NML Waterfront Buildings Feasibility Study Questions & Answers

Q - Could also advise on whether you are looking for an Architect to lead the Consultant Team, or are you open to the lead consultant being an exhibition planning and design firm?

A - I think we would be leaning towards a more traditional architect/design led team because it isn’t a solely exhibition based piece of work.

Q - Can you please confirm the deliverables for this project.  For example, is this an purely architectural project, or will it be expected that other disciplines should be considered in the proposals, specifically at the stage 2 process.

A -  The key deliverable is the production of options that can then be developed into Concept Design. At this stage it’s likely to be architecturally led with any other disciplines providing a high level input to ensure what is proposed is generally feasible, we’re not anticipating a detailed M&E report for example.

Q - Is a copy of the Masterplan available for reference?

A - I’m afraid the Waterfront Masterplan is not available for release to tenderers as it’s not a public document. We will obviously provide a copy to the successful tenderer.

Q - Is it anticipated that full scope RIBA stage 0 -2 will be completed within the 2.5 month window? Noted studies need to be complete by January. If there is delay to contract award will these dates shift?

A - The anticipation is that the contract will be completed by January. As per the tender documents the requirements for RIBA Stage 0 in particular are a review and analyse of the existing information developed by NML rather than a full Stage 0 process. Likewise the elements of Stage 2 are to be the production of the concept designs of the proposed option/s only

Q - Please can you confirm if the questions outlined in Quality and Cost schedule 3.6 the primary basis for assessment of  the tender and should they be answered directly? Or is this the schedule of how requirements set out in 4- Bid requirements will be evaluated only.

A - Yes, the questions and weightings in section 3.6 will form the basis for assessment of the received bids

Q - 4.2 Management Summary, question a) asks for a ‘brief overview of the proposed solution’. Can you confirm if this is based on methodology and approach or should include a design proposal?

A - The elements within section 4 can be incorporated into the responses to the questions in 3.6 i.e. the brief overview of the proposed solution can be covered within your proposed methodology. NML is anticipating responses based on methodology and approach rather than design proposals.

Q - Could you please clarify the following point: Is 3.6 a summary of all questions or a separate question (ie: timetable, projects reference, costs, etc.). We feel it gives an overview of the other documents/questions required so would like to get clarification on this.

A - The questions in section 3.6 are the main point for evaluating the quality submissions. There is information that covers off both 3.6 and the requirements in section 4, it doesn’t need submitting twice as long as where it’s in response to 3.6 it’s clear

Q - How many project example do you require in each question where reference is asked (3.6 and 4.3). Is there any requirement in terms of construction cost, date, built, etc.?

A - There is no set limit or minimum as to the number of projects required as examples, again it’s up to the tenderer if they wish to include construction costs, dates, references etc.

Q - 4.2: Can you clarify what you mean by solution

A - Solution in this respect is the proposed methodology for delivering the feasibility study to meet the requirements of the specification

Q - On the summary of document list, can you please clarify what “detailed specification of proposed solution” refers to?

A - As above this is essentially your proposed methodology for the delivering the specification which in turn is the answer/response to second question in section 3.6

Q - Has the Business strategy (including food and beverage offer and whole day experience principles) been completed, and therefore, does not require either additional specialist input from destination consultants or specialist food and beverage consultants. i.e. Will the museum provide the baseline for design feasibility studies to be prepared.

A - A high-level commercial assessment has been undertaken on the possible options within the masterplan. However, given the status of the masterplan as a high-level concept ideas document this assessment is reflective of that stage of development. The proposed feasibility study is likely to challenge some of the ideas and concepts within the masterplan and potentially drive new ideas as well, therefore a final business plan is likely to develop from the studies rather than vice versa

Q - Is a planning consultant required as part of the consultant team

A - Pre-planning application advice is required, but it is up to tenderers to decide if a formal planning consultant would be required and add value to their methodology

Q - Is a project manager required as part of the consultant team

A - As above it isn’t a formal requirement, if the tenderer feels it would add value then that is their decision

Q - Subsequently releasing completed masterplanning outputs after the determining the tender process could place any interested bidder unfamiliar with such outputs at a disadvantage – specifically if the incumbent team was to submit a bid. Can you provide reasons and reassurance to potential bidders this would not be the case.

A - The masterplan is a very wide reaching and high level document that covers and number of areas that are not within this commission. Because of its nature as a concept document it isn’t in the public domain in general, as it isn’t a definitive statement of intent to deliver all the options considered within it.

