status** | The consolidated bidding entity was required to meet at least **B-BBEE Level 4** to achieve scoring. |
| **Post-award requirements** | The successful entity could remain at Level 4 from year one through year three. From year three onwards, the project entity was expected to achieve Level 2. |
| **B-BBEE plan** | Bidders were required to submit a credible B-BBEE plan. The plan would be reviewed carefully to determine whether its commitments were realistic, properly supported and capable of implementation. |
| **Scorecard elements** | The five main elements identified were ownership; management control and employment equity; skills development; enterprise and supplier development; and socioeconomic development. |
| **Focus areas** | The project-specific scorecard placed particular emphasis on youth, local communities and land claimant communities. Bidders were expected to consider these requirements when structuring their consortiums, boards, management arrangements, employment plans and supplier-development initiatives. |
| **Enterprise and supplier development** | The project team encouraged bidders to identify lodge-related opportunities capable of producing economic benefits for surrounding communities. A possible shared laundry serving several concessions was mentioned as an illustrative example. |

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Scorecard total** | The project scorecard totalled **111 points**. The team undertook to issue a table showing the point ranges that would constitute Levels 2 and 4 against the 111-point total. |
| **Transformation requirements** | The project team made clear that the requirements reflected SANParks' transformation objectives and would not be relaxed merely because bidders considered them difficult. |

## 12. Land claimant arrangements

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Beneficiation agreement** | The meeting was advised that SANParks and seven land claimant communities had concluded a beneficiation agreement. The transcript states that it was agreed "as of last year" and signed earlier in the year. |
| **Application to concessions** | Certain scorecard provisions applicable to the six concessions were drawn from the beneficiation agreement. |
| **Joint governance** | The agreement would be administered through a joint structure involving SANParks and the seven land claimant communities, a "Joint Management Board". |
| **No direct matching** | SANParks would not match an individual land claimant community to a specific concession. The project team explained that doing so would be operationally difficult and that SANParks would retain responsibility for administering the agreed beneficiation arrangements. |
| **Free-carry interest** | Bidders were asked to warehouse the **10% free-carry ownership interest** because it was not being allocated to one specific land claimant community. |
| **Employment benefits** | The arrangement included employment opportunities at specified levels. Bidders were not instructed to dismiss existing staff. Rather, qualifying opportunities would be addressed as positions became available. The relevant roles were described as below management level. |
| **Engagement with communities** | At that stage, bidders were not required to meet the land claimant communities directly. Recruitment-related information would be channelled through the joint governance arrangement so that SANParks could coordinate the process and avoid conflict. |
| **Access to agreement** | The project team stated that the beneficiation agreement would not be provided to bidders because it was an agreement between the contracting parties. The relevant obligations had instead been incorporated into the project scorecard. |

## 13. Residual value and PPP Agreement

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Residual value removed** | The revised tender documents removed residual value from the procurement. Under the current contractual framework, SANParks would not be obliged to pay residual value. |

| Topic | Detailed record |
|---|---|
| **Incoming and outgoing concessionaires** | There would be no requirement for the incoming concessionaire to pay residual value and no residual-value payment to the outgoing concessionaire. |
| **Documents being amended** | The RFP and Information Memorandum had been amended, and the PPP Agreement was being updated to remove provisions dealing with incoming and outgoing residual value. |
| **Early termination** | The project team anticipated that the early-termination fee would remain in the PPP Agreement, but bidders were told to refer to the amended agreement once published. |

## 14. Information requests and operational matters

| Information item | Clarification provided |
|---|---|
| **Staff obligations, drawings and site plans** | Bidders could request this information from Jabulile Galane. |
| **Asset list** | The asset list would not be made available until the preferred-bidder stage. |
| **KNP Operational Manual** | The manual was under review and would be shared once approved otherwise Bidders are to use the manual version provided on the SANParks Website. |
| **ROD and EIA** | Information explaining the concession footprint was contained in the Record of Decision and Environmental Impact Assessment, which bidders could request from Jabulile Galane. |
| **Immovable assets** | It was clarified that the concession was not a sale of the assets. Immovable assets would remain the property of SANParks. |
| **Movable assets** | The transcript states that movable assets would “remain the property of the concessionaire”. |
| **Current lodge occupancy** | SANParks would not disclose the existing lodges’ occupancy figures because these were the operators’ information. Bidders were expected to undertake their own market research and develop occupancy assumptions suited to their proposed operating models. |
| **KNP performance information** | The Information Memorandum contained SANParks’ KNP performance information up to 2024/25. The team indicated that 2025/26 information would also be placed on the website once finalised. |
| **Staffing and salary information** | Questions about staffing and salary information would be answered directly to the bidders who requested it for the relevant lodge. The information would not be published on the general website because some of it was considered confidential. |
| **Attendance register** | Online participants were asked to enter their names and information in the meeting chat before leaving. |

# 15. Decisions and confirmed clarifications

| No. | Decision or confirmed position |
|---|---|
| 1 | All formal bidder questions and clarifications must be submitted and answered in writing. |
| 2 | The SANParks website folders for the six opportunities are the official source of tender communications and amended documents. |
| 3 | No further due-diligence site visits will be permitted. |
| 4 | A bidder may bid for up to four opportunities but may be awarded no more than two concessions. |
| 5 | Financial offers must be kept out of the functionality submission and submitted separately in Envelope 2. |
| 6 | Bidders must achieve at least 80 points overall and 50% in every functionality subcategory to proceed to financial evaluation. |
| 7 | Electronic copies will be submitted through the GTAC portal rather than on USB drives. |
| 8 | The electronic and physical submissions must contain identical documents. |
| 9 | The percentage component of the PPP fee must be a flat percentage of aggregate gross revenue over the 25-year term. |
| 10 | At bid stage, the bidding entity must submit a consolidated B-BBEE scorecard and achieve at least Level 4 to achieve a score. |
| 11 | The project entity is expected to progress to B-BBEE Level 2 from year three onwards. |
| 12 | SANParks will not directly pair each concession with a particular land claimant community. |
| 13 | Residual value has been removed from the procurement documentation and is being removed from the PPP Agreement. |
| 14 | Existing lodge occupancy information and the beneficiation agreement will not be given to bidders. |
| 15 | The conference presentation and minutes will be distributed to bidders. |