



Republic of Serbia
MINISTRY OF FINANCE
Department for Contracting and
Financing of EU Funded Programmes
(CFCU)
15/8/2025, Belgrade

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY'S CLARIFICATIONS No.4

Establishment of Regional Waste Management System for the City of Novi Sad and
Municipalities of Bačka Palanka, Bački Petrovac, Beočin, Žabalj, Srbobran, Temerin and
Vrbas

Lot 1: Construction of the Regional Waste Management Centre in the City of Novi Sad

Lot 2: Construction of the Transfer Stations in Municipalities Vrbas and Bačka Palanka

Publication ref.: **EC-ENEST/BEG/2025/EA-OP/0035**

No.	Question	Answer
1.	<p>Request for clarification of technical requirements for Lot 2: Construction of the Transfer Stations in the Municipalities of Vrbas and Bačka Palanka</p> <p>As part of the preparation of our bid for the subject tender, and in order to fully comply with the requirements of the tender documentation, we hereby request clarification regarding an inconsistency between the description of the sorting and baling line equipment provided in Vol. 3: Section 1 — Employer's Requirements and the graphical documentation provided in Vol. 5.1.1.</p> <p>Namely, in the Employer's Requirements, on page 66 (equipment list for the sorting line) and in paragraph 2.4.5.1.6 (page 70), it is stated that the technological process for dry recyclable waste sorting and baling includes the following position:</p>	<p>LOT 2</p> <p>1. The requirements outlined in Volume 3, Section 1, Employer's Requirements are mandatory. The Contractor is required to design, construct, put in operation and operate the Transfer Stations fully in accordance with these requirements. The graphical documentation provided in Volume 5, including the drawings BP-19.04 and VR-17.04 (<i>Hall for Waste Sorting — Equipment</i>), is to be considered indicative only.</p> <p>2. Please see the answer under item No. 1 above.</p>

	<p>"2.4.5.1.6 System for receiving of separated recyclable waste from sorting belt and its transport, by conveyer, to baling press</p> <p>The system for receiving of separated recyclable waste from sorting belt and its transport, by conveyer, to baling press shall be as per Contractor's design."</p> <p>This clearly indicates that recyclable waste is to be transported from the sorting belt to the baling press by means of a conveyer system.</p> <p>However, in the document Vol. 5.1.1 — Lot 2, on the drawings BP-19.04 — Hall for Waste Sorting — Equipment, the system shown does not include a conveyer, but instead features a "Lifter/reloader of container" system, as additionally confirmed in the legend of the drawing.</p> <p>We note that both solutions are technically functional in terms of the operational integrity of the sorting system; however:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The solution with a conveyer requires the construction of a sunken pit to house the horizontal section of the conveyer, which is not foreseen either in the textual requirements or in the technical (civil) documentation; • The installation of the conveyer, in relation to the illustrated equipment layout and available space within the sorting hall, could significantly impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ civil works and associated costs; ○ positioning of equipment; ○ required building dimensions; ○ functionality and safety of the operational space. <p>In light of the above, we kindly request your clarification on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which of the two solutions is considered valid and binding for the bidders: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The solution with a conveyer system, in accordance with the description in Vol. 3 — 	
--	--	--

	<p>Employer's Requirements, or</p> <p>b) The solution with a lifter/reloader system, as per the drawings in Vol. 5.1.1?</p> <p>2. If the conveyer-based solution is deemed mandatory, has the Employer foreseen the necessary adaptations in the civil design (pit construction, additional works, building dimensions) to allow its proper implementation?</p>	
2.	<p>In the EU directive (Directive 1999_31_EC) as well as in Annex 2 of the Regulation on waste disposal on landfills (Serbian regulation) in the part technical and technological conditions for the design, construction and commissioning of a landfill, it is defined that the landfill bottom for landfills for non-hazardous waste must satisfy in terms of layer thickness $\geq 1\text{m}$ and that the coefficient of water permeability should be $k \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/s}$. Also, it is stated that when the natural geological barrier does not meet the prescribed values, it is provided by covering the landfill bottom with synthetic materials or a natural mineral buffer that must be consolidated in such a way as to obtain the equivalent value of the bottom in terms of its water-permeable properties. The natural mineral buffer must not be less than 0.5 meters.</p>	<p>LOT 1</p> <p>The content under No. 2 is not a question but seems to serve as an introduction to Question No. 3.</p>
3.	<p>If according to tender conditions, GCL material (synthetic material) is placed in the geological barrier layer, the essence is that the equivalent waterproofness of GCL + soil beneath in a thickness of 50 cm should be with the coefficient $k \leq 1 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m/s}$. There is a common way to calculate total layer equivalence. In this regard, it is not clear to us why the layer of soil below the GCL has to meet special conditions in terms of waterproofing, and not those that are sufficient to achieve the geological barrier conditions required by Serbian</p>	<p>LOT 1</p> <p>Requirements for compacted soil to be placed below GCL as part of bottom lining system, provided in Volume 3, Section 1, Employer's Requirements, section 2.5.4.1. are mandatory and in line with Serbian and EU regulations.</p>

