
Moldova Roads Rehabilitation V

NATIONAL ROAD ADMINISTRATION

CLARIFICATION DOCUMENT No.1 **to Procurement Document**

**Supervision of Rehabilitation Works under the Contracts RSP/
W16/03-04: Rehabilitation of M1 – Leuseni - Chisinau Road, Lot
3: km 39+000 - km 61+750, and Lot 4: km 61+750 - km 85+460.**

(client's reference RSP/CS/M1/03-04/2025)

Issued on September 25, 2026

CLARIFICATIONS # 1 to Procurement Document (issue date: **per ECEPP**)
Procurement identification data:

Country:	Republic of Moldova
Project:	Moldova Roads Rehabilitation V
EBRD Project ID:	54423
Client:	J.S.C. „NATIONAL ROAD ADMINISTRATION”
Contract:	Supervision of Rehabilitation Works under the Contracts RSP/W16/03-04: Rehabilitation of M1 – Leuseni - Chisinau Road, Lot 3: km 39+000 - km 61+750, and Lot 4: km 61+750- km 85+460
Type of Contract:	Consultancy Services
Procurement Method:	Prequalification
Procurement Process ID:	RSP/CS/M1/03-04/2025

Note: This Clarification #1 contains amendment of the document “VI - Requirements (ToRs)_Aug”

Q #	Questions received from Participants on ECEPP:	Answers from Client/NRA:
1.	With reference to Section IV – Eligibility and Qualification Criteria, Table 3 – Experience, Criterion 3.2 “Management Experience”, the following requirement is stated: “Experience as a sole consultant or a lead partner in a JVCA in the execution of at least one contract with a value equivalent of at least EUR 3 million, that has been substantially completed.” We kindly request clarification regarding the interpretation of the EUR 3 million contract value referred to under this criterion. Please confirm whether the stated threshold refers to: (i) the value of the consultancy/supervision services contract performed by the Consultant; or (ii) the value of the underlying works contract that was supervised/managed by the Consultant under the relevant consultancy assignment. We would appreciate the Client’s confirmation as to which contract value shall be taken into account for demonstrating compliance with Criterion 3.2	Please be informed that the stated value under 3.2 Management Experience (Form IV - Eligibility and Qualification Criteria (C) new), refers to a contract value which was executed by Participant/Consultant. It does not refer to a works contract value which was supervised by the Participant/Consultant.
2.	Question no. 1 – Company experience With reference to Section IV: Eligibility and Qualification Criteria – Table 3. Experience, where we note the following provision: “Section IV: Eligibility and Qualification Criteria Period: from January 2021 until the deadline for submission of application 3.1 Specific Experience <i>Experience with the substantial completion of</i> • a minimum of 3 contracts similar in nature, complexity to the Contract and in similar locations⁵; and • at least 1 out of the 3 contracts above should have been implemented under an IFI/MDB financed project. 4 Similarity will be verified per activities described in form “VI - Requirements (ToRs)”. 5 For evaluation purposes, ‘similar locations’ are considered: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Slovenia. Projects submitted for non-similar locations shall not be considered for evaluation under Criterion 3.1. 6 IFI/MDB project implementation experience is primarily targeted, though EU-financed projects could also be considered.	1.1 The references submitted will be scored (per Form III – Evaluation Methodology) against the applicable requirements of all three criteria under para 7: (a),(b),(c). 1.2 In line with Form IV – Eligibility and Qualification Criteria (3.1) it is specified: contracts similarity and complexity will be verified per activities described in form “VI - Requirements (ToRs)”, without setting a specific contract threshold. The EUR 50 million threshold refers to a one single contract, including aggregate value of works/lots it included, including the value at completion of works. 1.3 In line with Form III – Evaluation Methodology - Prequalification (7 (b)), primarily are targeted supervision for road/highway contracts. References for other civil engineering sectors in eligible locations – could be considered but will be scored accordingly.

