

Memorandum of Information European Tender 'Geological desk study for various sites'

Date: August 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 **TN364253**).

No	Question	Answer
1	Please can RVO provide a few examples (screenshots) of the SEG-Y data per WFZ. This will help us to determine to what extent re-processing will be required.	Examples of pre-processed and post-processed seismic data can be found in the provided "R11727 TNO report 3D4Windfarms" report (see Annex 4 - Section III). Please note that only reprocessing of legacy 3D seismic data is part of the scope of this assignment. The extent of re-processing is expected to deviate per chosen dataset, which is up to the CONTRACTOR to suggest to the CLIENT.
2	Were the seismic data for the three WFZs acquired at a time using similar/the same equipment? Please provide details on the dates of acquisition per WFZ if different.	No new data has been acquired (yet) from any of the sites which are part of this assignment. All data used will be legacy data which has been acquired at different times with various equipment. Information on this of the RVO provided legacy data can be found in the provided TNO reports. Information of the remaining 3D Seismic data, as well as the data itself, is available through Nlog.nl
3	To what degree did reprocessing improve the Doordewind seismic data quality/imaging?	It improved the interpretability of the shallower soils, which was not the target when the original dataset was acquired. Details on this can be found in the provided "R11727 TNO report 3D4Windfarms" report (see Annex 4 - Section III)
4	Why is the target depth 150 m BSF? 150 m BSF is considerably deeper than for example, the IJV target depth, and it seems overly deep for an offshore wind farm.	RVO agrees that 150 m BSF is indeed rather deep for offshore wind farm infrastructure. However when considering the limited resolution of legacy seismic data and the likelihood that horizons may show considerable variations in the depth BSF (e.g. palaeovalleys), we consider an interpretation window up to 150 m BSF more suitable.

No	Question	Answer
5	What are the approximate total time window ranges per seismic section?	This will deviate strongly per dataset and particularly the source used. For details on the provided 2D legacy data, we would like to refer to the TNO reports.
6	Excluding the seafloor, picking only four horizons seems to be a conservative estimate of the subsurface complexity. The quantity of horizons interpreted in the IJV WFZ is significantly greater, and the IJV seismic data only penetrated to 40–60 m BSF.	Note that the IJV seismic data is recently acquired data, while the data used for this study will be all legacy seismic data which was not acquired specifically for wind farm development. The number of horizons that can be picked depends strongly on the resolution and quality of the seismic data. RVO's estimate is that four horizons is about the maximum which is reasonable considering the data quality.
7	Considering these datasets are expected to be interpretable down to 150 m BSF, should the estimate of four horizons (seafloor excluded) be increased? This would have implications on project cost, however, greater interpretation would likely be beneficial for further understanding the sites' geological/geophysical/geotechnical characteristics.	Please see the answer on Question 6. RVO's estimate is that four horizons is about the maximum which is reasonable considering the data quality of the legacy data. However we do note this is an estimate and may vary, also between sites. Interpretation strategy will need to be suggested by the CONTRACTOR and agreed upon by the CLIENT.
8	Doordewind WFZ is stated to have already been interpreted. Post review of this interpretation, if necessary, re-interpretation of the Doordewind WFZ may be required, is this anticipated by RVO?	No further interpretation of seismic data or the development of a legacy ground model is requested by the CLIENT for the Doordewind WFZ. RVO's only requirement is a general geological desktop study similar as has been done for other WFZs by RVO in the past (See Annex 4 - Section II for examples), which mainly includes literature study. In case the results of this study deviate from the results of the "R11727 TNO report 3D4Windfarms" report, the CONTRACTOR needs to clearly state these difference and the reasoning with the DWD WFZ report.
9	Please confirm whether the four horizons (BSF) are going to be consistent across the four WFZs (using the completed DDW interpretation as reference)?	The four horizons are an estimate made by RVO. Due to the distance between the sites (especially between DWD WFZ and the other), we do not expect that the same Units and Formations will be present at all four sites. It is up to the Contractor to determine a picking strategy for the CLIENT to approve. The number of horizons to be picked may deviate per site, but does need to be realistic with respect to the data quality and resolution. Nomenclature, including names of formations, does need to be consistent across all reports.

