

CONTRACT AWARD NOTICE

Name of Project: Chisinau Water Development Program

Country: Moldova

Project Number: 44027

Tender/Contract Reference No and name: 8282-IFT-44027 Rehabilitation of Wastewater Treatment Plant and new Sludge Treatment Facilities

Scope of Contract: Detailed design, manufacturing, delivery, installation of new mechanical and electrical equipment for the Chisinau WWTP and sludge digestion facility. Rehabilitation of existing civil works and any civil structures including buildings required for the new sludge treatment facility. Testing, pre-commissioning and commissioning of all new supplied and installed equipment and training of Chisinau Water Utility (ACC) staff in operation and maintenance of installed equipment.

Duration of Contract: 900 days from the commencement date including testing and commissioning followed by 1 years Defects Notification Period.

Evaluation Currency: EUR

Successful tenderer: Consortium PASSAVANT ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT GmbH & LUDWIG PFEIFFER Hoch-und Tiefbau GmbH & Co. KG

Contract price: 24.243.479,61 EUR

Other Tenderers

Tenderer Name	City	Country
HIDROCONSTRUCTIA – PROBIT – UTI Consortium	Bucharest	Romania
STRABAG AG	Spittal/Drau	Austria
Consortium Suez International SAS & S.C. Elsaco Electronic S.R.L.	Paris	France
BUILDING DEVELOPMENT HOLDING LTD	Sofia	Bulgaria
JVCA RIKO, OTV, ERBASU	Ljubljana	Slovenia
Consortium GIS – PWT	Zwingenberg	Germany
CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATION INTERBUDMONTAZH JSC	Kiev	Ukraine
ALKE İnşaat Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. & GÜNSAYIL İnşaat Ticaret ve Sanayi Ltd. Şti. JV	Istanbul	Turkey
POWER CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION OF CHINA LTD	Beijing	China
JV EMIT GROUP – CORAL	Milano	Italy
TAHAL Consulting Engineers Ltd	Or Yehuda	Israel
Consortium WATERLEAU-SADE-VEOLIA WATER SOLUTIONS & TECHNOLOGIES ROMANIA-SADE COMPAGNIE GENERALE DE TRAVAUX D'HYDRAULIQUE S.R.L.	Paris	France
CHISINAU – KP RIA & FERRMONT	Brno	Czech Republic
EKOLOG – VEKTO – EKOMECH Consortium	Pila	Poland

Tender prices at Tender Opening:

Tenderer Name	Currency	Price
HIDROCONSTRUCTIA – PROBIT – UTI Consortium	EURO	25.094.857,61
STRABAG AG	EURO	28.076.625,33
STRABAG AG Alternative 1	EURO	24.458.662,74
STRABAG AG Alternative 2	EURO	24,599,145.60
Consortium Suez International SAS & S.C. Elsaco Electronic S.R.L.	EURO	35.820.718,15
BUILDING DEVELOPMENT HOLDING LTD	EURO	28.198.686,00
BUILDING DEVELOPMENT HOLDING LTD Alternative	EURO	27,986,045.00
JVCA RIKO, OTV, ERBASU	EURO	37.670.898,54

JVCA RIKO, OTV, ERBASU Alternative	EURO	35.243.887,80
Consortium GIS – PWT	EURO	24.383.964,00
CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATION INTERBUDMONTAZH JSC	EURO	23.654.104,00
ALKE İnşaat Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. & GÜNSAYIL İnşaat Ticaret ve Sanayi Ltd. Şti. JV	EURO	22.299.894,00
POWER CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION OF CHINA LTD	EURO	24.125.055,84
JV EMIT GROUP – CORAL	EURO	24.285.609,34
JVCA RIKO, OTV, ERBASU Alternative	EURO	22.712.429,34
TAHAL Consulting Engineers Ltd	EURO	18.883.776,00
Consortium WATERLEAU-SADE-VEOLIA WATER SOLUTIONS & TECHNOLOGIES ROMANIA-SADE COMPAGNIE GENERALE DE TRAVAUX D'HYDRAULIQUE S.R.L.	EURO	30.035.264,00
Alternative 1	EURO	27.466.537,00
Alternative 2	EURO	27.466.537,00
Consortium PASSAVANT ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT GmbH & LUDWIG PFEIFFER Hoch-und Tiefbau GmbH & Co. KG	EURO	24.243.479,61
CHISINAU – KP RIA & FERRMONT	EURO	19.932.355,04
EKOLOG – VEKTO – EKOMECH Consortium	EURO	22.239.555,00
Alternative	EURO	20.490.955,00

Evaluated Tender Prices

Evaluated tender prices including Operating costs/NPV calculation and any corrections/adjustments in Euro

