
**REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA
ROAD SECTOR PROGRAM**

STATE ROAD ADMINISTRATION

**CLARIFICATION DOCUMENT No.1 TO
CONSULTANTS' QUESTIONS ON RFP**

**Supervision of Construction Works of M3 Vulcanesti Bypass,
km 0+000 - km 8+580 (client's reference RSP/M3/01/2023)
under the Contract RSP/W14/01**

Issued on September 15, 2022

Question 1

According to the Notification for Evaluation Criteria in Data Sheet, Under the criterion (d) Other factors – Participation of local individuals in Consultant’s Team, 7 (seven) points will be assigned only in case the proposed Key Expert(s)’ experience will be evaluated with a technical score of not less than 70% from the total points assigned for the position(s). In case the proposed candidate(s)’ experience is evaluated with a lower score, the points provided under this criterion will not be assigned to the Consultant. Could you kindly clarify, if the amount of proposed local individuals in Consultant’s Team affects the assignment of these 7 (seven) points? Would it be equally evaluated, if there is one local Key Expert with a technical score of not less than 70%, and if there are two or three local Key Experts with a technical score of not less than 70% in Consultant’s Team?

Answer

The referred 7 (seven) points for the ‘participation of local individuals in Consultant’s Team’ will be assigned based on the number of local expert(s) proposed in the submitted Proposal, as follows:

Number of proposed local key experts in the proposal (that pass the minimum technical score of 70%)	Percentage from the maximum score allocated to the criterion (d)	Points assigned under criterion (d)
0	0	0
1	70%	4,9
2	80%	5,6
3	90%	6,3
4	100%	7

The 7 points under the criterion (d) will be granted provided that the nominated expert has the citizenship of the Republic of Moldova and that following the evaluation of submitted CV, the said Key Expert(s) has been evaluated with a technical score of not less than 70% from the total points assigned for the position(s). In addition, it is important to note that all proposed candidates, irrespective of their position or other factors, at the time of contract implementation, should be free from other commitments. In case of, at the time of submission of Proposals, the nominated key-expert(s) is being involved in other Contracts, implemented by the Beneficiary, the Consultant should provide proof, satisfactory for the Employer, that it's further involvement in the tendered Contract will not overlap and influence expert's current commitment. Otherwise, in accordance with ITC 14.2 the Consultant’s Proposal will be disqualified and rejected from further evaluation.

Please also refer to the Amendment no.1 to the RFP.

Question 2

ToR’s clause 6.2 contains the statement, that: *“all other costs shall be borne by the Consultant and shall not be reimbursable. The Consultant will provide residential accommodation for their specialists, and local and international transportation, mobile telephones, topographical survey equipment, all necessary local support staff such as secretaries/interpreters, drivers, office assistants, field assistants, as well as any other goods, equipment or services for successful execution of Consultancy Services”*. As per common practice, as well as our experience the costs for residential accommodation, local transport (such as vehicles for supervision team) and

international transportation (air tickets), per diems are usually part of **reimbursable expenses**. Moreover, topographical survey equipment is usually provided by the Contractor. Could you please clarify this issue? If all these expenses will not be reimbursable, should the consultant include all these costs in the fees of the experts? Or how these costs should be shown?

Answer

The statements under ToR's point 6.2 Facilities shall be read in conjunction with RFP's Form FIN 2-3, para. 3. Reimbursable Expenses, where information regarding international transportation and office equipment is provided. All other costs, not specified directly in the RFP shall be borne by the Consultant and included in the fees of the experts.

As stated in Terms of References, point 6.2 "Facilities" the Consultant will borne the cost of the topographical survey equipment which will remain in his property. The insurances for the equipment must be provided by the Consultant and the specifications must be chosen by the Consultant in order to fit the project needs.

Question 3

Could you please clarify, if Consultants should include FSP "Universinij" SRL in their Proposals as Sub-Consultant to ensure fulfilling of Designer's Representative duties, according to Annex "Detailed Information on Works Contract to be supervised"? Could you also confirm, that one of FSP "Universinij" SRL's employees should be involved by Consultant as Designer's representative within Technical Support Staff Team (Non-Key Expert)?

