

RB Rail AS K. Valdemāra iela 8-7 Riga, LV-1010 Latvia

Phone: +371 66 967 171 www.railbaltica.org

Riga, 17 January 2018 No 6.1/2018- 35

Answers to the questions from the interested suppliers in Restricted Competition "Design and design supervision services for the construction of the new line from Kaunas to Ramygala ID. No RBR 2017/29

RB Rail AS presents the following answers to the questions received until 17 January 2018 from the interested suppliers:

the interested suppliers:		
No		Answer
1,	We have looked thorough and evaluated tender documents	Procurement Commission has
	for restricted competition "Design and design supervision	reviewed your letter with the
	services for the construction of the new line from Kaunas to	proposal to amend qualification
	Ramygala" (hereinafter - "The Procurement"). We believe that	criteria stated in the Clause 7.4, sub-
	some of the conditions are unproportional to the object of The	clause 3) of the Regulations. All
	Procurement and thus pose unreasonable boundaries on	qualification criteria set out by Clause
	open competition and may prevent contracting authority	7.4. of the Regulations are closely
	from receiving best offers they could get.	related to the subject-matter of the
	A requirement of technical and professional ability set in item	procurement and ensures that
	7.4 of the conditions inter alia describes that a candidate	Tenderer will have sufficient
	should have the experience: in the provision of 2 large bridge	experience for the purpose of the
	designs, where each bridge has a span length of at least 150 m	subject-matter to deliver high quality
	and at least one bridge is railway bridge with the speed above	services. Therefore the qualification
	200 km/h. As far as we are concerned such requirement is	criteria stated in the Clause 7.4, sub-
	unproportional due to several factors.	clause 3) of the Regulations are not
	The conditions require that a candidate would have prepared	amended.
	no less than two large bridge designs.	
	As qualification requirements are normally set in order to	
	verify whether potential candidate has enough qualifications and experience to perform required task. Therefore it is normal	
	to ask for experience with similar projects, however such	
	requirements should be reasonable. A single completed	,
	similar assignment is generally considered as sufficient proof	
	that a candidate is in fact capable of providing such services.	
	Doubling the quantity of such requirement does not really	
	affect its quality yet it may exclude candidates who had one	
	similar assignment in the past, successfully completed it, thus	
	are in fact capable of doing it again yet cannot meet formal	
	requirement as they never had another similar project.	
	Therefore such requirement may exclude competent and	
	experienced candidates from participating in The	
	Procurement and thus limits the competition and may not	
	allow for the contracting authority to receive best possible	
	offers.	
	The conditions also set that each of such bridges should have	
	a span length of at least 150 meters. As far as we can see the	
	only place in the proposed route where such bridge might be	
	needed is crossing of Neris river. This river is generally under	
$\overline{}$	and a second sec	<u> </u>

150 meters wide so contracting authority would only need 150 meter span if it would decide on building single-span bridge with no intermediate supports. However conditions of The Procurement do not describe the future parameters of the bridge in question and it is perfectly possible that a bridge with intermediate supports would be chosen thus rendering candidates experience with designing 150 meter spans completely irrelevant. It must also be noted that 150 meter span is very long for a railway bridge: for example such span is the longest for railway bridge in Japan, a country noted for its extensive and modem railway infrastructure. Therefore such requirement unreasonably and unproportionally limits competition and does not allow competent, qualified and experienced candidates participate in the competition merely because the could not comply with qualification requirement which in turn has no relevance to the services contracting authority intends to buy.

The condidions also set that at least one of the bridges designed should be a railway bridge with the speed above 200 km/h. In fact the bridge construction does not really depend on how fast the trains are going to pass on it. The railway bridge with the speed above 200 km/h will be technically quite similar to the bridge built in similar conditions and of similar size yet with the railway line speed of under 200 km/h. Higher speed may affect loads, but such loads would have to be estimated and calculated anyway and any construction would have to be chosen accordingly. While the speed is paramount to railway track design it is of little significance to actual bridge design thus requirements to have experience designing a bridge carrying high speed railway line would not help in any way to choose better designers and would merely limit the competition.

Having evaluated the aforementioned we kindly ask the contracting authority to limit requirements for bridge design to the requirements that are actually related to the object of The Procurement and may help to select qualified designers without limiting the competition unreasonably. Namely we ask to limit the requirement of experience to one successfijlly completed bridge design, describe the requirement of the bridge designed by its total length rather than its longest span and abolish the requirement for the bridge to carry the high speed railway line.

Procurement commission chairman

Mārtiņš Blaus