

JSC BELGRADE NIKOLA TESLA AIRPORT
PUBLIC PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE No. 90/2015

05 No.: 31118
Date: 14-12-2015
Belgrade

Dear Sirs,

Acting on the request of the Tenderer who has taken over the tender dossier in accordance with Article 63 of the Public Procurement Law ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 124/12, 14/15), we forward further clarification of the tender dossier for the public procurement „MANAGEMENT CONSULTANCY SERVICES – MANAGEMENT CONSULTING SERVICES (GENERAL MANAGEMENT CONSULTANCY) AIMED TOWARD SELECTING A CONSULTANT TO ASSIST THE PROCESS OF THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT OF JSC AIRPORT NIKOLA TESLA" No. 90/2015.

Question 1: We do not understand why the credentials of subcontractors will not be taken into account in the evaluation. We believe that this approach is inconsistent with what appears to be a desire to hire a team of consultants with very strong airports experience. Please allow the credentials of subcontractors to be taken into account in the evaluation.

Answer 1: The Client is pointing out that the subcontractors' references are not taken into account only when fulfilling additional conditions for participation in the subject of public procurement, as foreseen in Form 4 (table 4.1) and that they can be the subject of evaluation under item 19 of Form 5 of Tender documents (Instructions to Bidders – Contract Award Criteria).

Question 2: By setting the maximum amount of the Consultancy Service Fee at 136.000.000,00 RSD, we do not believe that ANT will achieve its objective of retaining world class consultants with airports experience. Please increase the level significantly.

Answer 2: The Client will consider the suggestion.

Question 3: We understand the desire to cap the fees payable to the selected consultants in the event that no transaction is concluded. Given the proposed level of cap of 136.000.000,00 RSD, VAT excluded we believe that it would be appropriate for it to be made clear that the consultancy services arrangement is for an initial term that reflects ANT's proposed timetable for concluding a transaction. We would recommend a period of 12 months. Without such clarification being included in the Tender Documents, we are left with no option other than to include contingency in our proposed pricing to deal with a protracted timetable.

Answer 3: In regard to the proposed suggestion, we are pointing out that the term for completing Project Phase 1 is an element of criteria for choosing an economically most favorable bid (item 19 of Form 5 of Tender documents) that the Bidder defines on his own.



COMMITTEE PRESIDENT
Raša Ristivojević