Framework Agreement - Consulting services regarding seismology

Info	
Version 1	**Publish date** 7/6/2012 4:54 PM
Url http://com.mercell.com/permalink/34791877.aspx	**Bid due date** 8/27/2012 11:59 PM
External tender reference id SSM 2012/2729	**Change date** 7/6/2012 4:45 PM
Tender type Tender	**Opening date** 8/28/2012 1:00 PM

Buyer
Company Stråsäkerhetsmyndigheten
Address Stråsäkerhetsmyndigheten
Zip/city 17116 Stockholm Sweden

Description

This procurement regards consulting services for the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority's (SSM) regarding seismology in connection to the review of geosphere performance for a repository for spent nuclear fuel. The work described here concerns for example the review of the SR-Site safety assessment published by the Swedish Nuclear Fuel and Waste Management Company (SKB). The SR-Site covers long-term nuclear safety and radiation protection for the post-closure phase and is part of the licence application by SKB. This procurement regards framework agreements to be established for a three-year review period. The framework agreements may be extended by a maximum of one additional year. This framework agreement may include other topics regarding seismology for consulting services for other organisational units at SSM. This can for example include review of frequency- and magnitude- distributions of natural earthquakes in connection with reviews of other nuclear facilities than the above described.

The procurement is handled by the procurement system Mercell. For questions and support please contact the support: +46 31-360 60 29.

Yours sincerely,

Lena Sonnerfelt

Stålsäkerhetsmyndigheten
Disposal of Radioactive Waste

CPV codes

Code	Description
71352100	Seismic services.
73300000	Design and execution of research and development.
73400000	Research and Development services on security and defence materials.

Demands

1	The “should” criteria no 1 The consultant(s) who will be responsible for the assignment will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria. Each criterion will be evaluated and attributed 1-4 points. A weighting factor is given for each criterion. After consideration of all “should” criteria, the remaining weighting up to 100% is determined by the price. The consultant(s) “should” have: 1. Documented experience of earthquake magnitude and frequency assessments. A maximum of 10 references may be selected. **The ‘should’ criteria (1 – 4 points)** The consultant(s) who will be responsible for the assignment will be evaluated in accordance with the requested “should” criteria described in the specification, enclosure 2 Determining factors for the evaluation of the “should▫ criteria are: · The quality and scope of referenced assignments, reports and published papers in relation to the requested criterion This can for instance be demonstrated by: · The number of full-time working years of relevance for the particular review topic · The number of assignments for regulatory agencies or international organisations (such as IAEA, OECD - NEA, EU) · The number of relevant assignments related to site investigations, site modelling, or safety assessments for disposal of nuclear waste or other radioactive wastes · The number of relevant publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals with good ratings · The number of organisations for which relevant assignments have been conducted · The number of relevant assignments with large responsibility and major undertakings in safety assessment projects The “should▫ criteria are evaluated on a scale of 1-4 points: 1. Previous experience and expertise regarded as non-existent or little in the context of the requested criterion 2. Previous experience and expertise regarded as good in the context of the requested criterion 3. Previous experience and expertise regarded as very good in the con-text of the requested criterion 4. Previous experience and expertise regarded as excellent in the con-text of the requested criterion Quality and scope can for instance be demonstrated by: The weighting in between different characteristics related to scope and quality varies depending on the specification of each should-criterion.	20.0%

