UNDP/GEF "Elimination of Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles and Addressing POPs Contaminated Sites within a Sound Chemicals Management Framework" full-sized project

Questions and Answers: RFP 063/16

#	Bidders' questions	UNDP answers
1.	On page 2 of the RPF a list of documents is given that includes 11 sections. However from this list the "Form for Performance Security" and "Form for Advanced payment Guarantee" are missing in the RFP. Will these documents be provided?	The Form for Performance Security and Form for Advanced Payment Guarantee indicated in the Letter of Invitation as Section 8 and 9 accordingly are not attached to the RFP. The winning company will be requested to provide Form for Performance Security by the date of Contract signing and Advanced Payment Guarantee if agreed by Parties. Anyway, the mentioned Forms are now posted and available by the following link:
		http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=34952
		See point F. 38 of the RFP - "Performance Security.
		A performance security, if required, shall be provided in the amount and form provided in Section 9 and by the deadline indicated in the Data Sheet (DS no. 14), as applicable. Where a Performance Security will be required, the submission of the said document, and the confirmation of its acceptance by UNDP, shall be a condition for the effectivity of the Contract that will be signed by and between the successful Proposer and UNDP".
2.	Data Sheet RFP. At point 18 of the Data Sheet it is mentioned that supplemental/reference materials will be posted on "http://procurement-	The link is checked and it is not broken. Anyway, if you face problem, please contact procurement.armenia@undp.org and we will send you the required documents.
	notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=34952" however this link does not seem to work. Can you provide us with the correct link?	http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=34952
3.	Both, Data Sheet Section 2 (DS No. 26) and Checklist of Documents Section 11 (numbered Section 9 in RFP) include the required documents we need to submit. However, the lists are not the same (see details hereunder); Our question is: which list is leading? Can you indicate which of the documents included in the lists below need to be submitted?	Please refer to the Data Sheet No. 26 of the RFP 063/16 as a primary source.
	 Included in Data Sheet Section 2 (DS No. 26), but not in Checklist of Documents Section 11 (numbered Section 9): ISO-IEC 17025 	

	o ISO-IEC 17025 for subcontractors	
	• Included in Checklist of Documents Section 11 (numbered Section 9), but not in the Data Sheet (DS No. 26)	
	o List of bank references	
	o Bank guarantee for Performance Security required amount	
	o Charter of the organization from the entrepreneurial registry	
	o Bank Guarantee for Performance Security required amount	
	o List of Bank references	
4.	According to the RfP the tenderers have to provide a bank guarantee for performance security in the amount of 10% of the proposal price, for a period of one year after the contract enters into effect, provided and dully accepted by UNDP, upon contract signature.	See answer under the Point 1.
	It is not clear for us if the bank guarantee shall be provided with the technical proposal already or after award? Normally in all our national and international projects the bank issues us a guarantee for performance security after award. Please clarify this.	
5.	Data Sheet RFP point 26. At point 26 of the Data Sheet it is stated that "Statement of Satisfactory Performance from the Top 3 Clients in terms of Contract Value, during the past 5 years" should be. For our top clients we mostly execute consultancy services that do not include POP-pesticides, is it possible to add statements of satisfactory performance from the top 3 clients where we execute POP-pesticides and/or soil contamination services instead?	Yes, any reference on the Company satisfactory performance will be considered. It is possible to add the statements of satisfactory performance from the top 3 clients where POP-pesticides and/or soil contamination services were performed.
6.	In the RFP it is indicated 9 months as duration of the project?	Nine months (May, 2017 – January, 2018) for Tasks 1 through 8 as specified in Section 3 (TOR). The schedule of delivery of Tasks 7 and 8 dependents on national approvals processes, but is integral with Task 5 and should be also completed by the end January, 2018. Completion of Task 10 before the end of November 2017. Scheduling of Task 9 and Task 11 to be determined by the schedule of site works implementation. The Project completion is determined April, 2019, as of now. The contract duration will be longer, capturing the Task 11 activities during the author's inspection period.

