

CLARIFICATIONS NO. 1

RFP No: GCF SAM 001/17- Consultancy services for the Provision of a Review Assessment of the Interdependence of Flood Mitigation Options for the Vaisigano River Catchment in Samoa

Dear Bidders,

Please note the following answers to some received question by Bidders:

No.	Questions from Bidders	Answers From UNDP
1	It was mentioned in the second pre proposal meeting that some parts of Apia do/may not have storm water and sewage drainage networks in place; in this regard, will the successful bidder be expected to complete any work in these areas, apart from undertaking 1D/2D hydraulic modelling of any nearby river network and floodplain? If so, is UNDP expecting that suggestions and/or prioritizations for future network upgrades are made for these areas? And, if so, should these be included in the Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA)? Please advise if UNDP has any further expectations for these areas.	There will be no requirement to undertake work in the specific area. The Land Transport Authority “LTA” is aware of the areas that need to be upgraded.
2	To which degree should current infrastructure re-developments (e.g. bridges and other infrastructure - you also mentioned some peer re-development) along the lower reach of the Vaisigano River be taken into account in the hydrological and hydraulic modelling?	All existing and proposed future infrastructure within the river should be considered in the hydrological model. This includes the four segments, the three new bridges etc.
3	We note storm surge modelling is not included in the Scope of Works – but sea level boundary conditions are to be used instead. Is there existing storm surge modelling completed? Please note, return period high tides are not the same as storm surges, which are also not the same as storm wave heights and wave run-up estimates, over-topping nor restrictions on flood channel conveyance.	The UNDP is currently unaware of any existing storm surge modelling; however this will be discussed with the Government of Samoa.
4	As a result of our recent experiences using LiDAR data in Samoa – as GIS Geomorphologists for both the UNDP-executed “Enhancing Resilience of Coastal Communities of Samoa to Climate Change” AF project and the World Bank “Pilot Programme on Climate Resilience” project -, we are aware of the accuracy and limitations of the LiDAR data for the study area, and thus the surveying requirements to validate and enhance usability of the LiDAR data. In this regard, although it has been made very clear in the meeting that UNDP does not anticipate additional surveying requirements, if such a requirement for additional surveying arises during the development of the project, would this justify a contract variation / amendment?	Bidders are required to provide a quote for all required services mentioned in the Terms of Reference, any additional required services shall require an amendment to the contract, therefore it is very important to provide a detailed breakdown of costs.
5	There are 5 names specialists – in our opinion the specialists expertise is somewhat overlapping – can 1 person undertake	Based on the Terms of Reference, there are distinct roles that the relevant positions would be required to undertake. For example, the civil

