

Pre-Bid Queries by Metavian

Dated, 25th August 2025

Section: Scope of Work – Physical Museum Development

1. **Architectural Design & Dimensions:** The RFP specifies architectural design, renovation, and possible new construction for the Physical Museum, but it does not provide clarity on the total deployable size (area in sq. ft./sq. m.), the breakup of new construction vs. renovation, or details of the existing layout. Since these factors directly affect cost, timelines, and planning, could the department provide floor plans, site dimensions, and structural drawings, or arrange a site visit to enable accurate design, costing, and scheduling?
2. **Project Feasibility :** The Scope of Work mentions several advanced technologies such as Metaverse platforms, Digital Twins, Robotics, 3D Printing, AI-based avatars, and XR training simulators, which are all high-end and resource-intensive. Considering the project value of approx. ₹2 Crores, kindly clarify whether these technologies are mandatory deliverables in full implementation, or whether they are expected only as feasibility/limited-scope components aligned with the overall project scope, as even a single component (such as a functional metaverse platform or robotics integration) could consume a significant portion of the allocated budget.

Section: Timelines & Project Execution

3. **Timeline Extension :** To achieve a quality outcome, and given the complexity involved (preproduction, civil works, fabrication, immersive technology, digitization, hardware installation and software deployment), could this timeline be extended to a more realistic duration, especially since the exact scope of work is yet to be clearly defined? Additional time may also be required for consultations between various stakeholders during preproduction to refine the scope of work, including elements such as storytelling and content finalization.
4. **Imported Hardware Lead Time:** Some of the specialized hardware components required for this project may need to be imported from overseas, which typically involves a lead time of 25–30 days for shipping and customs clearance. Would the department consider accommodating this grace period within the overall project timelines?

Section : Financials & Commercial

5. Page 2 of 15 / Section : 2.ii

The EMD is ₹35 Lakhs and PBG (Performance Bank Guarantee): 5% of project value (~₹10 Lakhs if project is ₹2 Cr). This is significant compared to the stated project

value of only ₹2 Cr. Typically PBG is higher because it secures performance for years, whereas EMD is just a bid security

6. **Page 15 of 15 / Section : 8.iii & v**

The payment schedule specifies monthly and half-yearly milestones. Given the heavy upfront capital expenditure (hardware, civil works, digitization), can there be a mobilization advance (e.g., 20–30%)?

7. Can the department consider the 3rd party hardware procurement and cloud infrastructure costs to be reimbursed at actuals, or are they expected to be absorbed into the quoted bid value?

Section : Technical Clarifications

8. **Future-Proof Installations:** We see potential to incorporate future-proof experiential formats such as immersive dome projection installations with LiDAR-based motion and gesture-controlled 6 DOF interactive experiences. Could the department clarify whether it is open to exploring such futuristic visions within the project scope, or if the expectation under Section 3.2 (“Optional/Feasibility”) is limited to simpler large-scale interactive projections? This clarification will help align expectations appropriately within the limited budget.
9. **DAM & System Integration (Page 8 of 15) :** The RFP mentions integration with NAI’s existing Digital Asset Management (DAM) system. Could the department provide details of the current DAM/CMS and its APIs or integration framework? This will help bidders evaluate whether the requirement is for direct integration or for proposing a new DAM solution.
10. **Content Digitization & Optimization (Page 6 of 15) :** The RFP mentions optimizing existing digital assets and digitizing select physical records, including 3D modelling of artefacts where applicable. Could the department clarify the expected scope and volume of work - whether this involves basic image/document based scanning/metadata tagging or advanced processes such as 3D Scanning / LiDAR-based scanning of artefacts (life-size or portable)? Additionally, should bidders propose and provision the required digitization infrastructure ?
11. **Digital Avatar / Digital Twin (Page 6 of 15) :** The RFP specifies the “**Creation of a Digital Avatar for Each Exhibition**” as a virtual representation or digital twin. As **digital twins** can range from simple 3D/VR visualizations to advanced, real-time interactive environments, could the department clarify the exact level of functionality expected? Specifically, should this be a basic 3D/VR representation or a more advanced dynamic twin with interactive, AI-driven, or real-time features? If the latter is required, we request proportionate extensions in project timelines and budget, as such deployments involve significantly higher effort, resources, and costs.

12. **Site Information & Point of Contact** : To prepare a more accurate technical bid, we may require additional details such as floor plans, site dimensions, existing layout, sample template for storytelling and digital system specifications. Could the department provide these details or make an arrangement for the same? Additionally, will a single point of contact or an official channel be designated for providing additional data and clarifications during the bid preparation stage?

Section : Operations & Maintenance

13. The RFP requires 5 years AMC including programming & engineering support. Could you clarify the expected staffing model (full-time onsite, hybrid, remote support or on demand)?
14. For monthly MIS reports, can the department specify the metrics and KPIs expected?
15. **Change Requests:** Given the fast-evolving nature of immersive technologies, will there be a defined process to address future scope changes in hardware and software, or additional feature requests after the award of contract, including corresponding adjustments to cost and timelines?

Section : Eligibility & Evaluation

16. RFP has an inconsistency here: (Page 9 of 15) at section “**2. Turnover** “
- It states “at least INR 1 Crores (**Indian Rupees One Hundred Crores**)”
 - That’s contradictory because 1 Crore ≠ 100 Crores.

More likely that the intended figure is ₹1 Crore rather than ₹100 Crores.

17. The turnover requirement is stated as ₹100 Cr average turnover in 3 years. This seems unusually high given the project value of ₹2 Cr. Can this be relaxed to a proportionate amount (e.g., ₹10–20 Cr) or waived for MSME/startups?