

CLARIFICATION LOG

Tender:	Professional Services - Heritage Restoration of Falmouth's Ponsharden Cemeteries
Tender Reference:	2020-21 (002)
Published Date:	02/10/2020
Version number:	0.1

Number	Clarification	Response	Reply date
1	Appendix 1 Core Design Team, Page 1, General, Conservation Architect. This paragraph requires the Conservation Architect to be “accredited as a Conservation Architect on the RIBA Conservation Register, this is a requirement for working on a Historic England grant aided project”. Please confirm that accreditation to Architects Accredited in Building Conservation (AABC) will be an acceptable alternative to the RIBA Register. I don’t believe that HE restricts its accreditation requirements to just those on the RIBA Register.	This would be acceptable from the Council's perspective	02/10/2020
2	Is there any word limit on the Supplier Responses in Volume 2?	No, we have not stipulated a word limit - we would however ask for the response to be clear, relevant and proportional	02/10/2020
3	Volume 2, Supplier Response “Delivery Method and Programme”. The introduction to this section has clearly been copied and pasted from another project, and is inappropriate for the Ponsharden project. It refers to a Listed Building, “adaptation” and an “extension”, whereas this project is about the consolidation and repair of monuments and boundaries associated with a Scheduled Ancient Monument. I don’t think that it would be appropriate for us to answer this question until the introduction is corrected to properly reflect the project that is being tendered.	Noted this has been reflected in an updated version of Volume 2 updated version has been included on Contracts Finder	02/10/2020
4	Please clarify the requirements for completion of the fee schedule. Volume 2 Section 4.2 page 15 requires lump sum fees, whereas Schedule 1 – Price appears to require a percentage fee submission as well. It would not be appropriate to submit both, and we cannot confirm sub-consultant tender prices until this is clarified.	Please ensure fees to be in line with Schedule 1	02/10/2020
5	Volume 2 Section 4.3 does not make sense. Please clarify.	Section 4.3 - had been amend " <i>Regarding any additional work, will be based on the fee scale for all consultants as set out in the Price Schedule 1</i> "	02/10/2020
6	Similarly, paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9 do not make sense. Please clarify.	Paragraph 4.8 and 4.9 have been deleted.	02/10/2020
7	The submission date of 27th September is a Sunday. Please clarify whether this is correct.	This was the original return date which has subsequently been amended to 12:00 hrs on 12.10.2020	02/10/2020