3.2 Management Experience

Experience as a sole consultant or a lead partner in a JVCA in the execution at least one contract with a value equivalent of at least 3 million EURO equivalent, that has been substantially completed.”

And with reference to **Section III: Evaluation Methodology – 7. Shortlisting**, where we note the following provision:

“Section III: Evaluation Methodology Criteria	Maximum Score
<i>Specific experience (a, b, c)</i>	
<i>(a) Experience in similar assignments (specifically FIDIC based contract supervision for road/highway contracts, where the value of the civil works contracts exceeds EUR 50 million) – per ToRs/Requirements¹.</i>	70
<i>(b) Experience in similar geographical locations - as per ToRs/Requirements.</i>	20
<i>(c) Experience in specific activities: Monitoring/implementing Inclusive Procurement components during works execution - per ToRs/Requirements.</i>	10
Total points:	100

¹ Experience and knowledge of the FIDIC Red Book 2017, is desirable, though the similarity and magnitude of executed works to the Requirements/ToRs under other FIDIC editions will also be considered and will be scored accordingly.

² ‘Similar locations’ are considered: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Slovenia. Projects submitted for non-similar locations shall not be considered for evaluation.”

We ask you to please clarify the following:

1.1 Please confirm whether the three shortlisting criteria in Section III, paragraph 7, i.e., (a) similar assignments, (b) similar geographical locations, and (c) inclusive-procurement activities, will be evaluated independently, and whether Participants may submit different sets of reference contracts for each criterion, provided that those references satisfy the requirements applicable to the respective criterion.

1.2 Please clarify whether the requirements for FIDIC-based road/highway supervision and civil works values exceeding EUR 50 million, stated under Section III, paragraph 7(a), also apply individually to each of the three qualifying references required under Section IV, Criterion 3.1, or apply only for shortlisting scoring.

For the EUR 50 million threshold, where one consultancy contract covers the supervision of several works contracts/lots, please confirm whether their aggregate works value may be considered. Please also specify whether the relevant value is the original or approved amended works contract value, excluding VAT.

1.3 Under Section III, paragraph 7(b), please confirm whether substantially completed FIDIC-based supervision assignments in other infrastructure sectors, including railways, undertaken in the listed similar locations may be evaluated independently of the road/highway-specific requirements under criterion (a), where they demonstrate comparable contract-administration and supervision experience.

Please also clarify whether additional qualifying references in a country already represented by another reference may increase the score by demonstrating greater depth of experience in that location.

1.4 Please confirm our understanding that the contracts submitted under Criterion 3.2, Management Experience, may relate to any type of sector or infrastructure and are not limited to road or transport infrastructure.

The larger the number of references submitted for eligible locations – could add to score.

1.4 In line with Form IV – Eligibility and Qualification Criteria (3.2 Management Experience) – does not relate to a specific sector.

1.5 For the purpose of this criterion, “substantial completion” refers to substantial completion of the consultancy services under the reference contract, and not necessarily completion of the underlying works or full certification/payment of the consultancy contract value.

Participants shall demonstrate the required experience through the information and supporting documentation submitted as part of their Proposal (specifically please see forms under V - Forms). Such documentation may also include copies of consultancy contracts, employer references, completion certificates, taking-over certificates, or other documents confirming the Participant’s involvement in works supervision services.

The submitted documentation should clearly indicate the nature of the services provided, the Participant’s role in contract administration and supervision, as well as the applicable form and edition of the FIDIC Conditions of Contract.

1.6 The minimum of three qualifying reference contracts is required for qualification (per Form IV – Eligibility and Qualification Criteria). At the scoring stage, additional relevant references shall be considered for scoring purposes, in accordance with the evaluation methodology.

1.7 For scoring purposes, relevant references of all JVCA members will be assessed jointly, without weighting according to their proposed participation percentages in the present assignment.

