

6/10

23. The above approach seems to have thrown up somewhat surprising outcomes. The marks given by the Consultants compare with world rankings as follows:

Airport Operator	Marks Awarded	Skytrax World Rank 2005
Frankfurt	22.5	42
Mexico	19.7	119
Paris	19.7	95
Johannesburg	17.1	39
Munich	16.7	4
Istanbul Ataturk	6.7	46

24. The above indicates that Mexico airport (Rank 119) has scored 3 marks above Munich (Rank 4) and 2.6 marks above Johannesburg (Rank 39). Similarly, Mexico has scored 13 marks more than Istanbul (Rank 46). The above marking seems subjective and based on the judgement of AAI's consultants as compared to world rankings which are based on widely accepted industry standards. It may be noted that Mumbai ranked 120 in 2004. (There are two other ratings viz. AETRA and JD Power but their results are not readily available.)

25. Another example of arbitrary evaluation relates to "The performance of commercial operations at major airports managed by the Airport Operator, covering retail, property and other commercial operations, focusing on airports where non-aeronautical revenue is 40% or more of total revenue". The words to be noted here are "40% or more" which implies that 40% is the cut-off level for giving weightage/ marks for this factor. Though Mexico's non-aeronautical revenue is only 37%, yet the consultants have awarded 75% marks to Mexico on this account.

26. Yet another example of arbitrary evaluation relates to the factor "Experience in operating and developing airports in non-OECD countries and a track record in improved performance". The consultants have awarded 80% marks to Mexico airport even though Mexico is a OECD country.

Arbitrary Treatment of Property and Infrastructure Experience

27. The Consultants have clubbed "1.2.2 Experience with major property development" and "1.2.3 Experience with major infrastructure development". At no other place have the Consultants clubbed two factors into one. Such clubbing