COUNCIL FOR DEVELOPMENT AND RECONSTRUCTION

BEIRUT - LEBANON

TELEFAX MESSAGE

FOR IMMEDIATE DELIVERY TO THE ADDRESSEE

To :	«List1095LEAPRubble_Mngmt_in_ Quarriess»		**FROM :**		COUNCIL FOR DEVELOPMENT AND RECONSTRUCTION BEIRUT - LEBANON
FAX NO.	: «FAX»		**FAX NOS.**	:	(961-1) 98 12 52 / 3
SUBJECT :	**Pre-proposal Conference minutes of meeting:** Request for Proposal: Technical Assistance for the Provision of Engineering and Consulting Services for Rubble Management in Quarry Sites.		**REF.**	:	1390/1
DATE	: 22/06/2026		**No. OF PAGES :**		**(11) INCLUDING COVER SHEET**

Dear Sir/Madam,

Reference is made to the RFP related to the "Consultancy Services for the Technical Assistance for the Provision of Engineering and Consulting Services for Rubble Management in Quarry Sites.".

Please find attached the related Pre-Proposal Conference minutes of meeting.

These minutes are considered an integral part of the bidding document.

Yours faithfully,

Council for Development and Reconstruction
President

Mohamad-Ali Kabbani

Council for Development and Reconstruction (CDR)

Request for Proposal: Consultancy Services for the Technical Assistance for the Provision of Engineering and Consulting Services for Rubble Management in Quarry Sites.

Pre-Proposal Conference

Minutes of Meeting
Beirut, June 8, 2026 – 12:00 a.m.

A. Invitation

An invitation to pre-proposal meeting was sent on May 23, 2026 to the following shortlisted consultants:

- ENVIROPLAN S.A	Greece
- JV: HYDEA S.P.A. and DAR AL HANDASAH NAZIH TALEB & PARTNERS	Italy Lebanon
- JV: LIBANCONSULT AGM and EPEM ENGINEERING S.A.	Lebanon Greece
- JV: BUREAU TECHNIQUE POUR LE DÉVELOPPEMENT (BTD) S.A.R.L. and LUXCONSULT (MAURITIUS) LIMITED	Lebanon Mauritius
- JV: HYDROTECH ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING AND GEOLOGY DPC and ECODIT LIBAN SARL	United States Lebanon

The meeting was scheduled for 12:00 p.m. at the CDR premises. Alternatively, shortlisted consultants were given the option to attend remotely via Google Meet using the link provided in the invitation.

B. Attendance

Employer – Council for Development and Reconstruction (CDR):

- Eng. Younes Hage (Project Director)
- Eng. Josette Khalil (Deputy Project Director)
- Eng. Simon Moawad (Senior Procurement Expert)
- Engineer Hani Oubari (Senior Infrastructure Engineer)

Ministry of Environment (MoE) Representative:

- Dr. Carla Khater, Advisor to the Minister

Representatives of Invited Consultants:

Attended in Person:

1. JV: BUREAU TECHNIQUE POUR LE DÉVELOPPEMENT (BTD) S.A.R.L. and LUXCONSULT (MAURITIUS) LIMITED
   - Eng. Elie Koury (BTD) S.A.R.L.
2. JV: HYDROTECH ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING AND GEOLOGY DPC and ECODIT LIBAN SARL
   - Mrs. Nour Mucharafieh (ECODIT LIBAN SARL)
   - Ms. Dana Halawani (ECODIT LIBAN SARL)

Participated Remotely (via Google Meet):

1. ENVIROPLAN S.A
   - Eleni Palla
   - Maria Sartorou

2. JV: HYDEA S.P.A. and DAR AL HANDASAH NAZIH TALEB & PARTNERS
   - Mr. Dimitri Abbado (HYDEA S.P.A.)
   - Ms. Bahia Sweidan (DAR AL HANDASAH NAZIH TALEB & PARTNERS)

3. JV: LIBANCONSULT AGM and EPEM ENGINEERING S.A.
   - Mr. Izzat Alayli (LIBANCONSULT AGM)
   - Eng. Tommy Nasr (LIBANCONSULT AGM)

