CLARIFICATIONS TO THE RECEIVED INQUIRIES

Zagreb, February 05, 2026
Ref. No.: 7-26-1/4-2
Reference No. (as per Procurement Plan): HR-ISRBC-528169-GO-RFP
Subject: "GEF SAVA AND DRINA RIVER CORRIDORS INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM" - Development and operationalization of Sava GIS 2.0
- clarifications of RfP

With reference to the Article 7.1 (Instructions to Proposers) of the "Request for Proposals" ("RFP") which has been published on January 5, 2026 for contracting of the Supplier for providing the service: "Development and operationalization of Sava GIS 2.0", the International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC – „the Purchaser") received clarification requests based on RFP. The deadline for receiving of clarification requests expired on January 28, 2026. Below please find all received inquiries and given clarifications:

1. **Inquiry: Submission format**
   The Submission of Proposals section refers to the delivery of the proposal in sealed envelopes, including an original and copies.
   Could you please confirm whether proposals must be submitted as **printed hard copies only**, or whether **electronic submission** (in whole or in part) is also accepted?

Clarification: Proposals must be submitted as printed hard copies. Also, as defined in SECTION II - PROPOSAL DATA SHEET (PDS), part D - Submission and Opening of Proposals, The Proposer is also required to submit the copy of the Technical Proposal in digital form (i.e. PDF), as part of the sealed envelopes. Proposers shall not have the option of submitting their Proposals electronically.

2. **Inquiry: Local representative requirement (Section III, Clause 1.6)**
   Clause 1.6 refers to representation by an agent in the Purchaser's country for maintenance, technical support, training, and warranty obligations.
   Could you please clarify whether this local representative must be **based in Zagreb specifically**, or whether a representative based in a **nearby country** would be acceptable, provided they are able to meet the contractual service and response-time requirements.

Clarification: As defined in Section III, Clause 1.6, a Proposer not doing business within the Purchaser's country, the Proposer shall submit documentary evidence in its Proposal to establish to the Purchaser's satisfaction that it is or will be (if awarded the Contract) represented by an agent in that country who is equipped and able to carry out / manage the Proposer's maintenance, technical support, training, and warranty repair obligations specified in the Purchaser's Requirements. By this clause it means that an agent must be based in Croatia.

3. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 127: "Include a broad list of pre-built base maps - ESRI, OpenStreetMap, Google, option for custom internal/external basemap services; tiled spatial layers for fast rendering, server-side caching for async large dataset loading". In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the following: Does the Sava Commission for ESRI

and GOOGLE basic maps have secured access and rights for use? Google base maps and data are not free property — they are licensed by Google, subject to the terms and limitations of the Google Maps Platform Terms of Service. Will the Sava Commission bear the cost?

Clarification: Sava Commission already maintains an active ESRI organizational account with valid access rights to ESRI basemap services, which will be made available for the project if required. Also, existing Sava GIS platform already incorporates ESRI basemap services. With regard to other external commercial basemaps such as Google Maps, any basemap services subject to third-party usage restrictions, or additional costs shall be omitted.

4. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 127: "Adhere to a common GIS data exchange formats (e.g., OGC-compliant services: WMS, WFS, WCS, OGC APIs, FileGDB, GeoJSON, GML, Geopackage, KML, NetCDF, Shapefiles etc.) to facilitate data interoperability". In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the following: Can you specify what other spatial exchange formats should be supported besides those listed?

Clarification: Along with all the data formats already supported by the current platform, the formats listed are considered sufficient to meet the planned interoperability requirements of the system. If it finds useful, the Supplier can propose additional data exchange formats.

5. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 127: "Data integration from selected international and regional platforms through web services and APIs: satellite imagery, land use, vegetation, climate data, monitoring, inland waterway transport (IWT) data, etc". In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the following: With which specific international and regional platforms is integration via API planned and for which specific data? Can you define the international and regional platforms you are referring to and do you have access to the API?

Clarification: Identification of the data sources, i.e., key public (free) online domain data and data services available from global, regional, national, and other high-quality data sources, is a part of the assignment C. SERVICE SPECIFICATIONS, 2.1.1. Assessment of the current System and requirements for the Sava GIS 2.0.
It is expected that the task should mainly use WMS and WMS-T services, analyzing but not be limited to the following sources: Earth Map (earthmap.org), World Bank Water Data Portal (wbwaterdata.org),Copernicus Open Data Hub (dataspace.copernicus.eu), UN WATER (sdg6data.org/en), UN FAO AQUASTAT (fao.org/aquastat/), IPCC Climate Data (ipcc.ch/data/), EU TEN-T Waterway Network (webgate.ec.europa.eu/tentec-maps/web/public).

6. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 128 that:"Bulk thematic data export via exchange file format for designated modules (RBM, FRM, APC, SED); data export filtering by object classes, by attributes, custom advanced filtering; option of additional formats for general data export (Geopackage, (Geo)Parquet, FlatGeoBuf, XLSX and other relevant spatial and non-spatial formats)". In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the following: Can you define what other relevant spatial and non-spatial formats are meant here, apart from those already mentioned?

Clarification: Bulk thematic data export via exchange file format for designated modules (RBM, FRM, APC, SED) implies FileGDB format. Along with all the data formats already supported by the current platform in the context of general data export functionalities, the formats listed are considered sufficient to meet the planned interoperability requirements of the system. If it finds useful, the Supplier can propose additional data exchange formats.

7. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 128: "System wide feature and mapping services - OGC Web Service, OGC APIs, REST; real-time sync with external systems". In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the following: You state that real-time sync with external systems is required. Which systems specifically do you consider to require real-time sync?

Clarification: Real-time sync with external systems implies automatic CHH submodule data retrieval via WFS services for Slovenia and Croatia (already part of existing platform), on-demand data retrieval via WFS implemented only for RBM and FRM modules (already part of existing platform), scheduled retrieval of HIS real-time observation datasets from FTP servers (already part of existing platform) and other planned data synchronization requirements with external systems like retrieval of hydrological yearbook data through external services by integrating national competent authorities' HIS APIs, retrieval of NtS messages (via NtS APIs), data retrieval from national competent authorities' Automatic Identification Systems (AIS APIs) and data integration from selected international and regional platforms.

8. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 127: "Supports multi-language interface for Sava countries, dynamic language switching, full functional coverage across languages". In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the following: Will the Sava Commission be involved in the preparation and verification of translations?

Clarification: Sava Commission Secretariat and Permanent expert groups (PEGs) will be involved in the verification of translations.

9. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 129:"WFD-compliant data model implemented following the latest WFD Reporting Guidance and specific ISRBC requirements. Design of templates for data collection in line with the latest version of the WFD Reporting Guidance will be performed through ongoing activity: Technical Assistance in the preparation of the management plans for the Sava River Basin (HR-ISRBC- 505383-CS-QCBS)". In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the following: Will the ongoing activity: Technical Assistance in the Preparation of Management Plans for the Sava River Basin (HR-ISRBC-505383- CS-QCBS) define only templates for data collection or a complete model for RBM aligned with the WFD Directive? Is the requirement only to implement the physical database model?

Clarification: Ongoing activity "Technical Assistance in the Preparation of Management Plans for the Sava River Basin (HR-ISRBC-505383- CS-QCBS)" shall define complete templates for data collection for RBM, FRM and SED modules (on par with existing FileGDB templates). The obligation of the Supplier within "Development and operationalization of Sava GIS 2.0" study shall be to analyze, adapt and implement the defined templates mainly in the context of the requirements of the information system needed for full functionality of the new platform. The Supplier is also obliged to implement the physical database model.

10. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 129: "Enables economic and water demand tracking (using web forms), PoM tracking (web forms)". In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the following: Can you describe in more detail what is expected under Enables PoM tracking (web forms)?

Clarification: Economic and water demand and PoM (Program of Measures) tracking implies data delivery via web forms. Data in question represents alphanumerical data structured in line with the latest version of the Reporting Guidances, whose data structure shall be defined within "Technical Assistance in the Preparation of Management Plans for the Sava River Basin (HR-ISRBC-505383- CS-QCBS)" activity. The Supplier obligations imply web forms definitions and corresponding tools for diagrams and data reports.

11. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 131:"Sava River Waterway Real-time Vessel Tracking functionality shall enable:
    a) Data retrieval from national competent authorities Automatic Identification Systems (AIS API) Identification Systems (AIS APIs)
    b) Real-time vessel tracking visualization and information retrieval (vessel location visualization and data querying)".
    In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the following: Can you specify in detail which AIS systems and national competent authorities you are referring to?