No	Question	Answer
10	Are RVO happy for additional horizon interpretations (possible variation order) to be added post meeting Four (Scope of Work, Section 5.4 - identification of major surfaces) should it be deemed geologically necessary?	As stated in the answer to Question 9, RVO is open for more (or less) horizons to be interpreted on the legacy seismic data. However the number of horizons interpreted does need to be in comparison with the resolution of the seismic data.
11	Is 3D seismic reprocessing mandatory (Scope of Work, Section 2.2, point b)?	Yes, it is mandatory for the LL WFZ, NW WFZ and SA8. It is however not needed for the DDW WFZ, as that has already been completed.
12	Is there an opportunity for interim payments prior to the submission of first report drafts? Otherwise, this could be perceived as being prejudicial to small businesses.	The Remuneration states that the Contractor will receive payment after receiving each draft report and after receiving each final report, which will be six different payments in total. RVO recognises that initiating this assignment requires an investment for the Contractor, however we consider this number of payments throughout the contract sufficient.
13	Please can RVO provide a few examples (screenshots) of the SEG Y data per WFZ. This will help us to determine to what extent re-processing will be required.	Examples of pre-processed and post-processed seismic data can be found in the provided "R11727 TNO report 3D4Windfarms" report (see Annex 4 - Section III). Please note that only reprocessing of legacy 3D seismic data is part of the scope of this assignment. The extent of re-processing is expected to deviate per chosen dataset, which is up to the CONTRACTOR to suggest to the CLIENT.
14	Tender document – Section 3.2: This section implies that "IJV WFS V-VI" is also part of the scope of work. Is this a typo?	This is indeed a typo. IJV WFS V-VI is not part of the scope of work.
15	Indicative schedule implies that the study is completed in around April 2023. What is expected from the winning Tenderer in the remaining period to end of contract (i.e. July 2023)?	Some additional time has been incorporated within the contract, to allow for the knowledge sharing session with the Archaeological Desktop study Contractor to take place.

No	Question	Answer
16	Presentation of the end results will be in person. Will this be at the RVO office in Utrecht (The Netherlands)?	This is to be agreed upon between the Contractor and RVO at the time. It can indeed take place at the RVO office in Utrecht, but also at the office of the Contractor.
17	Does the required experience with at least 1 geological desk study performed for an offshore wind farm or other offshore infrastructure under 3.4.6 include experiences with geological quickscans and/or offshore surveys (both in the Netherlands and abroad)?	RVO considers a quick scan as a desktop study and considers it sufficient as long as it is related to the shallow subsurface and it passes the minimum reference value of EUR 20.000. RVO also recognises that geological background is often part of offshore survey reports, but believes that this it is not possible to evaluate this as the exact contents and level of detail will deviate substantially between assignments. The latter will therefore not considered as appropriate reference assignment.
18	Does the required annual geological project for the Senior expert (3.4.2) need to be in the offshore realm (Netherlands or abroad) or do also onshore projects count?	RVO does accept onshore projects in case they focus on the Quaternary shallow subsurface in the range of 0 to 100/150 m BSF.
19	In Tender Document DEF 3.4.2 experience of the senior expert is limited to “annual involvement in” geological projects, whereas for the CV and track record in Tender Document DEF 5.3 experience is requested in “managing projects”. Please confirm that these are complementary requirements.	RVO does accept a different core team member than the senior expert as project leader. However if this is the case, this needs to be clearly explained in the PEP and RVO will evaluate the qualities of the proposed project leader as defined in the first bullet point at the bottom of Section 5.3 in the Tender document.
20	How will the relevance and quality of the publications be evaluated (Tender Document DEF 5.3)?	Relevance will be evaluated on the basis that it needs to contribute to our confidence that the proposed personal has sufficient expertise in the subject and the capabilities requested. Furthermore, we evaluate the innovative nature of the publications. It is important to note that RVO values relevance more than the nature of the publication (e.g. conference presentations, whitepapers or journal publications).
21	The planning presented in Section 6 mentions a 3 week period for issue of the second draft report. However regarding the data mentioned only two weeks are available of which one week only counts 3 working days because of Christmas. As also our staff very likely will be on vacation during this week it leaves only one effective week to finalize the second draft. Is it possible to extend the planning for this activity with one week and move the remaining activities and connected award criteria one week?	The dates mentioned in Section 6 of the SOW are all example dates. It is up to the Tenderer to suggest a time schedule which corresponds with the monthly timing proposed (e.g. Mid December). For the second draft report of NW more time has been allowed (3 weeks) compared to the other second draft reports (2 weeks) due to the Christmas period. RVO believes one work week should be sufficient to finalize a second draft

