

Museum Vision Tender – FAQ – as 26th July 2018

Format - Question / **Response**

Can we extend the deadline for hard copies received to 1pm on the 6th of August? (Royal Mail).

Yes this is fine as long as tenders are in by 1pm. We will amend the overall document on contracts finder.

Can we get a copy of the tender document in word format for ease of completion?

Yes, please email a request to marc.farrance@nmrn.org.uk.

Section 6 set's out the Pricing Proposals, and under 6.1 refers 'As defined on page 9/10'. There are no details referring to the Pricing Proposals or format on pages 9 or 10. Can you clarify please?

The pricing proposals actually refer to 3.2 - Schedule of Services (Summary of Project), which should have sat on pages 9/10. (PDF error) So in essence the pricing proposal should be to deliver the brief as defined in section 3.2 - Schedule of Services (Summary of Project).

Are you able to tell us the kind/size of firms you are expecting to tender for this work? Local, national, large or small?

There is no preference on the size of firm expected to tender for this work. The key for us is that the submission can demonstrate a clear understanding of the brief (section 3 of the tender) and approach / experience to be able to deliver the vision project overall (section 4.3.3). We welcome all submissions that could help us complete our aims.

The ITT documents contain "The Agreement" on pages 36-52, and since this will only need to be signed on appointment, can we leave it out of our submission?

That is correct, it is for visibility only at this stage.

Will a project timeline programme gantt chart be issued as part of the tender information?

No. We expect the tenderer to set out their methodology and timeline to meet the deadlines provided in the tender document.

In the terms of RIBA Plan of Work 2013, is the scope of this tender for Stages: 0 Strategic Definition, 1 Preparation and Brief, and 2 Concept Design?

Our requirement is very much for a design concept to illustrate the scope and ambition of Museum buildings that could be developed in detail by later work. In that sense the work we require will cover some elements of the initial RIBA stages rather than a full RIBA approach.

Is it anticipated that the same team will be retained to develop this Reports recommendations, if/when the client board instructs a planning application and project to develop further?

Any subsequent work will be put out to tender in the same manner.

Has any cost study been carried out to inform the project development CAPEX and likely construction budget; and will any portion of this information be shared as part of this tender information?

Detailed cost studies have not been undertaken. Supplier estimates for cladding of the existing museum were obtained in 2017 and are included in the internal Assessment report that will be provided as part of the tender.

Will a full complement of design team members (structure, services etc) also be appointed to work with the architect on this report, albeit their appointment by separate tender?

No. We are asking for outline concept designs (see answer to 2. Above).

Will building plans of the existing museum be issued as part of the tender; in order to fully understand the scope of services.

Existing plans of the Museum will be made available to the consultant engaged.

Will a content list of exhibited material be issued as part of the tender?

No. It is expected that the consultants engaged will visit the site as part of the process, to familiarise themselves with the displays. A broad collection description is available as part of the Internal Assessment report which will be provided.

Under (3.16.1) visiting the site is suggested. We would like to arrange a site visit, are there coordinated dates proposed by the museum, or may we attend at any point?

There are no set dates. We ask those interested to contact us to make an appointment.

Under (3.1.2) the time period is set out as circa 30 weeks, or just over five months. Does the client anticipate the fixed price contract set out under (6) to be invoiced/paid monthly; as per (6.2.4) of the Appendix 1 'This Agreement'.

We could clarify – payment will be made in full, subject to completion of the project report, as defined by contract.

Who is undertaking the commissioned piece of work to appraise options for the Museum developments location? Will they be retained to input into this report?

The Location review work is also currently out to tender, although not through Contracts Finder as its value is below the threshold. The consultants engaged for that work will not be retained to

input into this report, although the outcome of that study will clearly inform the Vision. We would be pleased to send out that document if required.

Is an option scenario being appraised that considers the implication of a site otherwise unconsidered were it not for the outcomes of the this new vision for the museum report; is there any opportunity for the museum's new vision process to input into any possible new location?

