

UPU HQ Strategic Transformation – Tender Q&A Analysis

Answers to regrouped questions: situation and clarification

NOT MENTIONED – absent from all documents	NOT CLEAR – referenced but ambiguous	PARTIALLY ADDRESSED – incomplete in documents	ADDRESSED – clearly covered in documents	CLARIFIED – answered by UPU clarification
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	---

A Existing Building Documentation				
1	Existing Documentation	Have any prior studies, surveys, or evaluations (e.g., structural, MEP, asbestos, fire protection) been conducted?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: The tender documents do not mention or confirm the existence of any prior studies. Module 101 tasks the consultant with conducting comprehensive analyses from scratch.</p> <p>UPU clarification: A laser survey of the building has been conducted. A BIM model at LOD 250 has been produced. Approximately 900 execution drawings have been scanned. All of these will be made available exclusively to the selected company (winner of this tender), not during the bidding phase.</p>
2	<i>Existing Documentation</i>	If previous studies exist, can they be provided?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No prior studies are referenced in the public documents.</p> <p>UPU clarification: The laser survey, BIM model (LOD 250), and scanned drawings (approx. 900 execution drawings) will be provided to the selected company only, after contract award. They are not available for consultation during the bidding phase.</p>
3	<i>Existing Documentation</i>	Are as-built drawings and/or a BIM model of the building available for review?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Module 202 references gathering existing as-built drawings but does not confirm their availability or completeness at bid stage.</p> <p>UPU clarification: Yes — a BIM model at LOD 250 and approximately 900 scanned execution drawings are available. These will be shared with the selected company after award. Bidders should plan accordingly in their methodology.</p>
4	<i>Existing Documentation</i>	UPU will provide a comprehensive set of digitized building plans at the beginning of the contract. Please confirm.	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 2 Module 202 tasks the consultant with gathering and organizing existing documentation. Proactive confirmation of availability at contract start is absent.</p> <p>UPU clarification: A BIM model (LOD 250) and approximately 900 scanned execution drawings are available and will be provided to the selected company after contract award. Digitisation of plans is not part of the consultant's scope.</p>
5	<i>Existing Documentation</i>	Will detailed construction drawings (e.g. 1:50) be digitized and available at Phase 1 start?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Not confirmed in any document.</p> <p>UPU clarification: Approximately 900 execution drawings have been scanned and will be provided to the selected company. A laser survey and BIM model (LOD 250) are also available. These will be shared after award. Digitisation is not part of the design team's scope.</p>
6	<i>Existing Documentation</i>	Please confirm that digitization of plans and construction drawings is not part of the services scope.	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Not explicitly confirmed or denied in the documents.</p> <p>UPU clarification: Correct — digitisation of existing plans and drawings is not part of the design team's scope. UPU has already scanned approximately 900 execution drawings and produced a BIM model (LOD 250), which will be provided to the selected company.</p>
B Technical Studies & Site Conditions				
7	Technical Studies	Are there already studies available on building permit requirements,	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No existing technical studies are publicly referenced. Module 101 requires the consultant to conduct all these analyses.</p>

		MEP concepts, structural concept, earthquake stability, fire security?		UPU clarification: <i>Seismic analysis Stages 1 and 2 are already completed (the model will be made available to the selected company). All other technical analyses (MEP, structural, fire, permits) are to be conducted by the selected design team as part of this mandate.</i>
8	Technical Studies	A Stage 3 deformation-based seismic analysis is required. Should professional hours for this be included in SIA Phase 1 of Annex 5?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 2 lists this as an 'Other Requirement' without specifying in which phase hours should be allocated. Annex 5 has no dedicated line for this analysis specifically.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Only Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the seismic analysis have already been completed by UPU. Stage 3 (deformation-based) is required as part of this tender. The selected company may use the existing BIM model for its Stage 3 calculations if it wishes. Hours for this analysis should be included under the Structural Engineer row in the Phase 1 table of Annex 5. If the bidder wishes to detail this task separately, it may use the 'Other specialists (to be specified)' row with a clear description.</i></p>
9	Technical Studies	What is a 'stage 3 deformation-based seismic analysis' and is this necessary at such an early design stage?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: The document requires this analysis but does not explain its definition or justify its inclusion at feasibility stage.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>UPU has already completed Stage 1 and Stage 2 seismic analyses. Stage 3 (deformation-based) is required to provide the level of structural confidence needed for the renovation option comparison. The winner may use the existing BIM model. UPU requires Stage 3 as a precautionary measure given the building's age (1970) and its pre-seismic code construction — regardless of Stage 2 outcome — in order to provide defensible structural evidence for the renovation option cost estimate. By way of explanation: Stage 1 is a rapid screening check; Stage 2 is a linear-elastic (force-based) code compliance check; Stage 3 is a nonlinear deformation-based analysis (typically pushover analysis per SIA 269/8) that assesses the actual ductility and deformation capacity of the structure and identifies any required retrofitting measures. For a 1970 building designed to pre-seismic standards, Stage 3 is the decisive tool for determining whether renovation is structurally viable and at what cost.</i></p>
10	Technical Studies	Are detailed surveys available (structural, MEP, asbestos, etc.)?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No existing surveys are referenced publicly. Module 101 tasks the consultant with conducting assessments.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>A laser survey and BIM model (LOD 250) are available and will be provided to the selected company. No asbestos or hazardous materials report exists — this will be part of the Phase 3 scope, not the current mandate. Bidders should treat the absence of a hazardous materials survey as a cost and time risk to be identified and quantified in their proposal. Per Annex 2 section 6.1, the Vendor is responsible for identifying and proposing any additional activities necessary for the successful completion of the project.</i></p>
11	Technical Studies	Has a technical condition assessment of the entire facility been commissioned in recent years? If so, can it be provided?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No technical condition assessment is mentioned in the documents.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>No recent comprehensive technical condition assessment has been commissioned. The consultant is expected to conduct this as part of Module 101. A laser survey and BIM model are available as a starting basis.</i></p>
12	Technical Studies	Are there known technical constraints already identified?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Ageing infrastructure, energy inefficiency, and potential heritage constraints are referenced as general challenges. No specific defects or technical constraints are disclosed.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>The building dates from 1970 and presents known challenges: ageing MEP systems, issues with energy performance, and very low risk of heritage considerations linked to its location in Berne's international district. No specific structural defects have been identified to date. The design team will receive the laser survey and LOD 250 BIM model after award, which will serve as the primary basis for assessing the technical condition.</i></p>
13	Technical Studies	What level of technical due diligence is expected in this phase?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Module 101 describes a comprehensive analysis (structural, MEP, compliance, costs, site context, legal). The depth per discipline is not precisely quantified.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Module 101 is expected to be conducted at a level consistent with SIA preliminary studies — sufficient to produce an order-of-magnitude cost estimate at ±40% accuracy (Phase 1) and to identify the key risks</i></p>