Q - In order to provide a tailored scope to price, can you provide a schedule of masterplan documents to released as part of the Stage 0 appraisal.

A - The documents released would be the Masterplan which includes high level options for the proposed locations, the high-level commercial consideration undertaken and existing building information on the buildings (condition and specialist surveys available etc.)

Q - Has a pre-app process been entered into (we presume so) as the three month period identified for the study could be incompatible with a potentially longer statutory process.

A - High level consultation has been had with Conservation Officers, but no formal process has been undertaken to date

Q - How has covid-19 impacted on the masterplan outputs and if so how has this been addressed.

A - No post COVID assessment has been undertaken. As above, because the masterplan is an informing document how it, or any new ideas, translate into the current situation would be considered within the proposed feasibility study

Q - Concerning the Consultant Team. Do you anticipate the makeup of the team for this commission mirroring that of the team that produced the Waterfront Masterplan, i.e. Architect, Landscape Architect, Activity Planner, Services and Structural Engineering?

A - The proposed team is likely to be architecturally led with high level input from other disciplines such as M&E/Structural/Commercial/Exhibitions etc. to ensure the proposed outcomes are viable and feasible. If the bidder wishes to propose other disciplines within their methodology NML is happy to consider these

Q - On pg.5 of the ITT document in the second paragraph of point 2.3, you mention sharing tender information with the engaged consultant without the express written consent of the bidder. Would this include any commercially sensitive information?

A - For the purposes of this bid, there are no other engaged consultants involved in the project. As such information within bids will only be shared within NML for evaluation of the tenders

Q - In the second paragraph of pg.7 you refer to NML being able to recover costs against the engaged consultant in relation to errors in ‘the response’, Please can you clarify if that relates to NML’s response to the clarifications sought or the bidders broader response to the ITT?

A - This relates to the wider ITT response in respect that should a bid actively misrepresent in terms of cost or methodology in order to secure the commission to the detriment of NML we would seek to recover the costs

Q - Does NML have access to current, dimensioned survey information for the buildings and their immediate contexts?

A - General arrangements with floor area will be provided to the successful bidder

Q - Has NML established a sustainability strategy for the buildings referred to in the tender documents?

A - NML does not currently have a defined sustainability strategy for its whole estate, although it is in the process of working towards this. It is anticipated that any proposals will seek improve and enhance sustainability within the buildings where possible

Q - Has NML carried out an accessibility audit for the buildings and associated public realm referred to in the tender documents?

A - No accessibility audits have been undertaken to either the buildings or public realm. We would anticipate that the successful bidder would ensure that any proposals take into consideration accessibility as detailed in Appendix F (Requirements Specification – Accessibility , Inclusivity and Diversity)

Q - Does NML anticipate to fulfil any design team roles (such as project manager) for this project?

A - NML will be acting as project manager for the feasibility works

Q - Does NML anticipate to take an active role in the organisation and management of stakeholders?

A - NML will facilitate the stakeholder engagement process, although it is anticipated that the successful bidder will take the lead in managing the process and its outcomes

Q - Does NML anticipate to provide a principal designer for this project, or would the tender winner be responsible for their appointment?

A - Formal Principal Designer appointment is not anticipated at this stage, although we do require the successful bidder to produce a Pre-Construction Health and Safety Plan and Designer Risk Register – as per the RIBA Stage 1 activities in Appendix G

Q - We are also wondering if you could provide a more detailed explanation of feasibility. Are you considering both architectural and economic feasibility as part of this study?

A - In the first instance we’re looking for an architecturally led feasibility to understand what could be developed within the buildings. However, if bidders wish to offer options for also consider commercial feasibility within their bids then NML is happy to consider this

Q - Do we need to follow the order set out in Appendix M to submit the required documents or are we free to submit our response in a clearly labelled order of our choice?

A - You are able to submit in the order easiest for yourselves

Q - Are you able to confirm which consultants you are looking to see within the wider team (as sub consultants to the architect  & Master planner). The brief is unclear as given length of time it would suggest higher level proposals and therefore may not require MEP/ Structural input.

A - The proposed team is likely to be architecturally led with high level input from other disciplines such as M&E/Structural/Commercial/Exhibitions etc. to ensure the proposed outcomes are viable and feasible

Q - Is urban realm and landscaping included within the scope of the study or is the study limited to the buildings themselves?

A - The study is just limited to the buildings themselves

Q - In the tender document section 4.2: Management Summary, point a) asks for "a brief overview of t**he proposed solution** including any partners and third parties.” Can you please confirm that the word solution refers to a project management/apporach solution and not a design solution?