7.	What is "a Charter of the organization from the entrepreneurial registry"? Can you describe the type of document you want us to submit?	Charter of the organization from the entrepreneurial registry or this is general information on the company's management structure, staffing – number, specialists by the subject fields, etc.
8.	As proposed main contractor/bidder (a Dutch company) we are assuming that we do not need to supply a "Official letter of appointment as local representative" (data sheet section 26). Is this correct?	It is up to company's decision to nominate a local representative (person), while performing the services. If your question relates to having a local company/representative, then please note that there is a requirement in the Data Sheet No.26 according to which national certification - civil engineering design license for the respective type of business (civil engineering documents design), which is awarded by the national authorized body and can be provided by local partner companies (representatives).
9.	Task 1: Are there any documents, which can be made available regarding the formerly predesign study realized by national engineers?	For bidders' reference, the conceptual design/drawing, developed during the Project preparation phase (2012-14), is uploaded and available on the announcement website (http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=34952) under the file name: Conceptual Design Drawing_Nubarashen
10.	In the Task 2 we understand that the Consultant will be responsible for the site sampling, analytical characterization and assessment with respect to the geotechnical and hydrogeological investigations. In the Task 3 we understand that the consultant shall take samples of the pesticide waste and package it, but PIU will be responsible for the assessment of samples. Please clarify if we understand this correct.	Sample collection and analytical characterization/physico-chemical analysis under the Task 2 will be conducted to assess the category, concentrations, and locations of buried POPs/OPs waste for delineation and modeling/design of Nubarashen site clean-up works. While the collection/packing of samples under the Task 3 will be performed by the Consultant to prepare validation samples (particularly extracted from Category 2 contaminated soil) to be exported/shipped (by the Project) for testing the efficiency of pre-selected soil de-contamination technologies. The Consultant shall analyze and provide characterization data for validation samples as well. Data on the selected soil de-contamination technology will be shared with the Consultant.
11.	Shall the geotechnical and hydrogeological site assessment and physico-chemical analytical investigations only for the landfill site (0,8 ha) or for all 5 cells?	The geotechnical and hydrogeological site assessment and physico-chemical analytical investigations need to be conducted for the landfill/burial site (about 0,8ha as a fenced area) which contains the burial site body/hillock (about 0,2ha), under the latter 5 cells are located (the 5 th cell is slightly out of the hillock, but still within the fenced site area). Physico-chemical analytical investigations need to be performed for analytical assessment and characterization, required for the: i) detailed delineation of areas of POPs/OPs location, and ii) site contamination with particular emphasis on the burial site body with identified 5 burial cells. Please see Nubarashen burial site pictures in posted materials: the second picture where two persons stand on the hillock of the body (about 0,2 ha) where 4 cells are located, and the 5 th cell out of the body but still within fenced area – bottom picture on the second page; and iii) close vicinity of the body. The landfill area is about 0,8 ha, bordered with fence. For accuracy of contamination characterization some investigations need to be done out of fenced area per Consultant's competent decision, based on the obtained analytical results (screening or confirmatory analysis), as well as available site data from previous studies.

		Note: The boreholes drilled for analytical investigation sampling should be backfilled with a clay soil and other layers to protect the integrity of the site and prevent any further leakage of water inside. The geotechnical and hydrogeological site investigation have to be carried out at the burial site and its close vicinity (including uphill and downhill areas which require stabilization works) to recommend on safety measures/works for proper planning of the temporary infrastructure installation, site excavation, waste handling and transportation, as well as for the final site stabilization activities. The purpose of geotechnical and geophysical investigations may also be aimed also at screening/identifying the waste locations, density under the ground, in addition to supplement the data generated by part 1 physico-
		chemical analytical investigations and assessment.
12.	Are 3 m depth for the drilling holes considered sufficient?	Per the existing information POPs/OPs materials may be found at the depth of up to 5 m (see posted reference materials Report OSCE 1, page 28, or Report OSCE 3, pages 21-23, etc.: "3.7 m - The information available on the borehole installed by the MES and reported in the minutes of the pre-proposal meeting, is that a 1 m topsoil covers a layer of waste from 1.3 – 5 m below surface"), or Report OSCE 3, pages 21-23 (Cell 4 is located 18 meters west of cell 3 and is also an excavated pit in the original soil and contains an estimated 109 m3 of pure pesticides. This cell is completely covered by the hillock and seems not to be disturbed by waste miners. The dimensions of this cell are 750 x 1,200 cm and the bottom of the cell is around 420 - 460 cm below the top of the hillock).
		For accuracy of waste location, concentrations and quantity identification the drilling depth will be identified by Consultant's competent decision, based on the available site data and previous studies, and obtained analytical results (screening or confirmatory analysis).
		Note: The boreholes drilled for analytical investigation sampling should be backfilled with a clay soil and other layers to protect the integrity of the site and prevent any further leakage of water inside.
13.	Task 3: Work to be realized by the consultant: packaging and correct labelling of selected soil samples (final quantities will be defined by PMU). PMU will care about the shipping of the samples to the selected soil clean-up technology / companies?	Yes. In addition, as indicated in the ToR (Task 3), the Consultant will also be responsible for: "iii) developing respective accompanying documents for the international shipment and for the testing technology company respectively" (in the formats as required for the international shipment and for the testing technology).
14.	Is the Consultant responsible for the selection of a company for the elimination technology for the pesticide waste based on the testing results? If yes, does this company need to be local or international?	No. The Consultant is not responsible for the selection of a company for the elimination technology. The elimination technology – assumed high temperature incineration facility for destruction of Category 1 waste, will be selected in a separate tender. The Consultant will develop tender specifications (Task 6) for this technology selection tender and will provide ad hoc consultation (Task 11) to the Project during the selection of destruction technology/facility See respective amendment to the Task 11 of the TOR. Note: Author's supervision should be conducted during the clean-up works (infrastructure establishment, excavation, etc.) by a competent engineering staff.