14	Technical Studies	Is the building currently under heritage protection?	CLARIFIED	<p>and constraints for each option. The design team is responsible for determining the appropriate depth per discipline to meet that output standard, in accordance with SIA 102 norms. The ±30% accuracy target applies to Phase 2 (Module 206).</p> <p>From documents: Annex 2 refers to 'heritage and planning review' and coordination with Denkmalpflege Berne 'if applicable', suggesting heritage status has not been formally confirmed.</p> <p>UPU clarification: The building is not currently listed as a heritage monument. However, given its location in Berne's international district and its age (1970), the design team must assess and liaise with Denkmalpflege Berne at an early stage to confirm whether any heritage or conservation constraints apply before or during the permit process.</p>
15	Technical Studies	Is there a hazardous materials report available? If not, should it be in scope?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No hazardous materials or asbestos report is referenced in any document.</p> <p>UPU clarification: No hazardous materials or asbestos report exists. This assessment will be part of the Phase 3 scope and is not included in the current mandate (Phases 1 and 2).</p>
16	Technical Studies	If a hazardous materials report exists, can it be provided before submission?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No such report exists, so provision before submission is not possible.</p> <p>UPU clarification: No hazardous materials report exists. The assessment is planned for Phase 3 and is outside the current scope.</p>
17	Technical Studies	Is a detailed contamination analysis (asbestos, PCBs, PAHs) part of Phase 1 to ensure cost certainty of ±30%?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Contamination analysis is not explicitly listed in Module 101. The 1970 building makes this a material gap.</p> <p>UPU clarification: No contamination analysis is part of Phases 1 and 2. A hazardous materials assessment will be conducted in Phase 3. Bidders should factor this absence into their cost estimation methodology and may note the associated uncertainty. In particular, bidders are advised to include an explicit risk allowance and/or uncertainty flag in their Phase 1 cost estimate for Option A (renovation) to account for the absence of a hazardous materials survey. This should be documented as a named risk item in the Initial Options Study Report (Module 104 deliverable).</p>
18	Technical Studies	Will the design team have access to historical operational data (energy consumption, maintenance logs, FM contracts)?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Not confirmed in any document. Module 101 implies UPU should provide this.</p> <p>UPU clarification: UPU guarantees access to all necessary documents and areas. However, requests must be submitted in advance for validation. Some zones are restricted and may only be accessed with UPU staff present.</p>
19	Technical Studies	To what degree does UPU guarantee the accuracy of existing documentation if no new surveys are conducted?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No liability or accuracy warranty is provided. The consultant is asked to identify discrepancies. This risk sits with the consultant.</p> <p>UPU clarification: UPU will provide the available documentation in good faith but cannot formally warrant its completeness or accuracy. The design team is responsible for verifying the data provided and for flagging any discrepancies. The laser survey, BIM model (LOD 250), and scanned drawings are the most reliable reference documents and should be treated as the primary source. Where uncertainties remain material to cost estimates, these should be explicitly flagged as risk items in the study reports.</p>
20	Technical Studies	Is laser scanning mandatory to create the BIM model, or are existing 2D plans considered sufficient?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Not addressed in the documents.</p> <p>UPU clarification: UPU has already conducted a laser survey and produced a BIM model at LOD 250. These will be made available to the selected company, eliminating the need for a new laser scan at this stage. Bidders should plan their methodology on this basis. However, should discrepancies be identified between the provided documentation and site reality during execution of the mandate, the need for additional surveys or analysis must be flagged by the Vendor as a risk item, with associated cost and time implications.</p>
21	Technical Studies	Are there any preliminary contracts signed with energy suppliers?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Not mentioned in any document.</p>

