

CLARIFICATIONS TO PARTICIPATION QUERIES DATED 18/09/2026

Reconstruction and modernization of Belgrade – Niš Railway Line, Section 3 Paraćin – Trupale – Medjurovo (subsections Paracin – Stalac, Djunis – Trupale and Trupale - Medjurovo, excluding subsection Stalac - Djunis)

TABLE OF CLARIFICATIONS

Question No 59: We kindly ask for your position on Answer to Question 1 of the Clarifications to Participation Queries Dated 14/08/2026: are reference projects also accepted if their starting date is earlier than the period stated in the answer (before 07/2016), but their completion date is already within the specified time interval?	Answer No 59: Referring to answer no. 1 of the Clarifications to Participants dated 14/08/2026, the date of Taking over certificate or other defined document submitted as a proof of substantially completed project must be within the reference period.
Question No 60: Regard to Criterion 3.3 – Specific Experience, we consider the requirement for relevant technical experience to be necessary for demonstrating an Applicant's capability to perform the Works. However, we would appreciate clarification regarding the requirement to demonstrate a minimum monetary value for the reference contracts. While the technical criteria are directly relevant to assessing an Applicant's capability and experience, according to the Procurement Document, references with higher contract values are ranked more favorably. Therefore, an Applicant having executed higher-value / more expensive (due to reasons such as different contract types, projects including other work items such as signaling and electrification, and/or less competition) contracts may be considered both more qualified and more favorably ranked than an Applicant with lower-value references, even where the technical scope and complexity of the works are comparable. Could the Employer kindly clarify the rationale for this approach, particularly considering that it could potentially be contradictory to a procurement process in which the lowest evaluated offer is ultimately selected? Is it possible for the Employer to re-assess such criteria supporting more economical solutions?	Answer No 60: The Client accepts such remarks so the sub-clause 18.7 of Section II-Data sheet will be amended as follows: “The limit to the number of the Participants to be prequalified is 4 to 6. Based on the applications received, at least 4 and at most 6 Participants will be invited to submit detailed Tenders for this contract. If the number of eligible Participants meeting the selection criteria is less than the minimum of 4, the Client may invite Participants who satisfy the criteria to submit a Tender. If the number of eligible Participants meeting the selection criteria is more than the maximum of 6, the Client will rank them using the re-examination criteria below. If more than six (6) eligible Participants meet the qualification criteria, the Client shall re-examine the Applications in order to identify the six (6) best qualified Participants. The re-examination shall be based solely on the extent, value and relevance of the experience demonstrated under Criteria 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, taking into account the following factors, in order of precedence: a) under Criterion 3.3 – Specific Experience: - the number of substantially completed contracts exceeding the minimum qualification requirement; and - if two or more Participants remain tied, the aggregate value of such contracts (value of the contract excluding value of telecommunication and signaling works); b) if a tie remains, under Criterion 3.2 – Management Experience:

	- the number of substantially completed contracts satisfying the criterion; and - if two or more Participants remain tied, the aggregate value of such contracts (value of the contract excluding value of telecommunication and signaling works); c) if a tie remains, under Criterion 3.1 – General Construction Experience: - the number of substantially completed contracts satisfying the criterion; and - if two or more Participants remain tied, the aggregate value of such contracts (value of the contract excluding value of telecommunication and signaling works). Participants are encouraged to submit all reference contracts that satisfy the qualification criteria. Any additional qualifying contracts submitted may be taken into account solely for the purpose of ranking Participants where more than six (6) eligible Participants satisfy the qualification criteria.”
Question No 61: Exchange Rate Date Consistency Sector IV Footnote 2 stated that non-EUR currency figures for financial statements shall be converted at the National Bank of Serbia (NBS) exchange rate as of July 1st of each reported year. For current year financial resources (From FIN-2 / FIN-3), should the exchange rate be fixed at the NBS rate on the exact date of application submission or invitation date.	Answer No 61: The Employer confirms that, for current year financial resources declared in FIN-2 / FIN-3, any amounts stated in currencies other than EUR shall be converted into EUR using the official National Bank of Serbia exchange rate applicable on the date of submission of the Application.
Question No 62: The current tender notice does not explicitly state the overall estimated budget/cost for the Design and Build works across the three applicable subsections (Subsection 3.1: Paracin-Stalac, Subsection 3.3: Djunis-Trupale, and Subsection 3.4: Trupale-Medjurovo). Request the Employer to kindly share the tentative estimated project value (in EUR) from Section 3 to assist prequalified applicants in structuring appropriate financial and banking capacities (e.g., credit lines, bid bond limits).	Answer No 62: The estimated value of the works is approximately EUR 700 million, including contingency and price adjustment. The tender documents will provide sufficient information for bidders to prepare their financial proposals and estimate the lump sum price.
Question No 63: Contract Packaging / Award Strategy (Lot-wise vs. Single Award) The current notice covers three distinct geographic subsections (Subsection 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4). Please clarify the following during the second-stage Tender/RFP issuance:	Answer No 63: The Client confirms that the shortlisted Participants will be invited to submit a Proposal for all three subsections together, namely: - Subsection 3.1: Paraćin – Stalać (approximately 20.8 km);