2	Should criteria no 2 The consultant(s) who will be responsible for the assignment will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria. Each criterion will be evaluated and attributed 1-4 points. A weighting factor is given for each criterion. After consideration of all “should” criteria, the remaining weighting up to 100% is determined by the price. The consultant(s) “should” have: 2. Documented experience of post-glacial seismicity. A maximum of 10 references may be selected **The ‘should’ criteria (1 – 4 points)** The consultant(s) who will be responsible for the assignment will be evaluated in accordance with the requested “should” criteria described in the specification, enclosure 2 Determining factors for the evaluation of the “should¤ criteria are: · The quality and scope of referenced assignments, reports and published papers in relation to the requested criterion This can for instance be demonstrated by: · The number of full-time working years of relevance for the particular review topic · The number of assignments for regulatory agencies or international organisations (such as IAEA, OECD - NEA, EU) · The number of relevant assignments related to site investigations, site modelling, or safety assessments for disposal of nuclear waste or other radioactive wastes · The number of relevant publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals with good ratings · The number of organisations for which relevant assignments have been conducted · The number of relevant assignments with large responsibility and major undertakings in safety assessment projects The “should¤ criteria are evaluated on a scale of 1-4 points: 1. Previous experience and expertise regarded as non-existent or little in the context of the requested criterion 2. Previous experience and expertise regarded as good in the context of the requested criterion 3. Previous experience and expertise regarded as very good in the con-text of the requested criterion 4. Previous experience and expertise regarded as excellent in the con-text of the requested criterion Quality and scope can for instance be demonstrated by: The weighting in between different characteristics related to scope and quality varies depending on the specification of each should-criterion.	10.0%

3	Should criteria no 3 The consultant(s) who will be responsible for the assignment will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria. Each criterion will be evaluated and attributed 1-4 points. A weighting factor is given for each criterion. After consideration of all “should” criteria, the remaining weighting up to 100% is determined by the price. The consultant(s) “should” have: 3. Documented experience of probabilistic estimates of seismic risk and/or hazard. A maximum of 10 references may be selected. **The ‘should’ criteria (1 – 4 points)** The consultant(s) who will be responsible for the assignment will be evaluated in accordance with the requested “should” criteria described in the specification, enclosure 2 Determining factors for the evaluation of the “should¤ criteria are: · The quality and scope of referenced assignments, reports and published papers in relation to the requested criterion This can for instance be demonstrated by: · The number of full-time working years of relevance for the particular review topic · The number of assignments for regulatory agencies or international organisations (such as IAEA, OECD - NEA, EU) · The number of relevant assignments related to site investigations, site modelling, or safety assessments for disposal of nuclear waste or other radioactive wastes · The number of relevant publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals with good ratings · The number of organisations for which relevant assignments have been conducted · The number of relevant assignments with large responsibility and major undertakings in safety assessment projects The “should¤ criteria are evaluated on a scale of 1-4 points: 1. Previous experience and expertise regarded as non-existent or little in the context of the requested criterion 2. Previous experience and expertise regarded as good in the context of the requested criterion 3. Previous experience and expertise regarded as very good in the con-text of the requested criterion 4. Previous experience and expertise regarded as excellent in the con-text of the requested criterion Quality and scope can for instance be demonstrated by: The weighting in between different characteristics related to scope and quality varies depending on the specification of each should-criterion.	10.0%

4	Should criteria no 4 The consultant(s) who will be responsible for the assignment will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria. Each criterion will be evaluated and attributed 1-4 points. A weighting factor is given for each criterion. After consideration of all “should” criteria, the remaining weighting up to 100% is determined by the price. The consultant(s) “should” have: 4. Documented experience of seismic wave propagation and/or fault displacements. A maximum of 10 references may be selected. **The ‘should’ criteria (1 – 4 points)** The consultant(s) who will be responsible for the assignment will be evaluated in accordance with the requested “should” criteria described in the specification, enclosure 2 Determining factors for the evaluation of the “should¤ criteria are: · The quality and scope of referenced assignments, reports and published papers in relation to the requested criterion This can for instance be demonstrated by: · The number of full-time working years of relevance for the particular review topic · The number of assignments for regulatory agencies or international organisations (such as IAEA, OECD - NEA, EU) · The number of relevant assignments related to site investigations, site modelling, or safety assessments for disposal of nuclear waste or other radioactive wastes · The number of relevant publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals with good ratings · The number of organisations for which relevant assignments have been conducted · The number of relevant assignments with large responsibility and major undertakings in safety assessment projects The “should¤ criteria are evaluated on a scale of 1-4 points: 1. Previous experience and expertise regarded as non-existent or little in the context of the requested criterion 2. Previous experience and expertise regarded as good in the context of the requested criterion 3. Previous experience and expertise regarded as very good in the con-text of the requested criterion 4. Previous experience and expertise regarded as excellent in the con-text of the requested criterion Quality and scope can for instance be demonstrated by: The weighting in between different characteristics related to scope and quality varies depending on the specification of each should-criterion.	15.0%