		Validation sample testing results will be used for efficiency testing and for further selection of Category 2 contaminated soil decontamination/remediation technology, which is the responsibility of the Project. The information on selected technology will be shared with the Consultant for the respective reflection in the design package (with installation, operation related engineering solutions)
15.	What is the relation regarding potential remediation options? In Task 3 is stated that the PMU will be responsible for choosing the remediation option to be applied and in Task 4 is written that the Consultant shall evaluate potential options? Who decides which options should be evaluated?	Under the Task 4 of the TOR now read: The principal Task 4 outputs as documented in Risk Assessment and Classification Criteria Review Report will be: i) an assessment and ranking of risk reduction options identified; and ii) detailed estimates of quantities of POPs pesticides/OPs and their distribution applicable to potential clean-up options. The assessment and ranking of risk reduction options relates to categorization of contaminated soil (Category 2 and Category 3) and modelling of infrastructure establishment, site excavation and packaging works in a way avoiding to increase the amount of highly contaminated (Category 2) soil by mixing the excavated substance with soil or by mixing the Category 2 soil with Category 3 soil. The point ii) under the Task 4 refers to the excavation/packaging/handling of POPs/OPs Category 1 waste. Task 5 also refers to "develop operational plans for the works at or adjacent to the Nubarashen site for up to three selected options", which should combine all respectively aligned elements/components of clean-up works of all phases (infrastructures, temporary constructions, excavation, packaging, transportation, onsite or off-site degradation (Category 1 POPs pesticides degradation with on-site installed technology also could be under discussion) and decontamination technologies — with technical pros and cons of solutions and respective cost estimates). One feasible option will be selected (together with executive stakeholders with consideration of their participation and co-financing) and further designed as a final proposal of clean-up works. Note: Contaminated soil treatment needs be based on the: soil clean-up testing findings (shared by the Project) under Task 3, finalized selection of the feasible (efficient, cost effective, rational, tested and
		recognized) soil remediation option under the responsibility of the Project, allowing completion of the contaminated soil treatment within the designed scope and the Project timeframe (till April 2019).
16.	Should on-site (contaminated soil) remediation options be only considered?	Yes. Per the Project Management Board's decision (as of 7 November, 2016, recorded by the Project Management Board protocol) the contaminated soil (around 7,100 ton) will not be transported to Kotayk hazardous chemical waste storage (to be developed/reconstructed parallel within the Project scope) for decontamination. Note: Please consider that on about 150 m distance on north, from the side of fence entrance the "Erebuni State Reserve protected area of ancient wild grains is located.
17.	Excavation should start in mid-2017 and remediation should be completed until April 2018?	Excavation works are expected to be started in mid-2018. The soil remediation works are expected to be completed by the end of the Project (as of now April 2019).