				UPU clarification: UPU has existing contracts with all suppliers for HVAC equipment. The design team must coordinate with these UPU-contracted suppliers during the design process if necessary.
22	Technical Studies	Which UPU-appointed specialized suppliers need to be coordinated?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 2 references 'UPU-appointed specialized suppliers' without naming them. Only IT/AV separate procurements are hinted at.</p> <p>UPU clarification: UPU has existing contracts with all suppliers for HVAC equipment. The design team will need to coordinate with these UPU-contracted HVAC suppliers during design integration if necessary.</p>
C Strategy & Decision Framework				
23	Strategy & Decision	Has a preferred scenario already been identified internally, or should the feasibility study remain fully neutral?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: The documents state UPU has not yet determined its preferred option.</p> <p>UPU clarification: UPU believes that renovation is more aligned with Berne's policies than new construction, but the study of each selected option, or both, must be conducted neutrally and to the same depth. If awarded, the two-option study must remain fully impartial.</p>
24	Strategy & Decision	Is it UPU's intent to run two full planning processes in parallel until the end of SIA Phase 2?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Yes. Both options A and B are explicitly required to be developed in parallel throughout Phases 1 and 2.</p> <p>UPU clarification: Yes, both options must be studied in parallel at the same level throughout Phases 1 and 2. The decision to discard one option is linked to a vote by UPU member countries during sessions — UPU cannot make this decision unilaterally between two sessions. Importantly, the commercial structure of the tender reflects this directly: Annex 6 (BOQ) defines four pricing scenarios — Scenario 1 (Phase 1 only), Scenario 2 (Phase 1 + Phase 2 Option A), Scenario 3 (Phase 1 + Phase 2 Option B), and Scenario 4 (Phase 1 + Phase 2 Options A+B in parallel). UPU will indicate at contract award which scenario(s) it intends to activate. The consultant is remunerated only for the scope that is formally instructed. Note: per Annex 6 clause 5, no minimum volume of services is guaranteed. Bidders must price all four scenarios in their commercial proposal.</p>
25	Strategy & Decision	Why not make the fundamental decision at the end of Phase 1 and simplify the scope of Phase 2 accordingly?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: The documents do not explain the rationale for maintaining two full Phase 2 processes.</p> <p>UPU clarification: The decision to select or discard one option cannot be made mid-mandate — it depends on a vote by member countries at formal sessions. Strategic decisions are not solely driven by technical results; UPU manages its institutional process independently. Two full parallel studies through Phase 2 may be necessary. That said, bidders should note that the BOQ (Annex 6) includes Scenario 2 (Phase 1 + Phase 2 Option A only) and Scenario 3 (Phase 1 + Phase 2 Option B only) as separate activatable scopes. Activating only one Phase 2 track via the BOQ is a commercial and operational mechanism — it does not replace or pre-empt the formal institutional decision, which still requires member country ratification. These are two distinct processes.</p>
26	Strategy & Decision	What benefits does UPU expect from developing two full Phase 2 processes in parallel, especially if financial differences may already be clear after Phase 1?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Not explained in the documents.</p> <p>UPU clarification: The option of new construction is exclusively a decision that UPU can make during or after the tender process. It is an option UPU must keep in consideration to avoid any risk of technical insufficiency in the renovation. Furthermore, the decision timeline is governed by member country sessions, not by technical milestones. Commercially, this is reflected in Annex 6 (BOQ) Scenario 4 (Phase 1 + Phase 2 Options A+B in parallel) — which bidders must price separately from Scenarios 2 and 3. UPU activates only the scenario it instructs; the consultant is paid accordingly. For clarity on the role of each phase: Phase 1 establishes the strategic and technical baseline — it analyses the existing situation, defines UPU's needs and objectives, and develops two viable strategic options. Its role is to confirm what is possible and appropriate, without selecting an option. Phase 2 validates and compares those options in detail: it develops coherent concept designs, assesses feasibility, costs, impacts, and financing, and brings both options to the same level of maturity so they can be objectively compared. In short, Phase 1 defines the options; Phase 2 demonstrates how each option would actually work, enabling an informed and institutionally sound decision. Note: Phase 1 concludes with a formal final report (Module 105) which constitutes the mandatory</p>

				<i>instruction to proceed with Phase 2. Any missing or incomplete information at Phase 1 may cause a delay in UPU's approval of this gate document.</i>
27	Strategy & Decision	What will be the primary decision criteria when comparing renovation versus reconstruction (cost, timeline, sustainability, operational continuity, etc.)?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: The documents list required deliverables (cost estimates, feasibility studies, risk assessments) but do not pre-define decision criteria or their weighting.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>The comparison will be assessed across five main dimensions: cost (CAPEX and OPEX), programme and schedule feasibility, sustainability performance, operational continuity during works, and long-term functional suitability. UPU does not pre-weight these criteria — the design team is expected to present a balanced comparative analysis that allows UPU's governing bodies to make an informed decision. Note: the scope of comparison (one or both options) depends on the BOQ scenario activated at contract award (see Annex 6).</i></p>
28	Strategy & Decision	What level of detail is expected in the final recommendation (high-level strategic vs investment-grade decision)?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Phase 2 requires a ±30% cost accuracy and a 'justified and detailed' comparative recommendation, suggesting near-investment-grade depth. The exact level is not explicitly labelled.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>The Phase 2 recommendation should be decision-ready for UPU's governing bodies: it must include a ±30% cost estimate, a comparative risk assessment, a sustainability pre-assessment, a programme schedule, and a clear professional recommendation with justification. It is not a full investment-grade feasibility study but must be sufficiently substantiated to support a formal institutional decision.</i></p>
29	Strategy & Decision	Is the bidding consortium free to make justified changes to the scope of work allocation between Phases 1 and 2?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: The documents do not explicitly permit or prohibit reallocation of scope between phases. The consultant is responsible for identifying any additional activities necessary, which may imply some flexibility.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Bidders may propose a justified reallocation of tasks between Phases 1 and 2, provided the overall scope is fully covered, the fixed Phase 2 deadline of 28 February 2027 is respected, and the reallocation is clearly explained and justified in the methodology. Any proposed deviation from the module structure described in Annex 2 must be flagged explicitly in the technical proposal. Such proposals will be evaluated as part of the methodology score. If accepted by UPU, the reallocation will be incorporated into the contract. Deviations not accepted will revert to the module structure as set out in Annex 2. Bidders should also note that Phase 1 concludes with Module 105 — a formal final report that serves as the mandatory instruction to proceed with Phase 2. If any information is missing or incomplete at the time of this report, it may result in a delay in UPU's approval and consequently in the start of Phase 2.</i></p>