	and EU regulations?	
4.	<p>In the document "General technical specifications" it is written that the quality of drainage gravel for leachate with a grain size of 16-32 mm is tested for every 50 m³ of installed material. This intensity of testing is unusual for landfill projects implemented in Europe. In accordance with good practice, we suggest that the characteristics of the gravel at the quarry and separation (during production) be confirmed first, that the consistency of the production method be considered, and then that after the quality has been confirmed at the place of production, quality control to be carried out on site for every 2500m³ of installed material. If the Supervision Engineer suspects the permanence of the characteristics, it would always have the right to request an extraordinary examination. Since the afore mentioned intensity of testing is unusual, is it acceptable to use good practice in EU, which is included in the valid EN and the national standards of the EU that we mentioned?</p>	<p>LOT 1</p> <p>The quality of the leachate drainage gravel layer, including filtration coefficient, shall be tested at a minimum frequency of 1 sample per 1,000 m³ of installed material. The quality of the gravel at the quarry and separation (during production) shall be tested first.</p>
5.	<p>Request for clarification of tender documents for Establishment of Regional Waste Management System for the City of Novi Sad and Municipalities of Bačka Palanka, Bački Petrovac, Beočin, Žabalj, Srbobran, Temerin and Vrbas</p> <p>Lot 2 – Construction of Transfer Stations in Municipalities Vrbas and Bačka Palanka</p> <p>In accordance with Clause 8 of Instruction to Tenderers we are submitting request for clarification of tender documents.</p> <p><u>Question 1</u></p> <p>We kindly request clarification regarding the requirement to demonstrate possession (prior to the</p>	<p>LOT 2</p> <p>1. The Works to be executed under the Lot 2 contract are permanent and therefore require a Construction Permit, which, in accordance with the Law on planning and construction, falls under the responsibility of the local self-government authority. Consequently, the requirement for a Company Licence issued by the Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure, referred to as the „large licence“, does not apply to Lot 2. However, the successful tenderer must have employed and/or contracted engineers with licenses, needed for design and construction of</p>

