

Memorandum of Information European Tender 'Morphological and Scour Study for IJWWFZ'

Date: April 16, 2022

In this Memorandum of Information, the department inviting tenders provides answers to the questions asked and remarks posted in the context of the above-mentioned European Tender. This Memorandum of Information forms an integral part of Tender Document (with reference **202201045**).

No	Question	Answer
1	"Article 27.4 ARVODI-2018 states that the Contractor shall grant the Contracting Authority access to the agreements on employment conditions. We are willing to work with you on this, assuming that you do not want to use these conditions to ensure that the Contractor acts in conflict with the AVG. Are you prepared to add to the last sentence of Article 27.4 ARVODI-2018 the phrase 'with due regard for the provisions of the AVG'?"	Agreed.
2	"It follows from Article 26.2 ARVODI-2018 that, at the request of the Contracting Authority, the Contractor must immediately submit (an certified copy of) the policies and the proof of the payment of premium for the insurances or a statement from the insurer to the effect that these policies exist and the premium has been paid. For reasons of competition, we do not provide access to our insurance policies. Copies of insurance certificates proving that the insurance requirements are met are available. Is it sufficient to provide a copy of an insurance certificate?"	Yes.

No	Question	Answer
3	"Article 21 ARVODI-2018 does not contain an expiry or limitation period, so that we fall back on the statutory limitation period (Section 3:310 of the Dutch Civil Code). Liability can therefore continue for up to 20 years after the damaging event. However, our advice is based on current reality and this reality is constantly changing. It may happen that the actual situation after a number of years is so different from our advice that our advice no longer fits the new situation. The applicability of the advice depends on changes in the actual situation that occur in the course of time and for this very reason it is not logical and we consider it disproportionate to follow the legal limitation period of 20 years. We therefore kindly request that you follow the regulations that are customary within the sector (such as the DNR 2011). We would like to see the liability expiring if 5 years have passed since the completion of the work according to the contract. Is it possible to add such a clause?"	Not accepted. There is no specific reason to further limit the liability as stated in Article 21, which article already limits the full liability under the Dutch law.
4	"Article 21.3 ARVODI-2018 states that liability is limited per event, whereby the number of events is not limited. We kindly request that you take account of what is common practice in the sector for this contract, in accordance with the advice of the Committee of Tendering Experts (number 154, see among other things consideration 6.2.14). Are you prepared to limit the number of events per contract to a maximum of five?"	Not agreed. In the opinion of the Contracting Authority, the ARVODI-2018 already contains a proper liability provision that takes into account both the interests of the Client and those of the Contractor
5	"In accordance with Article 19 ARVODI-2018, the Contracting Authority may require an on-demand bank guarantee (in Dutch: kredietinstellingsgarantie 'op afroep'), which entails additional costs for the contractor and should therefore be included in the pricing. Do you intend to require an on-demand bank guarantee(in Dutch: kredietinstellingsgarantie 'op afroep')?"	No. Considering that no advance payment is mentioned in the Tender Document, a bank guarantee is not part of the Agreement.

No	Question	Answer
6	"Article 15.2 ARVODI-2018 states that certificates of conduct for the Contractor's Staff may be required for the staff to be deployed. Because applying for and obtaining these statements takes some time, we would like to take this into account. Do you intend to request these statements?"	These certificates of conduct will not be asked for by the Contracting Authority.
7	"In section 4.2 of Annex 7 ""Starting Points and Assumptions"" the following is mentioned: All contractors must use the taxonomy as presented in the taxonomy list, which is available online at https://offshorewind.rvo.nl/file/view/55039930/Taxonomy+List+Offshore+Wind+Energy+-+Dutch_English Can the link be updated? This link is not available."	The correct link is: https://offshorewind.rvo.nl/files/view/dff880d4-9494-4e6d-b398-8fd1f097957e/162642502520210714_taxonomy%20list%20offshore%20wind%20energy_dutch-english.xlsx
8	"In section 4.1 of Annex 7 ""Starting Points and Assumptions"" the following is mentioned: Data described in the IHO S44 standards should be delivered according to that standard: https://iho.int/uploads/user/pubs/Drafts/S-44_Edition_6.0.0-Final.pdf Could this document be shared? The link is not available."	The correct link is: https://iho.int/uploads/user/pubs/standards/s-44/S-44_Edition_6.0.0_EN.pdf
9	"In item 7 of Annex 5 ""Section III Scope of Work"" the following is mentioned: Assess the impact of morphodynamics on the possible burial and migration of Unexploded Ordnances (UXOs). Reference is made to the UXO study IJV. Provide maps with the most likely depths for encountering (buried) UXOs on a grid of 20 x 20m. The impact of morphodynamics on the possible burial and migration of existing cables and pipelines is not mentioned explicitly. Should these effects also be addressed?"	No, this is not required