The scenario for the Location Appraisal is set out in that tender document. There are no other scenarios currently up for appraisal. If, as part of the Vision work, an alternative location scenario was suggested it would be duly considered. However, we would expect our Project Board to be made aware of such a proposal immediately it is conceived, rather than being held for the final report.

We noticed The National Museum of the Royal Navy project in the AJ, I understand that you are currently looking for architects input only, is this correct? Will structural engineering form part of this tender process, if yes is there a prequalification route onto the ITT list we could follow?

We are currently seeking consultants who will facilitate development of the Museums Vision taking into account its corporate and operational objectives etc. We are asking for some initial design concept work to help develop later bids. So, while we are certainly not exclusively looking for architects we envisage some architectural input into the concept design.

Please may we have a copy of the ITT documents for the Museum Vision?

We assume you have found out about our project through the Contracts Finder website. Please follow the links provided to download a copy of the document.

Can we see a copy of the Location Brief as defined in the ITT? Can we potentially bid for this as well? ***Yes, please email a request to marc.farrance@nmrn.org.uk. Due to the size and value of the opportunity, it has not been published on Contracts Finder in the usual way.***

Do you require us to retain the format of the supplier questionnaire?

Yes please, this will ensure we are able to assess and score the submissions in a consistent and fair manner.

5.1.2 Where these requirements are duplicated in Section 7 Supplier Questionnaire, would it be acceptable to make reference to the questionnaire (or vice versa), rather than repeating the same information?

Please include any information reference section 5.1.2. as required or in support of your answers in section 7.

5.3.2 You ask how we will manage our sub-contractor's relationships with stakeholders. Generally, we would not expect them to be involved with stakeholders. We

wondered if, by stakeholders, you were referring to members of the Project Team? Please could you clarify?

Stakeholders are in themselves members of the project board, other staff at the Museum and even individuals located externally outside the Museum. If sub-contractor relationships are required with any stakeholder, we would look to see definition on how this contact and relationship would be managed.

7.5.1 Should the requested examples of similar services only refer to RIBA Stage 1 as in this ITT, or can we describe more complete projects?

It is paramount your submission includes information to show you understand and deliver the specific brief, detailed in section 3.2 of the document. However, if detail on the wider project you have delivered helps you to demonstrate these points then there is no problem with additional information being sent.

Are you able to confirm whether the project is likely to include;

- A. Demolition of the existing Museum and redevelopment of the site to form a new Museum, or
- B. Extension and remodelling of the existing Museum, or
- C. Construction of a new Museum on a new site.

At this stage there are no preconceived outcomes. All of the scenarios described are possible dependent upon the outcome of the two pieces of work, the Vision development and the Location review, that have been put out to tender as stage-one of the Museum's development programme.

Are you able to provide any indication of the likely budget for the building work? This would help us to gauge the scale and scope of your ambition and what you are hoping to achieve.

We expect the building work to be part of a major redevelopment project, which will require significant investment of resources by the National Museum of the Royal Navy and for the project to be the subject of a major funding bid. The budget set will be commensurate to the scale of the project identified by the foundation work achieved through the stage-one work.

Do you require a number of different design options to be prepared as part of the vision and associated report, or do you foresee that just one design scheme will be developed after initial discussions and agreement?

At this stage we require an outline design concept, to help the NMRN project Board and Trustees think their way forward into the project and to illustrate "the possible" for advocacy purposes. If a number of design concept options could be delivered within the tender budget that would be great.

Your Tender document suggests that you require services for multiple different roles to complete the scope including:

- Preparation of Future Business plan.
- Development of Strategic Vision
- Analysis of Audience and Visitor profiles.
- Appraisal of catering and retail offer.
- Preparation of client and architectural brief.
- Preparation and appraisal of Architectural options.
- Outline of preferred concept to assist with fundraising.
- Option costing.
- Completion of final report
- This will require the input of a number of consultant including architect / master- planning, cultural consultancy, cost, and PM.
- As the project lead, are we allowed to propose consultants to fill all roles required and the full scope of services?

