

marginally. Therefore, we have not attempted to moderate the marks of the other bidders based on our observations of para 4.3 to 4.6.

4.9 While scrutinizing the marks for criteria 4.1.2 we have the following observations to make:-

The GETE have not studied the development plan of this bidder or any other bidder for that matter. We have also not discussed this with the GTA (Air Plan). Considering the type of deficiencies in the developmental plans pointed out by AAI, we feel the marking of bidder 'E' has been on a liberal side in regard to sub-criteria 6.1 to 6.5. This will also be evident if we compare the marks scored by bidder 'B' vis-à-vis marks scored by bidder 'E' in regard to Delhi Airport as brought out under:-

	Maximum score	Score of 'B'	Score of 'E'
Delhi	44.5	30.2	43.0

4.10 Admittedly bidder 'B' has better credentials for airport development and such vast difference in marks scored by bidder 'E' over bidder 'B' cannot be easily explained. We feel if a rational approach had been adopted, bidder 'E', who now gets qualified by 0.3 marks for Mumbai end by 1.1 marks for Delhi, would have been disqualified.

4.11 Since in any case in our view bidder 'E' gets disqualified on the basis of our assessment contained in Para-4.7 above, we are of the opinion that qualifying bidder 'E' technically is not correct.

5. Conclusions:

From what has been narrated above, we have come to the conclusion that there has been certain flaws in the technical evaluation process. The highlights of which are -

5.1 Assignment of marks to sub-factors was not done before the technical evaluation was commenced. These marks were neither approved by any competent authority nor kept