

Information Notice 2.xlsx

Title : European tender – C5200 Engineering Advisor, Amsterdam Airport Schiphol
TenderNed : 130378
Notice nr : 02
Date : 8-6-2017
Status : final

Pier & terminal
 Creating the Schiphol of tomorrow



Nr	Type	Document	Reference to tender document (page, section)	Question	Answer
1	Clarification	Request for Proposal	Page 11/49, § 1.4	The schedule on page 11 of the RFP does not show dates for the interviews, but these dates are likely to fall in holiday period. In order to provide the best possibility of being able to attend these interviews on the dates preferred by SNBV, we request the anticipated dates for these interviews to be published as soon as practicable.	The interviews will take place in weeks 30 and 31. We are aware that this is a holiday period and are therefore willing to accomodate, where possible, dates for the conduction of interviews preferred by Tenderers during the course of these two weeks.
2	Clarification	Request for Proposal	Page 14/49, § 2.4	Syndicates: No changes permitted. Question: in the case where a party participates in more than one bid to provide services to the Capital Program, or in different syndicates bidding for the same service. If this party were to win one of these bids, it is automatically excluded from the bids for the other services or from participating in another syndicate for the same service. As the RFP states that no changes are allowed, a syndicate with a partner that participates in different bids, may be excluded, because this partner has won a bid for another service or for the same service, but as partner in another syndicate. This leaves the other partner(s) in the syndicate empty handed. To avoid this, a syndicate may ask two different parties to complete the syndicate, leaving the final decision to the moment the different awards are made. This is however impossible as the syndicate may not change and it may also conflict with the interview part of the selection. Example: Party A covers all disciplines requested, except an architect. Party A forms a syndicate with Party X to fill this gap, but Party X also bids independently for another service. Party Y can also provide the architect, but also tenders for another package. Party A wants to ensure it has an architect on board and tentatively contracts with both Party X and Party Y. Party X and Y are willing to do this, because if they lose their other bids, they are left with nothing. This set up could work, but for the RFP requirement not allowing change or the requirement that only one candidate may be put forward for a core team position. Please provide insight.	Parties are not allowed to bid for the same service in different Syndicates. The provision included in the RFP under § 2.1, page 14/49 applies here. If Tenderer is reliant on a third party for fulfilling one or more of the core team positions, and this party is also bidding for one of the other SNBV tenders that conflicts with the Engineering Advisor tender, Tenderer may include two different third parties it may work with if it wins the tender. Tenderer needs to clearly indicate which party has first preference and which has second. In case the third party that has Tenderer's first preference, however it is appointed another assignment and thus a conflict with the Engineering Advisor tender occurs, then Tenderer may continue in the Engineering Advisor tender procedure with the third party of second preference. In this scenario, SNBV will re-evaluate Tenderers Proposal with regards to all changed information due to the change of third party.
3	Clarification	Request for Proposal	Page 14/49, § 2.4	Engaging third parties. Question: if a party wants to contract an individual for a core team position for a number of years without forming a syndicate, is this party free to do so, or is party required to ask permission from SNBV to engage this individual. Please elaborate on this requirement.	Yes, this is permitted. but in its Proposal Tenderer must indicate the third parties it intends to work with.
4	Question	Request for Proposal	Page 28-31/49, § 5.2.2	The documents make reference to peer reviewing. Peer reviewing is a term used to evaluate another's work in the same field. Our 'peer reviewing' process is stringent and can be the same level of detail as required if we were to review internal design deliverables or external design deliverables. Is it acceptable to submit reference projects where we can demonstrate our company quality control procedures on our 'in-house reviews'?	It is our preference that a review of an external client project is used as a reference. However, in the event that a Tenderer has insufficient external review reference projects available, SNBV reserves the right to consider internal peer reviews as well.

Information Notice 2.xlsx

Title : European tender – C5200 Engineering Advisor, Amsterdam Airport Schiphol
TenderNed : 130378
Notice nr : 02
Date : 8-6-2017
Status : final

Pier & terminal
 Creating the Schiphol of tomorrow



Nr	Type	Document	Reference to tender document (page, section)	Question	Answer
5	Question	Request for Proposal	Page 28-31/49, § 5.2.2	All three reference projects are required to demonstrate peer reviewing from Masterplanning to Detail design which is very specific. Is the tenderer prohibited to submit reference projects where the tenderer has reviewed an external design package in one design phase i.e. Masterplanning or Concept, and designed the other phases and carried out 'in-house reviews'?	It is our preference that reference projects demonstrating review from Masterplan to Detailed design on external design packages are submitted. However, in the event that a Tenderer has insufficient external review reference projects available, SNBV reserves the right to consider internal peer reviews as well.
6	Question	Request for Proposal	Page 28-31/49, § 5.2.2	The Plan of Approach comprises of A:Peer reviewing 20% / B: Team composition and staffing 50% / C: Price= 30% totaling to 100%. How do the 3No. reference projects contribute towards the final score and are there any guidelines as to how this is scored?	The Reference Projects as required under § 5.2.2 are Suitability Requirements that fall under the process of First Selection (as described on page 23/49, point 2). Hence, the Reference Projects are not scored, but treated as minimum requirements. Only Proposals that comply with all Suitability Requirements and therefore successfully complete the process of First Selection will be scored based upon Award Criteria A-C.
7	Question	Request for Proposal	Page 33-35/49, § 5.3.1	The Plan of Approach; section criteria A & B requires a document that describes an approach to peer reviewing, risk management etc. What is the format required for this document i.e. is there a word and page limit/page size/font size or is this open?	There is no format given for the Plan of Approach, Tenderers are free to choose the format they see fit. The part of the Plan of Approach related to Award Criterion A may encompass no more than 12 single-sided A4 sheets (printed on one side only) with a maximum of 500 words each, including supporting images, illustrations, diagrams etc. As for the part of the Plan of Approach related to Award Criterion B may encompass no more than 10 single-sided A4 sheets (printed on one side only) with a maximum of 500 words each, including supporting images, illustrations, diagrams etc., but excluding the required CV's as described on page 35/49, point 4.
8	Question	Request for Proposal	Page 35/49, § 5.3.1	What is the page limit for each core team member?	Please see the information given in the Request for Proposal, page 35/49, point 4.
9	Question	Request for Proposal	Page 35/49, § 5.3.1	Award criteria A & B make reference to " 'version 0' of the peer reviewing plan". Can you clarify what version 0 refers to?	Version 0' refers to the first version of the peer reviewing plan as submitted by Tenderers as part of their Proposal.
10	Clarification	Appendix 1 - Scope of Services	Page 7/12, § 2.2	The level of reviews differs as per Fidic's 'Guidelines to Reviewing the Work of a Professional Consulting Engineer' i.e. a) the review may involve the checking and verification of detailed calculations or b) more simply require the reviewer to follow through the design process to verify that appropriate assumptions and standards have been used and the conclusions reached are sound in general engineering terms, and are consistent with the design process followed. Can SNBV please clarify the level of review required as per 'Guidelines to Reviewing the Work of a Professional Consulting Engineer', Clause 1.3.	These guidelines are not referred to in our Tender Dossier. However, as the peer reviews need to be finalised within 7 work days, the level of peer review required will be more in line with b) rather than a).