No	Question	Answer
		report when sufficient progress meetings are being held.
22	Paragraph 7.3.15 of the Tender Document indicated that the rates and prices should be included in Section 5.5 of Annex 3. We suppose that we do not need to submit rates of team members as it is no award criterium?	This is a typo and should be Annex 4 instead. This annex does need to be filled in completely.
23	Paragraph 5.4 of the Tender Document states that 'The project plan and measures to ensure that the time schedule can be achieved must be described in a separate section of the project plan.' What is meant with separate section of the project plan in which to describe the project plan?	This is a typo and should say: "The measures to ensure that the time schedule can be achieved must be described in a separate section of the project plan"
24	Paragraph 5.3 of the Tender Document states that 'List of reference journal and/or conference publications relevant to Quaternary geology, geophysics and geotechnics in the past 10 years of project delivery team members.' How are journal and conference publications valued compared to project references?	RVO considers project references more relevant than journal and conference publications. The first is mainly evaluated for the capabilities of the project team and the latter for the innovative value.
25	Paragraph 2.1 of the Tender Document states that 'Provide in an early stage of development information on areas that might be less suitable for the construction of offshore wind farms'. As the scope and the experts in the team all are geo-based we suppose that the information asked for is of a geology/geophysics-basis only? Or also on geotechnics/geomorphology-basis? So no other fields of expertise and criteria like aquatic ecology or fisheries, ship transport etc.?	Less suitable areas mainly relates to potential geohazards or geological features which could influence wind farm development. Strongly related fields such as geotechnics and geomorphology are considered to be part of this. Fields such as aquatic ecology, fisheries or shipping transport are not considered part of this assignment
26	Paragraph 1.2 of the Tender Document states that 'As part of the future permit tender , the Tenderers will be provided with detailed information about the offshore Wind Farm Sites'. Is the consultant who will execute this Geological Desktop Study for multiple Dutch Offshore Wind Farm Zones free in the next project phase to participate in tenders for EIA or team up with Contractors	Yes.

No	Question	Answer
	that want to get the permit for the realization and exploitation of one of the wind farms?	
27	In section 3.5 to 3.7, Are time-to-depth converted 2D and 3D seismic data also a deliverable? Or are horizons and gridded surfaces in depth domain sufficient as a deliverable?	Time-to-depth converted seismic data is not a deliverable. RVO considers horizons and gridded surfaces in the depth domain sufficient for this assignment.
28	Would winning this tender exclude Tenderer from supporting Tendering Authority with site studies (e.g. RFP from 11 March 2022, "expert support to the Netherlands Enterprise Agency for site studies for Various Sites for offshore wind development", ref. 202112088)?	Winning this tender would exclude the Tenderer from supporting Tendering Authority with soil related site studies (ref. 202112088). The vice versa is also true: Winning the soil expert support tender (ref. 202112088) will exclude the Tenderer for doing a valid bid for this tender. However exceptions are possible. For example in the case the expert support is only active in WFZs or SA's which are not the area of interest for this assignment. Tenderer should elaborate in case they do not see a conflict of interest.
29	1st bullet of this page states: "...at least EUR 20,000 per competency assignment", where the grey boxed section states: "...at least EUR 30,000 per competency assignment". Please indicate the correct amount.	The correct amount should be EUR 20,000.
30	Shapefile is missing from tender documentation. Can this file please be provided with the Mol?	The shapefiles named 'VS_Annex_7_SPA_VS_GEO_shapefiles' have now been successfully uploaded to Tendered.
31	The project delivery team will not contain more than four (4) experts (including the project manager and possible backup). If more than four (4) experts are provided, the Tender will be disqualified. The tasks performed of all these experts should be described. What is meant by project delivery team? Is this the complete team working on the project (indicating that only 4 experts are allowed to work on this project) is this the project management team? The definition is not presented in the 'definition of terms' section of the document thank you for your time	The four (4) experts that are requested is intended as the core project team responsible for at least 75% of the work. Within the PEP it needs to be clear for every core team member how much of the work (%) will be performed by that particular expert. RVO understands that a total of 4 project members is limited, but believes a dedicated team is beneficial for successfully delivering the assignment. Backup personal, including the backup project manager, does not have to be part of the core team of 4 project members. We do leave room however for smaller tasks (maximum 25 %) to be performed by others. The complete SOW needs to be addressed in the PEP, including tasks which are not performed by the core project team. However the details and CVs of this additional personal