	1.5 Please define ‘substantial completion’ for reference contracts submitted for qualification and shortlisting. Please specify whether it is assessed by reference to the consultancy services performed, the certified consultancy contract value, or completion of the underlying works, and identify the acceptable supporting documents. 1.6 Please confirm whether additional relevant references beyond the minimum three may improve the score and whether any maximum number of references will be evaluated. 1.7 For shortlisting scoring under Section III, paragraph 7, please clarify whether a JVCA’s members’ relevant references will be assessed collectively without weighting by their proposed participation percentages in the present assignment.	
3.	Question no. 2 – Licenses With reference to Section II: Data Sheet - Documents Comprising Applications, where we note the following provision: <i>“In case a Participant does not possess some of the required licences, certificates and permissions at the time of submission of its application, the Participant shall submit a written statement demonstrating that it will be in a position to obtain in due time the required licences, certificates and permissions to ensure timely implementation of the Contract.”</i> We kindly ask you to clarify whether applicants are required to submit any licences, certificates, or permissions together with their application. If so, please specify the types of licences, certificates, and/or permissions that are required at the application stage.	No specific licenses, certificates or permissions are required to be submitted with the Application at this stage. For clarity, as specified in the Requirements/ToRs: “The Consultant shall perform the Services in accordance with the laws and any other instruments having force of law in Moldova, as may be issued and in force from time to time, the Terms of Reference, the Contract clauses and its annexes, and the Consultant’s offer.” Thus, The Consultant shall obtain and maintain all licenses, certificates and permissions required under the applicable laws of the Republic of Moldova for the proper implementation of the Contract.
4.	Clarification regarding the definition of “similar locations” – Section IV, Criterion 3.1 and Section III, Shortlisting Criteria Section IV, Table 3, Criterion 3.1 requires Participants to demonstrate at least three substantially completed contracts similar in nature and complexity to the Contract and implemented in “similar locations”. Footnote 5 defines the countries considered as similar locations and states that projects implemented in other countries shall not be considered under Criterion 3.1. The same geographical definition is applied under Section III for the shortlisting criterion “Experience in similar geographical locations”. We note, however, that the Terms of Reference consistently recognise previous experience in the European Region and/or former Soviet Union countries as relevant regional experience for the proposed key experts. Furthermore, Annex A identifies the M1 corridor as part of the TEN-T and requires the Works to comply, with standards and Eurocodes, in addition to the applicable Moldovan and international standards. In this context, Poland, the Czech Republic (Czechia) and Slovakia are Central European countries operating within the same European technical-standard and TEN-T framework and offer road rehabilitation/construction projects involving comparable engineering, quality assurance, road safety, environmental, contractual and supervision requirements. We also note that several other EU and Central/South-Eastern European countries, including Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Slovenia and Greece, are already included in the definition of similar locations. Considering the above, would the Client please clarify whether projects implemented in Poland, the Czech Republic (Czechia) and Slovakia may also be considered as projects implemented in “similar locations” for the purposes of both: (i) Section IV, Table 3, Criterion 3.1 – Specific Experience; and (ii) Section III, Shortlisting – Experience in similar geographical locations?	The definition of “similar locations” provided under Section IV, Criterion 3.1 and the corresponding Shortlisting criterion shall apply as stated in the Tender Documents. “Similar location” does not refer to a country with similar technical standards, but to a country with comparable implementation conditions for infrastructure projects in transition economies / relevant region(s). Experience in similar geographical and economic conditions is considered to be important for the successful implementation of the assignment, particularly in view of the regional specificities and familiarity with the relevant institutional, regulatory and socio-economic context. The reference in the ToRs/Requirements to experience in the European Region and/or former Soviet Union countries applies to the relevant experience of individual Key Experts and should not be interpreted as extending the definition of “similar locations” applicable to the Consultant’s corporate experience under Criterion 3.1. The two requirements are assessed separately and serve different purposes.
5.	As a reminder, Section IV (Eligibility and Qualification Criteria), specifically clause 3.1 regarding “Specific Experience”, stipulates that bidders must demonstrate the completion of a minimum of 3 contracts in similar locations.	The definition of “similar locations” provided under Section IV, Criterion 3.1 and the corresponding