<p>contract commencement date) of a proper company licenses for design and construction works in accordance with Serbian law.</p> <p>According to the Law on Waste Management (Official Gazette of RS, no. 36/2009, 88/2010, 14/2016, 95/2018 and 35/2023), a transfer station is legally defined as:</p> <p>“A place where waste is transported and temporarily stored for the purpose of separation or reloading before it is transported for treatment, recovery or disposal.” (Article 5, Paragraph 1, point 33 of the Law).</p> <p>In contrast, landfills are treated as final disposal sites and are clearly distinguished under the same law (Article 5, Paragraph 1, point 5 of the Law).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Rulebook on the Requirements to be Fulfilled by Legal Entities and Entrepreneurs for Performing Design and Construction Works for Buildings for which the Construction Permit is Issued by the Ministry or the Competent Authority of the Autonomous Province (Official Gazette RS, no. 21/2024) – which governs the issuance of so-called "large licenses" – lists in its Annex only the following relevant category:</p> <p>“Regional landfills, that is, landfills for the disposal of non-hazardous waste serving an area inhabited by more than 200,000 people”</p> <p>Transfer stations are not included in any of the categories for which possession of a licence is required under this Rulebook.</p> <p>Given the above and since transfer stations do not fall under the same regulatory classification as regional landfills and are of significantly lower environmental and construction complexity, we respectfully ask the</p>	<p>all items of transfer stations, like architecture, plant construction, traffics and traffic signalization, hydrotechnical installations (water supply and sewage, external and internal), electrotechnical installation (external and internal), thermotechnical installations, dust extraction, technology and technological process and equipment, telecommunication, landscape, fire protection, geology, etc., fully in compliance with the Law on Planning and Construction (articles 126, 126a, 127, 128, 128a, 150, 151, etc.) and the relevant secondary legislation in force.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. A list of plant for the execution of the contract, as referred in Volume 1, Section 1, section 12.1.9. of the Instructions to Tenderers, is indicative. The tenderer shall submit the list of equipment it intends to use, thus demonstrating the ability to complete the works reliably and efficiently. Information on whether the equipment is owned or hired shall be specified in the Form 4.6.2. No further evidence of availability is necessary. 3. Further to Question 3, kindly find the clarifications provided below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Tenderer shall provide a list of suitably qualified personnel proposed for the execution of the contract, in line with its proposed technical solution, thus demonstrating the capacity to timely and successfully complete the works. 2. During the tender evaluation procedure, proposed personnel and their CVs will not be evaluated against any minimum
--	---

<p>Contracting Authority to: Confirm that the requirement for possession of a company licences for design and construction is not applicable to Lot 2 under Serbian law, and — if so — to accordingly remove this requirement from the tender documentation.</p> <p>This clarification is essential in ensuring full compliance with national legal frameworks and a fair and competitive procurement process.</p> <p><u>Question 2</u> The tender documentation (Section 1: Instruction to tenderers) outlines the technical capacity in terms of required machinery, vehicles and other equipment.</p> <p>While the list includes various categories such as excavators, dozers, concrete pumps, trucks, cranes and a general reference to “vehicles and trucks” as well as “other plant”, we note that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No specific quantity is defined for any listed machinery or vehicles; 2. The category “vehicles and trucks” is too broad and not further clarified (e.g. tipper trucks, flatbeds, mixers, etc.); 3. The phrase “other plant” remains undefined and open to interpretation; 4. The documentation does not specify the required form of proof for availability or ownership of the listed items (e.g. registration documents, invoices, leasing agreements, declarations of availability, etc.). <p>In view of the above, we kindly ask the Contracting Authority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide clear minimum requirements for the type and number of machinery, vehicles and trucks expected for Lot 2; • Clarify the scope of the term “other plant”; 	<p>requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. As proof of qualifications, the Tenderer shall submit a CV for each proposed staff member, including references from similar projects. No additional documents will be required for the purposes of tender evaluation. 4. Personnel proposed for the execution of the Contract do not necessarily need to be employees of, or otherwise contractually engaged by, the Tenderer at the time of Tender submission. However, the key personnel nominated herein for the execution of the Contract may not be replaced during its implementation without the prior approval of the Engineer. <p>4. Each member of the consortium should complete and sign an individual copy of the Tenderer’s Declaration, stating the same total price as indicated in the Tender Form (Tenderer’s Declaration) signed by the Leader</p> <p>It is sufficient that only the Leader submits a duly completed and signed Appendix to Tender for a Works Contract.</p> <p>5. We confirm these are editorial inconsistencies regarding numbering of forms. For clarification, in documents d4b_itt_en and Detailed Evaluation grid - lot 2 instead of: Form 4.6.10 – Tender Technical Solution; Forms 4.6.10.1a - List of major equipment for TS Vrbas; Forms 4.6.10.1b - List of equipment for TS Bačka Palanka; Form 4.6.11 - Tenderer's proposed</p>
---	---

