

First Memorandum of Information Tender Document 'Metocean assessment for Dutch Wind Farm Zones' reference 202112138

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 Tender Document. This Memorandum of Information forms an integral part of the Tender Document.

This document contains the first 25 questions received until March 11, 2022. A second Memorandum of Information, with answers to the questions received after March 11 and up to March 21, will be published on April 1, 2022.

No.	Location in Tender Documents	Question	Answer
1.	Conditions for validity of references	1. Is it sufficient a study has been performed according to the standards, without actual certification? 2. If yes, one must consider the DVNGL standards are on many aspects somewhat vague and not specific, which leaves room for interpretation on whether or not a metocean study has been executed 'according to' this standard. How can we ensure that a proposed reference is accepted by RVO? 3. Is it correct that a study executed according to other standards (e.g. SECO) is also a valid reference? 4. The requirement of reference eligibility until maximum three years ago is quite strict. Can this be relaxed?	1. Yes 2. In Tender Document 4.3.2. the standards are listed. In case the Tenderer wishes to deviate from these standards by using different standards, please provide motivation why these other standards are equal or better than the ones listed in the document. 3. Yes, if equal or better standard. 4. No, the Dutch Public Procurement Act (clause 2.93 b) stipulates that reference assignments by the Company must have been performed in the last three years at most. Projects that started longer than three years ago, but where completed in the last 3 years can also be used as reference. This is a requirement, i.e. a knock-out criterium. Reference projects for the Project team (Tender Document 5.3) are allowed a longer eligibility period of 10 years, as this concerns a preference.
2.	Shapefile	Could you please provide shapefile of the IJV OWF, Search area 1 and other relevant sites?	Shapefile is published together with this Memorandum of Information.
3.	Modelling Period	The minimum modelling period is set to 20 years in SoW (Section 2.1), but it has been requested that we provide recommendations on long-term periods. Given the CPU	Scores will be determined as described in preferences 5.1. Criterion 1 Proposed methodology & validation, and 5.4. Criterion 4 Innovation.

No.	Location in Tender Documents	Question	Answer
		costs associated, how would RVO score longer return periods (which are obviously better for extreme value analyses purposes)?	Please provide motivation for the return period chosen. Offering a Variant may provide the opportunity to set up a tender with an innovative solution (e.g. a longer return period) with a higher risk/cost profile.
4.	General Scope	Item 13, Section 2.1 of SoW: RVO has requested advice on future metocean measurements. Is this part of Activity B? If not, how would RVO reimburse the hours spent? Or how many hours do we have to consider in the price?	Please anticipate 300 hrs in total for advice on future metocean measurements within Activity A. Contracting Authority will determine when these hours will be used during the contract period. Significant deviations from this budget can be reimbursed under Activity B.
5.	Database	Section 2.5 of SoW: Please elaborate on the comparison requested? Is it in terms of data and time series? Validation? Or database functionalities?	The comparison is in terms of data, time series and validation, but not limited to. Database functionalities are not requested for this comparison.
6.	Output resolution	Section 2.7 of SoW: "Spatial resolution shall be at least 100m in IJV" is not consistent with Table 1 in Section 2.13. Please confirm which resolution is correct?	Table 1 is the correct resolution (ie. 400 metres at IJV). The sentence in 2.7 should read: The output spatial resolutions for deliverables 1 – 4 shall be at least 400m in IJmuiden Ver Wind Farm Zone, 1000m in other Search Areas and 5km in the feasibility level domain, as defined above. Instead of : The output spatial resolutions shall be at least 100m in IJmuiden Ver Wind Farm Site, 500m in other Wind Farm Zones and export cable corridors and 5km outside the Wind Farm Zones but in the domain of interest, as defined above.
7.	Model resolution	Table 1 of Section 2.13: Please elaborate if grid convergence studies are required for all wind farm zones to demonstrate the optimum resolution? Or can the consultant use the required resolutions from RVO and do not perform grid convergence?	We expect that the contractor justifies that the grid resolution is adequate for the study. This could be with a grid convergence study, but can also be done based on previous analysis valid for the areas of interest.
8.	Spectral Grid	What is the required spectral grid output resolution? It is very costly (and not useful) to save spectral data within 400m as an example and host on the database. What is the minimum grid resolution accepted to RVO?	The grid resolution for the spectral output should be 2 km in the indicated wind farm sites (IJV, Search Area 1 and Optional Area). No grid of spectral data is required for the feasibility level domain. Instead it is required to provide 5 discrete data points in each of the indicated Search Areas (Figure 3 of SoW document) for which spectral grid output is