	We hereby request that the contracting authority relax this criterion by removing the location restriction. This adjustment would ensure the tender remains accessible to capable firms seeking to enter the Eastern European and Balkan regional markets.	Shortlisting criterion shall apply as stated in the Tender Documents. “Similar location” does not refer to a country with similar technical standards, but to a country with comparable implementation conditions for infrastructure projects in transition economies / relevant region(s). Experience in similar geographical and economic conditions is considered to be important for the successful implementation of the assignment, particularly in view of the regional specificities and familiarity with the relevant institutional, regulatory and socio-economic context.
6.	Regarding the scoring criteria “(a) Experience in similar assignments (specifically FIDIC based contract supervision for road/highway contracts, where the value of the civil works contracts exceeds EUR 50 million) – per ToRs/Requirements”, - confirm that contracts of works executed under local conditions of contract, such as contracts executed under Romanian Government Decision No. 1/2018, which is the normative act that approves the general and specific conditions, framework model for public procurement contracts for works financed from public funds, inspired by the international FIDIC standards, similar to FIDIC conditions of contract, are also scored as similar assignments. Therefore, please replace: "similar assignments (specifically FIDIC based contract supervision for road/highway contracts" with: "similar assignments (specifically FIDIC based contract supervision for road/highway contracts, or FIDIC equivalent"; - specify if design and build (Yellow FIDIC) supervision contracts are also scored as similar.	References clearly involving FIDIC-based contracts shall be considered as similar experience. Please note, per Form III - Evaluation Methodology - Prequalification (C): Experience and knowledge of the FIDIC Red Book 2017, is desirable, though the similarity and magnitude of executed works to the Requirements/ToRs under other FIDIC editions will also be considered and will be scored accordingly. Design and Build contracts based on the FIDIC Yellow Book shall be considered as similar assignments and shall be scored accordingly.
7.	Regarding Table 3. Experience: “Experience with the substantial completion of a minimum of 3 contracts similar in nature, complexity to the Contract” confirm that there are equally accepted/scored supervision contracts of rehabilitation, modernization and/or new construction of roads/highway contracts.	Supervision contracts for the rehabilitation, modernization, and/or new construction of roads/highways shall be considered as eligible for scoring under Table 3 – “Experience”, provided that they meet all other applicable requirements specified in the tender documents.
8.	Regarding Table 3. Experience: “Period: from January 2021 to until the deadline for submission of application” confirm that supervision contracts signed prior to January 2021, but which have been receptioned with taking over certificate after January 2021, will be accepted and scored. If so, confirm that the entire value of the works contract will be taken into account.	Supervision contracts signed prior to January 2021 shall be accepted and scored accordingly, provided that the works under the respective contract were substantially completed and the Taking-Over Certificate was issued during the period from January 2021 up to the deadline for submission of applications.
9.	Regarding criteria: “(b) Experience in similar geographical locations - as per ToRs/Requirements”, - specify whether contracts from the listed locations will be scored, regardless of the implementation period and stage they are in; - mention if contracts in supervision of civil buildings and/or railway are also accepted and scored.	References which have been substantially completed from January 2021 up to the deadline for submission of applications, shall be taken into consideration. Only experience related to the supervision of road/highway contracts shall be considered.
10.	Regarding criteria: “(c) Experience in specific activities: Monitoring/implementing Inclusive Procurement components during works execution - per ToRs/Requirements.” mention if the experience in specific activities: Monitoring/implementing Inclusive Procurement components during works execution is accepted and scored regardless of the field of activity, roads, railway, metro, civil buildings, environment.	Per Form III - Evaluation Methodology - Prequalification (C), para 7, criteria (c), it is specifically mentioned that references under Monitoring/implementing Inclusive Procurement components during works execution – (should be) per ToRs/Requirements.