As indicated in 3.2 schedule of services, Introduction to the project, this stage-one foundation work is anticipated to be establishing a vision for the new museum and the resultant development programme. The areas to be considered are to inform the vision rather than produce a fully detailed development plan. That will be the outcome of the next stage of work. Like-wise our architectural requirement is very much for a design concept to illustrate the scope and ambition of Museum buildings that could be developed in detail by later work. In that sense the work we require will cover some elements of the initial RIBA stages rather than a full RIBA approach. As per the Project Objectives:

- ***Prepare a new draft vision for the Museum within the NMRN***
- ***Facilitate agreement of scale and ambition of a development programme to achieve the vision***
- ***Deliver an architectural study to illustrate concept designs for buildings matching the ambition of the project***

Your ITT invitation document suggests a budget fee of £25K over 8 months to complete this work. Is this for the lead/ architect role only or do you expect this to cover all consultants for the full scope?

The £25K is anticipated to cover the work of all consultants involved in this stage-one work.

How frequently do you expect the team to report to the client?

We will expect the consultants to maintain regular contact with the Project Lead and the Project Board throughout the project and anticipate proposals from the consultant so agreement can be reached on how best that will be achieved.

Are you anticipating that the completed document will be used as part of an application to the Heritage Lottery Fund?

No, the report we expect from this stage will be foundation work that will inform the more detailed development stages and it is anticipated that it will be this later stage that will lead to a fully developed funding bid.

How will the project be funded?

The funding for this work has been assigned from the National Museum of the Royal Navy's own resources. It is envisaged that a future development programme for the Fleet Air Arm Museum will require a carefully constructed funding programme involving NMRN resources, a fundraising campaign and significant funding bids, as well as exploring all other funding options.

The estimated contract sum is 25k to prepare a feasibility study, over a period of 7 months, is this correct?

The sum available for the Vision tender is up to £25,000.

Can you confirm this project is being directed by the Fleet Air Arm Museum and Curator locally, rather than NMRN centrally?

The project is being run by a Project Board, which is made up of a Portsmouth and Yeovilton based staff, some at an executive director level. The project is being managed locally by a Development Team which is made up of Yeovilton and Portsmouth based staff. It is led by a Fleet Air Arm Museum-based team member. Key reporting and decisions will ultimately be taken to the NMRN's Board of Trustees.

Can you provide a list of key consultees / organisations to consult in developing the study?

A list of key stakeholders will be provided to the successful consultant by the Development Team.

Is there a realistic prospect of the museum building moving location, or is a creative refurbishment more likely?

At this stage both of those options will be explored by the Location review tender.

Do you have any specific audiences in mind for the refurbished museum, including service families?

The Museum has a range of audiences that have been identified, which include families, special interest groups, service families to name but a few. The Museum needs to establish its true range of audiences and how it meets their needs.

Do you yet have any thoughts about funding sources for the eventual museum development / refurbishment?

In today's funding climate the project will have to consider all possible funding sources from the HLF to new partnerships.

As a consortium, can we provide 3 case studies in our tender proposal?

The process requires two case studies.

What range of skills and experience do we expect the consultant's to have?

We certainly expect the consultant engaged to have a good understanding of the cultural sector and how cultural organisations, especially larger museums, work.

Would PDF format be acceptable, if the file size is reasonable? PDFs are still easy to view, print, circulate, etc.

PDF format is acceptable for your submission. All tenders should be submitted as per the ITT published on Contracts Finder, with final submissions sent to tenders@nmrn.org.uk.

The opportunity is for a consultancy to establish a new vision including architectural concepts with a fixed price contract up to £25,000. Could you please clarify whether this is anticipated to be the total fee and includes the services of other consultants (cost planner, engineers etc) or if the wider consultant team will be engaged directly by NMRN.

