POMOĆ EVROPSKE UNIJE
POPLAVLJENIM PODRUČJIMA
U SRBIJI

Program finansira EU

Program sprovode: UNOPS

Belgrade, 23 December 2015

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions and answers apply to request for clarifications in regard to Provision of Technical Documentation for Dams with Accumulations „PAMBUKOVICA“ on Ub River and „KAMENICA“ on Tamnava River, RFP UNOPS-SFRS-2015-S-066 (RE-ADVERTIZED)

1. By comparison of the current version of the ToR with the previous one it can be noticed that in Chapter IV of the ToR (Bases for Preparation of Technical Documentation) the following line was omitted:

Note: Mentioned bases are provided by the Contractor, except for Pos. 6 and 7 which are, under this ToR, conducted by Performer

Q: Who is liable to provide the Bases for Preparation of Technical Documentation, items 1 to 5 – UNOPS or the Performer? (provision of items 6 and 7 is obviously the obligation of the Performer)

A: It was maybe unclear in the first ToR but all 7 items are the bases for Preparation of Technical documentation but first 5 items should be obtained by relevant authorities and last two items are within the Contractors (Designers) obligation. The Contractor should however apply in the name of investor with a request followed by necessary documentation to obtain items no 1-5 from relevant institutions. The time required to authorities to issue the bases is out of time frame stipulated for production of Technical Documentation

2. We note that the content of geological investigation works (Annex 1) is significantly changed in comparison with the same from the previous version of the ToR. Our assessment is that the current programs of geological investigation for development of technical documentation for Pambukovica and Kamenica dams are inferior to the previous ones.There is a whole range of issues related to the technical feasibility and appropriateness of certain activities. Here are the highlights:

Q: Why were dilatometer tests omitted, as they were the only in situ experiments (directly on the site) intended for determination of the deformability of rock masses? The current program includes no adequate alternative – there are no in situ experiments!

A: We believe that the size of the facility allows us to omit this type of the experiment, so we decided to drop out dilatometer tests as unnecessary. On the other hand, we find RQD and WP Tests as well as all Geophysical investigations sufficient in situ experiments which can provide all necessary data.

Q: For the Pambukovica dam are envisaged 80 tests of uniaxial tensile strength! What is the purpose of such a large number of these tests? We have to remind You that in rock mechanics the compressive strength of rock masses is much more important information than their tensile strength, and the program envisages 3 tests of uniaxial strength. On the other hand, for the Kamenica dam uniaxial tensile strength tests are not envisaged, but are envisaged 80 uniaxial compressive strength tests! We believe that the number of tests is not harmonized with the drilling length.

A: We reduced to double the tests for Pambukovica and Kamenica compared to previous ToR where twice as much quantity of Point Load test was planned. We don't have any prognostic engineering-geological profiles to determine precise number of test, so we consider being on the safe side. Only relevant thing is the output: Results of purposeful geotechnical works **which are to be carried out in the framework of Terms of Reference according to the program listed in Annex 1 to this Terms of Reference.** The Contractor can reduce any unnecessary tests if the valid results can be obtained from the reduced number.

Q: Why were Point Load tests omitted? This type of test is an extremely useful method for quick and inexpensive examination, i.e. indirect determination of uniaxial strength, which can be used on a large number of samples and which can determine the heterogeneity of rock mass.

A: We don't have any objection that the Contractor uses Point Load tests if they are cheaper and easier for him, but since uniaxial tensile tests are more common we didn't want to make such limitation to the tender request as Point Load tests.

Q: What is understood under RQD tests? The determination of RQD is typically performed in the process of engineering-geological core mapping, which has been already envisaged in the program.

A: That's correct remark. RQD is something that is envisaged in the program for both dams and is standard in situ procedure during the core mapping. We did put the RQD in the table for Pambukovica to follow the core mapping and we omitted in table for Kamenica. RQD should be done for both dams.

Q: What is the exact number of WP tests? For example for Pambukovica dam, there are 8 x 10 tests mentioned in the text, but only 30 of them in the table! By the way, the number of tests has not harmonized with drilling lengths on both dams. Different terms were used for the water permeability test - do they refer to the same test?

A: For Pambukovica - The table should be adjusted with a text and item 5 in the table adjusted to 80 tests For Kamenica - Item 5 should be adjusted with text – instead the Hydraulic conductivity experiments it should say WP Tests. The quantity remains the same.