



RFP 22-4471 – RESPONSES TO CLARIFICATIONS

CLARIFICATION REQUEST	SPC RESPONSE
<p>Annex 4 in the Technical proposal submission form, indicates that under technical criterion 4, analytical skills must be noted. Additionally, this criterion is weighted as 15% in the evaluation matrix of the technical proposal. Shall we understand that under analytical skills we must indicate projects where a number of hydrological data have been analysed and how? Please confirm or otherwise indicate how to fulfil this part.</p>	<p>The intent of technical criteria 4 is to demonstrate the experience of consultant/consortium in analysis of similar issues and where possible examples of addressing similar issues in past projects.</p>
<p>Does the “Experience” refer to the company’s contracts and “personnel” to the experience of the experts involved in the project? Or is the other way around? We would appreciate some clarification.</p>	<p>The expectation is that experience refers to depth of experience for the team that is directly involved in the delivery of the work. Technical criteria responses should reflect both the experience of the project manager and team members who will contribute to the work. These technical requirements do not need to be completed for each team member, but rather as a guide on the overall experience that is contributing to the delivery of the work</p>
<p>Activity 1 consists of developing an overview of the data needs to construct the conceptual model. The RFP already contains an overview of the most critical data. We anticipate that a substantial amount of these data are already available. Can SPC provide an overview of data listed under activity 1 which is available?</p>	<p>? Relevant available datasets are being compiled and will be made available to the successful consultant. These will include daily rainfall, existing evaporation data (Majuro), available abstraction data, LiDAR, existing water level and salinity data for selected monitoring bores, (automatic loggers were installed during May 2022 in the following bores: 1-33, 3-28, 3-38b, 4-48, 6-33, 6-43, 9-33, 10-13, 10-43 and the following galleries: 2, 3, 6, 7. Bore names indicate the bore depth in feet (e.g. 1-33 is screened at 33 ft depth). Historical manual readings of water level and salinity are available from 1986 onwards, however the frequency of this monitoring is infrequent.</p>
<p>Activity 2: it is mentioned that the model should be calibrated to measured salinity. Groundwater levels are not mentioned. Is this deliberate? Can you give a rough indication of the duration of the historical period for which calibration data are available?</p>	<p>Groundwater level data will be made available and is being collected by the installed loggers, however it is anticipated that the impact to the lens and future management will be based predominately on the salinity readings of the freshwater lens to guide future management rather than water levels. Historical manual readings of water level and salinity are available from 1986 onwards, however the frequency of this monitoring is infrequent. Loggers have been installed in a (9) monitoring bores, and 4 galleries since May 2022 with hourly recording in and the data will be made available to the successful consultant for use in calibration. SPC will provide raster files of modelled depths of seawater overlying the groundwater system for various scenarios.</p>