	more than one specialist role? and/or can we have more than one person responsible for each specialist role ?	engineer will be required to undertake an evaluation of for example, the proposed infrastructure whereas the modeller would be looking at the actual hydraulics etc in the form of model outputs. The climate change and hydrological specialist would be required to provide advice on various climate change scenarios and how these feed both into the models and also as to the size etc of the structures. The Bidder <u>must</u> provide the required team as suggested in the ToRs, however if the Bidder wishes to provide additional personnel in addition to the already suggested key personnel in the RFP, may do so.
6	Each specialist has a stated requirement of Masters Degree or Degree level expertise – with a selection of MSc subjects. 3 of the positions have the phrase ... or similar qualification ... but two do not. Can you please confirm that it is acceptable for all 5 positions to require MSc or higher with an appropriate or similar qualification? For example – many hydrological modellers have advanced degrees in mathematics, but this is not mentioned in the MSc list, furthermore an engineer may have a PhD in reservoir engineering but this is not covered by the engineering qualification stated of an MSc in Hydrological Engineering. Can you please confirm ... or similar qualification ... will be acceptable across all positions?	There is no specific requirement for a Masters of Science within the Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference requires potential individuals that might be included in the proposal team to have Masters qualification; this could be for example, a Masters of Engineering etc. There is no specific requirement for a Masters of Science. Note that Bidders must provide a team that has the indicated degree as specified under each specialization.
7	Specifically we understand the project is limited to only the Vaisigano catchment, yet Apia has up to six rivers/channels flowing into the wider urban area of Apia (Vaisigano plus the Fuluasou, Gasegase, Mulivai, Vaivase and Fagalii). Of these at least two/three pass through central Apia. Can we please have a clear understanding if these other catchments are going to be included in the assessment or not, noting that the coastal floodplains are flat and are likely to coalesce to some extent, especially with respect to the urban drainage networks of ditches and culverts? There is a clear focus in the RFP on the storm sewer network, but is this just restricted to that draining into the Vaisigano River? Presumably it is. There is mention in the RFP of a diversion channel, but it is possible this might be located or need to be located to enter one of the surrounding catchments or even use one of the other catchment drainage channels. We need clear definition of this.	The Terms of Reference is for an assessment of flood interventions within the Vaisigano catchment only. Future studies may include the other six catchments. With respect to sewerage, this will be a separate study which is not included under this RFP.
8	There are six deliverables (p.33) which are to be delivered within 6 months (p.34). Yet the project is 7 months long. Is this timing correct?	It is assumed that there will be discussions post the submission of the final report and as such the timing is correct.

9	Are there any details available on the survey data available of the existing storm water ditch and pipe network within Apia ? If this data – level, dimensions, geometry, condition – is inadequate then surveys will need to be included in the project. It is difficult to scope this survey work up without knowledge of the adequacy of existing surveys of this infrastructure. Modelling of the network cannot be started until the network is adequately understood and re-surveyed if necessary;	Data will be made available from the Land and Transport Authority.
10	The above two points suggests there is only a month (or possibly 2) to undertake all hydraulic modelling work. This seems unwisely ambitious. Is this schedule consistent with your thinking?	It is understandable that modelling may take up to three months although it should be noted that a calibrated model has previously been prepared for the catchment.
11	Why does the design events allow for a 100 Year ARI for rainfall but only a 20 Year Storm Surge ? Given the 100 Year rainfall event is going to be from a cyclone event, it seems incongruous the cyclone event producing a 100 Year rainfall AVI should produce a smaller ARI storm surge?	If the consulting firm considers it beneficial to undertake a 100 year ARI flood with a 100 year storm surge analysis, then the consulting firm should suggest this in their proposal with a rational for the inclusion, however, the model scenario suggested by UNDP (i.e. 100 ARI year rainfall event + 20 year ARI storm surge event) is also to be modelled.
12	We note storm surge modelling is not included in the Scope of Works – but sea level boundary conditions are to be used instead. Is there existing storm surge modelling completed? Please note return period high tides are not the same as storm surges, which are also not the same as storm wave heights and wave run-up estimates, over-topping nor restrictions on flood channel conveyance.	The UNDP does not have information on any existing storm surge modelling. UNDP will seek information from the Government on Samoa on any available modelling.
13	Are there outline designs already for the different flood mitigation options? Presumably these have been costed to secure the GCF? We note the work includes rough cost estimates of the infrastructure, which is a significant undertaking as this requires an agreed design fix. Are existing cost estimates to be used within the Multi Criteria Assessment or do cost estimates have to be determined by the project team from first principles?	Yes, there are existing design drawings for Segments 1 through 4. Given the design drawings, the consultancy firm should be able to easily estimate the cost of undertaking the work. However, the study is not limited to the four segment walls and should consider all possible options.
14	In terms of the team composition, their functions seem to be similar so what is the difference for example between Senior Hydrological Engineer, the Hydrological Modeller and the Climate Change Impacts and Hydrology Specialist?	Please see answer number 5 above.
15	In terms of collection of data, does it mean how the company can find out what there is and to find the gaps?	There has been significant data previously collected on the catchment. The consultancy firm should undertake due diligence on past reports. The consultancy firm would be provided all available data as part of the consultancy. The consultancy firm should provide, based on their