No	Question	Answer
10	"In item 7 of Annex 5 ""Section III Scope of Work"" the following is mentioned: Based upon the previous analyses performed to deliver upon Objective 1 and Objective 2 of the SoW, apply a suitable method to predict the likely seabed level variability over the lifecycle of the development; inclusion of a discussion of the temporal scales associated with such variability would be welcomed. Could you explain what the lifecycle of the development is?"	The assessment period is 2022 - 2072. This includes 5 years prior to installation, 40 years life time of the wind farm after commissioning and 2 years of decommissioning.
11	"In item 7 of Annex 5 ""Section III Scope of Work"" the following is mentioned: Define and justify appropriate spatial and temporal scales of interest for the assessment. What is the lifetime of the wind farm?"	The assessment period is 2022 - 2072. This includes 5 years prior to installation, 40 years life time of the wind farm after commissioning and 2 years of decommissioning.
12	"In item 5 of Annex 5 ""Section III Scope of Work"" the following is mentioned: Once internally reviewed and agreed by RVO, the study will be subject to an industry certification review process with as a minimum one revision round. This should be accounted for in the tenderer's proposal. When does this certification review process take place? After the Final Report? And what is a typical period that should be accounted for in the proposal?"	Final Reports are to be certified following completion. The typical period for certification is 8-12 weeks. Contractor should take into account at least one round of Technical Questions following the review and comment of the Certification Body. On acceptance of the full Verification Comment Sheet produced by the Certification Body the contractor is requested to finalize and issue the Final Report with signatures.
13	"In item 5 of Annex 5 ""Section III Scope of Work"" the following is mentioned: Note: it is the intention that four tie lines will be included which will traverse the shipping lane which lies between IJV Site III-IV and Site V-VI. What is meant by the four ""tie lines"" and what is the Contractor expected to do with these?"	The planned shipping lane is not part of IJmuiden Ver WFS III + IV and IJmuiden Ver WFS V + VI. Only publicly available data of this part of the Wind Farm Zone is available. The four tie-lines between WFS III + IV and V + VI are survey lines (bathymetry and geophysical data) that will provide continuity of survey data along these survey corridors (across the shipping lane) between the areas. It is anticipated that these data will be useful to the successful contractor, and that they will be utilised by the contractor in their assessment of the investigation area for the morphological and scour assessment on IJmuiden Ver.

No	Question	Answer
14	"In item 5 of Annex 5 ""Section III Scope of Work"" the following is mentioned: It is anticipated that in the interim period, before the new primary data become available, work can be progressed on the study for 'Site V-VI' (in tandem with those for 'Site I-II' and 'Site III-IV') using existing available data sources, and when the new primary data become available these should be incorporated into the assessment. The amount of time to process this data is limited. Could you provide dummy data that can be used as an example to set up the post-processing tools in advance?"	The expected output data for IJmuiden Ver WFS V+VI is similar to the data that are available for IJmuiden Ver WFS I-IV. After contract award the succesful contractor will receive specific information on expected outputs as soon as possible for IJmuiden Ver WFS V+VI.
15	"In item 4 of Annex 5 ""Section III Scope of Work"" the following is mentioned: The Contractor is required to issue the final draft 10 working days after receipt of comments from RVO, including a full response to the DRF. In our view this is only achievable if the draft report is already almost finished at that moment. What if the comments from RVO require additional analysis (e.g. model runs) that need more computational time than 10 days?"	As per Scope of Work item 10 // Communication it is requested that the Contractor will provide regular insights on preliminary and draft results during bi-weekly meetings and during the presentation of the intermediate results. As a result of these meetings RVO will be able to monitor progress and provide feedback to the Contractor which can be included in the Draft Report. If, following the RVO review of the draft report, the comments require re-runs which cannot be completed within the 10 days, then additional agreements to extend the period for revisions can be made.
16	In item 4 of Annex 5 "Section III Scope of Work" desired date for the Draft reporting is mentioned as "23 November 2022", which is "Final delivery of all Geophysical reports and data sets + 40 calendar days". This implies that the final delivery of the latest dataset is at 14 October 2022. Can you confirm this?	Yes, 14 October 2022. The winning tenderer (or Contractor?) will be updated on the actual planning by RVO, when more is known.
17	"In item 3 of Annex 5 ""Section III Scope of Work"" the following is mentioned: Issuing of the 1st revision Draft Seabed Sampling Report - including all lab results is expected 1 September 2022. How to deal with this in the project planning? What if the data is not delivered at the "expected" date?"	It is up to the Contractor to provide their approach in this according to the Tender Document, 5.5, "Award criteria with respect to Planning and Feasibility". Tenderer is requested to provide a comprehensive project plan and associated time schedule for performing the works showing all activities, their duration and delivery dates. The impact of final data delivery by client mid-project for part of the investigation area (IJV V-VI) should be considered and accounted for in this planning (see Scope of Work for information relating to schedule for data delivery for IJV V-VI).
18	Section 3.2 of Annex 5 "Section II Remuneration" mentions that 80% of the contract value can be invoiced by the Contractor after the delivery of the Final Concept. Can you explain what is meant by "Final Concept"?	"Final Concept" is meant to be "Draft Report" which is provided to RVO for first review as per Scope of Work Item 4 bullet 2a.