18.	Schedule of Deliverables: Consultant is free to adapt the proposed time schedule, when delivering reasonable justification?	Yes. The Consultant is free to adapt the proposed time schedule/ Schedule of Deliverables, providing reasonable justification. The presented schedule is indicative, based on provisional estimates and reasonable judgments. See the modified Schedule of Deliverables in the amended TOR (pages 9-10).
19.	Who is responsible for the international shipment and for the testing technology of samples?	The Project (Project Management Unit) will be responsible for the international shipment of respectively packed samples and for arranging treatment efficiency testing of the soil samples by pre-selected technologies/companies.
20.	Who will act as the Initiator/Developer?	1. As stated in the Task 7 of the ToR: "The Consultant or its local representative organization (as the "Initiator") submits for EIA approval for this assignment."
		2. As stated in the Task 8 of the ToR: "The Consultant as the "Initiator" authorized by the Developer (Yerevan Municipality for this project) will submit the technical design package (the approved/positive EIA will be incorporated into the technical design package) for technical expertise and based on the recommendations of technical expertise will consider the design approval. Other regulatory/procedural/approval requirements and the response initiatives will be determined as needed."
21.	What activities will be subject for the ESIA national / international?	The ESIA / EIA, will address those activities that have a potential impact on the health of nearby communities' population and site personnel, immediate environment (nearby protected area, groundwater aquifer, biodiversity / livestock), etc., as detailed in the national legislation. Please note that public consultations and public hearings are integral elements of EIA approval process, per the requirement of legislation.
22.	Regarding the animated film. Is this film for internal use (i.e. showing to Ministries or other stakeholders) or is it envisaged for external use (conferences, Armenian media). The reason for this question is for us to understand what level animated film quality/professionalism (pixels, sounds quality) is envisaged. Therefore we would like you to elaborate more on your expectations concerning this animated film.	The animated film is envisaged as a simple demonstration of proposed options for site preparations (establishment of infrastructures, temporary structures, etc.) and operations for site excavation, waste packaging, transportation, on-site soil decontamination and containment, and other related works, for internal use (i.e. showing to the Project stakeholders involved, as well as for the Management Board members and Project's advisory committee members for their informed participation in discussions and decision making).
23.	Concerning Task 7 we would like to understand in detail in what phase of UNDPs new Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) the project currently is. Has UNDP carried out the Screening phase? Are potential (moderate / high) risks and their significance identified; are relevant SES requirements identified; and has the nature of	Environmental and Social Screening (ESSP) was conducted during the Project preparation phase (PPG) signed on 30.06.2014, and submitted as Annex F to the Project Document. The ESSP ranked the Project under Category 3a: "Impacts and risks are limited in scale and can be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty and can often be handled through application of standard best practice, but require some minimal or targeted further review and assessment to identify and evaluate whether there is a need for a full environmental and social assessment".
	further assessment been determined?	During the inception phase, the Project reviewed the ESSP by re-conducting social and environmental screening procedure (SESP) as per the new UNDP format/template. The screening revealed 10 social and environmental risks, which were analyzed and respective mitigation measures/management responses

	If UNDP has completed the Screening phase, could you send us the relevant documents? Has UNDP carried out the Scoping phase? Issues and types of analysis and the spatial focus are clear from the Nubarashen Clean-up Design Assignment ToR, but has UNDP carried out a stakeholder consultation; and has UNDP made a stakeholder engagement plan? If UNDP has completed the Scoping phase, could you send us the relevant documents?	were proposed. In the SESP report, the overall Project risk categorized as Moderate, since the Project mainly envisaging "downstream" activities with potential adverse environmental and social risks and impacts limited in scale that can be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty, and be addressed through application of standard best practice, mitigation measures and stakeholder engagement throughout the Project implementation. During the project implementation phase, limited social and environmental assessment/review may be required to determine how the potential impacts identified in the screening/assessment will be avoided or when not possible, minimized, mitigated and managed to ensure ongoing compliance with UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES). The SESP report (signed in August 2016) is uploaded and available on the announcement website (https://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=34952) under the file name: SESP - 4905 Armenia POPs 2016 (signed).pdf
24.	In Task 8, last sentence, first paragraph it is mentioned "Other regulatory/procedural/approval requirements and the response initiatives will be determined as needed." What is meant with this sentence and how does it translate to any resources from the Consultants side?	Any contingent requirements may include reference/descriptive materials, some permits – like from near located community administrations. Or new regulatory requirements for the design review and approval may be endorsed, which should be addressed by the Consultant respectively.