		due diligence, an overview of any additional data that may be required to complete the study and include this in their proposal.
16	<p>Point 26 of the Data Sheet: Required documents that must be submitted to establish qualification of proposers (in 'certified true copy' form only)</p> <p>Question: would it be possible to submit just copies, with the commitment to present certified true copies during negotiations if we are awarded the contract?</p>	The documents that are required to be certified true copy is especially the registration of the company including the list of shareholders and should be submitted with the offer.
17.	As per RFP, page 45, in Form No. 1 (Proposer Information Form), item 9, the Consultant must indicate "value and description of Top Three (3) Biggest Contracts for the past five (5) years" . Should these contracts be related to the provision of similar services to those described in the TOR or is it mandatory to indicate the biggest contracts awarded to the firm in the mentioned period, no matter which is the topic of such services? In that last case, is such information required in order to demonstrate the management capability of the firm in large/complex contracts?	Just to clarify, this RFP is addressed to consultancy firms/companies/ entities "Bidders" and not an individual Consultant. Yes. The Bidder's proposal should include information and specifics on three contracts of similar or relevant services provided in the past 5 years. This information is requested in the Form of "Proposers Bidder Information" which is part of the documents required to be submitted as indicated under BDS No. 26: <i>"Required Documents that must be submitted to Establish Qualification of Proposers (In "Certified True Copy" form only)"</i> .
18.	Regarding the description of Top Three (3) contracts in Form 1: is it admissible to provide just a short summary and then include complementary Project Data Sheets in a standard format (for instance, WB/IADB/ADB or similar) as an attachment to the proposal?	The Bidder's proposal must provide the required information as stated in the RFP. If the bidder wishes to include additional information, they may do so by attaching additional documents.
19.	As per RFP, Page 70, a Statement of Satisfactory Performance from the Top Three Clients for provision of similar services during the last five (5) years is required. Please, confirm if these Top Three Clients must be understood as the clients of Top Three (3) Biggest Contracts for provision of similar services during the last five (5) years or if any other criteria is being considered.	The required three references do not necessarily have to be from the same top three contracts during the past five years.
20.	As per RFP, Page 23 (and 70), a Local Government permit to locate and operate in the current location of office is required. Since this is an international RFP and taking into account the nature of this assignment, please confirm that the required document corresponds to the Consultant's country of registration.	A valid registration document of the consultancy firm "Bidder" is sufficient in the relevant country the firm is registered in.
21.	The Consultant foresees to subcontract some very specific logistic and field tasks to a local company (which will not provide any of the key professional profiles required in the TOR). However, as per RFP, page 51, item 2.4, the Consultant must indicate some information regarding the proposed sub-contractors (valid registration document, brief company profile, experience in undertaking similar activities and performance references). Since a signed agreement may not be available at the time of proposal	The Bidder may indicate the percentage of work that shall be undertaken by the subcontractor with the rationale and roles and responsibilities, however UNDP may still request additional information based on the provided information during the technical evaluation where the Bidder must provide responses to.