No	Question	Answer
19	Annex 4, tab 'Projects and publications', column H asks whether reference projects have been certified. What is meant by this?	A Certified Report has been reviewed and signed off as fit-for-purpose by a Recognised Industry Certification Body. For example please see the reports on: https://offshorewind.rvo.nl/cms/view/2dd28a50-5344-47a6-b3ff-7d0e36911159/soil-ijmuiden-ver or the example of TNW Morphodynamics report: https://offshorewind.rvo.nl/files/view/4985a940-cf31-4070-aa69-d33ff78c677c/tnw_20220224_deltares_morpho_report-f.pdf
20	In Annex 3, the daily rate should be specified. What is the rate we should mention here, if multiple persons are working on the same activity? Average rate of multiple persons? Or specify the hours for each person per activity?	It is up to the Contractor to provide a breakdown of activities, expected time per activity and a daily rate. The contractor is free to split the activities per role including rates per role such as junior, medior and / or senior.
21	Section 7.3.17 of the "Tender Document describes that in case the principal contractor does rely on the capacity of subcontractors that then the subcontractor must also complete a separate 'European Single Procurement Document', filling in parts II A, II B, III and IV and legally sign it. Should the signature be added in part VI?	Yes. Please note that part IIIC of the ESPD was not complete. Together with this Memorandum of Information a revised ESPD is published. Tenderers are requested to use the revised version.
22	"Section 5.4 of the ""Tender Document"" describes the following: List of reference journal and/or conference publications of offshore morphodynamic research in the past 10 years of project delivery team members. In Annex 4, however, the list of publications in the past 5 years is asked for. Which period should we use?"	This should be the last 5 years, as in Annex 4.
23	Section 5.3 of the "Tender Document" it is described that the Contractor should provide "A Project Quality approach with a description of controls, risks inventory and risk mitigation plan". In our view the "controls" are tools to mitigate the risks. With this definition in mind, could you explain the difference between "controls" and "risk mitigation plan"?	The project quality approach should include a risk mitigation plan, which includes a risk inventory and, where possible, describes the appropriate controls identified to mitigate these risks.