No	Question	Answer
		should not be included in the proposal and will therefore not be evaluated.
32	Can the work as described in the tender upon reward be executed by a larger team (called Project members) than just the stated (4) experts, given that the four experts are guiding and quality assuring the work and the Project members have a relevant background? i. If yes, should the organogram as stated under 5.3 contain only the four experts or also the (names and roles/responsibilities of the) additional Project members. ii. If yes, do all these Project members have to have experience with at least 1 geological desk study performed for an offshore wind farm or other offshore infrastructure, or does this only apply to the 4 experts?	The four (4) experts that are requested is intended as the core project team responsible for at least 75% of the work. The provided CV's and personal within the organogram can only be of the four core project team members. All though experience with geological desktop studies is beneficial, any additional team members will not be evaluated.
33	Is the Senior expert (3.4.2), also intended to be the project leader or is this the "expert with an academic study in relevant subjects" (3.4.1)?	It is up to the Contractor to propose the most suitable person as project leader. This can be the Senior expert (3.4.2), but also the expert with an academic study in relevant subjects (3.4.1).
34	Should the position for possible project manager backup (3.4.4) be filled by one of the other 3 experts or can this be an additional person? i. In case of the latter, are there any requirements for that position?	The project manager backup (3.4.4.) does not need to be filled by one of the other core project team members, but can be an additional person. The newly proposed project manager does however need to have comparable (or better) expertise, which needs to be agreed upon by the Client in case the original proposed project manager will be replaced.
35	Are the track record and publications (Annex 3) limited to the works of the 4 experts or can the track record and publications of all Project members be put forward.	The track record and publications in Annex 3 are limited to the four core team members of the project.
36	Under 3.5.2 it is mentioned that prices lower than EUR 150,000 or higher than EUR 350,000 will be set aside by the Contracting Authority, whereas under 5.6 it is stated that prices under 175.000 are disqualified. Please clarify	The statement under 5.6 is incorrect and needs to be EUR 150,000 as lower limit of disqualification.
37	Paragraph 5.3 of the Tender Document states that 'CVs of the dedicated senior expert (also the project supervisor) and project team members (including an organogram) and a description of their roles and responsibilities within the delivery of the project'. Are the project team members limited to the other 4 experts? Or are other non-experts also allowed to be shown?	See answer to Question 31

No	Question	Answer
38	Paragraph 5.3 of the Tender Document states that ‘CVs of the dedicated senior expert (also the project supervisor) and project team members (including an organogram) and a description of their roles and responsibilities within the delivery of the project’. What is meant with the project supervisor? Is it the Project Manager of the consultant?	The role of project supervisor is intended by RVO as a senior consultant and is considered not the same as the project manager or leader. It is up to the Tenderer to decide if the requested senior expert also takes up the role of project leader or if this task is been filled by one of the other core project members.
39	Paragraph 3.5.2 of the Tender Document states that ‘Prices lower than EUR 150,000 or higher than EUR 350,000 will be set aside by the Contracting Authority and will not qualify for award of the Contract’ and Paragraph 5.6 of the Tender Document states that ‘Price (P) below € 175,000 : disqualification’. What is the exact minimum award criteria with respect to prices/rates?	See answer to Question 36.
40	Paragraph 4.3.2 of the Tender Document first states that ‘the total value of the reference assignment(s) must be at least EUR 20,000 per competency assignment’ and later that ‘the references must also demonstrate that they have a total value of at least EUR 30,000 per competency assignment’. What is the exact minimum award criteria with respect to the total value of the reference assignment(s)?	See answer to Question 29.
41	Paragraph 4.3.2 of the Tender Document states that ‘You can only provide one reference for each core competence’. Above are only 2 core competences stated. Does this mean that we can only submit 2 reference assignment?"	Yes, that is correct. The maximum number of reference assignments to be filled is indeed two. The original ‘Annex List of Reference Contracts’ has been updated so only a maximum of two reference assignments can be submitted. Only the latest uploaded version ‘Annex List of Reference Contracts V2’ needs to be filled in and submitted.
42	Paragraph 4.3.2 of the Tender Document states that ‘The subject of the reference assignment must be comparable to the core competence in question’. When is a reference assignment considered comparable? Could some examples be provided?	The reference assignment is considered comparable when the references clearly show the Tenderer is able to fulfil the two core capabilities as stated in 4.3.2 in the Tender document. For example for core competence 2, the Tenderer can show a reference assignment related to processing shallow seismic data instead of an assignment related to reprocessing of legacy data.
43	Paragraph 3.4.4 of the Tender Document states that ‘the project delivery team will not contain more than four (4) experts (including the project manager and possible backup)’ and that these experts should be either geologists or geophysicist. However geotechnics and geomorphology also represents important aspects of the scope.	See answer to Question 31 and 32

No	Question	Answer
	Is it allowed to include non-expert staff as project team members and involve them in the execution of the project? Should they be shown on the organogram?	
44	Paragraph 3.4.1 of the Tender Document states that 'At least one expert with an academic study in relevant subjects: geology, geophysics or comparable'. Which academic background is considered comparable	Related fields in Earth Sciences. For example, physical geography is not stated, but is definitely considered relevant.