

Monopile Drivability Guidance for Vibratory Pile Driving – Clarification Questions and Responses

ID	Reference	Question	Response
1	Invitation to Tender	Could you clarify the requirement that the contractor “is expected to have relevant actual performance data before the project start”. Can you define a minimum number of data sets? Does it make sense to bid when having access only to few data sets?	These have not been specified – we welcome bids from any applicant that has some performance data and is able to prove that this can be used to obtain meaningful insights and conclusions relevant to the scope of work of this project.
2	Invitation to Tender – Section 4	Are full-scale or medium-scale onshore site research programs considered as "past experiences in the industry"?	Yes if these have produced data that is relevant to the offshore wind context and the objective of this project.
3	Invitation to Tender – Section 4	“Model monopile driveability with all or a selection of methods”: could OWA provide the minimum number of methods that will be required?	These have not been specified – applicants are expected to consider two or more methods that are relevant to the industry whilst feasible within the budget limit.
4	Invitation to Tender – Section 4	How many different "scenarios" will be required?	These have not been specified – applicants should put forward a number of scenarios that are relevant to the industry whilst feasible within the budget limit.
5	Invitation to Tender – Section 4	Could the OWA elaborate on what is meant by "provide inputs into the OWA costs model" and what is the approximate amount of time that should be considered for that work item?	The idea is to capture how the insights of this research project can potentially bring cost reduction benefits to offshore wind. The Contractor is expected to complete a simple Input sheet that will be provided by the OWA specifying which factors or activities could see a benefit as a result of the outcomes of the project – this needs to be quantified if possible. It is reasonable to consider 1.0-1.5 days of work for this task.
6	Invitation to Tender	The time frame suggested is 9 to 12 months. It might be possible and more efficient to conduct the work in a shorter timeframe. Would this be considered, and are there any constraints such as review cycles / durations or decision gates (e.g. between WPs 2 and 3) or milestone dates that should be considered?	The suggested timeframe feels reasonable. Slightly shorter or longer timeframes put forward by applicants are OK as long as they remain reasonable and do not impact the quality of the project. Applicants should assume a two-week period applicable to review cycles and decision gates.

			No specific milestone date is set for this project except for its kick-off period.
7	Invitation to Tender / Contractors Conditions	How long is the non-disclosure period for the report for WP4? It might be useful for some recommendations to be included in international recommended practice, if this is the case would there be time limited non-disclosure period?	Public disclosure or dissemination of any of the project outcomes can be discussed but it is at the sole discretion of the TWG and the OWA programme. The selected Contractor must understand this will not be possible unless agreed otherwise.
8	Invitation to Tender – Section 4	The SOW in WP3 is dependent on WP2. Can a decision gate be implemented at the end of WP2 to review the scope and budget for WP3 to make sure it is relevant?	Yes, the decision gate is implicit. Applicants should still present and develop in their proposal their views and expectations at this stage for the possibilities that could be explored in this Work Package. Applicants must 1) put forward possibilities deemed feasible within the project budget limit, and 2) clearly state which possibilities put forward would push the project budget beyond its limit.
9	Invitation to Tender – Section 4	Is there a presentation at the end of each Work Package, or at the end of the project?	Applicants should assume there will be a short presentation and discussion with the TWG at the end of each Work Package.
10	Invitation to Tender	Should one review/comment cycle be assumed in the costings?	All deliverables are subject to a review cycle. However, the Contractor must address any final comments from the TWG to the revised version of a deliverable if these pertain to the fact that comments in the first review cycle have not been addressed.
