

Tender Reference: MH-FIRE-25-03
Tender Description: Multi-party Framework agreement for Architect Led Multidisciplinary and Integrated Design Team Services for an extension and upgrade to Oldcastle Fire Station

Message ID	Ref.	Clarification Request	Response	Date Received	Date Issued
496063 raised and 496999 reply		From initial review of ITT documents would it be possible to confirm the following:-		24/09/2025	24/09/2025
	1a	- Number of successful Architect Led DT to be admitted to framework?	FIVE -"5"		
	1b	- Will a site visit be facilitated to visit Oldcastle Fire Station?	Yes. Preference is interested parties attend on a single visit. A tender bulletin will issue with details of visit. At this juncture visit to be scheduled for either Wednesday 8th October or 9th October given that 10th October is date for End of Clarifications		
	1c	- VAT exclusive budget for the Oldcastle refurbishment project.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 - Project Budget of the Project Master Plan which notes envisaged VAT Exclusive Budget of circa €2.3million.		
500365 raised and 508634 reply	1	<u>Tender Query</u> The SAQ Part 1 forms state that for all criteria (including 3.4a, b and c) that 'Declaration Required'. Can you confirm that for all these criteria is it correct that no evidence is required to be submitted at this stage and applicants need only submit a completed and signed SAQ Part 2 declaration for each discipline?	Given that Technical Capability (Service Providers Competency) is a pre-requisite to ensuring Competent Service Providers are appointed to the Framework, the Suitability Assessment Criteria shown on page 11 of the SAQ for each Principal Provider have been revised as follows: 3.4a, 3.4b, 3.4c, 3.4d and 3.4e Applicant Response revised to "Documentary Evidence Required". Note the response on pages 18,21,23,25 and 26 have also been revised to read "EVIDENCE REQUIRED" Note: Financial and Economic Standing Criteria 3.3a, 3.3b, 3.3e, 3.3f and 3.3g remain as previous namely "Declaration Required". It is assumed that Applicants will provide the requisite documentary evidence when requested prior to formal appointment to Framework for these criteria.	29/09/2025	08/10/2025
	2	<u>Tender Query 2</u> <u>Framework scope</u> Can you confirm this Framework is solely intended to be used for Meath CoCo Fire Services projects and will not be used for other Meath CoCo projects?	"The Framework is principally for Meath County Council Fire and Rescue Service. Given that Municipal Buildings are included in the Suitability Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) and Fire Stations are Municipal Buildings, Meath County Council reserve the right to utilise the Framework for other Municipal Buildings	01/10/2025	08/10/2025