Clarification: We are referring to the following national competent authorities:
  - *Ministry of the Sea, Transport and Infrastructure, Republic of Croatia*
  - *Directorate for Inland Waterways (Plovput), Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure, Republic of Serbia*

Inland AIS is a foundational, mandatory component of River Information Services (RIS) designed to enhance safety and efficiency in inland navigation:
  - *Croatia RIS - https://www.vodniputovi.hr/ris/*
  - *Serbia RIS - Plovput | Activities | River Information Services*

Inland AIS represents standardized procedure for the automatic exchange of nautical data between ships and between ships and shore installations:
  - *AIS transmits vessel name, ENI and MMSI number, GPS position, speed, course, and navigational status*
  - *Access to Automatic Identification Systems APIs shall be provided by the competent authorities*

12. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 135:"All sensitive data must be encrypted at rest (AES- 256 or equivalent) and all data transmissions must use HTTPS/TLS 1.3 or higher". In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the following: Apart from user data (GDPR PII) is there any other sensitive data in application data models which needs to be encrypted in DB?

Clarification: Data encryption in DB is limited to user data.

13. **Inquiry:** The Contracting Authority has stipulated in the ToR, page 136:"APIs must require authenticated access tokens, enforce authorization checks, implement rate limiting, and apply strict CORS policies". In relation to this requirement, could the Contracting

Authority please clarify the following: For API access (M2M) we see username and password authentication for OAuth token retrieval. In case we would also apply mTLS as additional clients would need to purchase official certificate from trusted CA in country. Does this seem as acceptable expenses for clients?

Clarification: Cyber Security Requirements define token-based authentication and authorization. Imposing mandatory client-side PKI or national CA certificate costs on API consumers is not intended and should not be implemented. We expect implementation of modern token-based API security without imposing any additional costs on clients.

14. **Inquiry:** Having carefully reviewed the RFP documentation, we note that the preparation of a fully compliant proposal requires the submission of a comprehensive technical solution, detailed compliance documentation, extensive qualification forms, and strict adherence to the World Bank Procurement Regulations and Standard Procurement Documents. Given the scope and technical complexity of the assignment, including system architecture design, data integration considerations, compliance matrix preparation, and coordination of key personnel and partners, we respectfully wish to inquire whether the Purchaser would consider a reasonable extension of the proposal submission deadline. Such an extension would allow interested Proposers to prepare higher-quality and fully responsive proposals, thereby enhancing effective competition and ensuring the best possible value for money, in line with the principles of fairness, transparency, and open competition promoted by the World Bank. We thank you in advance for considering this request.

Clarification: This issue will be resolved through Amendment No. 1 to RFP.

15. **Inquiry:** In Section III – Evaluation and Selection Criteria, bullet 1.3.1. lists the required documentation for meeting the Historical Financial Performance requirement as *Form FIN – 1.3.1. with attachments*. We kindly ask the Purchaser to clarify which documents will be accepted as valid attachments proving the Proposer's compliance with said requirements (e.g. balance sheets).

Clarification: Balance Sheet will be sufficient.

16. **Inquiry:** In Section II – Proposal Data Sheet (PDS), bullet 10.1 outlines:
    The language of the Proposal is: English
    All correspondence exchange shall be in English language.
    Does this condition apply to the additional documents – e.g. copies of financial statements (balance sheets, income statements…) – that the Proposers are tasked to provide as part of their Proposal?

Clarification: Copies of financial statements/additional documents can be in English or in official languages of the Sava Commission (Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian). If these documents are not in English or official Sava Commission languages, certified translations to English language will be required.

17. **Inquiry:** In Section VII – Purchaser's Requirements, listed in Technical Requirements, subsection B, bullet 1.3.2. Software Architecture Requirements states:
    No purchase of new software and services is envisaged.

Given this condition, is the Proposer obliged to deliver the Manufacturer's Authorization form found within the proposal forms? The proposal will pertain only to professional services, as any sale/resale of software by a 3rd party manufacturer is not foreseen by the Purchaser's Requirements.

Clarification: As defined in Section III, Clause 1.5, in the case of proprietary commercial software (i.e., excluding open source or "freeware" software) that the Proposer does not manufacture itself and for which the Proposer has or will establish an Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) relationship with the manufacture, the Proposer MUST provide Manufacture's Authorizations.