Lot Structure: Will the RFP stage invite bids organized into separate independent Lots (e.g., Lot1: Subsection 3.1, Lot 2: Subsection 3.3, Lot 3: Subsection 3.4), or will the entire Section 3 scope be procure as a single, non-divisible EPC/Design-Build contract package awarded to one main contractor/JV?	- Subsection 3.3: Dunis – Trupale (approximately - 37.7 km); and - Subsection 3.4: Trupale (Niš Marshalling Yard) – Medjurovo (approximately 6.7 km). The three subsections form a single Contract and will be procured and awarded as one Contract. Participants will therefore not be invited to submit Proposals for individual subsections separately.
Question No 64: We are reviewing the Pre-qualification Documents and require official clarification concerning the re-examination ranking mechanism defined under Clause 18.7 within II-Data-Sheet-Prequalification, to be applied together with Criterion 3.3-Specific Experience within IV Eligibility and Qualification Criteria, in the event that more than six eligible participants pass the pre-qualification eligibility check. Under Clause 18.7(a), the primary ranking factor is “the number of substantially completed contracts exceeding the minimum qualification requirement”. We seek your official interpretation on the definition of “contract exceeding the minimum qualification requirement”: 1. Would a substantially-completed contract qualify for this ranking count if only its contract value exceeds the minimum monetary threshold of Criterion 3.3, i.e. EUR 400 million, while the contract does not satisfy all technical - scope requirements under Criterion 3.3 (e.g. railway track, electrification, bridge or tunnel scope)? 2. Alternatively, must the contract satisfy both conditions below to be counted: - Exceed the minimum monetary value threshold of Criterion 3.3, i.e. EUR 400 million; and - Fulfil all applicable technical-scope requirements set forth in Criterion 3.3-Specific Experience? If neither of the above-stated interpretations reflects the Client’s intended evaluation approach, please fully explain the exact re-examination / shortlisting ranking mechanism for Criterion 3.3, including how to identify which contracts shall be counted for the 18.7(a) ranking factor.	Answer No 64: The Client considers that the requirement to demonstrate: - at least one (1) contract similar in nature and complexity to the Contract, with a value of works of at least EUR 400 million; or - at least two (2) contracts similar in nature and complexity to the Contract, each with a value of works of at least EUR 300 million, is appropriate having regard to the nature, scale and complexity of the Contract. In particular, the minimum value applicable to each reference contract is intended to ensure that the Participant demonstrates experience in successfully executing a project of sufficiently substantial individual magnitude, rather than relying solely on the aggregate value of several smaller contracts. Accordingly, the value thresholds under Criterion 3.3 shall not be aggregated across contracts for the purpose of satisfying the minimum value requirement, and the existing requirements remain applicable. The above minimum contract-value requirements are separate from the requirements to demonstrate the specified technical activities, which may be demonstrated across one or more contracts in accordance with Criterion 3.3. On the other hand similarity of the reference contracts must be proven, such as the length of the railway, existing structures in the Project (bridges, overpasses etc.)
Question No 65: We hereby kindly request a time extension of 30 days for the tender submission deadline, which	Answer No 65: The Client has considered the entire process since the publication of the tender. This review includes the clarifications issued by the Client and the changes