No	Question	Answer
24	"Section 5.2 of the ""Tender Document"" describes the following: The extent to which the Proposal gives insight into a clear understanding of the assignment, the clarity of the descriptions on the methodology, modelling approach, proposed analyses, and the amount of background information for the applicability of the method for the IJV WFZ. Is an analysis on the amount of background information prior to the Deadline for receipt of the Tenders required?"	No, it is not a requirement. However, tenderers' proposals would benefit from consideration of the relevant (publicly available) information that may be used to support the delivery of the SoW.
25	"Section 4.3.2 of the ""Tender Document"" describes that you can only provide one reference for each core competence. The core/key competences are listed in Annex 6. In total for two core/key competences evidences should be provided by filling in Annex 6. This means that in total (maximum) two references can be provided to demonstrate the required experience for the two core/key competences. In Annex 6, however, room is allocated for three references (there are three rows that can be filled in). Can you confirm that we should only fill in two of the three rows to demonstrate our experience for the core/key competences?"	The Contractor is to provide a minimum of one reference per core/key competence. If a single reference proves both core/key competences then 1 reference is sufficient. Each core/key-competence should have a minimal value of EUR 30.000,-. To confirm, the 3rd row in Annex 6 is not to be filled in.
26	Could you please confirm the ultimate deadline for the Draft deliverables? The Tender Document states under section 3.3. that "the draft reports based on partially preliminary data should be provided no later than 20 weeks following project technical Kick Off meeting". The preferred start date is the end of June so this would bring the delivery date for the draft reports to be on the 2nd December. The latest start date is the 15th July, which brings the delivery date to the 16th December. This contradicts with the planning as described in section 2.1 and the planning under Scope of Works documents: "The work should commence immediately after starting date of the contract. Draft reporting is required to be issued no later than 20 January 2023 [Ultimate Date]."	The starting date of the contract is as per the Tender Document: 29 June 2022. The preferred (23 November 2022) and ultimate (20 January 2023) date for draft reporting is as per Scope of Work item #4, bullet 1.

No	Question	Answer
27	In relation to the ultimate deadline for the Draft report: are the final tranche of geotechnical and geophysical data to be included in the draft report? Or is it accepted that these may be delivered without sufficient time for inclusion and might form part of the revisions for the final report?	The current preferred date, 23 November 2022, is based on the current planning of geophysical deliverables. The winning tenderer (= contractor) for the morphological and scour assessment will have at least 40 calendar days to include the results of the geophysical campaign into the draft reporting. To optimise programme and budget, it is requested that the tenderer should explicitly describe in their project planning how they will manage this staged data integration process within the required delivery schedule.
28	It is understood there will be a certifying body for certification of the study. Could you confirm that the review by the certifying body and the following certification is included in the described planning between Draft and Final reporting as described under 4.2 of the Annex 5 section III - Scope of Works document and section 2.1 of the Tender Document?	No. The certification will be performed after RVO approval of the Final Report and associated datasets. Final Reports are to be certified. Typical period for this is 8-12 weeks. Contractor should take into account atleast one round of Technical Questions following the review of the Certification Body. On acceptance of the full Verification Comment Sheet by the Certification Body, the contractor is requested to finalise and issue the Final Report with signatures. Also see question 12.
29	Could you provide an indication of the proposed life cycle of a wind farm?	The assessment period is 2022 - 2072. This includes 5 years prior to installation, 40 years life time of the wind farm after commissioning and 2 years of decommissioning. Cf. question 11.
30	Is it correct to assume that the task "Assess the impact of morphodynamics on the possible burial and migration of Unexploded Ordnances (UXOs)" is limited by assessing the most likely (burial) depth and location of UXO's, by comparing the expected bed form heights and sand dune and sand wave migration and location of the UXO's. The referenced UXO report concluded that morphodynamics and hydrodynamics have minor effect on the migration of UXO's.	For this element of the SoW, the tenderer should aim to qualify the likelihood of further burial and/or migration (along the vertical axis) of buried UXOs if they are encountered across the study site. Such an assessment should consider likely changes to seabed elevation due to natural variability and bedform migration and evolution.
31	Is there any plan available that indicates the expected structure type, (spatial) density and location within the windfarm zones?	No. This is up to the future wind farm developer.
32	Is RVO able to help gather data and information on scour experiences in nearby wind farms (based on publicly available data).	No. This is up to the successful contractor. All the publicly available information on RVO wind farm zone developments is available on: https://offshorewind.rvo.nl/