C. Discussions

The CDR representatives welcomed the attendees, and Mr. Hani Oubari proceeded to present the queries raised by the shortlisted consultants, which had been submitted to CDR in advance via email, as follows:

Question 1: We kindly request a 2-week time extension if possible because I am afraid with all the public holidays that took place in May, we will not be able to submit our proposal by June 11. We would appreciate extension of the deadline to the end of June. (Similar requests from several Consultants asking for an extension of time for submission of offers.)
CDR Response: this request will be submitted to the CDR Board for consideration, and that a separate official response will be communicated accordingly.

Question 2: In order to level up the competition and ensure consistency and comparability across financial proposals, we kindly request that the Client defines provisional sums for the topographical, geotechnical and hydrogeological surveys, to be applied uniformly by all consultants in their financial proposals.

CDR Response: Consultants shall determine the scope, methodology, and extent of all topographical, geotechnical, hydrogeological, environmental, and other investigations required to support site assessment, detailed design, environmental evaluation, and rehabilitation planning. The nature and extent of such investigations shall be commensurate with site conditions, the proposed facilities and infrastructure, the complexity of the engineering design, and the requirements of the relevant technical disciplines.

For the selected quarry rehabilitation sites, consultants shall undertake all investigations deemed necessary to support site selection, capacity assessment, rehabilitation design, drainage management, stability analyses, environmental assessment, and any other project requirements.

For the temporary MRF facilities, investigations shall be limited to the extent necessary to assess site suitability and support the proposed operational and environmental management arrangements. Given the temporary nature of these facilities, comprehensive geotechnical and hydrogeological investigations comparable to those required for the quarry rehabilitation sites are not anticipated unless justified by site-specific conditions, proposed infrastructure requirements, or regulatory obligations.

All costs associated with such investigations shall be deemed included in the corresponding unit rates and financial proposal submitted by the Consultant.

Question 3: Clause 11.1 of the Data Sheet states that the participation of Sub-consultants, Key Experts and Non-Key Experts in more than one proposal is not permissible. Given the complexity and highly specialized nature of this assignment, the pool of qualified experts in certain fields is limited. We respectfully request that the Client consider relaxing this restriction in order to ensure the quality and competitiveness of all submissions.
CDR Response: CDR representatives clarified that experts are considered external experts to the consulting firms. Accordingly, such experts may be included in more than one proposal, as they are treated as external resources.

Question 4: Clause 21.1 of the Data Sheet states:
"The firm's or JV partners' experience, in the field of the assignment based on the information provided including details of experience of similar assignments during the past 10 years, starting January 1, 2015, as follows:
a. Minimum two completed rubble management detailed design projects covering the following four (4) categories disciplines: 1) ESIA Studies for material recovery facilities (MRF). 2) Detailed design and tender document for the material recovery facility (MRF). 3) Detailed Design and tender document for the rubble processed and crushed into different size aggregates and sanitary landfills (SLF). 4) Preparation of Restoration Plans (RP), with total contract assignment value of at least USD 300,000.

b. Minimum one completed supervision project of similar Construction MRFs, preferably in the field of sanitary Landfills and restoration of quarry sites, with total contract assignment value of at least USD 800,000."
Regarding point a:

Our understanding is that the requirement for a minimum of two reference assignments is not a pass/fail criterion. Rather, the submitted assignments may collectively demonstrate experience across the four categories and their respective disciplines, with the technical score being allocated proportionally based on the extent of demonstrated coverage. Could you please confirm whether our understanding is correct?
Our understanding is that assignments involving either preliminary design or detailed design would be considered acceptable under point (a), with the technical score being allocated based on the relevance and extent of the demonstrated experience, rather than on a pass/fail basis. Could you please confirm whether our understanding is correct?
At the REOI stage, similar assignments were defined as: (i) preparation of ESIAs for large scale solid waste management infrastructure, (ii) design of solid waste management infrastructure such as sanitary landfills, MRFs, or C&D waste facilities, (iii) quarry rehabilitation - with direct rubble management experience considered an advantage only. Firms were shortlisted on this basis. Could CDR confirm that experience in these disciplines will continue to be recognized and scored at the RFP evaluation stage, and that the evaluation criteria have not been narrowed beyond what was communicated at REOI stage?