No.	Location in Tender Documents	Question	Answer
			required. The 5 points will be defined in consultation with the Contracting Authority.
9.	Database extension	Section 2.7 of SoW: "The database should be set up in a way that it will allow extension for more sites in the future." Does the future extensions only cover one site, or multiple sites? The cost to host one or multiple sites are quite different. In the event of extension, does RVO require the consultant to update the previous sites (model data and outputs) or it will just be the new sites?	Future extensions will likely cover multiple sites. The extensions meant in this sentence concern new sites under a different future contract, which may or may not be done by the same Contractor. It is anticipated that sites which are already disclosed on a design study level and have been already in a permit tender situation will not need updates.
10.	Activity C	Are the requirements for additional areas exactly the same as IJV? What if RVO's consultants or experts change from project to project, thus introducing risks and additional costs to consultants? Can this somehow kindly be elaborated or detailed?	The requirements for additional areas are the same as IJV, although the location and sizes of the areas might differ. RVO does the utmost to have a consistent line in the management of project, including the contribution from experts. Exchange of know-how, lessons learned, between experts and projects is stimulated by RVO. However, motivated differences between projects, learning from previous projects should be anticipated by the Contractor.
11.	Database requirements	Section 2.7 of SoW: Does the database have to include API functionality?	Yes, see item 7 of SoW, 2.2 Deliverables.
12.	Requirements	Section 3.2.7 of Tender Document: Please elaborate on "operational model". Does it mean a forecast model that runs operationally? Or an "existing" and validated model?	"Operational model" means an existing and validated wind and wave model.
13.	Activity A & Activity C	Section 3.2 of Tender Document: Could you please confirm that there will be 5 physical meetings? Will it be the same for all future sites (Activity C)?	For the deliverables for Activity A (which covers IJV and Search Area 1), it is anticipated that for IJV there will be 5 physical meetings and for Search Area 1 there will be 3 meetings. For Activity C (optional Search Area), 3 physical meetings are anticipated. If due to Covid physical meetings are discouraged by the Government, these meetings will be held online using MS Teams.

No.	Location in Tender Documents	Question	Answer
			Meetings are anticipated to be in the Netherlands at RVO offices, but may also take place in the offices of the Certifying Authority.
14.	Activity C	Section 3.2 of Tender Document: How many reports and analyses points are to be priced for Activity C? The text refer to "an" additional search area, but also says "Area(s)". How many sites to be included in the high resolution modelling? Please elaborate the outputs in detail.	One report is to be priced for in Activity C. The outputs with regard to the required resolution for Activity C are presented in Table 1 of the SoW. The delivery of Activity C will comprise one Area, but the size of the area may differ and the number of sites within the Area is yet to be defined.
15.	Award Criteria	Section 5.1 of Tender Document: Considering the existing studies referenced by RVO, how are the validations assessed by RVO? Is there a benchmark, for example the existing validation plots and statistical scores? How does RVO score the potential quality of the models?	Validations are assessed according to the award criteria in the Tender Document, section 5.
16.	Award Criteria	Section 5.2 of Tender Document: Is it advantageous if the database is already available and can be assessed by RVO (thus lower risks and more clarity)? If not, how would RVO assess the plausibility of the database? it's functions and performance? security?	The database is assessed according to the award criteria in the Tender Document, section 5.
17.	Award Criteria	Section 5.3 of Tender Document: Is it necessary for the database to have been certified before? Does it have added value for RVO if the database has been certified?	Under criterion 3 (track record and experience of the project team) it is not a requirement for any databases used as references to have been certified. Under Column K of Annex 6, tenderer has the opportunity to state whether the reference projects have been certified. This certification does have added value.
18.	Award Criteria	Section 5.3 of Tender Document: Please elaborate on the important/relevance of metocean publications for this project? We believe that actual project reference and certification is more relevant than conference papers or not reputable publications.	Contracting Authority does perceive publications as an indicator for the scientific base of the works and acceptance of this in the (end user and scientific) community. Contracting Authority will evaluate the relevance of the conference papers and publications.
19.	Award Criteria	Section 5.3 of Tender Document: For the MDS and WRA alignment, considering the possibility of making consortiums between different companies, is it valuable to RVO if the two	Yes, this could be of added value. Contracting Authority will take aspects like this into account under Tender Document 5.3, point 2: 'The overall experience of the team members