means until 02.11.2026. The complexity of the project requires additional time. In addition, the prequalification (PQ) selection criteria are quite challenging, requiring us to identify and secure a partner and/or subcontractor in order to submit a PQ response that fully meets the criteria.	made through those clarifications. The tender requirements have not been made stricter, nor additional circumstances have arisen that would make the preparation of the Applications materially more difficult or conflict with the conditions of the tender. The Client therefore maintains its position that the deadline for submission of Applications shall remain unchanged, in accordance with Sub-Clause 14 [Deadline for Submission of Applications]. The deadline for submission of Applications is 12:00h Central European Time (CET) on 02 October 2026.
Question No 66: With reference to the Employer's Answer No. 3, according to which the term "equivalent" refers to a mainline railway electrification system technically comparable to 25 kV AC in terms of scope, scale and complexity of the electrification works, and that experience with 15 kV AC or 3 kV DC systems may be accepted where the reference project demonstrates comparable scope, scale and technical complexity, including, as applicable, overhead contact line system, traction power supply/substations, protection, earthing and return-current arrangements, and associated interfaces, the Tenderer would like to request the Employer's confirmation regarding the following reference project. The reference project concerns the modernisation of the railway line, approximately 70 km of railway line, including station tracks and associated railway lines. The works included, inter alia, the construction and reconstruction of extensive overhead contact line systems and supporting structures, group earthing, traction return network, traction network disconnectors and their local and remote control, as well as interfaces with the traction power supply infrastructure. The works were carried out under a single contract while maintaining railway traffic on the adjacent track, with trains operating at speeds of at least 100 km/h. The Employer-issued references for the project confirm, among others: - construction of the YC150-2CS150 overhead contact line system, with a total length of installed/hung contact line of approximately 170km; - construction of the C120-2C overhead contact line system – approximately 35km; - construction of the C95-C overhead contact line system – approximately 30 km;	Answer No 66: The Client is not in a position to assess or confirm the acceptability of reference projects submitted by potential Bidders at the stage of responding to queries or issuing clarifications to the Prequalification Documents. Participants are therefore kindly requested to submit their Applications in accordance with the requirements of the Prequalification Documents and the clarifications issued by the Client. Following receipt of all Applications, the Client will evaluate them in accordance with Clause 18 of Section II – Data Sheet.

- local and remote control of traction network disconnectors at the stations; - construction of traction power supply connections from Substations, while the traction substations themselves were executed under a separate contract. The reference was also subject to TSI ENE EC Verification and certification. The TSI ENE assessment confirmed compliance of the Energy subsystem, including the 3 kV DC traction system, and the relevant documentation was subsequently used for obtaining the authorisation for placing the subsystem into service. The authorised railway section is designed for operation with a 3,000 V DC traction power supply system and a maximum line speed of 200 km/h. The scope of the assessed works also included the construction/reconstruction of the catenary system, supporting structures, group earthing and the traction return network. Could the Employer please confirm the above reference project, executed under a single contract and involving a 3 kV DC railway electrification system, will be accepted as meeting the requirement “Railway electrification (25 kV AC or equivalent) – at least 30 km under a single contract”, considering the demonstrated scope, scale and technical complexity of the works, including the construction of extensive overhead contact line systems, supporting structures, traction return circuit, earthing arrangements, traction network control, interfaces with traction power supply infrastructure, execution under active railway traffic, and successful TSI ENE EC Verification and certification, including certification and subsequent authorisation for operation at speeds of up to 200 km/h?	
Question No 67: Could the Employer please confirm that the use of a 3 kV DC traction power supply system, as opposed to 25 kV AC, does not in itself prevent the above reference from being considered “equivalent”, where the reference demonstrates comparable scope, scale and technical complexity, including a mainline railway electrification system successfully verified and authorised for operation at speeds of up to 200 km/h?	Answer No 67: Please refer to answers no. 3 and no. 66
Question No 68: We respectfully re-request extension to the tender submission deadline.	Answer No 68: The Client has considered the entire process since the publication of the tender. This review includes the clarifications issued by the Client and the changes