Regarding point b:

- Our understanding is that construction supervision assignments for MRFs and/or sanitary landfills and/or MBT would be accepted under point b. Can you please confirm? Can you also confirm whether supervision of rehabilitation of existing landfills would equally be considered acceptable?

CDR Response:

Regarding Point (a):

• The minimum experience requirements stated under Clause 21.1 constitute the basis upon which the Evaluation Committee will assess the Consultant's experience and capability to undertake the assignment. The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the RFP, including Clause 21 of Section 2 (Instructions to Consultants and Data Sheet).

• The Evaluation Committee will assess the relevance, adequacy, and extent of the submitted references against the requirements specified in the RFP, taking into consideration the Consultant's demonstrated experience across the various disciplines and components of the assignment.

• Experience in the preparation of ESIAs, design of solid waste management infrastructure, construction and demolition waste facilities, quarry rehabilitation, restoration planning, and related disciplines will be considered to the extent that it demonstrates compliance with the requirements set forth under Clause 21.1.

• References may collectively demonstrate the Consultant's experience across the different disciplines identified in Clause 21.1. The evaluation will consider the overall relevance and adequacy of the submitted experience in relation to the scope, complexity, and requirements of the assignment.

• As specified in the RFP, a Proposal may be rejected if it does not respond to important aspects of the RFP or fails to achieve the minimum technical score indicated in the Data Sheet.

Regarding Point (b):

Construction supervision assignments involving Material Recovery Facilities (MRFs) will be considered the most directly relevant experience under this criterion. Experience involving sanitary landfills, construction and demolition waste facilities, quarry rehabilitation projects, landfill rehabilitation or closure projects, MBT facilities, and other comparable waste management infrastructure may also be considered to the extent that such assignments demonstrate a scope, complexity, and level of engineering supervision comparable to the requirements of the present assignment.

The Evaluation Committee will assess the relevance and adequacy of the submitted references against the specific requirements of the assignment.

Question 5: The Terms of Reference state that the Resident Engineer must hold "a minimum of a B.Sc. degree in Civil Engineering / Environmental Engineering." Could you please confirm whether it would be acceptable for the proposed expert to hold a different degree than those specifically mentioned, provided that the expert demonstrates the required experience in the solid waste management field? For example, would a diploma in Architecture be considered

acceptable?

CDR Response:

The minimum qualification requirement for the Resident Engineer shall remain as specified in the Terms of Reference, namely a B.Sc. degree in Civil Engineering or Environmental Engineering. Accordingly, a diploma in Architecture would not be considered compliant with the minimum qualification requirements for this position.

Question 6: The ToR requires the Site Engineer (K-2) and Geotechnical Engineer (K-3) to have a minimum of 10 years of experience "in similar works", without further definition of what constitutes similar works in this context. Could CDR clarify what falls under "similar works" for these positions? Our understanding is that experience in sectors involving massive earthworks and ground engineering - such as:
Dams and hill lakes
Sanitary landfills
Large-scale earth embankment works
C&D waste facilities
...should be considered acceptable, given that the core technical skills (supervision of earthworks, materials, workmanship, geotechnical monitoring) are directly transferable to MRF and quarry rehabilitation construction supervision.
CDR Response: The term "similar works" refers to projects involving construction supervision and/or geotechnical engineering services for civil engineering works requiring significant earthworks, ground engineering, slope stabilization, site grading, geotechnical investigations, and related infrastructure works.

Accordingly, experience gained in projects such as dams and hill lakes, sanitary landfills, large-scale earth embankment works construction and demolition (C&D) waste facilities, quarry rehabilitation works, and other comparable civil engineering projects may be considered relevant, provided that the key responsibilities performed are substantially similar to those required under this assignment.

The evaluation of proposed experts will be based on the overall relevance of their qualifications, experience, and responsibilities in relation to the scope of services under the assignment, as detailed in the Request for Proposals.