5	Should criteria no. 5 The consultant(s) who will be responsible for the assignment will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria. Each criterion will be evaluated and attributed 1-4 points. A weighting factor is given for each criterion. After consideration of all “should” criteria, the remaining weighting up to 100% is determined by the price. The consultant(s) “should” have: 5. Documented experience of scientific or regulatory review of articles/assignments regarding feismic events. A maximum of 5 references may be selected. **The ‘should’ criteria (1 – 4 points)** The consultant(s) who will be responsible for the assignment will be evaluated in accordance with the requested “should” criteria described in the specification, enclosure 2 Determining factors for the evaluation of the “should□ criteria are: · The quality and scope of referenced assignments, reports and published papers in relation to the requested criterion This can for instance be demonstrated by: · The number of full-time working years of relevance for the particular review topic · The number of assignments for regulatory agencies or international organisations (such as IAEA, OECD - NEA, EU) · The number of relevant assignments related to site investigations, site modelling, or safety assessments for disposal of nuclear waste or other radioactive wastes · The number of relevant publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals with good ratings · The number of organisations for which relevant assignments have been conducted · The number of relevant assignments with large responsibility and major undertakings in safety assessment projects The “should□ criteria are evaluated on a scale of 1-4 points: 1. Previous experience and expertise regarded as non-existent or little in the context of the requested criterion 2. Previous experience and expertise regarded as good in the context of the requested criterion 3. Previous experience and expertise regarded as very good in the con-text of the requested criterion 4. Previous experience and expertise regarded as excellent in the con-text of the requested criterion Quality and scope can for instance be demonstrated by: The weighting in between different characteristics related to scope and quality varies depending on the specification of each should-criterion.	10.0%
6	Remuneration for the Consultant	35.0%

Submit the hourly rate excluding VAT in the table below. Please note that the submitted price is the ceiling price throughout the contractual period. The price submitted will be used to give evaluation points by considering the relationship to the other tender prices submitted.

Category	Name	Price per hour in SEK	Number of hours[2]	Total (SEK)
The Consultant who will be responsible for the assignment			800	
Tender price (sum)				

Please note that the price will be evaluated in accordance with item 6.4.2 of the enquiry documents. The hourly price submitted will be multiplied by a fictitious number of hours (800) in order to compute the tender price submitted.

Submit hourly rate excluding VAT in the specification, enclosure 2.

The price submitted will be given points in relation to the tender prices sub-mitted.

The tender prices will be converted into points using “reference prices□.

The highest (maximum) and the lowest (minimum) reference price will then generate an interval for rating tender prices and giving points, where the lowest reference price corresponds to maximum points.

A minimum reference price correlates to the lowest tender price. A maxi-mum reference price is calculated using the following formula:

Key for formula:

***Pmax**: Maximum reference price*

***bmax**: Highest tender price submitted*

***bmin**: Lowest tender price submitted*

The tender prices will be converted into points using the following formula:

Key for formula:

***P**: The tender price submitted (present tender being evaluated)*

***Pmax**: Maximum reference price*

***Pmin**: Minimum reference price*

***rmax**: Maximum points*

***rmin**: Minimum points*

Qualification demands
Documentation demands to suppliers organisation and legal position
Tenderers will be excluded if the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority become aware of the presence of a circumstance as described in Chapter 10, Article 1 of the Public Procurement Act (2007:1091; 'LOU'). The tenderer must confirm in writing that none of the conditions stated in Chapter 10, Article 1 have arisen (see the Swedish Public Procurement Act).
Should any of the circumstances as described in Chapter 10, Article 2 of LOU be present, a tenderer may be excluded from the procurement process. This also applies to any sub-contractors. In order to monitor compliance, the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority reserves the right to, through the Swedish Tax Agency or UC AB, verify that tenderers have performed their obligations in terms of taxes and social security contributions. This is why tenderers and any sub-contractors are to provide their corporate identity number. If the Authority in the tenderer's home country does not release information about obligations concerning taxes and social security contributions, and the reason for this is stated in the tender, a certificate can instead be signed by the managing director, chairperson of the board or the auditor of the company.
Requirements relating to legal status. With the aim of verifying that tenderers are entered in trade and business registers (in the event of this obligation), the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority will check to ensure that there are no related impediments. In terms of this requirement, no documents need to be attached: The Swedish Radiation Safety Authority will carry out checks through the UC AB, a credit information agency.
Documentation demands on suppliers economical and financial capacity
-
Documentation demands to suppliers technical qualifications
Tenderers shall provide a brief description of the company, its operations as well as its history
Tenderers shall submit a signed truth afirmation, showing that the tender is truthful (see appendix 4).
Consultants are to either be employees or cooperating partners (sub-contractors), though the tenderer is always fully responsible for the work performed by sub-contractors. The tenderer must state whether sub-contractors will participate in the stipulated supply capacity. In the event that tenderers wish to utilise the capacity of another party (sub-contractor), they must clearly state that they actually exercise control over the relevant resources (for example, through a certificate from the sub-contractor).
Quality assurance. The tenderer must actively perform quality assurance work. Please note that certification is not a requirement. Has this requirement been fulfilled? Describe how the tenderer performs quality assurance work.
Other qualification demands
Tenders shall be submitted in English or Swedish in writing. Attached documents shall be in Swedish or English.

Minimum requirements		
Level	Description	Information only
1	Terms and conditions	No
	The tenderer shall accept the terms and conditions in the enclosed Framework Agreement (see Appendix 1). The tender may not contain information contravening the commercial conditions. Has this requirment been fullfilled?	
2	Shall criterion regarding the Specification	No
	The tenderer shall provide one (1) or two (2) named consultant who will be responsible for the assignment. The consultant’s education and experience shall be documented in an accompanying Curriculum Vitae. If the tenderer submits more than two names of consultants to be in charge of the assignment for this review topic, SSM will select and evaluate only two of them. 	
3	Shall criterion regarding the Specification	No

	The named consultant shall have knowledge and experience of: <i>Previous assignment connected to natural or induced seismic events </i> The consultant(s) shall have completed at least three (3) assignments over the past 5 years connected to natural earthquakes or induced seismic events. Has this requirement been met? Submit a brief description of completed assignments: 	
4	Shall criterion regarding the Specification	No
	<i>Impartiality requirement</i> The consultant shall not have been involved directly, or indirectly through subcontracting, in work for the Swedish Nuclear Fuel and Waste Management Co. (SKB), any of its subsidiaries or its Finnish counterpart, POSIVA[1], in the past two years. The tender must include a declaration that individuals intended for review or modelling tasks have not been involved in work commissioned by these companies after 01/01/2010. Furthermore, all work conducted by the consultant for SKB or any of its subsidiaries, directly or indirectly through subcontracting during the past four years must be stated in the application. SSM reserves the right to disqualify a consultant who has made essential contributions to the license application through assignments for SKB or any of its subsidiaries, directly or indirectly through subcontracting during the past four years. Moreover, SSM will evaluate the significance of other engagements and financial ties according to the appended SSM policy document dealing with disqualification and conflicts of interest. Have these requirements been met? Submit the declaration and, if applicable, a summary of the consultant’s work for SKB or any of its subsidiaries, directly or indirectly through subcontracting during the past four years. In addition, fill in and submit the appended SSM form dealing with disqualification and conflicts of interest, enclosure 5. 	
5	Shall criterion regarding the Specification	No
	<i>Fluency in the English language in speech and writing</i> The consultant shall have fluency in English in speech and writing. Has this requirement been met? 	
6	Shall criterion regarding the Specification	No
	<i>Other consultant(s) within the area of seismology for technical assistance </i> The tenderer may propose one (1) or two (2) consultant(s) for technical assistance for the assignments requested. All the proposed additional consultant(s) shall have at least two (2) years knowledge and experience from seismology projects and fluency in the English language in speech and writing. Have both these requirements been met? State the name(s) of the proposed consultant(s) and submit a brief description of their expert knowledge and experience. 	