No	Question	Answer
33	Is the indicative scour prediction to be assessed and mapped for all structure types as listed in the Scope of Work (Task 15.c), including and limited by monopile, jacket, gravity-based foundation, suction buckets or only for typical monopile diameter of 12m as described under Task 16.a? Please clarify.	Task 15.c requests that the contractor should, for typical foundation types (e.g., monopile, jacket, gravity-based foundation, suction buckets), describe the potential for scour that may be expected for each of the individual sites (considering site specific hydrodynamic and sedimentological data utilised within the study). Task 16.a requests a specific analysis (and deliverable) of scour potential (depth and lateral extent) anticipated to occur across the sites, for a typical monopile diameter of 12m on a spatial grid of 20 x 20m.
34	Could you elaborate/clarify the 0.5 m deformation for Task 16.b? Does this refer to rock stability? Rock stability is commonly not specified by means of spatial deformation in meters.	In this context the term deformation refers to 0.5 m of seabed lowering of (any part of) the scour protection as a result of an extreme event with a 50-year return period.
35	"Section 4.3.2 of the ""Tender Document"" and Annex 6 the describes a reference has to be provided for the following core competence (number 1): 1) Capability to undertake morphological assessment of offshore sites including the use of site-specific geophysical and geotechnical data, of at least one inter-array and/or export cable site and at least one wind farm site; In our view a morphological assessment on other offshore infrastructure (pipelines and interconnector cables) is of comparable value of a similar assessment on inter-array cable, export cable and wind farm site. Are you willing to change the requirement such that we are allowed to use morphological assessments on pipelines and interconnector cables as a reference?"	You can include this experience, as RVO recognises that morphological assessments on pipelines and interconnector cables are valuable and comparable, in terms of their demonstrated skills and experience, to morphodynamical assessments of inter array and export cables. It should be noted, however, that direct windfarm experience with evidenced experience of undertaking morphodynamical assessments, which also consider risks to offshore (windfarm specific) foundation structures is considered to be an essential requirement for all tenderers.

No	Question	Answer
36	"Section 4.3.2 of the ""Tender Document"" describes that you can only provide one reference for each core competence. The core/key competences are listed in Annex 6. In total for two core/key competences evidences should be provided by filling in Annex 6. This means that in total (maximum) two references can be provided to demonstrate the required experience for the two core/key competences. Morphological assessments for export cable sites and wind farms sites are typically two seperate projects (at least for the Dutch North Sea). So given the fact that we are allowed to provide only one reference for each core competence, we interpret it such that for the core competence number 1 a reference for a morphological assessments for export cable site is sufficient. Can you confirm this?"	The Contractor is to provide at least of one reference per core/key competence. If a single reference proofs both core/key competences then one reference is sufficient. Each core/key-competence should have a minimal value of EUR 30.000,-. The 3rd row in Annex 6 is not to be filled in. Please refer to question 25.

No	Question	Answer
37	Draft Public service agreement (ARVODI-2018) After providing the results, the Contractor is not able to influence the future use of the documents, while third parties could base decisions upon the results that could lead to liabilities. Furthermore in the tender document Annex 5 section III Scope of Work item 7 the following is stated: "Note: RVO assumes dedicated scour (protection) studies will have to be performed for the actual structure types, which is considered a responsibility for the developer. The aim of Objective 4 is to describe the typical scour conditions and mitigation measures that might be expected at each of the individual IJV sites, to help prepare developers for their dedicated designs." The Contracting Authority is able to influence the use of the results and therefore should bear the risks of this use. We therefore propose that the following new provision for the Public service contract (ARVODI 2018): "Contractor is not liable for and the Contracting Authority indemnifies Contractor against all claims of third parties on account of damage suffered by these third parties resulting from the application and/or use of (part of) the results of the activities of the Contractor by or through the Contracting Authority." Draft Public service Agreement (ARVODI-2018) Since the results might be provided to third parties that could use this for future projects, contractor proposes to add a disclaimer to the documents in which is made clear that no warranties are given, the use of the documents is at the sole risk of the user and any liability of Contractor is excluded.	Not agreed, the Contracting Authority must be able to rely on the correctness of the data and be able to trust that it can be used in the sense that the Contracting Authority envisages and as known to the Contractor. However, if the Contracting Authority or a third party demonstrably and culpably makes incorrect or incorrect use of the information, this is obviously not attributable to the contractor. In that case the damage that has arisen will be borne by the party who culpably caused it.
38	The 2018 General Terms and Conditions for Public Service Contracts (ARVODI 2018) apply to the contract regarding this tender. Furthermore a Draft Public service agreement (ARVODI 2018) for the Seabed Morphological and Scour Study at IJmuiden Ver Wind Farm Zone is provided as part of the tender documents. We would like to discuss the modification of the following terms and/or provisions: ARVODI-2018 Art 13.1 We prefer not to guarantee confidentiality as a perpetual obligation and therefore propose that the confidentiality provision has a limited duration, for example 5 years. We therefore propose an addition to Article 13.1 as follows: "Up to five years after the signing of the Agreement, the Contractor shall keep confidential all the information received from the Contracting Authority in the execution of this Agreement and of which the confidentiality is explicitly labelled confidential, with the exception of information that the Contractor has to disclose under any statutory provision or under a court order."	Agreed.