Question 7: For a number of positions across the assignment, taking the Air Quality and Dust Control Specialist, who is required to have "a minimum of 7 years in air quality monitoring and management, particularly in dust mitigation and air quality compliance from transport, crushing and handling operations of rubble" as an example, the experience requirements appear to apply to both the design and construction supervision phases without further distinction. Could you please

clarify whether the stated experience requirements are intended to cover both phases jointly, or whether CDR will assess design-phase experience and supervision-phase experience separately?

CDR Response:

The stated experience requirements may be satisfied through relevant experience gained in design activities, construction supervision activities, or a combination of both. The Evaluation Committee will assess the overall relevance of the expert's experience against the requirements of the proposed position.

Question 8: The Terms of Reference require the Transport Engineer to "have a minimum of 7 years of experience in transportation management, including routing, distance optimization, and safety management". Could you please clarify whether:?

- a profile specializing in GIS-based road optimization would be considered acceptable for this position?
- an MBA, supported by a demonstrated focus or specialization in transportation management and relevant professional experience in the field, would be considered an acceptable equivalent qualification for this position?

CDR Response: A profile specializing in GIS-based road optimization or an MBA, supported by a demonstrated focus or specialization in transportation management and relevant professional experience in the field, would not be considered acceptable for this position.

Question 9: The Terms of Reference state that the Resident Engineer must have "a minimum of 10 years of experience as a Resident Engineer or equivalent capacity in the Solid Waste Management field." Could you please clarify what is meant by "equivalent capacity" in this context? For example, would a Project Manager who has managed the construction and/or operation of solid waste management facilities (such as sanitary landfills, material recovery facilities, or transfer stations) be considered as having equivalent capacity to a Resident Engineer?

CDR Response: The term "equivalent capacity" refers to senior positions involving responsibilities comparable to those of a Resident Engineer in the solid waste management sector. Accordingly, experience as a Project Manager or similar senior position responsible for the construction and/or operation of solid waste management facilities may be considered acceptable, subject to the Evaluation Committee's assessment of the relevance and scope of the experience presented.

Question 10: In Section 3 — Technical Proposal — Standard Forms, it is indicated that the maximum page limit for TECH-2 is 5 pages. However, it is also stated that the maximum page limits for TECH-2A and TECH-2B are 2 pages and 5 pages respectively, which appears to be inconsistent. We would kindly request your clarification and confirmation regarding the applicable maximum page limits. In addition, we would appreciate your consideration in increasing the page limit in order to allow consultants to adequately demonstrate their relevant experience.

CDR Response: The applicable page limits are as follows:

- TECH-2A: Maximum of 2 pages.
- TECH-2B: Maximum of 5 pages.

Total for TECH-2A & 2B: 7 pages for each Consultant in case of JV.

Question 11: Mrs. Nour Mucharrafieh representing JV: HYDROTECH ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING AND GEOLOGY DPC and ECODIT LIBAN SARL asked a question about the baseline related to requirement in the preparation of the ESIA, specifically for air pollution requirements in the Quarry/MRFs sites.

CDR Response: For the purposes of this assignment, air quality requirements shall focus primarily on baseline air quality characterization and the monitoring of dust and particulate matter associated with rubble handling, transport, crushing, stockpiling, and rehabilitation activities. Consultants shall establish the existing environmental conditions at sensitive receptors, undertake field measurements as required, and propose an appropriate monitoring program for the construction and operational phases.

The assessment is expected to rely principally on site-specific observations, field measurements, dust monitoring, and particulate matter monitoring. Detailed atmospheric dispersion modelling is not anticipated unless specifically justified by site conditions, the scale of the proposed facilities, the proximity of sensitive receptors, or regulatory requirements.

Question 12: Mrs. Nour Mucharrafieh, representing the JV of HYDROTECH Environmental Engineering and Geology DPC and ECODIT Liban SARL, sought clarification regarding the assessment of environmental impacts resulting from leachate percolation into soil and groundwater, including the estimation of the quantity and quality of potential leachate leakage and its potential effects on groundwater and receiving surface water bodies.