Information Notice 2.xlsx

Title : European tender – C5200 Engineering Advisor, Amsterdam Airport Schiphol
TenderNed : 130378
Notice nr : 02
Date : 8-6-2017
Status : final

Pier & terminal
 Creating the Schiphol of tomorrow



Nr	Type	Document	Reference to tender document (page, section)	Question	Answer
11	Clarification	Appendix 1 - Scope of Services	Page 7-9/12, § 2.2 and 2.3	The ambitions of Schiphol airport are clearly set out in the ambitions document, it is clearly stated that the reviewer will review the deliverables to ensure the ambitions are met. From a technical perspective i.e. calculations (dependent on Q1's answer), BIM model reviewing and O&M manual reviewing, what baseline of information will be provided to review the deliverables against? i.e. experience, Dutch standards, Eurocodes, international standards etc.	The BIM model and O&M manuals will be provided for review. Typical SNBV O&M manuals will be provided as a reference.
12	Clarification	Appendix 1 - Scope of Services	Page 8/12, § 2.3	For Task 2b it states that the 'Engineering Advisor will deal with any architectural, engineering or technical queries during the construction of all Capital Programme Projects that neither the contracted Design Consultants nor the contracted PMCM can answer.' Fidic's Guidelines to Reviewing the Work of a Professional Consulting Engineer' for reviewing state 'Although a reviewer should not attempt to take over or usurp the design or impose their own solutions, they may, if involved from the start in a review of this type, be involved in review of the selection of the option chosen for the solution of the problem. Likewise the reviewer should not, unless the client insists, undertake numerical checking but should be satisfied by the designer that design quality assurance is being applied by the designer.' Fidic guidelines make no reference to the scope of reviewer carrying out design tasks and as such answering technical queries, only carrying out numerical checks upon request. Please confirm that the scope for this task is carrying out numerical checks when requested and that the reviewer will only be reviewing information provided by the Design Consultant and/or the PMCM. If the reviewer is to propose changes to the design this will be a conflict of interest as the reviewer is not the Designer.	These guidelines are not referred to in our tender dossier. You are correct - the Engineering Advisor is not the Designer.
13	Clarification	Appendix 1 - Scope of Services	Page 7/12, § 2.2	With reference to Fidic's Guidelines to Reviewing the Work of a Professional Consulting Engineer, 'A reviewer should not sign or be responsible for any compliance certification. That is the responsibility of the original designer. Note that when the review is required as part of a regulatory/statutory process, the reviewer will be required to submit some form of producer statement (design review certificate). This will normally attract some liability.' Can SNBV confirm the level of liability i.e. is the level of liability accountable to a percentage of the lump sum fee provided for Task 1?	No. This is not correct. The level of liability is accountable to a percentage of the overall lump-sum fee. Please refer to clause 6.2 of the Particular Conditions.

Information Notice 2.xlsx

Title : European tender – C5200 Engineering Advisor, Amsterdam Airport Schiphol
TenderNed : 130378
Notice nr : 02
Date : 8-6-2017
Status : final

Pier & terminal
Creating the Schiphol of tomorrow



Nr	Type	Document	Reference to tender document (page, section)	Question	Answer
14	Question	Annex H	N/A	In annex H we are requested to substantiate. Is it acceptable for the substantiation to be referenced to an appendix attached to the back of the forms rather than answering in the form tables?	Yes, this is acceptable. But please bear in mind that the following does still apply for each submitted Reference Project: 'In addition to the form above the Tenderer must add a description of the Reference Project encompassing no more than 4 single-sided A4 sheets (printed on one side only) with a maximum of 500 words each, including supporting images, illustrations, diagrams etc.' and 'The description must follow the structure as provided by the two tables below.'.
15	Clarification	Annex K	N/A	Are the CVs required to be completed in the template/form as set out in Annex K or is it acceptable to take the content and format into our bespoke template for presentation purposes, providing the level of content remains the same?	Yes, this is acceptable as long as the provided structure in Annex K is adhered to.
16	Question	Overall	N/A	Are captions included within the word count?	Captions may be excluded from the word count.