D Functional Programme & Spatial Planning

30	Programme & Space	Have any studies regarding UPU's specific needs or requirements been conducted? If so, are they available to bidders?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No prior needs analysis is referenced. Module 102 tasks the consultant with conducting a full needs analysis from scratch.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>UPU has a functional programme covering professional activities. Social areas and other non-professional activities are for the design team to develop. The full functional programme will be developed and refined during Phases 1 and 2. Note: the needs analysis and stakeholder engagement required to build this programme is explicitly scoped in Phase 1, Module 102 ('Work intensively with UPU stakeholders to define and validate detailed project requirements').</i></p>
31	Programme & Space	Can you please provide details of the existing premises and the project brief including space/function programme as a base for calculations? Is there already a client design brief available?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Only a high-level building description is provided. No space programme or client design brief has been shared.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>UPU has an existing functional programme for professional activities. The development and expansion of this programme (including social and other non-professional spaces) is the design team's responsibility during Phases 1 and 2.</i></p>
32	Programme & Space	Is there already an existing or validated space programme that would serve as a base for	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No existing space programme is provided. Module 102 tasks the consultant with establishing one.</p>

		conceptual work? If not, is it part of the scope?		UPU clarification: UPU has a functional programme for professional activities only. The development and expansion of this programme (including social spaces, conference centre, etc.) is part of the consultant's scope across Phases 1 and 2.
33	Programme & Space	Has the volume and functional programme of a future events & conference facility already been determined? If not, is it part of the scope?	CLARIFIED	From documents: The Call for Tenders mentions a conference centre but no programme exists yet. UPU clarification: The conference centre programme has not been pre-defined. Developing this programme is part of the consultant's scope. UPU's strategy does not constrain the future use of the building, beyond guaranteeing a workplace for all staff and visitors.
34	Programme & Space	Are there expected changes in occupancy, density, or ways of working that UPU wants explicitly considered?	CLARIFIED	From documents: Remote/hybrid working is mentioned as a consideration, but no specific occupancy data or targets are provided. UPU clarification: UPU expects the design team to take into account current and emerging workplace trends, including hybrid and remote working arrangements. No specific occupancy targets or density ratios have been pre-defined. The design team is expected to propose appropriate workplace standards as part of the needs analysis in Module 102, for validation by UPU. Note: specific data on current UPU staff numbers and tenant headcount has not been provided in the tender documents. This information will be gathered by the design team during the Phase 1 stakeholder engagement process (Module 102).
35	Programme & Space	To what extent should tenant requirements of the embassies be considered in the feasibility study?	CLARIFIED	From documents: Tenants are referenced in phasing and relocation planning, but depth of requirements integration is unspecified. UPU clarification: Tenant requirements are limited to functional and spatial requests (rooms, access, etc.). All technical requirements are identical to those of the building as a whole. Only UPU manages tenant relations — the design team must minimise disruption and must not engage with tenants directly on technical matters.
36	Programme & Space	Are tenant requirements to be integrated into a functional and spatial programme?	CLARIFIED	From documents: Tenants are mentioned for phasing purposes but their integration into the spatial programme is not spelled out. UPU clarification: Tenant requirements are limited to functional/spatial requests (rooms, access, etc.). Technical requirements are those of the building as a whole. Tenants should be maintained and the aim is to increase free space available for other uses.
37	Programme & Space	Will all current tenants remain in the future UPU facility?	CLARIFIED	From documents: Not stated in any document. UPU clarification: All current tenants should be maintained. The design objective is to maintain all tenants and to increase free space for other uses within the building.

E Business Continuity & Tenant Management

38	Business Continuity	Are there specific operational constraints (e.g. maintaining occupancy or conference activities during works)? If yes, please specify.	CLARIFIED	From documents: A Business Continuity Management Plan is required but specific constraints are not pre-defined. UPU clarification: All high-level positions and tenant operations must be maintained during site works. Only UPU handles tenant requests and issues. Disruption to tenants must be minimised to necessary noise during works. Access, cleaning, and HVAC services must be maintained throughout construction.
39	Business Continuity	Will tenant management (lease termination, continuation, temporary arrangements) be handled directly by UPU?	CLARIFIED	From documents: Not addressed in the documents. UPU clarification: Yes — only UPU handles tenant requests and issues. The design team must not engage directly with tenants on contractual or technical matters. The design team's role is to minimise disruption and plan for continuity of access, cleaning, and HVAC services.

40	Business Continuity	Are the specific requirements of the five external tenants (space, security, IT) already fully available, or is gathering them part of Phase 1?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No tenant requirements have been provided. The consultant must gather these as part of the needs analysis.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Tenant requirements are limited to functional and spatial requests (rooms, access, etc.). Technical requirements are those of the building as a whole. Only UPU manages tenant relations. The design team should plan without needing to engage tenants directly. UPU will facilitate the gathering of tenant spatial and functional information during Phase 1 as part of the Module 102 needs analysis process. This information is essential for defining space requirements and the design team should flag any delays or gaps in its availability as a risk in the Phase 1 report.</i></p>
41	Business Continuity	To what extent should construction phasing scenarios (e.g. partial occupation) be developed?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: A Business Continuity Management Plan is required including phasing and decanting strategies. The level of detail expected is not precisely defined.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Construction phasing scenarios should be developed to a level sufficient to demonstrate the feasibility of maintaining operations throughout the works and to allow a meaningful comparison between the two options. For Option A (renovation), this includes a realistic sequence of works with decanting phases. For Option B (new construction), a high-level relocation strategy is required. This should address at minimum: whether staff relocation would be total from the beginning of works or phased progressively; the estimated duration of the relocation period; the type of temporary accommodation solutions that would be required; and the main operational, organisational, and cost impacts of the relocation. Detailed planning of the temporary site is not required at this stage, but the strategy must be sufficiently developed to allow a credible cost comparison with Option A.</i></p>
42	Business Continuity	To what extent has UPU already addressed temporary facilities planning during renovation or reconstruction?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No prior temporary facilities planning by UPU is referenced.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Installation of site works and necessary facilities are not part of the scope for Phases 1 and 2. The design team is not expected to plan or procure temporary facilities during these study phases.</i></p>
43	Business Continuity	Has there been a concept worked out for temporary accommodation of staff and operations during the works?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No existing temporary accommodation concept is mentioned.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Temporary accommodation planning is not part of Phases 1 and 2. All high-level positions and tenant operations must be maintained. A phasing and relocation strategy is part of the design team's scope, but physical temporary facility procurement is not.</i></p>
44	Business Continuity	Is the planning of temporary facilities and swing spaces part of the scope of this mandate?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 2 requires a Business Continuity Management Plan including phasing/decanting strategy.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Physical procurement and installation of temporary facilities is not in scope for Phases 1 and 2. However, planning for temporary services is explicitly required: Annex 2 section 7.1 lists a 'Business Continuity Management Plan' as a mandatory Phase 1 deliverable, including phasing, relocation, and temporary services strategy. The design team must therefore plan for temporary services (access, HVAC, cleaning, operational continuity) and include this strategy in the Phase 1 deliverables.</i></p>
45	Business Continuity	If Option B (new construction) is selected, does finding and planning a temporary replacement location fall within the scope?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: The Business Continuity Plan includes decanting planning but whether sourcing an alternative site is in scope is unclear.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Construction phasing scenarios should be developed to a level sufficient to demonstrate the feasibility of maintaining operations throughout the works and to allow a meaningful comparison between the two options. For Option A (renovation), this includes a realistic sequence of works with decanting phases. For Option B (new construction), a high-level relocation strategy is required. This should address at minimum: whether staff relocation would be total from the beginning of works or phased progressively; the estimated duration of the relocation period; the type of temporary accommodation solutions that would be required; and the main operational, organisational, and cost impacts of the relocation. Detailed planning of the temporary site is not required at this stage, but the strategy must be sufficiently developed to allow a credible cost comparison with Option A.</i></p>
46	Business Continuity	Are any specific restrictions (e.g. night or weekend work due to noise	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No specific operational or noise restrictions are defined. The consultant must minimise disruption. This information is not provided in any document.</p>

