Query No.	Date received	Tender Query	Response Date	Response	Contract Amendment (Y/N)
1	01/05/2025	Scope Clause S208 sets out the requirement for a FRAP to be submitted by the Client. The clause goes on to state the contractor is to consider any constraints and requirements imposed by the EA as part of the FRAP application process. These constraints and requirements are currently unknown and cannot be considered by the contractor at this tender stage. Can you confirm that any constraints and requirements in relation to the FRAP will be dealt with by a compensation event	23/05/2025	There is a requirement for the contractor to support the client in providing information for the submission. The Contratcor is to allow in there tender price in maintaining the flood protection. Refer to S208	N
2	01/05/2025	Could you provide contract data in a word format so we can add our data	23/05/2025	Word Document of Contract Data uploaded on Fine A Tender portal	N
3	01/05/2025	There are examples of ambiguities for the same sections of work between the different design organisations. For example Resin Bound Gravel Type B on the De Matos Ryan Drawings, has a construction build-up of 100mm type 3 sub base, 40mm AC10 surfacing, 9.5mm resin bound gravel. The SWECO drawings for the same area has a construction build-up of 150mm type 1 sub base, 70mm AC14 surfacing, 25mm resin bound surface. There are several examples of these ambiguities. Could you give clarity on which details should be used.	23/05/2025	The specifications within SWECOs drawings should take precedence during tender over the De Matos Ryan drawings	N
4	01/05/2025	We would expect a specification for the civils works, is this being prepared and when will it be issued.	23/05/2025	The specification of civil works shall be the Civil Engineering Specification for the Water Industry (CESWI), 8th Edition, published by UK Water Industry Research Ltd. All other specifications is provided within contract documents. Refer to paragraph 1.3.7	N
5	01/05/2025	Damages are listed as £1,000 per day per section and then also at the same level for overall completion. This is quite a high risk profile on damages given the multiple sections and £7k per week per section. As such could we propose a total cumulative limit of damages be included within the contract of £50,000. This would maintain a stick for the client to ensure timely completion but would put the risk profile of damages to a more usual footing and avoid risk monies being added to cater for this within the bid.		Answer to follow	
6	12/05/2025	Secondary Option X2 removes the risk for the contractor for changes in law that we have no control over. We would like to see X2 added		Answer to follow	
7	12/05/2025	X5 includes a sectional completion date for the demobilisation of the west compound which is the same as the contract completion. We would like to see the removal of this sectional completion as the client can rely on the completion for the whole of the works	23/05/2025	Sectional completion for the west compound is to remain.	N
8	12/05/2025	Both 'if option X7 is used without X5' and 'if option X7 is used with X5' have been completed. Only the latter should be completed, so damages for the whole of the works should be removed.	23/05/2025	Option X7 is to be used with Option X5 therefore damages for the whole of the works will be deleted.	Y
9	12/05/2025	X7 Sectional completion delay damages can be applied cumulatively, which has the potential to be a significant risk, which appears out of line with the project value. We would like to see the value of the damages reduced and / or a cap on damages introduced. remembering that damages should always be demonstrable calculation of loss.		Answer to follow	
10	12/05/2025	5% retention is higher than we would expect to see, we would like to see this reduced to 3%	23/05/2025	Retention to remain as 5%.	N
11	12/05/2025	Z29 - includes a new clause referenced 60.1(20). This clause reference already exists, we assume this is an additional clause and not a replacement	23/05/2025	Z29 updated to 60.1 (22)	Y
12	12/05/2025	4.9.1, S501 Programme requirements state 'The Contractor shall provide a detailed project plan in Microsoft Project and pdf format' would it be acceptable to submit in Asta Power Project instead?	23/05/2025	We can accept MS Project or Primavera P6	Y
13	12/05/2025	Drawing 65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1382: States that the existing floodwall buttress is to remain. However it also shows that the proposed retaining wall foundation is to be constructed below this buttress. This is not possible. As the new retaining wall structure will in effect be serving the same purpose of the buttress, once constructed, please confirm whether the buttress can be removed to enable construction.		Answer to follow	
14	12/05/2025	65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1301 & 65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1382 indicate that there is an existing gas service, adjacent to the footbridge, that (in the first instance) is to be removed and subsequently diverted around the new retaining wall and footbridge structures. Typically there are long lead in periods for the diversion of gas services. Have Cadent been contacted and is this diversion process underway?		Answer to follow	
15	12/05/2025	Please provide further design information for the Precast steps and in turn their foundations/ seatings		Answer to follow	
16	12/05/2025	Please could you confirm the specification of concrete to be used for the construction of the stairs at each location.		Answer to follow	
17	12/05/2025	Please could you confirm the specific depth of subbase for the Car Park/Access road construction. 65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1070 states a depth between '300-500mm'		Answer to follow	
18	12/05/2025	Drawing 65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1211 shows a proposed concrete surface. Could you please confirm the buildup of the 'proposed concrete surface' as there is no specification or construction detail.		Answer to follow	
19	12/05/2025	Please could you provide a detail on the metal edging as described in the typical details drawing 65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1070, please also confirm where these edgings are required.		Answer to follow	
20	12/05/2025	Please could you confirm whether the footway construction on drawing 65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1070 is the same as the 'resin bound gravel' on drawing 65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1321 (Henry Moore Lawn) and if not, could you provide us with a construction detail and specification for the resin bound gravel.		Answer to follow	
21	12/05/2025	Drawing 65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1401 states "existing block paving to be taken up & stored for reinstatement." However, the proposed GA drawing indicates this area is to be paved footway. Could you confirm that the block paving should not be reinstated, and therefore stored on site?		Answer to follow	
22	12/05/2025	Drawing 65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1311 shows an extension of the existing retaining wall on the eastern side of Henry Moore Lawn along the entire length of the existing retaining wall, however, the sections on drawing 65208756-SWE-XX-XX-D-C-1381 does not show it going long the entire wall, as well as the existing wall being shown as 'buried under embankment fill' in the site clearance drawings. Please can you confirm what the scope is for the retaining wall extension.		Answer to follow	
23	12/05/2025	Please can you provide a construction detail indicating how the retaining wall extension mentioned in the previous TQ is connected into the existing wall along Henry Moore Lawn.		Answer to follow	
24	20/05/2025	Please can you provide a specification and a detail for the lighting bollards, and could you also specify how you would like it to connect to a power source.		Answer to follow	
25	20/05/2025	Please can you confirm if the contractor is required to import the clay fill for the embankment construction or if this material will be FOC from the borrow pits indicated in the Ground Investigation report	23/05/2025	Material is to be import	N
26	20/05/2025	Please can you confirm the required specification of the clay material, including permeability requirements etc.	23/05/2025	Specification is included in Appendix B of the River Alde Flood Defences Ground Investigation Report	N
27	20/05/2025	Further details, particularly of the foundation details for the demountable partitions, were to be issued on April 30th. Are these details imminent		Answer to follow	
28	21/05/2025	We noted the ITT asks for a hard copy submission for the tender for Snape. Is this essential, it's quite unusual nowadays with most submissions being just digital to save waste paper and printing etc.	23/05/2025	Tenderers may only submit a digital copy. A digitial copy on a memory stick with a covering letter shall be returned East Suffolk Water Management Board, Pierpoint House, 28 Horsley's Fields, Kings Lynn, Norfolk, PE30 5DD. This shall be submitted in a plain envelope marked 'Flood Cell 06, Snape Maltings Tender' but bearing no markings to identify the Contractor by 12:00 noon on the 27th June 2025.	Y