Answer

It is not a mandatory condition for the Consultant to include FSP "Universinij" SRL in its Proposal as a sub-consultant. However, as per Annex A of the ToR, since the duties of the designer's representative "may only be fulfilled by the Moldovan licensed design company which has prepared the designs", the nominated Designer's Representative shall be a representative of the Project Designer, i.e., of FSP "Universinij" SRL. In any case, the technical support staff are not examined prior to the signature of the Contract and are not required to be included in the technical proposal.

Please be reminded that the remuneration rate for the Services of the Designer's Representative is Euro 2,500 (two thousand five hundred) per month. This rate shall be included without modification in the Financial Proposal Form FIN – 3.

Question 4

Regarding the Consultant's Experience (section B of Form TECH-2) in correlation with ITC Data Sheet (Evaluation Criteria), kindly confirm that the Consultant may present as similar experience assignments undertaken particularly during the past five years, but also started prior to the five years period, on the condition that the assignments have been substantially completed during the past five years.

Answer

One confirms that the Consultant may present, as similar assignments, the projects successfully implemented under FIDIC Conditions of Contract, which were mostly undertaken and substantially completed during the past 5 years prior to deadline for submission of tenders. The start date may be a date prior to the related 'five years period'. Evidence of successful completion shall be provided for evaluation purposes, as per the RFP Form Tech 2-6.

Please also refer to Answer 6.

Question 5

Regarding the Consultant's Experience (section B of Form TECH-2) in correlation with ITC Data Sheet (Evaluation Criteria), please indicate if the Consultant's experience in infrastructure fields other than roads/highways is also acceptable (e.g., railways, water and wastewater).

Answer

Please note that the required "Similar experience" refers to the Supervision of Asphalt Roads /Concrete Bridge Works or Airport runways built under FIDIC General Conditions of Contract. The projects under similar FIDIC conditions will not be taken into consideration for the evaluation process.

Railways, dams and water / wastewater projects are not considered as being similar for the purpose of evaluation.

Question 6

Regarding the Consultant's Experience (section B of Form TECH-2) in correlation with ITC Data Sheet (Evaluation Criteria), kindly indicate if the Consultant is requested to actually attach to the Technical Offer the Taking-Over Certificates/equivalent documents OR if the Consultant should be prepared to substantiate the claimed experience by presenting copies of such relevant documents and/or references if so requested by the Client (as indicated at para 2. of section B in FORM TECH-2);

Answer

For evaluation purposes, the Consultant shall attach to the Proposal the Taking-Over Certificate(s) or equivalent confirmation acceptable to the Employer, to demonstrate the successful completion of the assignment(s). In case any additional questions will arise, the Employer reserves the right to further request clarifications from the Consultant or persons/entities nominated as contact references.

If, due to reasonable circumstances, the Consultant cannot provide such documents, it is to provide details of dates issued and parties involved with appropriate Contact details of the previous Employer to enable the State Road Administration to confirm the event.

Question 7

Evaluation Criteria a) “Consultant’s relevant professional experience” specified that for evaluation purposes, ‘similar locations’ will be considered the Newly Independent states (NIS). Please accept that experience/assignments carried out by the prospective tenderers in South-East European (SEE) countries would also qualify as ‘experience in similar locations’; this approach was considered acceptable to the Client in previous tender procedures such as Supervision of Rehabilitation Works under the Contracts: Lot 1: RSP/W11/01: Rehabilitation of R14 Balti – Sarateni Road and Lot 2: RSP/W11/02: Rehabilitation of R14 Balti – Sarateni Road, km 43+000 – km 61+000 and bridge at km 64+756, and Supervision of rehabilitation works under the contract1: RSP/W11/03: Rehabilitation of R6 M1-Ialoveni Road, km 0+000 –km 6+550 (Rehabilitation of M2 – Chisinau Bypass, km 0+000 - km 6+550).

Answer

It is confirmed that for evaluation purposes, additional to the NIS countries, the Consultant will accept as “similar locations” the countries from the South-East Europe.

Please refer to the Amendment no.1 to the RFP.