		constraints) already defined for renovation works during operations?		UPU clarification: No formal restrictions have been defined at this stage. The design team should plan on the basis that standard Swiss construction hours apply (typically Monday–Friday, 07:00–20:00, with restrictions on Saturdays and Sundays). Any specific noise or access constraints will be confirmed during the mandate based on coordination with the building occupants and local regulations.
47	Business Continuity	Are tenant contracts aligned with the project timeline (renovation or reconstruction)?	CLARIFIED	From documents: No information on tenant lease terms, contract expiry dates, or alignment with the construction timeline is provided. UPU clarification: Tenant lease terms are managed exclusively by UPU and will not be disclosed to the design team. The design team should plan on the basis that all current tenants remain in the building throughout the study phases and model continuity scenarios accordingly. UPU will manage any lease-related decisions independently.
48	Business Continuity	Will tenant management (lease termination, temporary arrangements) be handled directly by UPU?	CLARIFIED	From documents: Not addressed in the documents. UPU clarification: This question is addressed under Q39 above. Yes — only UPU handles all tenant requests, lease terms, and contractual matters. The design team must not engage tenants directly.

F Budget & Cost Expectations

49	Budget & Cost	Is there a total cost budget already defined, to understand the size and expectations of the project?	CLARIFIED	From documents: No indicative budget, cost range, or investment envelope is provided in any of the tender documents. UPU clarification: No budget has been defined at this stage. The purpose of Phases 1 and 2 is precisely to establish a credible cost estimate ($\pm 40\%$ at Phase 1, $\pm 30\%$ at Phase 2) that will inform UPU's future investment decision. The design team should not assume any pre-set financial envelope.
50	Budget & Cost	Is there an indicative budget range or investment envelope for the project?	CLARIFIED	From documents: No budget figure or cost range is provided in any tender document. UPU clarification: No budget has been defined. UPU has not set an investment envelope at this stage. The cost estimates produced during Phases 1 and 2 will form the basis for future budget approval by UPU's governing bodies.
51	Budget & Cost	What level of cost accuracy is expected at this stage (order of magnitude, +/- %)?	ADDRESSED	From documents: Annex 2 specifies $\pm 40\%$ accuracy for Phase 1 (Module 104) and $\pm 30\%$ accuracy for Phase 2 (Module 206). These are explicitly stated in the updated tender documents.
52	Budget & Cost	Should lifecycle cost (CAPEX + OPEX over the entire lifecycle) be a key factor in the decision-making process?	CLARIFIED	From documents: Module 102 references 'Life-Cycle & Economic Goals'. It is not explicitly identified as a primary decision criterion versus other factors. UPU clarification: Yes — lifecycle cost (CAPEX + OPEX over the building's expected service life) should be included as a key component of the financial comparison between options. The financing study in Module 204 should include a high-level lifecycle cost projection for each option instructed under the activated BOQ scenario (Annex 6), enabling a total cost of ownership comparison alongside the capital investment estimate.

G Schedule & Deadlines

53	Schedule & Deadlines	Are there fixed deadlines or key milestones driving the project? Are there committee deadlines in January/February 2027?	ADDRESSED	From documents: Yes. Annex 2 confirms that all Phase 2 deliverables — including the final comparative analysis report and $\pm 30\%$ cost estimate — must be submitted by 28 February 2027. This is a firm, contractual deadline. The period from February to August 2027 is then dedicated exclusively to developing the single selected option. These are hard milestones stated in the updated Annex 2 and the Call for Tenders delivery schedule.
54	Schedule & Deadlines	What is the expected timeline for the overall project, including future phases?	CLARIFIED	From documents: Phases 1 and 2 are covered through February 2027, with further single-option development to August 2027. No timeline for SIA phases 3–5 is provided.

55	Schedule & Deadlines	How much time is allocated for UPU to review and approve Phase 1 before Phase 2 is authorised?	CLARIFIED	<p>UPU clarification: The overall project timeline from contract start is estimated at approximately 5 years, covering all phases through to completion. Phases 1 and 2 (this mandate) run to 28 February 2027. Subsequent SIA phases (3–5, covering detailed design, tender, and execution) will be the subject of separate procurement processes and are not part of the current scope. This 5-year estimate is confirmed through this Q&A response, which forms part of the official tender documentation published on the UPU procurement portal.</p> <p>From documents: The documents do not define a review/approval period between phases.</p> <p>UPU clarification: A minimum of one month is allocated for each UPU validation step. Bidders should include this buffer in their project schedule for each phase approval milestone. In particular, Phase 1 concludes with Module 105 — a formal final report and mandate for Phase 2 that serves as the institutional gate for proceeding. If any required information is missing or incomplete at the time of this submission, it may result in a delay in UPU's approval and consequently in the authorised start of Phase 2.</p>
----	----------------------	--	-----------	--

