

**Circular No. (12)**

**Reference: SEZAD Tender No. (19-2015) "EPC Construction Services for Detailed Design and Construction of the Duqm Refinery Service Corridor to the Liquid Jetty"**

Date of Collection of Tender Documents: 24/08/2015 Submission date: 03/11/2015

**Subject: Reply to Queries**

Reference to the bidder's clarification on the above subject.

Please see the attached reply to queries for your kind action and record.

**NOTE:**

- All Bidders are to endorse this Circular and attach it as part of their tender submission.
- Last Date for the Receipt of further Queries/Clarifications shall be 13<sup>th</sup> Oct 2015.
- Submission (Closing) Date of tender is: Tue/3<sup>rd</sup> Nov 2015; 1200pm Muscat Time.

Kind regards

*FOM*  
SEZAD, Tenders & Contracts.



**Circular No. (12)**

**Reference: EPC Construction Services for Detailed Design and Construction of the Duqm Refinery Service Corridor to the Liquid Jetty**

SN	Query	Answer
1.	<p>According to Document 1409 - DUQM - 112 - SE (Typical Bored Pile details) and more specifically in the document's notes the below is written:</p> <p><i>"Where there is a mix of piling and footing foundations along the pipeline support corridor, the piping Contractor has to make provision between the two different types of foundation (e.g. provide flexible joints) to cater for possible differential settlement"</i> (note #4).</p> <p>This note implies that there are indeed footing foundations in certain areas, which is consistent with the findings of the geotechnical investigation. However this is inconsistent with the attached in the same document schedule of bored pile, as well as with documents 1409-DUQM-122-SE through 1409-DUQM-129-SE (Piling &amp; Pile cap Layout), which all imply that a</p>	<p>The EPC Contractor in his detail design to propose the foundation types (either pile of footing) based on the geotechnical investigation, and his assurance of the soils type at the location of each support site, and meeting the maximum permitted settlement criteria as stated in section 2.2 of the Specification and Standard for bored piling in the Technical Specification, Volume 4. This foundation type is subject to the approval of the Engineer.</p>



	<p>piled foundation is used in all pipeline supports.                  Please clarify.</p>	
2.	<p>Further to the clarifications provided in Circular no. 6 item 4, as well as in Circular No.8 item 1, you are kindly requested to specify the location of the available areas for site establishment, offices, etc</p>	<p>The response to the Query 4 of the Circular No. 6 is clear, The EPC Contractor to propose the location for the site establishment, offices, etc. which to be approved by SEZAD.</p>
3.	<p>Appendix D to the Form of Bid, Schedule of Unit Rates reads three types of Sleepers Beams while two other types appear on the drawings (SB1a and SB4), kindly confirm if the Bidder can add line items to the aforementioned Schedule of Unit Rates.</p>	<p>The bidders attention is drawn to the table in the Sleeper Tie Beam Layout drawings, The size of SB1a matches size SB2 and Size of SB4 matches with Size of SB3, Bidders are not required to add any line items to the aforementioned Schedule of Unit Rates.</p>
4.	<p>The Tender documents contain information about Bore holes BH33 to BH57 which are classified as Zone 5.</p> <p>Also, Appendix D to the Form of Bid, Schedule of Unit Rates reads under the "Piling" heading, Zone5.</p> <p>The Bidder's understanding from the provided drawings and documents that the scope of work and the battery limits encompass only BH01 to BH32.</p>	<p>The scope is clear and does not include any works between BH 33 to BH 5.</p> <p>Please delete from the page 46 of the Volume 1 the Item (e) of the section 7 of the Appendix D to the Form of Bid- Schedule of Rates.</p>

	Kindly confirm that BH33 to BH57 are not in scope, and that the Bidder shall not price the aforementioned line item reading "Zone 5".	
5.	please provide details for "unsurfaced patrol road" which appears for example on drawing #1409/DUQM/143/SE.	Please refer the section 5.3.4 on the Page 9 of the Duqm Refinery Specification of the Volume 4. The contractor shall use his experience in the construction of such a graded road.
6.	The note on drawing #1409/DUQM/151/SE talks about demolition of service road and replacement by bridge structure. This note states "By Others". Kindly confirm the demolition scope and the replacement with bridge structure are both not in the scope of this Bid and will be done by others.	The RFP is clear, Irish crossing of the wadi is by others and there is no other crossing, either temporary or permanent. For clarity please delete the referred note from the drawing # 1409/DUQM/151/SE.
7.	<p>1. Reference is made to Drawing no. 1409/DUQM/152/SE, please clarify the following:</p> <p>A B3 - UB 457X279X128 KG/M is a non-standard profile. Please confirm the Profile.</p> <p>B B4 - UB 457X279X144 KG/M is a non-standard profile. Please confirm the Profile.</p>	We note that many queries been submitted to date give the impression that bidders believe they are bidding on a detailed design or FEED. The document is clear in as much that the design is only a <u>CONCEPT</u> . Bidders have an obligation to provide a detailed design aligned to the concept that they believe will be fit for purpose and will be subsequently checked by SEZAD's consultant. The concept was developed in Singapore where the profile may

	<p>C Plan @ Level 8 shows Member B2 in grids B-A, B-B, B-C &amp; B-D. But Elevation at these grids show Member B3. Please confirm the member size.</p>	<p>indeed be standard. But in any event for this query refer to the response to query 4 of circular 10.</p>
--	--	---

h-k  
c

