**Nuclear Waste Services is a trading name of LLW Repository Limited and Radioactive Waste Management Limited.  This document applies only respect of Radioactive Waste Management Limited**

This form is to be used at Stage 3 of Intelligent Client Process when the tender has issued. The table below is used to record all Clarification Questions received from suppliers during a tender exercise. All responses must be shared with all bidding suppliers during the tender exercise.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| NWS Tender Ref: XXX | Tender Title: XXX |
| NWS Customer: XXX | Commercial Lead: XXX |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref No** | **Clarification Question** | **NWS Response** | **Date of Question** | **Response Date** |
| Q1 | Will you accept an alternative IT plan in lieu of Schedule 4 to the funding terms? | We are not realistically in a position to amend this schedule as it would require IT & Security review | 17/10/22 | 21/10/22 |
| Q2 | For Project 2, are there any natural samples that are of particular interest for this theme from locations that are considered critical for this study? For example, specific geological characteristics of sites of interest for GDF. If so, would they be available to the PhD candidate for analyses? | This can be discussed with the successful applicant, not having a precise answer now does not affect a proposal being developed. NWS cannot provide samples nor will be required to participate in a process to acquire samples. It’s reasonable to assume NWS might be interested in the geology present in community partnerships, info can be found online. | 14/10/22 | 26/10/22 |
| Q3 | Are there particular areas in the UK that the NWS are most interested in, i.e. should samples be targeted at a specific region or can we tailor the sample collection according to the research question of the project? | This can be discussed with the successful applicant, not having a precise answer now does not affect a proposal being developed. NWS cannot provide samples nor will be required to participate in a process to acquire samples. It’s reasonable to assume NWS might be interested in the geology present in community partnerships, info can be found online. | 14/10/22 |  |
| Q4 | Do potential placements need to be pre-defined within the proposal or can we say that the student will be encouraged to undertake a placement that is aligned to their interests, background and future intentions? The latter would provide flexibility to tailor the training and placement aspects to the individual student, which from experience usually translates into a more motivated, productive student and overall project | The placement for the student doesn’t need to be predefined, again for discussion with the successful applicant. | 14/10/22 | 26/10/22 |
| Q5 | Would you welcome a further developed and modified application to the 2023 PhD bursary round on the theme: “experiments and modelling of fracture development, permeability and rheology of halite-mudstone beds”, this time submitted as an Open Topic? | We did award the PhD that is mentioned (mudstone / halites) last year. Due to the limitation on the number of projects we can fund there is limited benefit resubmitting the proposal and there is no guarantee the proposal will be funded | 12/10/22 | ? |
| Q6 | If your answer to 1. Is YES, and a different proposal was funded on topic 2 of last round, could you share that proposal with us so that we can ensure our application for this 2023 round is fully complementary? Or, if information on all projects awarded in 2022 is already available, could you point us to where this information can be found | N/A | 12/10/22 | ? |
| Q7 | Would NWS be able to provide us with halite-mudstone samples of interest to be used in our experiments and as a field reference for modelling parameters? If so, could you provide some geological background on these samples, their provenance and characteristics | We personally don’t hold any samples. We could put the supervisors in contact with colleagues at the BGS that may be able to provide samples. | 12/10/22 | ? |
| Q8 | Project 11: Is this project to develop a high heat/ temperature resistant cementitious material only? | Please constrain the project to the development of high heat/temperature resistant cementitious-type materials, so that it aligns with the PhD scope/brief. This includes geopolymers and also cement additives that may provide favourable backfill properties. | 08/10/22 | 12/10/22 |
| Q9 | Project 11: Would you also consider to develop a material with high conductivity? | Yes we are open to this (assuming you are referring to thermal conductivity), so long as it’s in keeping with the use of cementitious materials. We’d like to understand the benefits / detriments, in relation to the material itself, and how there could be an impact on other materials / parts of the disposal facility. | 08/10/22 | 12/10/22 |
| Q10 | Project 11: In Summary, it says ‘Their interaction with HHGW, other …… should be evaluated.’  o Do you expect a physical test with HHGW to be carried out?  o If yes, do you have a testing facility to deal with HHGW in your company?  o Would you provide HHGW? | No physical test with HHGW is expected to be carried out and no HHGW will be provided. The project needs to be aware of potential interactions (e.g., chemical compatibility with the waste form) when developing new backfills. | 08/10/22 | 12/10/22 |
| Q11 | Project 11: The last paragraph of Background on Page 22 says ‘… accelerated leaching tests ………. is expected to be included in the project.’ What kind of leaching test do you mean? | Any tests that can be used to understand how the mineralogy of cementitious material could change over long-time periods and subsequent impacts on key safety-related properties (e.g. porosity, pore water composition etc.). The approach to accelerated leaching is open to suggestion. This could be hydrothermal aging followed by materials characterisation tests for example. Note that the time the waste remains hot for is relatively short (1000’s years) compared to the timescales of the GDF safety case (1 million years). Phenomena such as re-saturation state of cementitious materials, changes through time, and how mineralogy etc. are affected are also relevant considerations. | 08/10/22 | 12/10/22 |
| Q12 | When is the deadline? The website says 12:00 on Friday 11th November 2022 while the document entitled ‘RSO PhD call details and submission guidance 2023’ says November 21 2022. Which one is correct? | 12:00 on Monday 21st November 2022 | 08/10/22 | 12/10/22 |
| Q13 | Data Protection Legislation definition: I appreciate that this has been updated since previous years, however will any further updates be made to refer to the UK GDPR? | The document was originally drafted in 2020/21 with the involvement of several universities. We are not in a position to revise the grant agreement template again at this time | 17/10/22 | 25/10/22 |
| Q14 | Clause 2.5: Could you please clarify that this would only be where such public authority or agency requests information on similar grants as part of funding applications? | The document was originally drafted in 2020/21 with the involvement of several universities. We are not in a position to revise the grant agreement template again at this time | 17/10/22 | 25/10/22 |
| Q15 | Clause 3.1: Given funding would have been set aside where a grant has been awarded, I am unsure why it would be necessary to include this clause, particularly in addition to broad withholding rights. Please clarify the intent behind this clause or remove where possible. | The document was originally drafted in 2020/21 with the involvement of several universities. We are not in a position to revise the grant agreement template again at this time | 17/10/22 | 25/10/22 |
| Q16 | Clause 4.8: Please clarify that this would be in relation to the grant only (edit suggested here to be more specific). | The document was originally drafted in 2020/21 with the involvement of several universities. We are not in a position to revise the grant agreement template again at this time | 17/10/22 | 25/10/22 |
| Q17 | New clause 4.9 (as suggested by edit in the attached): Wording added in relation to no guarantee that the project would lead to any particular result or successful outcome. This kind of clause would be standard for research projects. | The document was originally drafted in 2020/21 with the involvement of several universities. We are not in a position to revise the grant agreement template again at this time | 17/10/22 | 25/10/22 |
| Q18 | Clause 9.3 (publications): This does not currently have a time limit and could delay publications indefinitely which would not benefit the research purpose of many projects and organisations – I have suggested edits as a solution and would appreciate clarity if such edits are not able to be included. | The document was originally drafted in 2020/21 with the involvement of several universities. We are not in a position to revise the grant agreement template again at this time | 17/10/22 | 25/10/22 |