



Ballycoolin Bus Depot – Design and Build Contract.

Tender Circular 01

**National Transport Authority,
Haymarket House,
Smithfield,
Dublin 7
D07 CF98**

11th August 2026

SECTION A: TENDER QUERIES

Detailed hereafter are queries that has been received with respect to the National Transport Authority (NTA) competition – Ballycoolin Bus Depot – Design and Build Contract, together with the NTA's response. Grey shaded items represent queries and responses issued in a prior circular:

Tender Query 1:

With regards to section 3.4b, it states "Not Required".

However under the Health and Safety section 3.4.1b and 3.4.2b , it states "Evidence Required" but no instruction as to what is required.

Could you please clarify the CV's that are required or if none are required at this stage.

Response:

Applicants are required to demonstrate compliance with the Management Health & Safety competence requirements. Sections 3.4.1a and 3.4.1b shall be completed in accordance with the requirements of the criterion.

For the avoidance of doubt, there is no requirement under Section 3.4.2b for this submission. The relevant Health & Safety requirements are those contained in Sections 3.4.1a and 3.4.1b only.

Tender Query 2:

is there a brief or scope of works to be supplied here?

We would like to analyse this opportunity from the perspective of the architect role - realising that this is contractor led.

Response:

A scope of works was provided in Section 2 of the Suitability Assessment Questionnaire Project Information Memorandum that was included in the tender pack.

Further information can be found in the planning application that was submitted to Fingal County Council on the 11th of July 2025. The submitted planning application received the planning

reference FW25A/0296E.

Final grant of permission was issued on the 29th of April 2026.

Tender Query 3:

We refer to Appendix B, Suitability Assessment Questionnaire Document Schedule, of Project Information Memorandum PIM and note the Response Requirements for Designers namely BCD QW1 Part 1 and Part 2 SAQ for Contractors and the BCD QC1 Appendices.

However, Appendix E, PIM Submission Checklist, does not identify any documents to be returned by the Designer.

Could you please clarify whether,

BCD QW1 Part 1 and Part 2 SAQ for Contractors is to be completed jointly by the Contractor and Designer as part of a single submission or

Separate BCD QW1 SAQs are required, with one completed by the Contractor and a separate submission completed by the Designer.

We would appreciate your confirmation of the intended submission requirements for the Designer.

Under Appendix E, document BCD QC Part 3 FC. Where it says Part 3, is this a typo and is supposed to read Part 2?

Response:

BCD QW1 2 shall be completed by the Applicant Works Contractor.

Under the Design & Build Contract, the successful Contractor will also undertake the roles of Designer and PSDP and is therefore required to nominate the proposed specialist service providers. Accordingly, the proposed Architect, Civil & Structural Engineer, Mechanical & Electrical Engineer and Fire Consultant shall each complete the relevant BCD QC1 Suitability Assessment Questionnaire. These QC1 submissions shall form part of the Works Contractor's overall SAQ submission and are not separate stand-alone submissions to the Contracting Authority.

With regard to Appendix E, the reference to "BCD QC Part 3 FC" is an error. The intended reference is BCD QC1 Part 2 FC

Tender Query 4:

Under section 3.4a of the Architects SAQ you ask for a CV for the Managing Director.

We presume in this instance that this refers to the Director that will manage the contract, rather than the managing director of our firm?

Response:

The requirement is for a CV for the Managing Director of the Applicant organisation, being the individual with overall responsibility for management of the company. This requirement does not refer to the individual who will manage the contract unless that individual also holds the position of Managing Director.

Tender Query 5:

RFI Query – Section 3.4c: Equivalent Project Experience

Section 3.4c requires Applicants to demonstrate experience of a light industrial building, office building or equivalent building with a minimum GFA of 5,000 m².

Could the Contracting Authority confirm that education or sport infrastructure projects with a minimum GFA of 5,000 m², incorporating similar structural construction methods, complex M and E

services, significant civil infrastructure and external works, ancillary office and administrative accommodation be considered equivalent?

Response:

An education project with a minimum GFA of 5,000m² will be considered an equivalent project for the purposes of this criterion. Sports facilities will not generally be considered equivalent unless the Applicant can demonstrate comparable building complexity, building services content and operational characteristics.

SECTION B: TENDER AMENDMENTS

The information provided in this Section C, Additional Information, constitutes part of the Instructions related to this tender competition

SECTION C: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The information provided in this Section C, Additional Information, constitutes part of the Instructions related to this tender competition