18. **Inquiry:** In Section VII – Purchaser's Requirements, listed in Technical Requirements, subsection B, bullet 1.3.2. Software Architecture Requirements states:
The external data services shall be at no cost.
We kindly ask the Purchaser to further specify which external data services are implied here?

Clarification: Any external services being integrated on the Sava GIS 2.0 platform, whether pre-built base maps, data integration from selected international and regional platforms through web services and APIs and other planned data synchronization requirements with external systems shall be at no cost.

19. **Inquiry:** In Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, one of the requirements for Form EXP 1.4.2. – Specific Experience is as follows:
The successfully completed similar contracts shall be documented by a copy of an Operational acceptance certificate (or equivalent documentation satisfactory to the Purchaser) issued by the purchaser(s).
Will the Purchaser accept the copies of standard acceptance documents (issued on the Proposer's template) that are signed by the representatives of the Proposer and the purchasers as valid? If so, do these documents also have to be provided with a certified translation?

Clarification: Certified translations to English language will be required only in case that Operational acceptance certificates issued by the previous Purchasers are not in English or in official languages of the Sava Commission (Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian).

20. **Inquiry:** If two members of a Joint Venture acting as the Proposer worked on the same project, are both of the JV members obliged to provide their own version of the Form EXP 1.4.2. – Specific Experience listing the same project?

Clarification: Yes, in this case each partner should provide its own version of the Form EXP 1.4.2.

21. **Inquiry:** In Section VII – Purchaser's Requirements, listed in Technical Requirements, subsection B, bullet 1.3.2. Software Architecture Requirements states:
Migration of data from the old system to the new one is the Supplier's obligation.
With a further explanation given in a footnote:
The existing Sava GIS is deployed on two physical, rack-mounted servers, an application server and a database server, both located at the ISRBC premises. The operating system (OS) is Microsoft Windows Server 2012 R2 Standard.

We kindly ask the Purchaser to further specify the foreseen scope and requirements of data migration.

Clarification: Migration of data from the old system to the new one implies the migration of all current user data as well as thematic modules data (HIS, RBM, FRM, NAV, APC) currently existing on the Sava GIS platform. Since the new platform will have updated data model and functionalities, it is the Supplier's responsibility to define ETL logic and procedures to satisfy the requirements of the new platform.

22. **Inquiry:** In Section VII – Purchaser's Requirements, listed in Technical Requirements, subsection F, bullet 5.1. Warranty states:
The offer for warranty services must include professional engagement of IT professionals for a period of 30 man-days during the warranty period (12 months). A detailed description will be provided in the SLA document outlining warranty and support terms.
Is the said SLA document outlining warranty and support terms a part of the tender documentation, and if so, where can the interested parties access it?

Clarification: SLA document is not part of the tender documentation.

23. **Inquiry:** In Section VII – Purchaser's Requirements, listed in Technical Requirements, subsection B, bullet 1.4. Functional Requirements of the Sava GIS 2.0 mention *planned general platform improvements* several times, in reference to the service that is being procured. We kindly ask the Purchaser to clarify if *improvements* imply only the upgrade of the existing application or if they also encompass the possibility of replacing the existing modules with new ones that are compliant with the Purchaser's requirements.

Clarification: Improvements imply the development and operationalization of Sava GIS 2.0 as a new and independent platform compliant with the Purchaser's requirements. As defined in Section VII - Requirements Of The Information System, Technical Requirements, subsection B, bullet 1.3.2., the technical solution and system design must be based on up-to-date technologies. The existing Sava GIS platform only serves as the starting point for development of the new platform in terms of functionalities developed and implemented system logic.

24. **Inquiry:** According to the RFP, we are required to submit Auditor's Reports. These reports are very extensive documents which, in Croatia, are prepared in the Croatian language. Croatian is, among other things, one of the official languages of the ISRBC, and these reports are signed as such by the auditing firms. Given that these documents consist of several hundred pages and that their certified translation would require a significant amount of time, we kindly ask whether these specific documents must be translated into English by a certified translator, or whether an exception could be made for these particular documents, allowing them to be submitted in Croatian.

Clarification: As we clarified above (inquiries 16 and 19), documents issued in Croatian language should not be translated into English language.

Sincerely yours,

<div align="right">

Procurement Specialist

Igor Guja

</div>