This project is of high complexity. Forming a joint venture to meet qualification requirements has become the preferred option for most tenderers. Accordingly, additional time is required for parties to finalise cooperation arrangements and prepare tender documents. The ongoing European summer holiday season has already slowed down coordination within our cross-border team. Meanwhile, the upcoming China Mid-Autumn Festival and National Day holidays will further interrupt the workflow of our Chinese side. As hard-copy tender documents must be physically submitted, holiday impacts may cause delays in cross-border delivery. We sincerely ask the Employer to consider these practical difficulties and provide all bidders with adequate time to finalise their tender submissions, and would greatly appreciate your favourable consideration of a three-week extension to the tender deadline.	made through those clarifications. The tender requirements have not been made stricter, nor additional circumstances have arisen that would make the preparation of the Applications materially more difficult or conflict with the conditions of the tender. The Client therefore maintains its position that the deadline for submission of Applications shall remain unchanged, in accordance with Sub-Clause 14 [Deadline for Submission of Applications]. The deadline for submission of Applications is 12:00h Central European Time (CET) on 02 October 2026.
Question No 69: Following the site visits carried out yesterday and today in Serbia by our company and the other members of our consortium, we would like to contact you regarding the tender submission deadline, currently set for 2 October. These visits have enabled us to gain a better understanding of the specific features of the project, the site constraints, as well as the various technical and organizational challenges involved. They have also highlighted several aspects that now require further analysis and coordination among the different members of our consortium in order to submit a fully developed proposal that best meets the project requirements. In this context, and considering the scope of the tender and the coordination work required following these site visits, would it be possible to extend the tender submission deadline by four weeks, ? This additional time would allow us to fully incorporate the findings from the site visits, finalize the necessary studies and consultations, and consolidate a high-quality technical and commercial proposal.	Answer No 69: At this stage of the procedure only request to participate needs to be submitted, not technical or commercial proposals. As it is explained in answer no. 68, the deadline for submission of Applications shall remain unchanged. The deadline for submission of Applications is 12:00h Central European Time (CET) on 02 October 2026.
Question No 70: We refer to Addendum No 1, dated 09.09.2026 in which some clarifications concerning table 3, points 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 were made. Some of these clarifications are leading to changes in initial interpretation of major experience requirements	Answer No 70: The Client has considered the entire process since the publication of the tender. This review includes the clarifications issued by the Client and the changes made through those clarifications. The tender requirements have not been made stricter, nor additional circumstances have arisen that would

and to the necessity to reassess and recheck tour proves and strategy. In this regard we kindly ask you to extend the deadline for presenting the prequalification documents with 4 (four) weeks.	make the preparation of the Applications materially more difficult or conflict with the conditions of the tender. The Client therefore maintains its position that the deadline for submission of Applications shall remain unchanged, in accordance with Sub-Clause 14 [Deadline for Submission of Applications]. The deadline for submission of Applications is 12:00h Central European Time (CET) on 02 October 2026.
Question No 71: With reference to Section IV: Eligibility and Qualification Criteria, Table 3. Experience, 3.2 Management Experience, which requires: “Experience as a main contractor or a lead partner in a JVCA in the execution of at least one (1) major transport infrastructure construction or reconstruction contract with a value of works of at least EUR 350 million equivalent, that has been substantially completed”, Could you please confirm whether, in the case of a contract executed by a JVCA, the requirement of a minimum value of works of at least EUR 350 million equivalent refers to the total value of the works under the contract executed by the JVCA, rather than to the individual share of the works implemented by Participant?	Answer No 71: If a contract was executed by a JVCA, each partner may only claim the specific share of works they actually implemented. Specific share will be proven by submission of the Taking over certificate with clearly stated share of the works by each JV partner or Employer's statement/confirmation of the substantially completed project with clearly stated share of the works by each JV partner.
Question No 72: With reference to Section IV: Eligibility and Qualification Criteria, Table 3. Experience, 3.3 Specific Experience, which requires: “Experience as contractor, JV member or management contractor with the substantial completion of – at least one (1) contract similar in nature and complexity to the Contract, with a value of works of at least EUR 400 million; or – at least two (2) contracts similar in nature and complexity to the Contract, each with a value of works of at least EUR 300 million” Could you please confirm whether, in the case of a contract executed by a JVCA, the requirement of a minimum value of works at least EUR 300/400 equivalent refers to the total value of the works under the contract executed by the JVCA, rather than to the individual share of the works implemented by Participant?	Answer No 72: If a contract was executed by a JVCA, each partner may only claim the specific share of works they actually implemented. Specific share will be proven by submission of the Taking over certificate with clearly stated share of the works by each JV partner or Employer's statement/confirmation of the substantially completed project with clearly stated share of the works by each JV partner.
Question No 73:	Answer No 73:

With reference to Section II, Data Sheet, E. EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS, 18. Evaluation of Applications, Re-examination criteria for six (6) best qualified Participants

a) under Criterion 3.3 – Specific Experience:

- the number of substantially completed contracts exceeding the minimum qualification requirement; and
- if two or more Participants remain tied, the aggregate value of such contracts;

and

With reference to Section IV: Eligibility and Qualification Criteria, Table 3. Experience, 3.3 Specific Experience, which requires:

“Experience as contractor, JV member or management contractor with the substantial completion of:

- at least one (1) contract similar in nature and complexity to the Contract, with a value of works of at least EUR 400 million; or
- at least two (2) contracts similar in nature and complexity to the Contract, each with a value of works of at least EUR 300 million”

and

- the Participant shall demonstrate experience (experience as a subcontractor will be accepted also) in the execution of the following activities (which may be demonstrated across one or more contracts: ...“

Could you please clarify how the above re-examination/ranking criterion relating to number of substantially completed contracts is to be applied? Will contracts for specific experience where the Participant shall demonstrate experience in the execution of the following activities be included in re-examination also? If these projects are also included in the scoring, does their number carry the same weight/importance as the number of projects with a minimum value of EUR 400 or 300? Does this mean that, in order to achieve a better ranking, it is advantageous for a Participant to offer the execution of activities from various projects?

Could you please clarify how the number of substantially completed contracts exceeding the minimum qualification requirement will be determined for ranking purposes when a Participant qualifies under Option 1 (one contract of at least EUR 400 million) compared with a Participant qualifying under Option 2 (two contracts, each of at least EUR 300 million)? For

The contracts for specific experience, where the Participant shall demonstrate experience in the execution of the following activities, will not be included in re-examination/ranking criterion.

The contracts for fulfilment of value criterion will be accepted if they are „similar in nature and complexity“. For fulfilment of the rest of required specific experience, it is foreseen that contractor will demonstrate other smaller contracts with required experience.

The Participants who proposed two projects worth EUR 300 million will be equally evaluated as a Participant who proposed a single project worth EUR 600 million euros.

example, is a Participant who proposed two projects worth EUR 300 million evaluated more favorably than a Participant who proposed a single project worth EUR 600 million euros?

Question No 74:

With reference to Section II: Data Sheet /18. Evaluation of Applications /18.7. the limit to the number of the Participants to be prequalified is 4 to 6. which requires:

„If more than six (6) eligible Participants meet the qualification criteria, the Client shall re-examine the Applications in order to identify the six (6) best qualified Participants. The re-examination shall be based solely on the extent, value and relevance of the experience demonstrated under Criteria 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, taking into account the following factors, in order of precedence:

a) under Criterion 3.3 – Specific Experience:

- the number of substantially completed contracts exceeding the minimum qualification requirement; and
- if two or more Participants remain tied, the aggregate value of such contracts;

b) if a tie remains, under Criterion 3.2 – Management Experience:

- the number of substantially completed contracts satisfying the criterion; and
- if two or more Participants remain tied, the aggregate value of such contracts;

c) if a tie remains, under Criterion 3.1 – General Construction Experience:

- the number of substantially completed contracts satisfying the criterion; and
- if two or more Participants remain tied, the aggregate value of such contracts.