No.	Location in Tender Documents	Question	Answer
		(or more) companies can demonstrate previous experience of collaboration in offshore wind and delivering similar certified products?	executing a metocean study and/or WRA study and the alignment between these studies preferably in the North Sea'
20.	Award Criteria	Section 5.1 & 5.4 of Tender Document: It seems that non-stationary extreme value analyses is becoming the standard in offshore wind. Is that considered as added value to RVO? Or traditional extremes are just fine? What is meant by "present metocean modelling approaches and databases"?	Methodology will be assessed according to the award criteria in the Tender Document, section 5. Please provide motivation for the extreme analysis method proposed. Any available validations for any methods proposed will be considered as adding value. Present metocean modelling approaches and databases means industry standard approaches and databases.
21.	Award Criteria	Section 5.5 of Tender Document: How are the time schedules assessed in relation to delivery time? Will one get full points if the deliverables follow RVO's request in terms of time (apart from being smart and feasible)? Or faster deliveries will score higher?	5.5 Should read: "Assessment of this criterion will be based on the following sub criteria: 1. The extent to which the time schedule is comprehensive, complete and SMART. 2. The feasibility of the proposed delivery date." The feasibility of the date will be assessed. In this assessment the amount of float in the planning will be taken into account. The timing is defined under 2.2 of the SoW (Deliverables). Faster deliveries will not score higher.
22.	Variants	Section 2.5 of Tender Document: Does this mean that consultant can offer optional items (apart from requested optional tasks)? Could you please elaborate on "alternative tender" or "second tender"? If optional tasks are offered, is the proposal rejected?	Tenderer can propose optional items in the variant. The market is allowed to propose two solutions (one base and one variant).The variant is there to stimulate innovation and it is therefore recommended to propose the more innovative (additional) approaches/items in the variant. This alternative proposal or variant might come with a higher price/ risk profile. The base proposal and the variant should meet the requirements set. For the variant, deviations from the SoW

No.	Location in Tender Documents	Question	Answer
			will be evaluated by Contracting Authority as to whether they are acceptable or not. Meeting the objectives of the Metocean Assessment is key in the evaluation of the variant.
23.	Time schedule	Is it possible to postpone the deadline for the receipt of tenders to April 15th?	Deadline for receipt of tenders is extended to 19 th April 2022 at 1pm CEST.
24.	Wind data	Section 2.3.2 of SoW: EMD-ConWx data is not freely available. Shall we include the price in our base price? Or will it be acquired by RVO?	All models and data (except for metocean campaign data by RVO) should be acquired at cost and risk of Contractor and included within the base price. See answer to question 25, it is not obligatory to use EMD-ConWx.
25.	Wind data	During the last 3 projects at TNW, HKW and HKN, the EMD-ConWx data has not been used as the final source for neither of WRA & MDS. It has only been used for comparison. Why does RVO require using such data, if experience from nearby projects indicate that other source are better?	It is not mandatory to consider EMD-ConWx data if the tenderer considers other data sources to be better. Please provide motivation for the data sources to be considered. It is required to consider 3 reference data sources / models.