



MALTA RESOURCES AUTHORITY

MRA/WAT/19/2013

Clarification Note 6

12th September 2013

Tender: Acquisition of an underwater remotely operated vehicle (ROV)

Question 1: The ROV manufacturer advises us that it is standard procedure in this type of business for the client to witness the Factory Acceptance Test (FAT) before the ROV is shipped. During an FAT the ROV is fully tested in a test rig simulating actual field conditions. Tests include also camera operation and all other functions. The client usually signs off the acceptance certificate during such tests.

(a) Given that this has not been asked for, how does the Contracting Authority intend to certify the ROV delivery.

(b) Does the client intend to witness the FAT?

(c) Will the acceptance certificate be issued upon delivery to stores?

(d) Or will this be done in field conditions?

(e) If, the latter is the case, what period of time will elapse between delivery to stores and field tests?

Reply 1: Reference is made to paragraph 8.4 of the tender document which clarifies that: *“The ROV supplied as part of this tender should be a standard off the shelf system. Tender submissions with ROV’s specifically developed for the MRA will not be considered.”*

Question 2: The ROV manufacturer advises us that it is standard procedure for clients to take at least 1 day’s familiarisation course on the ROV operation given the complex nature of such an item and also given the experience required to operate a ROV safely.

(a) Should bidders include the cost for 1 day training in their bid?

(b) If yes, where is the contracting’s authority preferred training location and what travelling costs should bidders cater for?

Reply 2: The minimum technical requirements are outlined under Section 8 of the Tender Document, entitled Tender Specifications and Conditions. Tenderers can include in their bid specifications higher than these minimum technical requirements.

It is however noted that as stated in paragraph 8.5.15 of the tender document *“Tender shall be evaluated at the total price of all items listed in the Schedule of Price and Rates.”*

Question 3: Clause 8.5.1 (page 28) says that cameras can be integral or external. It also

requests that one of the cameras should have the ability to pan 120 degrees to provide improved hemispherical coverage. The ROV manufacturer advises us that the market segment for mini ROV's (as is this case here) does not cater for this pan feature as the camera would be integrated in the view port or front dome. This pan feature is usually available on larger ROV's which need to have side visibility to see tools attached to it. In the case of a mini ROV, the panning would thus be obtained by panning the ROV itself. Can the contracting authority consider to waive this 120deg panning requirement on one of the cameras as otherwise the specification would risk being highly exclusive limiting the choice of ROV supplier?

Reply 3: The Contracting Authority notes that the specific feature noted in this question is required to increase the maneuverability of the ROV in the envisaged operating conditions. Therefore no changes to the specifications outlined under Section 8 of the tender document are being considered.