Participants are encouraged to submit all reference contracts that satisfy the qualification criteria. Any additional qualifying contracts submitted may be taken into account solely for the purpose of ranking Participants where more than six (6) eligible Participants satisfy the qualification criteria.“

Given that the evaluation and ranking of eligible participants may take into account the number of reference contracts submitted under Criteria 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, and that Participants are expressly encouraged to submit all reference contracts meeting the qualification criteria, the preparation of the required supporting documentation may require considerable additional time.

Answer No 74:

The Client has considered the entire process since the publication of the tender. This review includes the clarifications issued by the Client and the changes made through those clarifications. The tender requirements have not been made stricter, nor additional circumstances have arisen that would make the preparation of the Applications materially more difficult or conflict with the conditions of the tender. **The Client therefore maintains its position that the deadline for submission of Applications shall remain unchanged, in accordance with Sub-Clause 14 [Deadline for Submission of Applications].**

The deadline for submission of Applications is 12:00h Central European Time (CET) on 02 October 2026.

Furthermore, the Application documentation and supporting reference documents are required to be translated into the Tender language by a translator legally authorized or officially recognized to certify translations in accordance with the laws of the country where the translation is performed. In view of the above and considering the extensive amount of documentation that may need to be collected, reviewed, translated and duly certified, we kindly request the Client to consider extending the Application submission deadline by at least one (1) month. Such an extension would allow all interested Participants sufficient time to properly prepare and certify their Applications and to submit complete and duly documented reference evidence, thereby ensuring fair and equal conditions for all Participants.	
Question No 75: We would like to kindly remind our former question regarding Criterion 3.3 – Specific Experience, we consider the requirement for relevant technical experience to be necessary for demonstrating an Applicant’s capability to perform the Works. However, we would appreciate clarification regarding the requirement to demonstrate a minimum monetary value for the reference contracts. While the technical criteria are directly relevant to assessing an Applicant’s capability and experience, according to the Procurement Document, references with higher contract values are ranked more favorably. Therefore, an Applicant having executed higher-value / more expensive (due to reasons such as different contract types, projects including other work items such as signaling and electrification, and/or less competition) contracts may be considered both more qualified and more favorably ranked than an Applicant with lower-value references, even where the technical scope and complexity of the works are comparable. Could the Employer kindly clarify the rationale for this approach, particularly considering that it could potentially be contradictory to a procurement process in which the lowest evaluated offer is ultimately selected? Is it possible for the Employer to re-assess such criteria supporting more economical solutions? Furthermore, Metro projects are also among the similar experience where the difference is mainly electrification and signaling	Answer No 75: Please refer to answer no. 60.

where this project also do not include. In that respect, we also kindly request yourselves to add metro projects in this criterion too.	
Question No 76: In the Data Sheet, Clause 18.7 explains how the evaluation will be conducted if there are more than six eligible participants. We believe that considering the number of completed contracts as part of this evaluation is not the most appropriate approach. Instead, we are of the opinion that considering the total value of completed projects would provide a more meaningful and effective basis for assessment. For example, under the current evaluation method, two projects with a value of EUR 300 million each would rank higher than a single project valued at EUR 700 million. In our view, this does not accurately reflect the scale or complexity of the experience demonstrated. Accordingly, we kindly request that this provision be revised so that the evaluation process can be conducted in a fairer manner and enable the Contracting Authority to work with the most suitable participants, thereby contributing to the successful delivery of the project. Proposed drafting amendment* (if any) a) under Criterion 3.3–Specific Experience: - the aggregate value of substantially completed contracts exceeding the minimum qualification requirement; and - if two or more Participants remain tied the number of such contracts;	Answer No 76: The Client wants to thank the Participants for their shared opinion on the ranking method but the sub-clause 18.7 of Section II-Data sheet remains unchanged.
Question No 77: In the IV – Eligibility and Qualification Criteria - Prequalification document, Section 2.2 Average Annual Revenues states that: "A Participant's minimum average annual construction turnover shall be equivalent to EUR 300 million, calculated as the total certified payments received for contracts in progress and/or completed during the last five (5) financial years, divided by five. In the case of a Joint Venture, the combined turnover of all members shall satisfy this requirement." The required supporting document is Form FIN-1 (Income Statement). However, Form FIN-1 only contains columns for three years, whereas the qualification criterion refers to the last five (5) financial years.	Answer No 77: The Participant can add additional columns to the prescribed form FIN-1 in order to include five years of data and submit audited financial statements/audit reports covering the full five-year period as supporting documentation.

