



**SOUTH AFRICAN TOURISM**

**Tender no SAT 165/19**

**Brand Content Hub**

**Notes for Bid Clarification**

***“Please include a signed copy of the Addendum with the Bid submission”***

## Introduction

This Addendum with clarification notes serves to inform potential Tenderers of changes, amendments and/or clarifications made to the Bid documentation. The following queries and/or changes have been received from those that have collected documentation.

| Item | Description   |
|------|---|
| 1    | <p><b><u>Question</u></b></p> <p>Pg 19 of the RFP document states that there is a need for 70% current content (Archieved) and 30% new content (Originated from South African Tourism for all platforms), however during the brief it was stated that new content is 70% and Old Content is 30%</p> <p><b><u>Response</u></b></p> <p>The correct wording is the RFP explanations where 70% is for archived and 30% new Content</p>  |
| 2    | <p><b><u>Question</u></b></p> <p>In point 1 of the Evaluation Criteria: In the first bullet point you ask the tendering company to provide clear examples of work and case studies. In the second point you ask for letters of reference. Our question is as follows:</p> <p>Must the letters of reference relate specifically to the examples of the work referred to in the first bullet point?</p> <p><b><u>Response</u></b></p> <p>It would be beneficial for the reference to relate to the tender requirements.</p> |
| 3    | <p><b><u>Query</u></b></p> <p>Continuing with point 1 of Evaluation Criteria in the second bullet... a point of clarity please on the 12-month specification for the letters of reference: If, for example, our letter of reference refers to a job done in 2016, is that OK as long as the letter of reference is dated within the last 12 months?</p> <p><b><u>Response</u></b></p> <p>It is preferred that it is a relevant reference for a client and work completed in the last 12 months</p>                        |
| 4    | <p><b><u>Query</u></b></p> <p>Three SA Tourism markets are specifically mentioned in this RFP namely India, Nigeria and China. Can you tell us the reasons you have specifically highlighted these markets (and not, for example, other historically significant markets of South Africa from a tourism point-of-view e.g. the United Kingdom and Germany)?</p> <p><b><u>Response</u></b></p> <p>These are the 3 key growth markets.</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 5 | <p><b><u>Query</u></b></p> <p>This is a 2-part question around cost: A budget of R30 million per annum over three years is indicated for this scope of services</p> <p><b><u>Response</u></b></p> |
|---|---|

|    |  |
|----|--|
|    | <p>There is no budget of R30 million per annum provided.</p>   |
| 6  | <p><b><u>Query</u></b></p> <p>Should the cost of R30 million in year 1 be adjusted by inflation to get to year 2 and 3 figures? e.g.: Year 1: R30 million<br/>Year 2: R30 million + CPIX of say 6% = R31 800 000<br/>Year 3: R31 800 000 + CPIX of say 6% = R33 708 000<br/>So total cost over 3 years' equals R95 508 000 or does it equal R90 million i.e. there is no annual inflation adjustment?</p> <p><b><u>Response</u></b></p> <p>You need to make the proposal you feel relevant for the final costings. Financial Cost for Gate 2 (Price and BEE) should be included in a separate envelope in original and hard copy pack.</p> |
| 7  | <p><b><u>Query</u></b></p> <p>Does the total amount over 3 years (either R95 508 000 or R90 000 000) include or exclude VAT?</p> <p><b><u>Response</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The financial costing for three years should be vat inclusive. NB: The projected budget is not R90 million, I meant to say PPPFA require Sub contract should the tender value be more than R30 million. Not R30 million x 3 years. Bidders must cost us based on the scope of work and capabilities to deliver the work.</li> </ul>  |
| 8  | <p><b><u>Query</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If you are a company registered in South Africa, do you need to be registered on CSD</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Response</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only applicable to SA registered companies.</li> </ul>  |
| 9  | <p><b><u>Query</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the BEE scorecards of parties in an Unincorporated Consortium need to be combined? into a new scorecard for the purposes of this submission, or does it suffice for each party to submit their own BEE Scorecard?</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Response</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, you need to combine. No individual BEE will be considered.</li> </ul>  |
| 10 | <p><b><u>Query</u></b></p> <p>9.1 Scope of services<br/>In the case of facilities equipment being owned by a third party that is not an EME, and in the event of this party being a lower level BEE supplier than the Main Bidder, would the facilities supplier be regarded as a sub-contractor subject to a 25% cap per the preferential procurement regulations, or could the facilities supplier simply be part of the production operation as a 3<sup>rd</sup> party supplier, alongside for example freelance national camera crews et c</p> <p><b><u>Response</u></b></p>   |

|        |   |
|--------|---|
|        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum sub-contractor is 30% and we will consider BEE certificate for main-bidder.</li> </ul>   |
| 11     | <p><b>Query</b></p> <p>Unincorporated consortium =If the Main Bidder and an EME elect to enter into an Unincorporated Consortium relationship, would the inclusion of such EME at more than 30% satisfy the EME subcontract requirement, or would both parties be required to further subcontract an additional 30% to an EME over and above the Unincorporated Consortium split?</p> <p><b>Response</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You still need to have sub-contractor. Have combine BEE. register on csd</li> </ul> |
| 12     | <p><b>Query</b></p> <p>RFP page 26<br/>3. Platform information relating to (including but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Value and volume of catalogued content</li> </ul> <p>Please could you clarify the expectation regarding the reference to “value”</p> <p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Value relates to the quality, importance, uniqueness, relevance etc of content.</p>  |
|        | <p><b>Query</b></p> <p>SAT 162/19 versus SAT 165/19, Is the intention for the successfully awarded agencies on the SAT 162/19 RFP to curate and, for example, social media community manage the content that is being asked for as part of this RFP 165/19?</p> <p><b>Response</b></p> <p>RFP 165/19 is a content broadcast/newsroom curation, creation and distribution. This is different to the RFP 162/19.</p>  |
|        | <p><b>Query</b></p> <p>Content acquisition and usage, the deadline is very tight to stipulate exact content licensing prices for some of the content we have access to, is it adequate to describe the options that would be available to SAT in principle?</p> <p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Price should be submitted with the bids proposal on the 13 December 2019</p>  |
|        | <p><b>Query</b></p> <p>As per the digitalassets.satourism.net website, is the intention that the content we license has open usage rights post negotiation?</p> <p><b>Response</b></p> <p>If it is possible</p>   |
| tion13 | <p><b>Query</b></p> <p>Existing assets and content that resides in the existing SAT DAM system, do you have an existing policy around data security, and intellectual property of content that you apply to current partners?</p> <p><b>Response</b></p> <p>No, we do not currently have a content hub partner. This would have to be drafted</p>   |

14

Query

Page 26 - Distribution

“Sustainable distribution network for distribution/syndication to all markets particularly: Nigeria, China and India.

““Please explain what you mean by sustainable distribution network

Response

Distribution and syndication of content on a regular and sustainable basis.