

Rīga

21.09.2020

Our Ref: 1.13p/LV-352

Electronic Procurement System

***Answers to questions from interested suppliers
in the open competition "Rail Baltica Transport demand
model development and analysis",
identification number RBR 2020/13***

RB Rail AS presents following answers to the questions received from the interested supplier until 21 September 2020:

Nr.	Question	Answer
1.	<p>To help us understand the level of detail and granularity required in the forecasts, please provide some examples of what commercial questions the demand forecast would be aiming to support. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The on-board offering and class structure for passenger services - The choice of rolling stock / carriage configuration - Timetabling of services (e.g., how many services required per hour at different times of day) for passenger and freight services - Ticket prices, including peak / off-peak pricing - Infrastructure access charges for freight services - Capacity requirements for car parking and other forms of station access and egress - Capacity requirements for infrastructure surrounding the stations 	<p>With respect to the list of examples made by the interested supplier, Procurement commission indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - we expect the demand forecasts to support decisions related to timetabling of services for passenger and freight services, capacity requirements for car parking and other forms of station access and egress, capacity requirements for infrastructure surrounding the stations; - we expect ticket prices and access charges to be included in the considerations regarding the modelling of the mode choice; - supporting decisions related to the choice of rolling stock / carriage configuration and on-board offering and class structure for passenger services would be a plus, but it is not strictly necessary.
2.	<p>The use of RailML usage seems operational, rather than for use in a demand forecasting context. How do Rail Baltica envisage the interface between the demand forecast model and output</p>	<p>Procurement commission indicates that the demand forecasts will possibly be used to feed operational scenario analyses run with software (e.g. Railsys) that use RailML data format.</p>

	in RailML format in the context of demand forecasting for this project?	
3.	<p>In the requirements for the lead expert in the field of transport demand modelling (8.4.6.1), the criterion related to the TSI performance parameters is not very clear to us. “(a) In the past 10 (ten) years (2010 2019) until the date of submission of the Proposal has experience in at least 1 (one) transport demand model analysis of a single or dual-use (passenger and freight) railway infrastructure compliant to TSI performance parameters for passenger and freight traffic according to P1, P2, P1-F1 or P2-F1 and the expert responsibilities within this project included at least demand modelling and forecasts using a quantitative modelling software”</p> <p>1. TSI performance parameters are generally assessed by a rail network modeler, not a transport demand modeler. As such, is it necessary for the rail project of the Lead Transport modeler to be compliant to the TSI performance parameters listed?</p> <p>2. Also, would it be sufficient that the project is compliant only with one of the parameters listed?</p> <p>3. In general, could you please clarify that criterion (also for the other expert positions that it is asked for) in more detail by referring to its significance level in the evaluation?</p>	<p>Procurement commission indicates that Section 8.4.6.1 of the Regulations contains requirements for Project manager. Section 8.4.6.2 stipulates the requirements for Lead expert in the field of transport demand modeling (hereinafter – Lead expert). As the question contains quote from Section 8.4.6.2 (c) of the Regulations, Procurement commission assumes that interested supplier has indicated an inaccurate reference to the relevant Section of the Regulations and provides following answers regarding the experience of the Lead expert in the field of transport demand modeling (Section 8.4.6.2 (c) of the Regulations):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To meet the requirement stipulated in the Section 8.4.6.2. (c) of the Regulations transport demand model analysis made by proposed Lead expert must be performed on railway infrastructure that is compliant to TSI performance parameters for passenger and freight traffic according to P1, P2, P1-F1 or P2-F1. Still, that does not mean that Lead experts responsibilities within this project should include assessment of TSI performance parameters. Additionally, Procurement commission indicates that TSI certification for specific railway infrastructure is not mandatory (please see the footnote No 8 of the Regulations). 2) Yes, railway infrastructure analyzed by Lead expert should be compliant to at least one of the indicated TSI performance parameters: P1 or P2, or P1-F1, or P2-F1. 3) In order for the Tenderer's proposal to be considered as compliant, it shall meet all requirements stipulated in the Regulations (except Section 20 of the Regulations as in this Section procedure of the proposal evaluation is described. But in order to gain more points, Tenderer shall consider the requirements stipulated in Section 20 of the Regulations as well). If Tenderer itself or any of proposed experts will not meet requirements, e.g. proposed Lead expert's transport demand model analysis will not be performed on railway infrastructure that is compliant to TSI performance parameters indicated in the Section 8.4.6.2 (c) of the Regulations or his/her responsibilities

		within this project will not include demand modelling and forecasts using a quantitative modelling software, Tenderer's proposal will be rejected as not compliant to Regulations.
4.	Can you confirm that there is no Conflict of Interest between this Open Competition "Rail Baltica Transport demand model development and analysis" and the Shadow Operator Services Tender Process?	Procurement commission has already answered this question on 31 August 2020. Please see the answer provided here: https://www.eis.gov.lv/EKEIS/Supplier/Procurement/43507 .
5.	In case the answer of the previous question is affirmative, in order to prevent any eventual conflict of interest in performing the Services related to this contract and the Shadow Operator Services Tender; would it be enough that the contractor assures the application of specific measures to prevent those situations in collaboration with the client? (As for example assuring the independence of the teams assigned to the contracts with potential conflict). Please, confirm if our understanding is correct.	As Procurement commission has already indicated in the answer to received questions on 31 August 2020, considering the specifics of both subject-matters of the procurement procedures, <i>prima facie</i> , Procurement commission does not see a situation of conflict of interest in the described situation. However, the potential conflict of interest situations are assessed on a case-by-case basis in each procurement procedure separately. This means that the adequacy and sufficiency of the specific measures applied to prevent conflicts of interest are also assessed on a case-by-case basis. At this point, the Procurement commission cannot confirm or deny the suitability of a particular measure to prevent conflicts of interest.
6.	In order to deliver our best proposal, we would like to kindly ask for a time extension for the proposal submission of 15 days.	In determining the deadline for submission of proposals, the Procurement commission has taken into account the degree of complexity of the Procurement contract and the time required for the preparation of the proposal, as well as the minimum deadlines for submission of proposals specified by Public Procurement Law of the Republic of Latvia (hereinafter – PPL). As the deadline for submission of proposals was set reasonable and moreover - longer than required by PPL and as the interested supplier did not include a justification for the request for extension of the deadline for submission of proposals, the Procurement commission has decided to reject the request for extension.

Sincerely,

Procurement commission chairperson

A. Benfelde