

<p>Bidder B score (maximum score) – 1.7 (2.8)</p> <p>Bidder C score (maximum score) – 0.6 (2.8)</p>	<p>clarification as to why does Bidder B get a higher scoring in comparison to Bidder C, given that both of them do not have significant experience of operating multi-airport system?</p>	<p>and is not operated as a multi-airport system.</p> <p>This was not agreed to by the IMG members since the criteria has not been applied properly.</p>
<p>1.2.2 – Experience with major property development</p> <p>Bidder score (maximum score) – 1.4 (1.6)</p>	<p>A clarification was sought by Member (Fin.), AAI and the representative of the Planning Commission regarding the entity of bidder B has the property development experience?</p>	<p>GEL has undertaken property development work in respect to a number of its infrastructure projects. Other GMR group entities are involved in property development but these are not Evaluated Entities and have not been assessed.</p> <p>The IMG members did not agree with the explanation given and stated that there is no relevant experience of this Bidder for this criterion.</p>
<p>4.2.12 – Number and scale of airport and / or other development projects undertaken/ completed in India within the previous 10 years</p> <p>Bidder B score (maximum score) – 2.2 (2.5)</p> <p>Bidder C score (maximum score) – 2.2 (2.5)</p>	<p>Chairman, Member (Fin.), AAI sought clarification as to whether the experience of Hyderabad airport project can be taken given that it is not completed?</p> <p>Further, it was queried as to why Bidder C's scoring should not be higher than that of B?</p>	<p>The Consultants clarified that it is a relevant experience as this project is being undertaken and progress made with regard to the planning work.</p> <p>On the second point, Consultants clarified that both Bidder B and E have similar levels of Indian development experience and as such have been rated at the same level.</p> <p>This was not agreed to by the member of the IMG.</p>
<p>6.1- Long term vision</p> <p>Bidder score (maximum score) – 3.6 (8.9)</p>	<p>Despite the markings being lower for Bidder B, how does it qualify?</p>	<p>The Consultants pointed out that the Bidder B did get a lower scorings on all the factors where its plan was sub-optimal, however it must be borne in mind that the aggregate scoring is a function of a number of factors and hence a conclusion of pre-qualification based on a single factor is not justifiable. The strong scores achieved on certain factors outweigh the weaknesses of the offer in certain areas and hence the aggregate score for this global evaluation criteria determines the pre-qualification.</p>

8/22