**RSSB2724 -T1132 Development of Supplementary Freight Container Gauges - Tender Question and Answer**

Tender Question and Answer Document

|  |
| --- |
| **Supplier Question 1**1. Please clarify the conflicting project timescales set out in the ITT.
* Section 5 Phasing (p.24) states: “ The project should be completed by October 2019...”
* Budget, Timescales & Dependencies (p.28) states: “ RSSB Expects the work to commence in December 2018 and to be completed in November 2019”.
* Section 3 of the Tender Instructions gives the estimated notification of contract as 24th December 2018 with a target contract commencement date in W/C 7th January 2019.
 |
| **RSSB Answer 1**The timeframes should read that work will commence in January 2019 and conclude in November 2019 across the document. |
| **Supplier Question 2**1. Please clarify whether RSSB is seeking a financial impact analysis from FOC perspective, or an assessment of economic impacts for the whole economy, which would also include an assessment of demand for FOC services.
* ITT Work Package 2.1 (p.23) requires an economic assessment of benefits.
* The success criteria in Section 5 Phasing (p.24) include “A comprehensive economic assessment of the potential financial benefits to freight operators of the new gauges”.
* An economic assessment would usually look at overall net impact, including for instance monetised safety and emissions reductions from mode shift. “An economic assessment of the possible financial benefits to freight operators” implies a financial impact analysis rather than an economic assessment.
 |
| **RSSB Answer 2**The assessment should be based on the rail case specifically, looking at the benefits and costs to both Network Rail and FOCs of developing a new gauge, with the intent of supporting a decision on which variant gauges to proceed with. As a consequence evaluating the commercial impacts on FOCs is a key element and will be influenced by demand in the UK freight business more widely. As a consequence evaluating impacts such as carbon reduction of a shift from road to rail is not part of this assessment, but increased opportunities for rail freight market share is. |
| **Supplier Question 3**Please clarify the payment profile (milestone payments or monthly invoicing against timesheets). |
| **RSSB Answer 3**RSSB will agree an invoicing schedule with the winning tenderer. |
| **Supplier Question 4**Please could you confirm that both work packages (2.1 and 2.2) are expected to be delivered by the successful applicant, i.e. you cannot complete 2.1 in isolation? |
| **RSSB Answer 4**We confirm that we expect to appoint a single tenderer to cover both WP2.1 and WP2.2 |
| **Supplier Question 5**Please could I also ask would RSSB accept non-compliant bids that we believe might provide economic benefit and, if so, is a compliant bid also necessary?By non-compliant, we mean a bid that addresses the objectives but with some additional elements (scope) during Work Package 2.1 that we believe would overall benefit the project and de-risk Work Package 2.2. We understand that you will consider bids that are above the indicative budget of £120,000, provided that this is explained, though I assume this is where the scope is directly aligned with the ITT document.   We consider that a slightly expanded scope would be beneficial, though technically this may be a ‘non-compliant’ bid.Going by your guidance on page 28, under Budget, Timescales & Dependencies, I consider that we would be able to provide this as a costed option for your consideration, would that be acceptable? |
| **RSSB Answer 5** The submissions received will be evaluated against the criteria and scope defined in the I.T.T., as such tenderers should submit a cost for the work as outlined in the I.T.T.Should a tenderer submit any additional information where the tenderer considers an expanded scope to achieve additional value, tenderers are encouraged to do so as a costed option and will be reviewed once the formal evaluation and subsequent contract awarded. |