	<p>submission (due to tight deadlines), is it possible to indicate only the percentage of work to be subcontracted, its rationale and the role of the sub-contractors, while just identifying/suggesting some potential candidates? (Of course budget allocated to the subcontractor will be properly estimated in the Financial Proposal, according to good practices in the sector).</p>	
22.	<p>Regarding the minimum staff required, there is some confusion with the present roles and the requirements for each position. In particular, the Hydrological Modeller must demonstrate experience in multi-dimensional flood and fluvial modelling, as well as in flood risk assessments, which is more typical of a "Hydraulic Modeller" (or a "Hydrological and Hydraulic Modeller"); in addition, a Climate Change Impacts Specialist does not necessarily require experience in hydrology and, in fact, it is not required in the TOR (which is right), so the expert should be named "Climate Change Impacts (AND HYDROLOGY) Specialist". Please clarify if, no matter which name is given in the TOR, the scoring will be strictly applied as indicated in Page 27. Please note that a closely related question was also made by other Consultant during the pre-bid meeting and it has not been clarified yet.</p>	<p>Please see answer in Number 5 above. Also noting that the scoring of the required specializations shall be done against the offered qualifications by the Bidder for each proposed personnel.</p>
23.	<p>Minutes of the 1st pre-bid conference call were posted in UNDP Portal. However, several questions were not answered there and a 2nd pre-bid conference call was organized. At this time, no clarifications / minutes have been officially posted in UNDP Portal and, therefore, answer to some questions has not still been given. As this Consultant could not attend to the 2nd conference call, it is kindly requested that UNDP posts those clarifications / minutes as soon as possible (or at least, sends them to the Consultant in short notice). Due to this issue, an extension of deadline by a week is requested, so as to guarantee that a successful proposal which takes into account all the relevant clarifications can be submitted.</p>	<p>Clarifications No.1 including the pre-proposal second minutes of meeting are now posted. The deadline for receipt of offers has been extended till 20th November 2017 through Amendment No. 3.</p>
24.	<p>In the TOR, page 28, section 1, Paragraph 3, it is mentioned that a hydraulic model was developed by Water Technology (WT) long ago, in the framework of the Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Plan for the Greater Apia Catchments, but problems were reported with LiDAR data then available. Nonetheless, it is asserted that additional LiDAR data is currently available for any further modelling work. Which is the extension/coverage and cell- size of this new LiDAR data? Will UNDP-Samoa Country Office and/or Government of Samoa make this data available free of cost to the Consultant (exclusively for conducting this assignment)? Regarding the river system, apart from this LiDAR data and any other data extracted from the former hydraulic model, is it expected that the Consultant carries out any additional topographical surveys during this assignment or, instead, shall the Consultant only use already existing information?</p>	<p>At no time has the UNDP indicated that there is additional LiDAR data available. The LiDAR data referred to is part of the existing data. This data will be made available to the successful consultancy firm that shall be awarded the contract. Please see early comments with respect to additional survey data and the need for this information.</p>

25.	Which was the particular modelling software used by Water Technology (WT) in the former assignment? Is it expected that this particular choice poses any practical constraints to the development of the required new integrated modelled (i.e. if the existing model has to be rebuilt to some extent and integrated in the new one)?	Information on the modelling software used is contained with the previously published Water Technology reports. There is no need to maintain the same modelling software for this work.
26.	Some existing data (land use covers, LiDAR, hydrometeorological datasets, stormwater network inventory, etc.) which may be extremely useful to build the hydrologic / hydraulic models, could be owned/funded by third parties (private companies, foreign development agencies, etc.), despite being currently managed by UNDP-Samoa Country Office and/or entities linked to the Government of Samoa. Therefore, access to this data may be limited or subjected to potential fees. Is it anticipated that the Consultant has to bear any cost for accessing such data? Or instead, will that data be made available to the Consultant free of cost (exclusively for conducting the present assignment)?	The Government of Samoa and UNDP will provide the successful bidder with the available documentation as part of the consultancy services.
27.	In the TOR, page 28, section 1, Paragraph 5, it is stated that an integrated model is required to understand the combined performance of several (existing and proposed) works, and that it has to include the floodplain, upper catchment and urban drainage network. At the same time, in page 32, it is mentioned that such integrated floodplain and stormwater model will consist of several model components. Would it be acceptable that the Consultant builds those integrated models (and related boundary conditions) in a separate manner (for instance, using the most suitable modelling package for each component), as long as the Consultant ensures that the overall problem can be properly studied? Or instead, must the Consultant commit to provide a single global model using only one modelling package?	The consultancy firm will be required to deliver the relevant outputs as stated within the RFP. If the consultancy firms think that a better approach is to build an integrated model and provide the reasons for this, then it should clearly explain this within their technical proposal in a way that a non-technical person can completely understand their rationale for this approach.
28.	In the TOR, page 33, sections 8 and 9, some preferred software packages are indicated for stormwater hydraulic modelling, but it is also stated that alternative packages may be considered, as long as the Consultant demonstrates their capability of meeting project objectives. However, the final decision is conditioned to an agreement with the client. Since this is not expected to happen during the bid evaluation process, should it be understood that this issue would then be dealt with during the negotiation stage, in case of being awarded?	The consultancy firm must provide the required information on the type of software to be presented in the Technical Proposal itself. That contained within the RFP were, as was clearly stated, examples only. The consultancy firm should clearly establish the proposed model to be used and then it should clearly explain this within their technical proposal in a way that a non-technical person can completely understand their rationale for this software.
29.	Regardless of the considered software package, it is stated that the model and any associated data must be delivered in such a manner that allows all scenarios to be simulated, as well as further developments. Please clarify if: (i) it is acceptable that the Consultant budgets a lump sum to cover potential license costs of any of the preferred modelling software packages; (ii) a minimum number of licenses of the finally used modelling software should be provided to the client; (iii) no additional license is required by	The RFP refers to the need for licences for the models themselves. The consultancy firm should include information as to what it proposes with respect to licences and then it should clearly explain this within their technical proposal in a way that a non-technical person can completely understand their rationale for this software/licences.

