

in a sealed cover to prevent midway alterations. It would have been more transparent if these distributions were indicated in the RFP itself.

5.2 In the judgement of subjectivity there are clear indications that a liberal attitude has been shown to bidder 'E' which has enabled them to get marks just above 80% and thus get qualified. If a more logical and rational approach had been followed our assessment is, they would score only 75.0 for Mumbai and 74.6 for Delhi under criterion-4.1.1. Under criterion-4.1.2 also we feel they would score less than 80%. Thus they are clearly ineligible for pre-qualification.

5.3 In our view, rectifying the flaws in assigning marks would neither have changed the status of 'B' materially nor would have disqualified them. At the same time none of the other bidders would have come up to the level of scoring more than 80%. Therefore, a fresh exercise to assign marks to bidders 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D' & 'F' is not considered necessary.

6. Way forward:

6.1 There is no need to take up the technical evaluation afresh nor to scrap the whole tender process and invite fresh bids. Tenderer 'B' should be declared as the only bidder technically qualified and their financial bids should be opened for both IGI Airport and Mumbai Airport. Based on the best advantage to the country, one of the two Airports can then be considered for assigning to them.

6.2 For the other Airport, again following the process of re-bidding to select another consortium would involve considerable delays. As the re-structuring and modernization of the second Airport cannot brook any further delay, we would recommend that the airport which is not assigned to bidder 'B' should be taken up for modernization and improvement through an agency of a Special Purpose Vehicle specially set up for this purpose on the lines of Delhi Metro Rail Corporation. However, in this SPV with the public-private partnership route, Government's participation including that of Airport Authority of India