No	Question	Answer
39	Draft Public service agreement (ARVODI 2018) We would like to be able to publish on the results of the research. In case of contract award we would like to discuss the possibility for the Contractor to publish on the research results and propose to amend the Draft Public service agreement (ARVODI 2018) contract with a clause on Publishing. We suggest the following text: "The Contracting Authority acknowledges the Contractor's interest in publishing the results of its research in order to obtain recognition within the scientific community and to advance the state of scientific knowledge. Each Party also recognizes the mutual interest in protecting confidential information and/or obtaining valid patent protection. Consequently, if the Contractor wishes to publish with respect to the contracted research, the Contractor will send a draft of the publication to the Contracting Authority. The Contracting Authority will inform the Contractor within two (2) weeks of receipt of the draft publication whether the Contracting Authority has objections to the publication. The Contracting Authority shall not unreasonably object to such a request from the Contractor. In the event of objections, the Parties will consult in a constructive manner to adjust the publication in such a way that the objections are removed. If the Contractor has not received a response from the Contracting Authority within two (2) weeks, the Contractor can publish the draft publication."	Not accepted
40	ARVODI-2018 Art. 13.4 It is not entirely clear from Article 13.4 that this section pertains to information received from the Contracting Authority. The phrase "the Contractor must hand over to the Contracting Authority"; is unclear. The official Explanatory notes on the ARVODI 2018 mentions "return information that it has in its possession" and "demand return", which implies that it is information received from the Contracting Authority. Could you confirm this interpretation?	No, your interpretation is not correct. It is "all the information that the Contractor has in its possession for the purpose of performing the Contract".
41	ARVODI-2018 Art. 13.5 In the Draft Public service agreement (ARVODI 2018) for the Seabed Morphological and Scour Study at IJmuiden Ver Wind Farm Zone does not contain a penalty clause. Could you confirm that there is no penalty based on article 13.5 written in this Public service contract?	Confirmed. No penalty for breach of confidentiality is included in the contract.

No	Question	Answer
42	ARVODI-2018 Art. 19 Please confirm no bank guarantee is applicable as mentioned in Article 19.	Yes we can confirm that. Please refer to question 5.
43	ARVODI-2018 Art. 21.3 and Public service agreement (ARVODI 2018) We propose to limit liability completely. Contractor therefore proposes to limit the liability re. Article 21.3 in the Draft Public service agreement (ARVODI 20118) as follows: "The Party that imputably fails to fulfil its obligations shall be liable to the other Party for the damage suffered or to be suffered by the other Party, with the proviso that the liability is limited to an amount equal to three (3) times the total value of the contract, but in no case will exceed the value of € 1 million"	Not accepted. There is no specific reason to further limit the liability as stated in Article 21, which article already limits the full liability under Dutch law.

