

Condition	GMR-Fraport	Reliance-MICA	DS-FMG	Mac-ADP	Remarks
	commercial experience in the group, though the specific Indian experience is relatively low. Assess overall experience at 4.5 and Indian experience at 2, giving a weightage average of 3.25	experience.	experience, all of it in India.	medium assessment overall of 3, gives an overall assessment of 1.5	DS has no international experience thus 4. Is it on account of relevance of experience that marks differ. Need to clarify this issue.
1.2.2 1.2.3 Experience with major property development of direct relevance to airports and experience with major infrastructure developments in order to demonstrate relevant experience with implementing major projects akin to an airport development.	<b>Score: 5</b> <b>Assessment:</b> Experience assessed as high and directly relevant to the transaction.	<b>Score: 3</b> <b>Assessment:</b> Assessed as having medium property development/ infrastructure experience of relevance to airport development but with a discount for no non Indian experience and no direct airport experience.	<b>Score: 4.5</b> <b>Assessment:</b> Experience is assessed as high, with a modest discount to reflect a lower scale and less direct relevance of experience to those assessed at 5.	<b>Score: 2</b> <b>Assessment:</b> There is only non-Indian experience and the Macquarie Bank experience is one the financial and project appraisal side rather than on the technical and implementation side. Assessed as low to medium.	The 2 criterion has been clubbed in variance to the RFP condition. Need to confirm if this is permissible. This issue was also raised by GRC and is mentioned in their report. The 2 criteria should be segregated and scores under each head calculated. REL is primarily been involved in power distribution and to a limited extent in power generation. This experience does not appear to be relevant to airport. On the other hand DS has substantial experience including overseas infrastructure projects and