Tenderer	Corrected/Discounted Tender Price	Operating costs/NPV	Total Evaluated Price
HIDROCONSTRUCTIA – PROBIT – UTI Consortium	25,094,857.61	10,245,903.38	35,340,761.00
STRABAG AG (main offer)	28,185,257.76	7,359,924.27	35,545,182.03
JVCA RIKO, OTV, ERBASU (main offer)	37,670,898.42	13,920,338.89	51,591,237.31
JVCA RIKO, OTV, ERBASU (alternative offer)	35,243,887.97	13,032,494.72	48,276,382.69
Consortium GIS – PWT	24,383,963.65	8,559,946.36	32,943,910.01
CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATION INTERBUDMONTAZH JSC	23,654,107.60	13,915,427.23	37,569,534.83
ALKE İnşaat Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. & GÜNSAYIL İnşaat Ticaret ve Sanayi Ltd. Şti. JV	22,299,894.00	8,469,876.83	30,769,770.83
POWER CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION OF CHINA LTD	24,125,055.86	16,555,208.84	40,680,264.70
JV EMIT GROUP – CORAL (main offer)	24,285,609.36	8,596,099.76	32,881,709.12
TAHAL Consulting Engineers Ltd	18,885,871.64	11,860,530.55	30,746,402.19
Consortium WATERLEAU-SADE-VEOLIA WATER SOLUTIONS & TECHNOLOGIES ROMANIA-SADE COMPAGNIE GENERALE DE TRAVAUX D'HYDRAULIQUE S.R.L. (Main)	30,255,118.15	11,480,970.94	41,736,089.09
Consortium WATERLEAU-SADE-VEOLIA WATER SOLUTIONS & TECHNOLOGIES ROMANIA-SADE COMPAGNIE GENERALE DE TRAVAUX D'HYDRAULIQUE S.R.L. (Alt. no 1)	27,653,897.40	11,480,970.94	39,134,868.34
Consortium WATERLEAU-SADE-VEOLIA WATER SOLUTIONS & TECHNOLOGIES ROMANIA-SADE COMPAGNIE GENERALE DE TRAVAUX D'HYDRAULIQUE S.R.L. (Alt. no 2)	27,653,897.40	10,427,184.44	38,081,081.84
Consortium PASSAVANT ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT GmbH & LUDWIG PFEIFFER Hoch-und Tiefbau GmbH & Co. KG	24,243,479.64	7,498,703.33	31,742,182.97
EKOLOG – VEKTO – EKOMECH Consortium(Main)	22,239,555.00	15,112,571.40	37,352,126.40
EKOLOG – VEKTO – EKOMECH Consortium (Alt).	20,490,955.00	13,057,568.86	33,548,523.86

Name of Tenderers who did not pass post qualification and reasons

1. TAHAL Consulting Engineers Ltd.

Tenderer is unable to provide evidences about completion of projects comparable to the proposed contract. Tender Document specifies requirement that tenderer shall have experience in design and construction of the anaerobic digesters at least in two projects. Information provided by the tender as response to the clarification request was checked.

2. Alke İnşaat Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. & GÜNSAYIL İnşaat Ticaret ve Sanayi Ltd. Şti. JV

Based on the data provided by the Tenderer in Form 4 Financial Situation as the lead partner cannot meet requirements set in the qualification criteria (turnover over the last three years of not less than €20,000,000 equivalent). No evidences submitted confirming that Works of 2 sludge digestion plants are performed being as prime contractor.

Name of Tenderers rejected and reasons for rejection:

The following tenders were rejected for a material deviation during the detail review stage due to no statement in technical offers or inclusion in price schedule for the hygienization/pasteurisation of sludge as required by Moldovan Authorities:

- Consortium Suez International SAS & S.C. Elsaco Electronic S.R.L.
- Buildings Development Holdings Ltd (Main and Alternative offers)
- Chisinau KP Ria and Ferrmont Consortium.

In accordance with Volume I.ii Tender Data Sub-Clause 10.3 Alternative Offers allowed alternative offers for the sludge digestion only so long as supporting information provided in the offer. Alternative offers would be considered on their own merit during evaluation. Results are presented below:

- STRABAG A/G Alternative 1 (€24,458,662.74): The offer proposes the relocation of both the sludge treatment building and digesters, however this requires the relocation also of the pre-treatment building containing fine screens and grit removal system to space currently allocated for primary settlement tanks, this in turn limits the options for Phase 2 which STRABAG have resolved by constructing 2 new primary tanks rather than simple rehabilitation of the old 3 tanks as required.
- STRABAG A/G Alternative 2 (€24,599,145.60): The offer makes full use of those proposed for alternative 1 and introduces a change to the water line process by providing a high load tank before primary settlement to reduce the biological load in aeration tanks reducing the blower power which is covered in the guarantees. New approach and proposed process design is in conflict with requirements set in the Tender Document.
- JV Emit Group Coral Alternative (€22.712.429.34). The offer makes use of the batch pasteurization of sludge prior to anaerobic digestion and reducing the digestion time from 20 to 15 days. Clarifications were requested to provide supporting information for the reduction in sludge digestion capacity. No specific European experience was provided and the alternative was rejected on the basis that the offer was not compliant with the requirements of the Tender Document.