<p>Activity 3: Can you provide more detail about the process for the development of management scenarios?</p>	<p>It is anticipated that to some extent this will be a collaborative and iterative process whereby SPC will facilitate consultation/communication with the water supplier, government, and the consultant to identify a range of scenarios to determine the max volumes of water that may be required to be abstracted based on demand/need. It is anticipated that these scenarios will include consideration to low, avg and high recharge scenarios; storm surge scenarios with Annual return interval of 10,25, 50, 100yrs; and SLR scenarios current, 0.25m, 0.5m, and 1m SLR.</p>
<p>Activity 3: In case of future scenarios: is the definition of the scenarios stresses part of the consultant's work? Are projections of e.g. future rainfall, evaporation and mean sea levels available or will they be based on extrapolated and amended historical records.</p>	<p>The consultant will be called upon to provide input into the development of scenarios which will be determined in consultation with RMI government and water supplier, and SPC. SLR and storm surge projections are based on existing modelled datasets which will be provided to the successful consultant. Unless modelled projected rainfall and evaporation data is available, future rainfall scenarios and evaporation scenarios are expected to be based extrapolated and amended historical records.</p>
<p>How will the due diligence information in annex 3 be used? Does this table include any knockout questions? Does SPC have any particular requirements regarding business insurance (for example an indication of what is considered an adequate amount of liability cover as per clause 14.3 in SPC's general terms and conditions of contract)?</p>	<p>The due diligence queries are part of standard queries for all RFP. All responses to the questions in due diligence will be assessed based on their merits, noting that there is no specific knock out questions, rather a request for consultant to provide sufficient explanation on due diligence questions to allow SPC to undertake its assessment. SPC will contact the bidder if there is a need for further clarification on requested questions. Regarding business insurance and liability cover, this activity it is not considered to be high risk and that business insurance amount will be discussed during the award phase</p>
<p>The technical proposal in annex 4 comprises a table with one cell for the proposed workplan and schedule. Can the bidders provide a separate document for the technical proposal/work plan?</p>	<p>The submission of comprehensive workplan and schedule as a separate document would be permitted and encouraged.</p>
<p>Regarding the comment "Since May 2022, hourly data on groundwater levels and electrical conductivity is being collected in a number of monitoring wells and galleries through automatic loggers"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the nested piezometers, would it be possible to clarify how many observations are available and at what depths? 	<p>Automatic loggers were installed in the following bores: 1-33, 3-28, 3-38b, 4-48, 6-33, 6-43, 9-33, 10-13, 10-43 and the following galleries: 2, 3, 6, 7. Bore names indicate the bore depth in feet (e.g. 1-33 is screened at 33 ft depth).</p>
<p>Regarding the geophysical data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would it be possible to clarify what type of geophysical data exists (e.g., 2-D resistivity data)? 	<p>2D resistivity cross sections along the island.</p>

<p>Regarding Activity 3: Development of optimized management strategies based on future climatic scenarios and the impacts of predicted storm surge and sea level rise inundation scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do “sea level rise inundation scenarios” refer to rises in groundwater levels caused by rising sea levels, and the potential emergence of groundwater at the surface? 	<p>Activity 3 is looking at assessing the model as a management tool to optimize abstraction during periods of low rainfall (and thus shrinking of the lens) and during wave inundation/overtopping events. These inundation events are exacerbated by SLR and that is why we would like to consider a number of SLR scenarios (see also answer below).</p>
<p>Regarding activity 3 and the statement “using existing numerically modelled inundation scenarios”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does SPC plan to provide a detailed spatial description of an overtopping event (e.g., 1-in-10 year event in 2030) with an estimate depth of seawater overlying the groundwater system? 	<p>SPC will provide raster files of modelled depths of seawater overlying the groundwater system for various scenarios. SLR scenarios will include current, 0.25m, 0.5m, and 1m SLR</p>
<p>Regarding sub-contractors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the experience of sub-contractors (both the company and the personnel) considered when reviewing the proposal? 	<p>The experience of sub-contractors will be considered, please provide the relevant details.</p>
<p>Are there any word limits for responses to technical criteria in Annex 4?</p>	<p>No word limit</p>
<p>We conducted several projects with SPC in the past. Is it possible to list those projects as references in the “Experience” section of Annex 4?</p>	<p>This is appropriate</p>
<p>Do our responses to technical criteria 1-4 (Annex4) have to cover all team members or only the project manager?</p>	<p>SPC recommends that the team that is part of the bid is included to demonstrate the depth of the experience. Technical criteria responses should reflect both PM and the teams experience in general who will add to the work. It does not need to be completed for each team member</p>
<p>Would you please clarify the difference between the “Proposed workplan and schedule” and “Details workplan” asked in technical criterion 5 (Annex 4; page 25 of RFP22-4471 - MCA Laura groundwater model 1.pdf?</p>	<p>Technical criteria 5 – is an opportunity for you to present a proposed approach to implementation. We have deliberately not been too specific about the implementation modality as we are hoping for bidders to provide an approach which from their experience is what will be required to achieve the development of the model and the delivery of the results</p> <p>The workplan and schedule would form this part of the proposal. The detailed workplan reference is really meant to expand on what is expected in the proposed work plan with detailed information on what travel may be required and other approaches to achieve successful implementation.</p>