H Sustainability & Energy

56	Sustainability & Energy	Is the client pursuing a specific energy or sustainability label (SNBS, Minergie, etc.)? Are there specific targets or standards defined for comparing options A and B?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No specific label or certification target has been pre-selected. A sustainability workshop is planned in Phase 2.</p> <p>UPU clarification: No sustainability target, energy label, or certification standard has been pre-defined by UPU. The design team is expected to propose appropriate labels and targets (e.g. Minergie, SNBS, LEED) and include these proposals in the feasibility study. The final certification target will be defined jointly with UPU during a dedicated sustainability workshop in Phase 2. Until that workshop, both options A and B should be assessed against the same proposed sustainability framework.</p>
57	Sustainability & Energy	Should embodied carbon and lifecycle environmental impact (grey energy, circularity) be included in the analysis?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Module 102 references life-cycle and economic goals. A full LCA per ISO 14040/14044 including grey energy and circularity (Cradle-to-Cradle) is not explicitly required.</p> <p>UPU clarification: A full ISO 14040 lifecycle analysis is not mandatory at this stage. However, the design team is encouraged to include a high-level embodied carbon comparison between options A and B as part of the sustainability assessment, particularly given the relevance of demolition vs. retention for the carbon balance. The level of detail will be aligned with the sustainability targets defined during the Phase 2 workshop.</p>
58	Sustainability & Energy	Beyond CO ₂ in operation, should a complete LCA including grey energy and circularity (Cradle-to-Cradle) be conducted for both options?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: A full lifecycle analysis including grey energy and circularity is not explicitly required. The documents reference sustainability KPIs and energy goals but do not mandate an LCA.</p> <p>UPU clarification: A Cradle-to-Cradle or full circularity assessment is not explicitly required. The design team may propose including it as part of the sustainability pre-assessment if it considers it relevant to the option comparison. Any such proposal should be flagged in the methodology and costed accordingly.</p>

I BIM & Digital Delivery

59	BIM & Digital	What are the BIM requirements at this stage (level of detail, coordination)?	ADDRESSED	<p>From documents: Annex 3 defines LOD 100 / LOI 100 for Phase 1 and LOD 200 / LOI 200 for Phase 2. IFC 4.3 exchange format is mandatory. Clash detection is required before each milestone submission. LOD 350 applies to Phase 3.2 only and is outside the current scope.</p>
60	BIM & Digital	The requirement for LOD 350 for preliminary design seems very high. Does this apply to all models or primarily coordination-relevant components?	ADDRESSED	<p>From documents: Annex 3 confirms that LOD 350 applies to Phase 3.2 (tender documentation) only. Phase 2 requires LOD 200. LOD 350 is listed as preparation for future stages and is not within the current design scope. However, Annex 4 section 2.4.4 requires bidders to include in their technical proposal a BIM execution plan that addresses LOD 350 requirements and the pathway to an as-built BIM model with asset data. LOD 350 delivery is a future phase obligation; planning for it is a current submission requirement.</p>

61	BIM & Digital	Are existing BIM models or digital documentation available when starting the mandate?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Not confirmed in public documents. Module 202 tasks the consultant with gathering existing documentation.</p> <p>UPU clarification: Yes — a BIM model at LOD 250 and approximately 900 scanned execution drawings will be provided to the selected company after contract award. A laser survey of the building has also been completed.</p>
62	BIM & Digital	Does UPU stipulate a specific CDE platform, or is the choice left to the design team? Who bears the license costs for client access?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 3 confirms no specific software platform is mandated. The CDE must meet Swiss data protection law, support IFC 4.3, and include required workflows. License cost responsibilities are not explicitly addressed.</p> <p>UPU clarification: The choice of CDE platform is left to the design team, subject to compliance with Annex 3 requirements (IFC 4.3, Swiss data hosting, role-based access, audit trail). License costs for UPU's read-only access to the CDE should be included in the design team's fees and not billed separately.</p>
63	BIM & Digital	Is a 4D & 5D simulation (visual construction phasing and cost-linked BIM model) required?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No 4D or 5D BIM requirement is mentioned in Annex 3 or Annex 2. BIM requirements for Phases 1–2 are limited to LOD 100–200.</p> <p>UPU clarification: 4D and 5D BIM simulations are not required for Phases 1 and 2. If the design team considers that a visual phasing simulation would meaningfully support the business continuity analysis or the option comparison, it may propose this as an optional service with separate costing.</p>
64	BIM & Digital	Does the client require simulations of construction/demolition methods and energy efficiency for both options A and B?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Energy analysis is required as part of sustainability assessment. Construction/demolition method simulations and BIM-linked energy simulations are not explicitly required in Annex 3.</p> <p>UPU clarification: Detailed construction or demolition method simulations are not required. A high-level energy performance comparison between options A and B is expected as part of the sustainability assessment. Full energy simulations (dynamic thermal modelling) are not mandated at this stage but may be proposed by the design team as an optional service. However, studying the actual building envelope and highlighting its technical difficulties is mandatory. Note: this envelope analysis requirement is confirmed through this Q&A response, which forms part of the official tender documentation published on the UPU procurement portal.</p>
65	BIM & Digital	The SIA phase terminology used does not align with official SIA 102. Please confirm the mapping to official stages.	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 2 uses non-standard SIA terminology without providing a mapping to official SIA 102 stages.</p> <p>UPU clarification: The SIA phase names used in the documents are translations of the official German and French SIA terminology. The scope should be interpreted accordingly, in line with official SIA 102 definitions.</p>