Message ID	Ref.	Clarification Request	Response	Date Received	Date Issued
502025 raised and 508644 reply	3	<u>Quality submission - quantity of work</u> The Quality submission as set out in the ITT calls for approximately 30 A4 pages of bespoke work if broken up as follows: B1 - Strategy - 4 A4 pages B2 - Programme - circa 3 A4 pages B3 - Improvements / Quality in delivery - 4 A4 pages C1 - Organisation - circa 2 A4 pages C2 - CVs - 10 A4 pages D1, D2, D3 - Risk / Quality / Health Safety - 3 A4 pages D4 - Sustainability - 4 A4 pages We are concerned that this quantity of bespoke quality submission (which does not include SAQ documentation and other particulars) is excessive for the scale and value of the commission. This does not include the significant work required of IDT lead practices to compile and coordinate other team member inputs. For comparison we recently submitted a max 7 A4 page quality submission for a circa €15m ex VAT public works project. Conservatively this may cost a practice in the order of €10,000 to €15,000 to prepare and submit a high quality bid (the nature of the work requires significant Director and Senior Architect input). There is also the risk that submissions will be very heavy on irrelevant copy/past text from previous bids, or be composed entirely of AI 'workslop'. While we welcome the inclusion of a quality submission we respectfully suggest that the quantity of work required be significantly reduced, possibly by reducing the maximum number of pages that may be submitted for each criteria (by at least half). We believe this will result in more carefully considered answers from all tenderers and will reduce the amount of work the Contracting Authority will need to undertake to review and score submissions.	Meath County Council (MCC) as Client recognise that there is a time and cost involvement for Tenderers in compiling submissions. The adoption of the Open Procedure rather than a two stage Restricted Procedure is a step to optimise and recognise the time and cost involved. As noted in the Project Information Memorandum, MCC are confident that a number of projects will be realised via the Framework. The page limits noted in Table 8 – Initial Contract Award Criteria, contained in the Project Information Memorandum (PIM) are maximum page limits. There is a balance to be achieved for the Contracting Authority in receiving appropriate information to consider vis a vis the time and workings asked from the applicant tenderers. In response to the query and request, MCC have reviewed the page limits and offer the following comments and amendments: •B1 – Strategy. 4 No. A4 pages requested. Given this represents 20% of the score, this is an appropriate limit. REVISE TO 3 No. A4 PAGES. •B2 - Programme - circa 3 A4 pages. (No page Limit for Gantt Chart). Contracting Authority have provided overview of key tasks. Tenderer to review/adapt as they see programme will run. NO CHANGE •B3 - Improvements / Quality in delivery - 4 A4 pages. REVISE TO 2 No. A4 PAGES. •C1 - Organisation - circa 2 A4 pages. NO CHANGE •C2 - CVs - 10 A4 pages. 5 key CVs requested. Normally CV is 2 pages. NO CHANGE. •D1, D2, D3 - Risk / Quality / Health Safety - 3 A4 pages. Single page for each criterion is appropriate. NO CHANGE. •D4 - Sustainability - 4 A4 pages. REVISE TO 2 No. A4 PAGES For clarity and ease of reference Table 8 in the PIM will be revised accordingly. For clarity and ease of reference the Particulars in the Instructions to Tenderers will be revised accordingly.		
502065 raised and 506297 reply	1	<u>Request</u> In light of the upcoming site visit scheduled for next week, as well as the preparation and submission of both the SAQ and Tender Documents due on 20 October, could you possibly grant an extension of time to accommodate the volume of work required.	Tender Bulletin issued on 06/10/2025 (MESSAGE ID 506297) noted the following: Please note the submission deadline has been extended to: Monday 3rd November @ 12:00 noon, Latest day for queries: Friday 24th October @ 12:00 Noon	01/10/2025	08/10/2025
5026297		Submission Deadline extended	Tender Bulletin issued on 06/10/2025 (MESSAGE ID 50697) noted the following: Please note the submission deadline has been extended to: Monday 3rd November @ 12:00 noon, Latest day for queries: Friday 24th October @ 12:00 Noon	n/a	06/10/2025

Message ID	Ref.	Clarification Request	Response	Date Received	Date Issued
507950		Tender Bulletin 1	Given that Technical Capability (Service Providers Competency) is a pre-requisite to ensuring Competent Service Providers are appointed to the Framework, the Suitability Assessment Criteria shown on page 11 of the SAQ for each Principal Provider have been revised as follows: 3.4a, 3.4b, 3.4c, 3.4d and 3.4e Applicant Response revised to "Documentary Evidence Required". Note the response on pages 18,21,23,25 and 26 have also been revised to read "EVIDENCE REQUIRED" Note: Financial and Economic Standing Criteria 3.3a, 3.3b, 3.3e, 3.3f and 3.3g remain as previous namely "Declaration Required". It is assumed that Applicants will provide the requisite documentary evidence when requested prior to formal appointment to Framework for these criteria. This response shown on attached LOG. See attached revised SAQ Documents. I have added a prefix "R1" to denote that they are Revision 1 • OLDFS_QC2 SAQ 1.A R1- Architect • OLDFS_QC2 SAQ 2.CS R1 • OLDFS_QC2 SAQ 3.ME R1 • OLDFS_QC2 SAQ 4.QS R1	n/a	08/10/2025

Message ID	Ref.	Clarification Request	Response	Date Received	Date Issued
TBC		<u>Tender Bulletin 2</u>	Please note the following: Project Information Memorandum (PIM) revised to Revision 1 (R1). Arising from Tender Query ID 500365 and response 508634 on SAQ, the following change made: •Table 3 - SAQ Criteria on page 16 updated. Note: Revised SAQ issued as part of Tender Bulletin 1 (ID 507950) issued on 8th October 2025. Arising from Tender Query ID 502025 and response 508644 on Page Limits, the following change made: •Table 8 - Award Criteria on pages 28 & 29 updated. Volume A – Instructions to Tenderers revised to Revision 1 (R1) Revision in the light of response to Query ID 502025 and response 508644 on page limits for Tenderers response, the Particulars have been amended to reflect changes on Award Criteria page limits. MH-FIRE-25-03_Tender Document Register revised to Revision 1 Document Register updated to include: •Revisions to SAQ •Revised PIM Revised Instructions to Tenderers (Particular)	n/a	09/10/2025