<p>• Specify what types of documents are acceptable to demonstrate possession or availability (ownership certificates, traffic permits, lease contracts or other forms). This clarification is important to ensure consistent and fair evaluation of all tenders.</p> <p><u>Question 3</u> In accordance with Clause 12.1.9 of the Instructions to Tenderers, tenderers are required to submit a list of personnel proposed for execution of the contract (Form 4.6.1.2), and CVs of key personnel (Form 4.6.1.3). However, the same clause states that: “CVs of key personnel are for informational purposes and will not be subject to evaluation.” In this context, we kindly request clarification on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the CVs are not evaluated, what is the purpose of requiring Forms 4.6.1.2 and 4.6.1.3 at all? Is this information used solely for administrative purposes? 2. Will the submitted personnel and their qualifications be subject to any minimum eligibility checks or legal criteria, even if not evaluated? 3. Is the submission of the forms sufficient or are additional supporting documents (e.g., diplomas, contracts, statements of availability) also required to be submitted at this stage? 4. Must the proposed personnel be already contractually engaged with the tenderer at the time of submission? <p>Clarifying the intent and practical purpose of these forms is important to ensure that all tenderers prepare their submissions consistently and that unnecessary administrative burdens are avoided.</p> <p><u>Question 4</u></p>	<p>training programme; Form 4.6.12 - Conditions of Contract; Form 4.6.13 - Further information. Please read: Form 4.6.9.1 – Tender Design; Form 4.6.9.2.a - List of major equipment for TS Vrbas; Form 4.6.9.2.b. - List of equipment for TS Bačka Palanka; Form 4.6.9.3 - Tenderer's proposed training programme; Form 4.6.9.4 - Conditions of Contract; Form 4.6.9.5 - Further information. This numbering applies to discrepancy on the title page of the file d4k_techofferform_4dot6_en.docx, meaning there are no additional forms after Form 4.6.9.5.</p>
---	--

	<p>In preparation for submitting a tender, we kindly request clarification regarding the completion of the Tender Form, specifically if the tender is submitted by a group of economic operators (Consortium).</p> <p>The form includes a section for indicating the total offered price and, as per the instructions, it must be signed by each member of the consortium.</p> <p>We would appreciate your guidance on the following point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it acceptable, in the case of a joint tender, for the total price to be stated only in the Tender Form signed by the lead partner, while the other consortium members submit and sign the same form without indicating the price? <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should each member of the consortium complete and sign an individual copy of the Tender Form, with the same total price inserted? <p>Apart from that, it is clear that each member of the consortium is required to submit a signed Annex 1 - Declaration On Honour On Exclusion And Selection Criteria. However, we would appreciate your confirmation as to whether each consortium member is also required to individually complete and sign Annex 2 - Appendix To Tender For A Works Contract or if it is sufficient for only the lead partner to submit Annex 2 on behalf of the consortium?</p> <p><u>Question 5</u></p> <p>We would like to respectfully bring to your attention several inconsistencies between the Evaluation Grid for Lot 2 in Volume 1: Section 5 of tender documentation (specifically Table 4 – Technical Compliance) and the Forms officially published as part of the tender documentation in Volume 1: Section 4</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>(document titled „d4k_techofferform_4dot6_en.docx“).</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation grid refers to Form 4.6.10 – Tender Technical Solution, which does not exist in the published forms. However, Form 4.6.9.1 – Tender Design appears to contain that content. • The evaluation grid refers to Forms 4.6.10.1a and 4.6.10.1b for the list of mayor equipment, while the corresponding and published forms are 4.6.9.2.a and 4.6.9.2.b. • For the training program, the evaluation grid refers to Form 4.6.11, which does not exist in the published forms, while the published and correct form is 4.6.9.3. • Other technical elements such as Calculation of energy consumption, Instrumentation and SCADA monitoring system and technical drawings are all referenced under Form 4.6.10 in the evaluation grid, which is not included in the published documentation. <p>Additionally, we would like to highlight a discrepancy between the title page of the file d4k_techofferform_4dot6_en.docx, which states: "FORMS 4.6.1 TO 4.6.13", while the last available form in the document is 4.6.9.5 – Further Information. No forms from 4.6.10 to 4.6.13 are included.</p> <p>Since these references may cause confusion and impact the correct structuring of technical offers, we kindly ask you to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm whether these are editorial inconsistencies and • Revise and align the form references in the evaluation grid and title page with the actual numbering and structure of the published tender 	
--	--	--

	<p>forms.</p> <p>This clarification will ensure consistency and prevent misinterpretation during both the preparation and evaluation of technical offers.</p>	
--	---	--