J Scope of Services

66	Scope of Services	Should all specialist consultants (MEP, fire safety, building physics, etc.) be included at the feasibility stage (Phase 1)?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 5 lists all specialist roles as Phase 1 contributors, implying full team mobilisation from the start.</p> <p>UPU clarification: It is the design team's responsibility to include all necessary specialists. The design team takes responsibility for the correctness and completeness of its final output, in alignment with SIA standards and UPU requirements.</p>
67	Scope of Services	Is it expected to mobilize project management from the beginning of Phase 1, or would it be acceptable to introduce it at a later stage?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 5 includes a Project Manager as a Phase 1 role.</p> <p>UPU clarification: The design company's internal project manager (Design Coordinator for its own design work) must be present from Phase 1. Note: overall project management across the full project is outside the scope of this mandate. The company organises only its own internal project management for Phases 1 and 2 design and studies.</p>

68	Scope of Services	Is a single point of responsibility (general planner) expected, or a coordinated consortium?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 4 allows consortium submissions. Annex 2 requires a Design Manager/Coordinator as the single point of coordination. 'General planner' in the Swiss legal sense is not explicitly required.</p> <p>UPU clarification: A coordinated consortium is acceptable. The Design Manager/Coordinator named in the proposal will act as the single point of contact and coordination with UPU for all design-related matters. UPU does not require a Swiss-law 'Generalplaner' structure, but the lead firm must be clearly identified and must hold the Swiss representation required under section 5.1 of Annex 4.</p>
69	Scope of Services	The list of roles in Annex 5 includes only leading experts. Where should hours for support staff, juniors, and planners be recorded?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 5 lists only senior/lead roles. No explicit provision for junior or support staff hours is made.</p> <p>UPU clarification: Support staff, junior professionals, and planners should be included under the relevant lead role in Annex 5 — their hours are to be aggregated within each specialist category. Alternatively, bidders may use the 'Other Specialist(s)' row to list additional categories, clearly identifying the profile. The total hours declared must reflect the full team effort, not only senior-level contributions. Note: bidders will observe that the Heritage specialist row present in the Phase 1 table and the Phase 2 Option A table is absent from the Phase 2 Option B table. This is intentional — heritage analysis is not applicable to a new construction scenario.</p>
70	Scope of Services	Can a subcontractor be included in more than one bid/tender team?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: The documents do not address whether a subcontractor may participate in multiple competing consortia simultaneously.</p> <p>UPU clarification: A subcontractor firm may not participate in more than one competing bid team for this tender. Doing so would constitute a conflict of interest and could result in rejection of one or more tenders.</p>
71	Scope of Services	Is the selected tenderer eligible to participate in subsequent tenders (e.g., SIA phases 3 to 5)?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: The documents do not address eligibility or exclusion from future phase tenders. This is a significant gap.</p> <p>UPU clarification: The selected tenderer will not be automatically excluded from future tenders for subsequent SIA phases. However, UPU reserves the right to conduct separate competitive processes for those phases. The question of whether any preference or right of first negotiation will be offered to the Phase 1–2 consultant for Phase 3 has not yet been decided by UPU. Bidders will be informed of any such mechanism in due course.</p>
72	Scope of Services	Annex 5 has a single Phase 1 hours table (not split by option), while Phase 2 has separate Option A and Option B tables. However, Annex 6 commercial compliance item 3.2.2 requires fees to be 'clearly separated for options A and B in phases 1 and 2'. How should Phase 1 fees be structured?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 5 Phase 1 has a single combined table, while Annex 6 requires fee separation by option. This creates a structural inconsistency between the two annexes.</p> <p>UPU clarification: Bidders must respect the pricing structure as defined in Annex 6 and Annex 5 without modification. Phase 1 hours should be completed in the single table as provided in Annex 5. For the commercial proposal (Annex 6), Phase 1 fees may be presented as a single baseline amount covering the dual-option analysis, since Phase 1 modules (101–105) are inherently shared across both options. The option-specific fee separation required by Annex 6 item 3.2.2 applies primarily to Phase 2, where Annex 5 already provides separate Option A and Option B tables. Bidders should not add columns or modify the structure of Annex 5.</p>

K Governance, Organisation & Evaluation

73	Governance & Evaluation	Can you please provide an organisation chart? Is there a client representative organisation? Is an external management (AMO) appointed? What is the governance structure and approval process?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No client-side organisation chart is provided. Only a 'UPU Project Board' is referenced. No governance chart or approval timelines are defined in the documents.</p> <p>UPU clarification: An AMO (Assistance à Maîtrise d'Ouvrage / building owner's project manager) has been appointed and holds sole responsibility for governance, approval processes, and coordination across all project stakeholders. An organisation chart is not provided in the tender documents; the design team will coordinate directly with the AMO. The design team is responsible only for organising its own internal work (design and studies for Phases 1 and 2) — overall project management is outside its scope. For approvals: a minimum of one month is allocated for each UPU validation milestone. Phase 1 deliverables must be formally approved before Phase 2 is authorised. Strategic Brief and Project Programme documents will be signed off by UPU at each phase gate.</p>
----	-------------------------	--	-----------	---

