Państwowe Gospodarstwo Wodne Wody Polskie

CEB COUNCIL OF EUROPE DEVELOPMENT BANK BANQUE DE DEVELOPPEMENT DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

THE WORLD BANK IBRD • IDA | WORLD BANK GROUP

Wroclaw, October 14, 2026

Our sign: V.JRP.532.5.2026.KR.1108

According to distribution list

Regarding: P514927 Climate Resilience in Water Management Project – CRWMP II.1.1

Please find attached the **Minutes** of the meeting, held online on October 7, 2026, at 12:00 CEST in the form of a panel discussion and Q&A session via Microsoft Teams - as part of the **Early Market Engagement for an investment task of CRWMP II.1.1 Construct the Kamieniec Ząbkowicki multifunctional reservoir**.

Yours sincerely,
Jacek Drabiński
Director of the Regional Water Management Authority in Wrocław
/signed electronically/

Signature Not Verified
Dokument podpisany przez Jacek Drabiński
Data: 2026.10.14 16:17:19 CEST

Appendix:

1. Minutes of the meeting held as part of the Early Market Engagement (EME) procedure witch presentation

The case is being led by:
Karolina Radwan
tel. +48 (71) 347 94 10
e-mail: Karolina.radwan@wody.gov.pl

State Water Holding Polish Waters
Regional Water Management Authority in Wroclaw
34 Norwida Street, Wroclaw, 50-950, Poland
Project Implementation Unit
phone: +48 (71) 337 88 00 fax.: +48 (71) 328 50 48, e-mail: jrp.wroclaw@wody.gov.pl **www.gov.pl/wody-polskie**

Wrocław, October 7, 2026

MINUTES OF THE PANEL DISCUSSION HELD
as part of the Early Market Engagement (EME) procedure

Project: ***P514927– Climate Resilience in Water Management Project (CRWMP) – in preparation***

Employer: ***State Water Holding Polish Waters – Regional Water Management Authority in Wrocław***

Name of the task: ***CRWMP II.1.1 Construct the Kamieniec Ząbkowicki multifunctional reservoir***

1. Subject of the Meeting

With reference to the Request for Participation in Early Market Engagement (Early Market Engagement – EME), published on August 31, 2026, for the task: CRWMP II.1.1 Construct the Kamieniec Ząbkowicki multifunctional reservoir, as part of the continuation of the Early Market Engagement (EME) procedure, the Employer – State Water Holding Polish Waters – Regional Water Management Authority in Wrocław – on September 28, 2026, invited representatives of interested Applicants/Bidders (Contractors) to participate in an additional online meeting in the form of a panel discussion.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

The purpose of the Early Market Engagement procedure which included meeting held on October 7, 2026 -is to gather construction contractors' market feedback on the preliminary assumptions of the planned procurement procedure, including the systematization of information obtained from the questionnaires submitted by interested companies (by September 25, 2026).

The following topics were discussed during the panel discussion:
A. Procurement process and market interest
B. Requirements and eligibility criteria
C. Allocation of contractual risks
D. Conditions of the contract, financing and schedule

3. The following entities have submitted applications to participate in the meeting:

By the deadline of October 6, 2026, as specified in the invitation dated September 28, 2026, to participate in an additional online meeting in the form of a panel discussion, the following interested entities submitted their registration for the meeting:

4. Meeting Participants

The meeting was attended by, including representatives of the Employer - State Water Holding Polish Waters Regional Water Management Authority in Wroclaw, the Project Coordination Unit, the World Bank, the Consultant/Designer – Sweco Polska sp. z o.o./ "HYDROPROJEKT-WROCŁAW" sp. z o. o., as well as invited participants—representatives of eleven entities/potential applicants/bidders.

5. Course of the meeting

The meeting began on October 7, 2026, at 12:00 p.m. The meeting was opened and subsequently chaired in a bilingual format (Polish and English) by Head of the Project Implementation Unit at the Regional Water Management Authority in Wrocław – who first discussed the agenda and format of the meeting, as well as the options for asking questions verbally or via chat, and encouraged active participation in the discussion.

This was followed by a presentation that served as the basis for the discussion and covered the following topics:

- The Reservoir and Scope of the Contract
- Investment location
- EME's timetable
- Purpose and principles of the EME
- Questionnaires
- Four discussion blocks:
    A. Procurement process and market interest
    B. Requirements and eligibility criteria
    C. Allocation of contractual risks
    D. Conditions of the contract, financing and schedule

During Block A, participants raised the following questions and issues:

1. QUESTION: Is it possible to participate in the procurement as a consortium?

   RESPONSE: Of course, that is possible.