11.	Due to the complex level of the requirements, we kindly ask for an extension of the submission date with a period of at least 3 weeks in order for interested companies to be able to prepare competitive expressions of interest in accordance with the Beneficiary's requirements.	Bearing in mind this is a prequalification stage, the Contracting Authority considers sufficient time is granted to the Consultants to prepare their Initial Proposals. Therefore, the deadline for submission shall not be modified.												
12.	With reference to Section III: Evaluation Methodology – 7. Shortlisting, where we note the following provision: “Section III: Evaluation Methodology <table><tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Maximum Score</th></tr><tr><td>Specific experience (a, b, c)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>(a) Experience in similar assignments (specifically FIDIC based contract supervision for road/highway contracts, where the value of the civil works contracts exceeds EUR 50 million) – per ToRs/Requirements¹.</td><td>70</td></tr><tr><td>(b) Experience in similar geographical locations² - as per ToRs/Requirements.</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>(c) Experience in specific activities: Monitoring/implementing Inclusive Procurement components during works execution - per ToRs/Requirements.</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>Total points:</td><td>100</td></tr></table> ¹ Experience and knowledge of the FIDIC Red Book 2017, is desirable, though the similarity and magnitude of executed works to the Requirements/ToRs under other FIDIC editions will also be considered and will be scored accordingly. 2 ‘Similar locations’ are considered: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Slovenia. Projects submitted for non-similar locations shall not be considered for evaluation.” We kindly ask you to confirm our understanding that contracts implemented under conditions of a contract similar to FIDIC (a) may be accepted as one of the three contracts required under Section IV, Criterion 3.1, and, (b) will be eligible for scoring under Section III, Shortlisting Criterion (a), considering that contracts administered under other internationally recognized conditions, particularly when they are IFI financed, contain substantially equivalent provisions and procedures in terms of contract administration, risk allocation, and the responsibilities of the supervising/Engineer’s function, even where the contract is not formally based on a FIDIC form.	Criteria	Maximum Score	Specific experience (a, b, c)		(a) Experience in similar assignments (specifically FIDIC based contract supervision for road/highway contracts, where the value of the civil works contracts exceeds EUR 50 million) – per ToRs/Requirements ¹ .	70	(b) Experience in similar geographical locations ² - as per ToRs/Requirements.	20	(c) Experience in specific activities: Monitoring/implementing Inclusive Procurement components during works execution - per ToRs/Requirements.	10	Total points:	100	References clearly involving FIDIC-based contracts shall be considered as similar experience. Please note, per Form III - Evaluation Methodology Prequalification (C): Experience and knowledge of the FIDIC Red Book 2017, is desirable, though the similarity and magnitude of executed works to the Requirements/ToRs under other FIDIC editions will also be considered and will be scored accordingly.
Criteria	Maximum Score													
Specific experience (a, b, c)														
(a) Experience in similar assignments (specifically FIDIC based contract supervision for road/highway contracts, where the value of the civil works contracts exceeds EUR 50 million) – per ToRs/Requirements ¹ .	70													
(b) Experience in similar geographical locations ² - as per ToRs/Requirements.	20													
(c) Experience in specific activities: Monitoring/implementing Inclusive Procurement components during works execution - per ToRs/Requirements.	10													
Total points:	100													
13.		<i>Please note, the document “VI - Requirements (ToRs)_Aug” is amended and appended to this Clarification # 1. Clause:</i> 6.1 Implementation Arrangements {the total duration of services is increased with plus 12 months, due to increase of defects notification period from 12 to 24 months}; The Services to be provided by the Consultant are expected to last circa 58 months, which includes 1 month for pre-Commencement activities, 30 months of works supervision, 24 months covering defects notification period and 3 months for the Performance Certificate issue and other closing activities.												
14.														

End of section.