74	Governance & Evaluation	How many stakeholders are involved and what level of coordination is expected?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Stakeholders include UPU, five tenants, local Bernese authorities, and UPU-contracted HVAC suppliers. The full stakeholder list and coordination intensity are not specified.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>The primary stakeholders are: UPU's Project Board and designated AMO (building owner's assistant), the five building tenants (four embassies and UNHCR), the relevant Bernese authorities (Bauamt, Denkmalpflege, Energieamt), and UPU's contracted HVAC suppliers. The design team should anticipate regular coordination meetings with UPU (minimum bi-weekly) and periodic liaison with authorities as required by the permit process.</i></p>
75	Governance & Evaluation	How will early-stage strategic decisions be aligned with future execution?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Phase 1 produces a 'Strategic Brief' and Phase 2 produces an 'Approved Project Programme', both signed off by UPU. No further alignment mechanism for later phases is described.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Strategic decisions validated at Phase 1 and Phase 2 are formally documented and signed off by UPU before the next phase is authorised. These approved documents (Strategic Brief, Project Programme) will form the contractual basis for any subsequent design phases. The design team should therefore ensure all recommendations are traceable, documented, and presented in a format suitable for institutional approval.</i></p>
76	Governance & Evaluation	What are the evaluation criteria and their respective weighting?	ADDRESSED	<p>From documents: The Call for Tenders lists evaluation criteria in descending order: quality of tender, proven experience in renovation, knowledge of complex real estate projects, and price. No explicit weight is shared.</p>
77	Governance & Evaluation	What type of references are considered most relevant?	ADDRESSED	<p>From documents: Annex 4 requires at least 3 references as a multidisciplinary design team on projects ≥15,000 m², with complex MEP systems, occupied-site constraints, and institutional use — within the last 10 years. At least one must be in Switzerland. The 10-year recency criterion (section 2.5.1) is a scored evaluation criterion, not a pass/fail disqualification. A reference older than 10 years will not be rejected outright but will score less favourably. The ≥15,000 m² institutional use requirement (section 5.5) is the pass/fail qualification threshold.</p>
78	Governance & Evaluation	Is experience with institutional or international organizations a key factor?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: 'Institutional use' is part of the reference project definition. International organisation experience is not a separately weighted evaluation criterion.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Experience with international or intergovernmental organisations is not a separately scored evaluation criterion. However, demonstrating familiarity with the specific constraints of institutional clients — such as diplomatic security requirements, UN procurement protocols, and multilingual working environments — will be viewed positively in the assessment of the team's understanding of the project.</i></p>
L Team Qualifications & Swiss Representation				
79	Team & Qualifications	Which team roles need to be bilingual in English and French? Is it just the Design Director and Project Manager?	ADDRESSED	<p>From documents: Annex 4 section 5.3 singles out the project/design manager as individually required to be bilingual in both English and French. Section 5.2 requires the team as a whole to have strong proficiency in both languages for UPU-facing meetings and exchanges — this applies to all client-facing team members, not only two named roles. Additionally, all team members interfacing with Berne's local authorities must communicate in German (section 5.1). No other roles are individually named, but any team member participating in UPU meetings or communications should be able to work in English and French.</p>
80	Team & Qualifications	Is a local registration in Switzerland mandatory? We plan to collaborate with a German engineering firm with past experience in Switzerland.	ADDRESSED	<p>From documents: Annex 4 section 5.1 is a pass/fail qualification requirement: the Bidder must have a legally registered entity or permanent office in Switzerland with decision-making authority, and must be able to liaise with local administration in German. A German firm without a qualifying Swiss presence cannot satisfy this criterion on its own. However, in a consortium, the requirement can be met if one consortium member holds a qualifying Swiss presence — it does not need to apply to every sub-consultant. The qualifying member should be clearly identified and supported with a Swiss commercial register extract in the Qualification folder.</p>
81	Team & Qualifications	Insurance coverage of 10 Mio. CHF per claim seems high for this project volume. Can this be reduced to 5 Mio.?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: Annex 4 section 5.8 sets this as a pass/fail qualification requirement at CHF 10,000,000 per claim. No flexibility is indicated in the documents.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>The insurance requirement of CHF 10,000,000 per claim cannot be reduced. However, if a bidder does not currently hold this level of coverage, it may commit in its tender to obtaining it upon contract award.</i></p>

82	<i>Team & Qualifications</i>	According to section 5.4, a site visit is mandatory. Please define the date so we can plan ahead.	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: The site visit date appears as a placeholder '[Date]' in Annex 4 and has not been communicated in the tender documents.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>The site visit date will be communicated to all registered bidders directly and via the UPU procurement portal. Attendance is no more mandatory but informing of attendance must be included in the Qualification folder. Note: the consolidated Q&A response — including this document — will be published after the site visit has taken place.</i></p>
M Tender Process & Procedure				
83	Tender Process	Is the tender submission deadline May 29, 2026?	ADDRESSED	<p>From documents: The tender submission deadline is confirmed as 29 May 2026. All three folders (Qualification, Technical, Commercial) must be submitted in full by this date in accordance with Annex 4. Late submissions will not be considered.</p>
84	<i>Tender Process</i>	There are no floor plans available on the tender portal. Where can they be downloaded?	CLARIFIED	<p>From documents: No drawings or plans are published on the tender portal. As clarified in questions A1–A6, existing documentation is not provided during the bidding phase.</p> <p>UPU clarification: <i>Floor plans and construction drawings are not available for download during the bidding phase. Only a volumetric IFC file is shared. The tender portal provides only the call for tenders and its annexes. After contract award, the selected company will receive a BIM model at LOD 250, and approximately 900 scanned execution drawings. Bidders must plan their methodology and fee proposal on this basis.</i></p>
85	<i>Tender Process</i>	What are the award criteria to qualify for Phase 2?	ADDRESSED	<p>From documents: There is no separate qualification round for Phase 2. This tender selects a single multidisciplinary design team through one competitive process. The selected firm is then instructed by UPU on which BOQ scenario to activate (Annex 6). Phase 2 is not a separate competition — it is part of the same contract, activated at UPU's instruction. Award criteria are set out in the Call for Tenders section 2.18 and Annex 4 Part 2.</p>
86	<i>Tender Process</i>	How many bidders will be admitted for Phase 2?	ADDRESSED	<p>From documents: This is not a two-stage shortlisting process. One firm (or consortium) is selected through this tender and awarded the full contract. UPU then instructs which scope scenario to activate (Phase 1 only, Phase 1 + Phase 2 Option A, Phase 1 + Phase 2 Option B, or Phase 1 + Phase 2 Options A+B). There is no second admission round or shortlisting for Phase 2.</p>
87	<i>Tender Process</i>	What are the award criteria to qualify for the final contract after February 28, 2027?	ADDRESSED	<p>From documents: February 28, 2027 is the Phase 2 delivery deadline — it is not a second award date. The contract is awarded once, through this tender process. After Phase 2 is delivered, UPU selects which single option (renovation or new construction) to develop further. Subsequent SIA phases (3–5) will be the subject of separate procurement processes. The Phase 1–2 consultant is not automatically selected for those phases but is not excluded from future tenders.</p>