	the client regarding GIS software (MapInfo and ESRI are mentioned in the TOR).	
30.	In the TOR, page 34, item 16, it is stated that “in order to obtain the required information for completion of the assessment, the contractor is expected to travel to Samoa as and when necessary for the duration of the assignment”. Since this bidding process is an international call and is not restricted to the most immediate neighbouring countries (in particular, Australia and New Zealand), it should be remarked that significant deviations from the initially agreed schedule of visits to the country could mean a relevant over cost and limited capability to fulfil this condition if strictly enforced out of the approved schedule. In that case and in order to minimize impacts on the work schedule, would it be acceptable that a local trusted company (maybe a subcontractor) could act on behalf of the Consultant just to gather, digitise and send the information as soon as possible? Would presentation of a signed agreement (including non- disclosure clauses for sensitive information) by that trusted company, once the contract is awarded, be sufficient or would any other evidencing document be required?	The Bidder has the choice to either subcontract or enter into a partnership with another company. UNDP shall evaluate the eligibility of any company the “main Bidder” is entering into a partnership with or is subcontracting as applicable. It is up to the Bidder how he wishes to implement the required services. Please also see clause 19 “Joint Venture, Consortium or Association”.
31.	In the TOR, page 29, it is stated that a stakeholder workshop will be organised by the Government of Samoa with assistance from UNDP to identify an optimum integrated flood mitigation option for the Vaisigano River Catchment. Please clarify: (i) if UNDP and/or the Government of Samoa will bear the costs of this workshop and the Consultant just needs to budget potential costs incurred by its staff; (ii) if UNDP anticipates how many days would that workshop last; (iii) which key staff from the Consultant, apart from the Team Leader, should attend to that workshop or if it is up to the Consultant.	The Government of Samoa and UNDP will provide facilities for the purpose of undertaking the workshop. The Consultancy firm shall not bear the costs for the organization of the workshop itself. The Consultancy Firm’s staff and their relevant expenses must be quoted. Also the consultancy firm should specify who will attend and this should be clearly explained in the technical proposals and relevant expenses should be reflected in the financial proposal as applicable. The consultancy firm should be stating who they believe, based on their experience should attend the workshop. The Government of Samoa and UNDP will not stipulate to the consultancy firm who this should be; however the consultancy firm should have the relevant personnel to immediately answer any question.