No	Question	Answer
44	• Related to the Tender Document: When compared to morphodynamical assessments for Hollandse Kust (west) (HKW) (20190797) and Ten noorden van de Waddeneilanden (20201209) (TNW) the pricing award preference changed to a range of €70.000 to €120.000 from a range of €50.000 to €100.000 and €70.000 to €120.000: - o While this range decreased the scope of TNW remained similar to HKW, of course with some improvements based on lessons learnt and this change in pricing only reflected the smaller area of analysis and less mobility of the seabed. For the current tender the price range increased to €90.000 to €135.000. When comparing IJmuiden Ver to HKW, 3 major changes are observed, definitely impacting (i.e. increasing) the amount of work: 1. The investigation area is significantly larger: ~890 km² (IJmuiden Ver) versus ~349 km² (HKW). The reduction in prices between HKW and TNW (70-120 to 50-100 kEuro) was mainly based on the reduction of the analysis area - in the previous tender this was a reduction from 349 km² (HKW) to ~110 km² (TNW). It is stressed that for IJmuiden Ver an area ~8 times as large as TNW has to be analysed, whereas HKW was only ~3 times as large as TNW. The increase in area size significantly impacts computational times but also describing in detail morphodynamics and scour in the area (i.e. as requested to be performed per individual sites to be tendered (i.e. Site I-II, Site III-IV and Site V-VI)); 2. Compared to previous assessment, the IJmuiden Ver morphodynamic scope is split in two parts. Although this can be done in an efficient manner, splitting up an analysis always costs additional time compared to an assessment performed in one go; 3. In point 7 of the scope of work explicitly wave modelling is requested. This was not part of the scope of work in previous assessment (previously this was mentioned under point 9 of the scope of work (both HKW and TNW) as setting up a hydrodynamic model). For the higher energy events analysis also coupling between the hydrodynamic and wave model is required. This adds a significant part of work to the overall scope. Could you please elaborate on the reasoning to expand the scope of the numerical modelling? 4. Lastly, in point 7 of the scope of work a detailed analysis of the sediment transport regime including the anticipated magnitude of sediment transport during higher energy storm events, transport rates and pathways is requested. In case calibration of sediment transport is required to gain confidence in the modelled magnitudes of sediment transport, a significant increase of work is expected. • Could you please reflect on the above and the pricing schedule?	RVO considers that the allocated budget range of €90-130k is suitable to provide a thorough and robust study, delivering on the requested SoW within the allocated timeframe. Due to the proximity of the I-IV and V-VI sites to each other, RVO would request that tenderer's could seek economies of scale and offer an evidenced proposal that is sufficient to deliver the SoW within the specified price range. If it is the view of the tenderer that elements of the scope are not necessary to deliver the required study outputs, evidence to support this view specified for the IJV IA, should be provided in the tenderer's proposal responses, as well as the alternative approach(es) to deliver the SoW outlined. With regard to the inclusion of wave modelling in point 7 of the SoW, this could include for example the use of existing wave models, historic wave data and/or empirical approaches to assess the influence of waves on the local sediment transport regime.

No	Question	Answer
45	Under Item 6, 5 objectives are mentioned. The scope of work only reflects 4. Could you please confirm that objectives 4 and 5 under item 6 are considered one objective?	RVO confirms that objectives 4 and 5 under item 6 are considered to be a single objective
46	"": It is requested to describe the anticipated interaction between mobile bedforms, structures and structure-related scour. Should this also include the interaction between scour protection and bed form migration/mobile bed forms? Often the scour protections prevent structure induced scour, and thus also the interaction between structure induced scour and mobile bedforms;	Yes, where possible this should also include consideration of the interaction between scour protection and bed form migration/mobile bed forms. As stated in the SoW, RVO assumes that dedicated scour (protection) studies will be performed for the actual infrastructure that will ultimately be installed on the sites, and that this aspect is considered a responsibility of the future windfarm developer. The aim of Objective 4 of the SoW is to describe the typical scour conditions and mitigation measures that might be expected at each of the individual IJV sites, to help prepare developers for their dedicated designs.
47	Could you please confirm that you are looking for sediment transport conditions and patterns under various conditions (e.g. tide-only, tide + wind and extreme conditions (storms)? Please note that modelled sediment transport magnitudes are subject to significant uncertainty in the absence of relevant field data to calibrate the sediment transport modules and considering the schematization of soil conditions. Could you please advise if calibration of the sediment transport is required additionally to the calibration and validation of the hydrodynamics & waves?	As stated in Section 7 of the SoW, a detailed analysis of the sediment transport regime including the anticipated magnitude of sediment transport during higher energy (storm) events, transport rates and pathways across the IJV sites should be performed. Calibration-validation of the hydrodynamic and wave model would be considered to be sufficient to support this.
48	Should we interpret anywhere "morphodynamic publications" (point 3 in sheet: Assessment project team) as "morphodynamic and/or scour publications" in order to be able to also express relevant experience with scour studies in an offshore environment, offshore wind farms and in the vicinity of IJmuiden Ver?	Yes, that is correct.
49	The Time schedule (Section 1.3 of Tender document) indicates 27 May 2022 for 'Announcement of the award of Contract' and 13 June 2022 for 'Deadline for asking questions and preliminary injunction'. This time period is less than the legally allowed 20 days. Are any of these two dates incorrect?	The date for 'Deadline for asking questions and preliminary injunction' mentioned in the Time Schedule (Section 1.3) is incorrect. The actual date is 17 June 2022 instead of the mentioned 13 June 2022. This allows sufficient time after announcement of contract award.