A - Yes, the solution would be the bidders proposed methodology for delivering the studies

Q - In the tender document section 4.3.1: Company Details, point e) asks for "**The proportion of the total business accounted for by the proposed services**” . Could you please explain what that means?

A - If your company provides multiple diverse solutions to customers, what percentage of your business is covered by the disciplines required for this solution

Q - In the tender document section 4.3.2 Financial Information "The bidder must provide **audited accounts** for the last three financial years.”  We do not have audited accounts. We would be able to submit a Statement of Turnover, Profit and Loss/Income Statement, Balance Sheet/Statement of Financial position and Position of Cash Flow for the last three financial years.  Would that disqualify us or would it be acceptable?

A - That would be acceptable

Q - In the tender document section 4.3.3 Third Party Services, point c) asks for "**Product Name/Version**”. Could you please explain what products you’re expecting?

A - This isn’t relevant to the proposed works, please ignore

Q - In the tender document section 4.9 Summary of Documents to be returned as part of submission point vi) asks for  "**Detailed Specification of proposed solution"**. Again, can you please confirm that the word solution refers to a project management/approach solution and not a design solution?

A - Yes, the solution is the proposed methodology for delivering the studies

Q - Appendix F refers to areas on the plans of the Museum of Liverpool that have not been named in the plans. Would it be possible for us to have a set of **plans that have the spaces named** (such as Staff Areas and Learning and Participation Areas)?

A - Yes, a high-level plan can be provided.  These can be forwarded under separate cover (I can provide them on Wednesday when I’m not out on site all day)

Q - Would it possible to have a list of the **internal and external stakeholders** so we can evaluate with more accuracy the engagement process.

A - Internal stakeholders – museum and curatorial, exhibitions, commercial, learning and participation and facilities and maintenance. External stakeholders – Liverpool City Council, Historic England, Royal Albert Dock, Canal and River Trust

Q - The tender document states that "NML is seeking to appoint an experienced and creative **Consultant  Team**". Could you please let us know if we are expected to bid along with a team of sub-consultants that would cover all areas necessary to produce the feasibility study or if NML has already appointed or will be appointing any sub-consultants such as cost consultants, exhibition design consultants, fire safety consultants, services consultants, structures, acoustics, conservation, access, planning consultants, landscaping and business planning?

A - The makeup of the proposed team is up to the tenderer. NML views the proposal as being architecturally led with high level support from other areas such as structural/M&E/exhibition/cost consultant etc.

Q - There is no mention of **budget** for the intended developments in the tender documents.. Evaluating the amount of work required from us and therefore our fees is very dependant on the budget available for the work projected. Could we have an idea of what budget would be available for the development and improvement of the Museum of Liverpool, the Great Western Railway Building, the Pilotage, and the Piermaster’s group?

A - NML is not working toward a defined budget for these works and is looking for the tender process to inform the budget requirements

Q - Are you able to confirm how many firms have attended a site visit in relation to this bidding for this tender?

A - To date we have had 10 site visits as part of this tender

Q - Could you also please provide the following: NML's Expenses Policy, NML’s Diversity and Equality Policy, NML's Dignity at Work and risk management procedures. These are referred to in Appendix H Form of Agreement but we can’t find them in the available documents.

A - The Form of Agreement attached within Appendix H is an example form of agreement. A final form agreement will be entered into with the successful bidder and any relevant policies will be provided at that point.

Q - The emphasis of the briefing documentation seems to focus on design feasibility.  Please can you clarify to what extent NML is looking for the tenderer to address the financial feasibility of the identified waterfront buildings or, is the intention for this to be tendered separately or addressed by NML’s own internal resources?

A - At this stage the studies are to be architecturally led. In relation to financial feasibility there is a need to understand the budget implications of the proposed solutions from a capital perspective. With regards to wider commercial feasibility it is likely this will be developed outside of the feasibility study, however if the tenderer feels it would add value to their bid to include for commercial feasibility then NML is happy to consider this.

Q - Do we have to sign the Appendix H Example Form of Agreement at this stage or only if we are selected to proceed ?

A - Appendix H doesn’t need to be signed, it is an example of the Form of Agreement that will be entered into between NML and the successful tenderer

Q - We intend to return our submission by email. Do you also require hard copies?

A - No we don’t require hard copies

Q - Do we need to sign up/express our interest in this opportunity via a tender portal or do we just need to return our response to the specified email address?

A - No need to express your interest, just send your response to the specified email address

Q - Could you please confirm what disciplines do you envisage that the team for this project will include?