The fee of 25,000 has been set as the maximum fee for completion of the project objectives and vision work outlined in section 3.2 of the tender document. Your submission can include the input and support of other consultants although this must be included within your submission and then your overall fee (section 6).

Can we have a copy of the location brief?

Yes.

Can we offer a submission for the projects combined.

No, but you can submit a bid for both projects separately.

The ITT makes no reference to other consultants. Is it the intention of FAAM to procure the services of other consultants, in particular a cost consultant directly?

The Tender for the Vision Development is capped at £25,000. The only other consultancy we have set out to Tender at the moment is for a review of the location of the Museum. At a later stage of the Development Programme appropriate consultancies may be put out to tender.

Will the Site Options Appraisal noted in section 3.2 include desktop site investigations for the chosen site to mitigate the need for engineering input during RIBA stage 1?

The location study will probably include desktop investigation but is not anticipated to necessarily include site engineering work. Please refer to the brief to see that both these pieces of work are more about operational issues than architectural issues as this stage of the Museums development programme.

Re: ITT item 1.7.1 - Has there been any clarification changes made to the ITT?

Re: ITT item 1.7.3 - Is it possible to share any other queries and answers that have been submitted by other tenderers?

Any changes to the brief are listed in the FAQ's and the FAQs will be made publically available on the Contracts Finder Platform as set out in the process.

What stage are you at with the Location review and do you have a consultant on board who is working on this?

Work out to tender at the moment with same closing date.

When do you think the outcome of the work will be known?

We are asking for this work to be concluded by end of November 2018.

What criteria is the options appraisal being based on – available land, best location for the museum etc.?

There is a key assumption that the location must be close to a working, or recently working, airbase. The appointed consultants will review the candidate sites set out below and recommend an option to pursue for the location of a museum development:

- ***Yeovilton, Somerset. HMS Heron, an active Royal Naval airbase. This is the site of the existing museum***
- ***Culdrose, Helston, Cornwall. HMS Sea Hawk, an active Royal Naval airbase.***
- ***Lee-on-Solent, Portsmouth, Hampshire. HMS Daedalus until 1996. Now used for general flying, which has included Search & Rescue and Hampshire Police. Hosts Solent Enterprise Zone.***
- ***RAF Lossimouth, Moray, NE Scotland. HMS Fulmar 1946 to 1972. Now one of the RAF's biggest and busiest air bases.***

The sites will be reviewed taking into account the potential to support a development model for a viable museum that will attract and sustain visitor numbers above one hundred thousand per year taking the following points into consideration:

- ***Access to a vibrant local tourism sector***
- ***A robust local infrastructure, including transport links and area development plans***
- ***Links to appropriate strategic initiatives***
- ***A supportive environment for cultural, heritage and tourism businesses and other opportunities for future development***
- ***Potential to build creative partnerships from all sectors to support the offer***
- ***A viable site for the construction of new museum buildings***

The skills required include 'identifying and assessing emerging technologies and their bearing on the outcomes of this project'. This has quite a wide scope but can you confirm (or not) that you would expect this to include consideration of the following:

- Visitor experience and the nature of future exhibitions and displays?
- Collections, future collecting policy and collections display and storage?
- Visitor transport and travel, e.g. electric vehicles?
- Construction technologies?

Is there any other aspect that we should specifically consider?

In order to "Future proof" the development of the museum, as much as anyone can hope to, we would expect the engaged consultants to alert us to, and weave into their work, the emerging technologies that they feel are appropriate. We are very aware of developing digital interpretive technologies but all of the examples cited are good.

The brief identifies the points to be considered in relation to the sites. These consider the strategic context and the viability of the site for the construction of new buildings. Our knowledge of existing aircraft and related museum sites identifies that some of the most successful sites have strong stories associated with their previous use and evidence of those uses through existing buildings and other features. Has any assessment of the supportive Interpretive Potential been conducted with the identified sites, e.g. The internal Assessment report submitted to the CRLA Committee in December 2017?