Could you please clarify whether we may add additional columns to the prescribed form in order to include five years of data, or whether we should complete Form FIN-1 using the available three-year format and submit audited financial statements/audit reports covering the full five-year period as supporting documentation?	
Question No 78: In addition, our understanding is that preparing the required documentation and submitting it physically is sufficient, and that there are no additional requirements to be fulfilled in order to participate in the tender. Could you please confirm whether our understanding is correct?	Answer No 78: Participants shall submit one (1) original and two (2) copies of the Application in sealed packages, together with an electronic version of the complete Application in PDF format on a USB memory device. Submission of the application is defined within clause 12 of Section II-Data sheet, and the participation conditions are explained thoroughly in complete Tender documentation.
Question No 79: According to ITP art. 14.2 and taking into consideration the Addendum No. 1 to the PQ EIB-GtP-MOB-1.2021-3.4-3 3.4-4 provided by the client on the 9th September 2026, we kindly request you to extend the deadline of the Prequalification phase with at least 2 weeks, 14 days, in order to be able to analyze all the updated documents and prepare and present all reference contracts that satisfy the qualification criteria in order to present a clear and comprehensive image of our company's experience in execution of major transport infrastructure construction projects.	Answer No 79: The Client has considered the entire process since the publication of the tender. This review includes the clarifications issued by the Client and the changes made through those clarifications. The tender requirements have not been made stricter, nor additional circumstances have arisen that would make the preparation of the Applications materially more difficult or conflict with the conditions of the tender. The Client therefore maintains its position that the deadline for submission of Applications shall remain unchanged, in accordance with Sub-Clause 14 [Deadline for Submission of Applications]. The deadline for submission of Applications is 12:00h Central European Time (CET) on 02 October 2026.
Question No 80: 3.3 Specific Experience - "Substantially completed" means that at least 80% of the contract value has been completed or that the Taking-Over Certificate (or equivalent contractual milestone) has been issued. We kindly ask the Client to confirm whether, in the absence of a Taking-Over Certificate (TOC), a Certificate of Good Performance or Reference Letter will be accepted as evidence of the specific experience.	Answer No 80: Please refer to answer no. 55 of Clarifications (no.2) to participation queries dated 08/09/2026. In addition to the IPC, the Client will accept Certificate of good performance or Reference letter as evidence of specific experience.
Question No 81: Considering the comprehensive nature of the Prequalification requirements and the extensive documentation required to demonstrate compliance with the eligibility and qualification criteria, we kindly request the Client to consider	Answer No 81: The Client has considered the entire process since the publication of the tender. This review includes the clarifications issued by the Client and the changes made through those clarifications. The tender requirements have not been made stricter, nor additional circumstances have arisen that would

extending the deadline for submission of the Prequalification Documents. In particular, the preparation and coordination of supporting documents, including relevant experience records, financial information, technical qualifications, and other documents required from the participating entities, require sufficient time to ensure that the submission is complete, accurate and fully compliant with the requirements of the Prequalification Documents. In view of the above, we kindly request the Client to grant an extension of the deadline for submission of the Prequalification Documents. An extension of the submission deadline would allow the Tenderers sufficient time to properly compile, review, verify and finalize all necessary documentation and submit a complete and compliant Prequalification submission.	make the preparation of the Applications materially more difficult or conflict with the conditions of the tender. The Client therefore maintains its position that the deadline for submission of Applications shall remain unchanged, in accordance with Sub-Clause 14 [Deadline for Submission of Applications]. The deadline for submission of Applications is 12:00h Central European Time (CET) on 02 October 2026.
---	---

END OF REVISION 003

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PERIOD FOR CLARIFICATION EXPIRED ON 11th September 2026. ANY QUERIES RECEIVED AFTER THE EXPIRY DATE WILL NOT BE ANSWERED.