A - The process will be architecturally led and it is for the bidders to decide on what other disciplines are to be involved. However, we would anticipate input of varying levels from M&E, structural, exhibition/creative and QS

Q - Could you please confirm if there are any page limits or word limits to any of the questions?

A - There are no page or word limits on submissions

Q - Beyond architectural services what other Consultant Team disciplines are NML requiring to ensure a compliant ITT

A - There is no defined team structure required for bid compliance. However, we would anticipate the study is architecturally led with input from all the disciplines listed

Q - Can you provide a total floor area in GIA split between the MoL and Small Buildings

A - The broad split of floor area is as follows – small buildings 800m² and Museum of Liverpool 3000m²

Q - Can the design outputs that have informed the Strategic plan be made available at this stage

A - The Waterfront Masterplan and outputs will only be made available to successful tenderer, the broad outputs are as described in Appendix F

Q - Are the incumbent master planning team precluded from submitting for tender

A - No, the tender process is open to any interested bidders

Q - Will the master planning role be a separate overseeing appointment / and form part of the wider client team

A - No, the masterplan process has been completed and the feasibility work will be a standalone appointment to develop the work to the next stage

Q - Can a fuller list of stakeholders be provided at this stage

A - At this stage the stakeholders will be internal departments (Curatorial, Exhibitions, Commercial, Facilities, Learning & Participation) and external parties Royal Albert, Canal & Waterways Trust, Historic England, Liverpool City Council Conservation Officer

Q - We have assumed planning and listed building would be required at RIBA Stage 3

A - Yes, although we would anticipate pre-planning advice and engagement with the Conservation Officer to be sought within this study

Q - We are wondering if the awarding of the feasibility study for National Museums Liverpool Waterfront Buildings also will result in a contract afterwards?

A - Depending on the outcome of the feasibility study and available funding NML would be looking to award contracts for development into concept and technical design.

Q - Item 4.9, The ‘Summary of Documents to be returned as part of Submission’ differs from Appendix M, the ‘Tender Submission Compliance sheet’.  Can you clarify the submission requirements so that we can ensure our submission is valid.

A - The core documents required for a bid to be evaluated are as per Appendix M. It is acknowledged that in providing responses to Items 3.6 and 4.2 bidders will also provide information that is covered within Item 4.3 i.e. details of relevant experience etc.

Q - For the “creative Consultant Team”, what are the team requirements (e.g. Landscape, Structure, Architecture…)

A - The team is likely to be led architecturally, but there will need to be input from other disciplines such as M&E, creative/exhibition, commercial to ensure the proposals developed meet NMLs requirements

Q - Is there a required consultancy that should be leading the Consultant Team?

A - The lead consultant is the choice of the tenderer/s

Q - Is there exclusivity required for the sub-consultants?

A - There is no exclusivity on consultants, i.e. there is no requirement to retain the previous consultants who developed the initial masterplan

Q - Is the tender open to international offices (outside UK)?

A - Yes, the tender is open to international offices

Q - Can you stipulate the total area covered?

A - The area isn’t a defined site, but broken down across the individual buildings within Appendix F

Q - How do we submit our final tender? We cannot find a link through the [Gov.uk](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/0xENCjRDLcNENLIWGnfK?domain=gov.uk) website.

A - You submit your response via email to [Tenders@liverpoolmuseums.org.uk](mailto:Tenders@liverpoolmuseums.org.uk)

Q - we are wondering if NML prefers and finds it appropriate for a foreign applicant to team up with a local partner.

A - NML is happy to accept bids from international bidders as long as the criteria within the tender specification is it met. If the tenderer feels it would add benefit to their bid and to the delivery of the contract to work with a local partner then also NML would have no issues with this proposal.

Q - Please could you also confirm whether there is a word or page limit to guide bidders on the length of their response to questions?

A - There are no limits re your response

Q - For sections 3.6 and 4.2, is there any response template we need to follow or other restriction (ie page limit, font size, etc.) than to ensure that each email is less than 8Mb?

A - There are no restrictions re page limit, font, etc.  If attachments total more than 8Mb then please split over multiple emails

Q - 4.3 & 4.6 sections are not part of the Tender compliance submission sheet but we assume we need to follow the 4.9 Summary of Documents to be returned as part of Submission? Is there any response template to follow here again or we are free to use our own?

A - Please use your own format

Q - Shall we attach all documents/answers in one single PDF or create one per answer?

A - Please choose how you want to present  - in one document or multiple

Q - Options Appraisal: It feels like there may be a number of potential options for the various spaces.  Are you expecting the successful consultant to deliver an options appraisal?