Work done during the internal assessment led to a the statement in the Project Objective section of the Location Review brief;

"There is a key assumption that the location must be close to a working, or recently working, military airbase. The proximity of live flying provides visitors with a unique experience, which also puts the displayed heritage in context."

We expect the work of this tender to build on that assumption. It is also fair to say that many of the displays and stories told as part of the interpretation of the collections are linked to the proximity of the airbase.

Q1) Can we confirm that it is allowable to submit a Method Statement in addition to the Section 6, 7, 8, and 9 Questionnaire Forms?

Q2) Is there any guidance on the length of the Method Statement?

Q3) Is there a prescribed format for the Method Statement, or can we develop a Word document to provide: Relevant Skills and Experience; Understanding of the Brief; Method Statement and Approach; Resource Schedule; and Programme?

We request people follow the format of the Contract Finder form as set out in 5.1.1. There is further format guidance within the document. We have to follow this format and it also provides continuity when evaluating submissions.

Q4) Can we confirm that if the Lead Consultant completes the Section 7 (and other) Forms, do the sub-consultants have to separately complete any aspect of the Section 7 Form, e.g. 7.3

As lead consultant you are responsible for filling out the form.

It is most likely that our bidding model, would be as a lead consultant with other sub-consultants under ourselves – What company information will the sub-consultants need to provide if any? Or will the company information from our firm only be sufficient?

You should provide enough information about sub-consultants to provide assurance that they are appropriate to the ITT and meet the contractual requirements.

For purposes of completing the commercial sections, does a bidding model of lead consultant, with sub-consultants under them represent a consortium?

No.

Regarding the pricing schedule – There is a request for a daily rate and an offer price. Do you require the schedule to be expanded to show the rates of the individuals working on the project, as well as the time for each individual and then multiplied by the time to give a price?

Yes.

Is there an anticipated construction budget for the works?

No. This work is to establish a vision for the later development programme. It is anticipated that this type of detail will be part of the next stage of development.

Regarding the proposed form of appointment - Clauses, 5.1.3, 5.1.4 and 5.1.5 are fitness for purpose clauses and not typical clauses usually seen in an architectural appointment. So as to align with insurance requirements, please could you clarify if it would be permissible for these clauses to be removed in the event that we are fortunate enough to be appointed?

No these are NMRN's standard terms

Regarding the proposed form of appointment - Clause 6.6 - It looks as if that the words from the first part of this clause are missing as the sentence appears to be incomplete, please clarify the whole clause?

Subsequent to final payment the Supplier will indemnify the Customer against any liability of the Customer to the Supplier, whether present or future, liquidated or unliquidated, and whether or not the liability arises under this Agreement.

Regarding the proposed form of appointment - Clause 8.1 allows the customer to take over the IP of the consultant. As this is not a market standard for architectural appointments, please could you clarify if it will be acceptable instead for the consultant to issue a license to the customer to use the IP for the purposes of the project instead, as is more typical under these circumstances?

No, these are NMRN's standard T&C's

Regarding the proposed form of appointment – We note that clause 9.1 is an indemnity. We don't have any problem with the basis of the clause, however as it is drafted in the form of an indemnity, it would potentially be an issue for our insurance coverage. Therefore, please may we ask if it would be acceptable to amend the clause slightly so as that it is not expressed in this way. For example as follows:

- 9.1 The Supplier is liable to customer in respect of any reasonably foreseeable and properly mitigated claims (including loss of profits, loss of business, depletion of goodwill and similar losses), costs, proceedings, damages and expenses (including legal and other professional fees and expenses) awarded against, or incurred or paid by, the Customer as a result of or in connection with:

No we will remain with NMRN's standard T&C's

The proposed form of appointment does not appear to contain a limit on overall liability – Please could you clarify?

We have not set an overall liability limit.