

Bidder score (maximum score) – 2.1 (2.8)		that Mexico though being a OECD country is still a developing country has been removed from the factor of assessment.  The IMG members did not agree with the statement and stated that the experience in the countries mentioned by the Consultants do not relate to the criteria under consideration.
6.4.1 – Staged development plan that has no significant impact on day to day airfield operations  Bidder score (maximum score) – 8.9 (8.9)	The comment raised by one of the IMG members was that “The Development Plan requires early demolition of T2 which is not feasible in his opinion and hence the scoring is higher than justifiable ”	The Consultants have now furnished a written explanation which is at Annexure A.  The explanation given by the Consultants during the IMG meetings were not agreed to by the Technical members of the IMG.

**Bidder “B”**

Evaluation Criteria/ Factor	IMG Query	Evaluation Committee’s response
1.1.4 – The level of service quality performance achieved at major airports managed by the Airport Operator and trends over the last 5 years  Bidder score (maximum score) – 1.7 (2.8)	A query was raised by one of the IMG members that while the assessment stated that limited information was provided on the level of service quality performance achieved, the scoring given was 3. Is this justifiable?	The Consultants noted that the assessment was based on evidence and information provided on service quality performance achieved and list of industry awards. However, since the airport did not provide information on a rating system in place it led to the discount. They further stated that the reference to the limited information should be read in the context of information pertaining to the rating system. There was sufficient information to form an assessment about the quality of service.  This was not accepted by the IMG member.
1.1.5 – Experience if any, with operating a multi airport system	AS&FA, MCA, the representative of the Planning Commission and Member (Fin.), AAJ sought a	CONSULTANTS clarified that Bidder B operates major airport and a smaller airport at Hahn which is operated as a part of a multi-airport system, whereas in the case of Bidder C, the airport operated at Augsburg is a much smaller airport

7/22