A - Options Appraisal – Yes, the anticipated output would be an appraisal of the options proposed with a view to a preferred option or options being proposed – this may be in the form of  a phased proposal over a period of time

Q - Scope: Could you give more clarity on the outputs or scope of the work expected. This will help us to determine whether architectural or QS input is required, for example should you be looking for indicative design proposals or outline costs.

A - Scope - The key deliverable is the production of options that can then be developed into Concept Design. At this stage it’s likely to be architecturally led with other disciplines being a high level input. With regards to QS input specifically we would be looking for an indicative project budget for the proposed option/s – part of the RIBA Stage 1 activities in the Pricing Schedule

Q - Evaluation of bids:  As the brief is quite open, could you please tell us how you will evaluate different levels of service and fee.  
A - Evaluation – The method of evaluation of the Quality will be against the questions in 3.6 and the pricing schedule in Appendix G

Q -  Will the authors of the wider masterplan be retained as client advisors – and if not who will be responsible for overseeing that any future proposals align with that vison.

A - It is not intended to retain the previous team to act as peer reviewers for the works going forward. NML is anticipating the successful bidder (with guidance from NML as Client) will ensure that the proposals align with its strategic visions and aims whether this is directly developing the concepts and ideas from the Masterplan or where new ideas have been introduced

Q - Are there Conservation Management Plans currently available for the heritage buildings?

A - At this stage we don’t have Conservation Management Plans to share. However, should the documentation become available we will of course share it

Q - During the study period do you envisage collective meetings with key stakeholders, or individual meetings over a defined period? And is this being reviewed in relation to Covid 19?

A - It is very difficult to tell given the on-going situation. However, we would anticipate that an initial meeting is held with all internal stakeholders from which individual meetings can then be convened, it is highly likely that some stakeholder groups will require more engagement than others – key to the process will be effective updating and reporting to ensure NML can keep all groups informed. In relation to external groups a tailored approach is probably more suited. NML is currently working very successfully using Microsoft Teams, in the main, to host meetings with internal and external partners and we would anticipate this could be used should the ability to meet in person continue to be a no go

Q - Are you expecting initial ideas and design concepts / proposals as part of the ITT bids, in relation to the **‘*Detailed specification of proposed solution’*** as highlighted in the list of deliverables?

A - No, the proposed solution is essentially your methodology for delivering the study/scope. If you want to include any initial high-level ideas or concepts that is up to you as a bidder

Q - In relation to **third party services** highlighted in section **4.3.3**, is this relating to the wider services provided by the full design team, or specifically targeted at particular elements that you may expect consultants to sub-contract out during the study?

A - This specifically relates to any services you as a bidder are seeking to bring in from other suppliers or sub-contractors i.e. who is the proposed wider design team

Q - As part of the deliverables you note that we should include - **Standard Terms and Conditions** – is this relating to the ‘Example form of Agreement’ – if not is there an Appendix we should be aware of as part of the tender documents.

A - This is for you to provide any Standard T&Cs you may have as an organisation

Q - As part of the Masterplan study – are high level costs for the elements of the Waterfront Buildings Study included?

A - The Waterfront Masterplan considers high-level costs in relation to Capital spend and potential revenue. This information will be shared to the successful bidder

Q - Can you expand on the’ Academia, educational or charity pricing schemes’ and is there a specific cost target or percentage for the ‘phased payment schedule across the lifetime of the schedule, with minimal upfront payment’.

A - This is essentially if you as an organisation are tied into any wider Government led pricing/contracting programmes for educational, charity or academic bodies we would look to ensure pricing, where applicable, is concordant with them

Q - Can the design team anticipate to receive existing building information from archives / dimensional surveys / condition reports / H&S Files that will be helpful in considering proposed modifications?

A - Yes, existing building information (surveys/O&M Manuals/Statutory certs etc.) will be made available to the successful bidder

Q - Is it anticipated that only visual / non-intrusive surveys of the existing buildings will be undertaken in the feasibility study?

A - Yes, we are not anticipating intrusive surveys within these works

Q - What is the contractual Limit of Liability that is required for the appointed design team?

A - The limit of liability will be aligned with the successful bidders Professional Indemnity Insurance

Q - Is there a requirement within the feasibility stage to further consider the public realm / branding / wayfinding / external lighting in the design proposals to provide a common theme? Or are NML expecting this to be developed as a later phase of the implementation of the masterplan?

A - Consideration to the wider public realm and wayfinding etc. does not currently form part of these works