CDR Response: The assessment of water percolation, runoff, and potential leachate generation shall be differentiated by site type as follows:

1. Quarry Rehabilitation Area

The reject material used for quarry rehabilitation is expected to be predominantly inert. In this context, the generation of leachate in the classical sense is not applicable. Environmental management shall focus on stormwater runoff, rainwater percolation through the fill material, sediment control, and wash-water management to prevent fine particles and suspended solids from reaching soil and surface water bodies.

2. Confined Cells within the Quarry

Should hazardous or contaminated fractions be identified and confirmed during Phase 0 investigations, the Consultant shall evaluate appropriate management options, including the potential development of dedicated engineered containment cells within one of the selected quarry sites, subject to confirmation of technical, geotechnical, hydrogeological, environmental, and social suitability and approval by the relevant authorities. The ESIA shall in this case consider

78

- Identification and characterization of potentially contaminated fractions
- Estimation of leachate quantity and quality
- Assessment of potential impacts on groundwater and receiving surface water bodies
- Appropriate lining, capping, and leachate collection measures

3. MRF Sites

Incoming unsorted C&D waste may contain non-inert fractions. Rainwater contact with this material during operations may generate contaminated runoff. Given the temporary nature of the MRF sites, management measures shall be proportionate to the scale and duration of operations, and shall include surface drainage control and sediment management.

Question 13: Mr. Elie Khoury representing JV: BUREAU TECHNIQUE POUR LE DÉVELOPPEMENT (BTD) S.A.R.L. and LUXCONSULT (MAURITIUS) LIMITED asked whether there are any restrictions on the nationalities of the proposed key personnel.
CDR Response: No, there are no restrictions on the nationalities of the key personnel. Provided that they meet the qualification and experience requirements specified in the RFP.

Hazardous Material : At the conclusion of the meeting, Dr. Carla Khater, representing the Ministry of Environment (MoE), emphasized that the Consultant shall consider, as part of the Phase 0 investigations and subsequent design process, the potential need for dedicated engineered containment cells for hazardous or contaminated rubble should such materials be identified and confirmed during the characterization phase. In such a case, one of the three selected quarry rehabilitation sites shall be assessed for its suitability to accommodate such cells, taking into consideration geotechnical, hydrogeological, environmental, operational, and long-term monitoring requirements. The final decision to include such facilities shall be subject to confirmation of site suitability and the approval of the relevant ESIA and competent authorities.

Additional clarification 1: The project does not envisage the development of conventional sanitary landfills for construction and demolition waste. The primary objective of the quarry sites is the recovery, sorting, processing, beneficial reuse, and temporary storage of construction and demolition materials. Any placement of residual materials within quarry sites shall form part of an approved quarry rehabilitation and restoration design and shall not be considered disposal of municipal solid waste.

Additional clarification 2: The primary objective of the quarry sites is the recovery, sorting, processing, and beneficial reuse of construction and demolition materials. Recovered materials meeting the required specifications shall be stockpiled and managed for future reuse in reconstruction and infrastructure projects. Only non-recoverable residues and rejects from the

sorting and processing operations shall be used within the approved quarry rehabilitation plans, in accordance with applicable environmental and engineering requirements.

Environmental assessment requirements for the temporary MRF sites shall be determined in accordance with applicable World Bank Environmental and Social Framework requirements and national environmental regulations set by MOE. The level of assessment may range from updating existing environmental studies, to preparation of ESMP or to preparing full site-specific environmental instruments, as determined by the competent authorities.

Consultants may consider the use of mobile or modular sorting and crushing units where technically and economically justified. Permanent buildings or enclosed processing facilities are not mandatory unless deemed necessary by the proposed operational approach and site conditions. The proposed solutions shall demonstrate compliance with applicable environmental, occupational health and safety, and operational requirements.

Consultants shall assess storage requirements, stockpile management measures, and potential end-use opportunities for recovered materials. Consideration should be given to local market demand, reconstruction activities, transportation logistics, and mechanisms that could facilitate the beneficial reuse of recycled aggregates and recovered construction materials