2. QUESTION: How much time does the Employer allow for submitting a bid?

   RESPONSE: At this stage, responses are being collected; the Employer is analyzing them and, after summarizing the responses, will decide how much time will be needed to prepare a bid. At this point, a representative of the World Bank, explained that according to World Bank guidelines, the minimum timeframe for preparing bids is 30 Business Days; however, for such large tenders, this period may be extended. Therefore, if feedback from the market indicates that more time is needed for such a complex project, this will be taken into consideration.

3. QUESTION: No one currently knows the content of the procurement documents being prepared—which will outline the scope and details of the bid — so it is difficult at this stage to determine the time required to prepare such a bid..

   RESPONSE: The 30-business-day deadline is the minimum; if necessary, it will be adjusted appropriately to the scale of the project.

During Block B, the following points were raised by meeting participants:

1. The EME questionnaire stipulates that bidders must demonstrate experience in executing projects valued at USD 464 million. This requirement disqualifies the majority of Polish companies. Consequently, one of a potential applicant/bidder has proposed allowing the combined value of several completed projects to count towards meeting the experience requirement.
2. Another participant in the discussion proposed allowing the aggregation of up to three contracts to demonstrate the completion of investments with a total value of at least USD 464 million.
3. A meeting participant representing the Employer asked the other participants for their opinion regarding the appropriateness of the evaluation criteria weightings and the division of requirements between the bidder and the subcontractors indicated in the bid. No opinions or proposals were raised in this regard.
4. A representative of the World Bank spoke again, explaining that the bid evaluation methodology is standard for World Bank procurement procedure and will be described in the Procurement Documents, with compliance with the conditions for participation in the procedure assessed on a pass/fail basis; she also noted that non-price criteria (technical evaluation) will apply. For a high-value, high-risk project, the technical evaluation will account for at least 50% of the total score and may reach even up to 80%.

As part of Block C, the following points were raised by meeting participants during the discussion:

1. QUESTION: Referring to the opinions on risks received via the completed questionnaires, the meeting participant representing the Employer asked the other participants to present their views on the tentatively proposed risk allocation—specifically:
   Is the risk allocation based on FIDIC conditions acceptable? Which elements of the proposed risk allocations will be of significant or critical importance to Contractors regarding their participation in the procurement procedure?

   RESPONSE 1: A representative of one of the potential applicants/bidders indicated that the FIDIC 2017 Red Book contract conditions are generally acceptable; however, at the current stage (due to the fact that the Procurement Documents are not yet available), it is not possible to comment on any potential amendments to the General Conditions of Contract (Red Book) that the Employer might introduce.

   RESPONSE 2: The meeting participant representing the Employer explained that, at present, it is unable to state whether, or what, Special Conditions of Contract will be established for this contract.

   RESPONSE 3: A representative of the World Bank encouraged meeting participants to familiarize themselves with the applicable standard Conditions of Contract found in the World Bank's sample Procurement Documents (the versions currently in effect on the World Bank's website are dated September 2025). These are based on FIDIC Conditions but incorporate additional clauses required by the World Bank (e.g., regarding environmental and social safeguards, audits/inspections of the Contractor's records, etc.).

2. QUESTION: The meeting participant representing the Employer requested an indication of the expected limits regarding potential risks, the scope of liability, and the time-related or financial consequences that should be specified in the tender documentation and the contract.

   RESPONSE 1: One of the meeting participants stated that, at this stage of the procedure and without information regarding specific risks, they could not take a position on the matter. They asked whether the Employer had already assessed the risks, and if not, when—or indeed if—the Employer planned to provide information on the allocation of risks.

   RESPONSE 2: The meeting participant representing the Employer explained that risks have not yet been estimated at this stage; however, the question was intended to determine whether the risks already listed in the questionnaire are appropriate for the conditions under which similar projects are implemented.

As part of Block D, the following points were raised by meeting participants during the discussion:

1. QUESTION: A meeting participant representing the Employer asked whether the assumptions presented in Section D provide potential Contractors with sufficient information to prepare a bid.

   NO RESPONSE WAS FORTHCOMING TO THE QUESTION POSED IN THIS WAY.

2. QUESTION: A meeting participant representing the Employer asked whether there were any questions regarding payments, insurance, or security, and what required clarification at this stage.

   NO RESPONSE WAS FORTHCOMING TO THE QUESTION POSED IN THIS WAY.

A meeting participant representing the Employer once again invited the potential applicants/bidders to ask questions and provide suggestions to the Employer.

Since there were no further questions, a meeting participant representing the Employer thanked the participants for attending and sharing their opinions and reminded them that all activities under the EME are carried out by PIU/RZGW Wrocław; the consultant plays a supporting role and also provided the contact information for a representative of the PIU RZGW in Wrocław in case of any additional questions. The meeting concluded.

Appendix:

1. Presentation shown during the meeting