Response to Queries on "Selection Of Independent Engineer for Monitoring the Concession Agreement in Respect of Operations, Management and Development of Alluri Sitaramaraju International Airport at Bhogapuram, Vizianagaram District, Andhra Pradesh"

RFP Notice No. 04/APADCL/IE/Bhogapuram/2026-27, dated 02.11.2026

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
1	**Clause 2.4.4(A); Pg: 18/170** Technical Capacity: The Applicant shall have, over the past 10 (Ten) years preceding the PDD, undertaken a minimum of 2 (two) Eligible Assignments. Out of the minimum of two Eligible Assignments, at least one Eligible Assignment shall be a Core Sector Airport Assignment as specified in Clause 3.1.3.	The mandatory requirement of a Core Sector Airport Assignment restricts participation to a very limited number of firms. Firms with strong Independent Engineer / PMC / Authority's Engineer credentials in other large transport and building infrastructure sectors can equally discharge the scope of this Consultancy. We kindly request you to consider deleting the mandatory Core Sector Airport Assignment requirement and allowing the minimum of 2 (two) Eligible Assignments to be met through Core Sector Airport Assignments and/or Non-Core Assignments. Alternatively, we request you to kindly consider allowing the airport-specific experience to be demonstrated through the proposed Key Personnel (Team Leader and Airport Operations Expert) who have worked on Core Sector Airport Assignments.	**RFP Condition Prevails.**
2	**Clause 2.1.4(e) Pg: 12/170** The Lead Member shall independently have completed or substantially performed at least 1 (one) Core Sector Airport Assignment meeting the requirements of Clause 3.1.3.	We request you to kindly consider allowing the Core Sector Airport Assignment requirement (if retained) to be satisfied by any Member of the Consortium, and not only by the Lead Member, consistent with Clause 2.1.4(f) which allows the remaining Technical Capacity to be satisfied collectively by the Consortium Members. If the request at Sr. No. 1 is accepted, we request the client to kindly delete this sub-clause.	**RFP Condition Prevails.**
3	**Clause 3.2.3 Pg: 46/170** Non-Core Sector work: Any other infrastructure projects comprising Commercial/ institutional buildings/retail/offices/hotels/	The listed non-core categories are narrow and do not recognise comparable, technically more complex transport infrastructure assignments involving the same Independent Engineer / PMC functions (design review, construction supervision, quality assurance, contract management, testing and commissioning).	**Refer to Corrigendum 9**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	Logistic Park/ Hospital/Residential township undertaken by the Applicant shall be considered.	We kindly request you to consider including Metro Rail, Railway, & all Infrastructure projects within the Non-Core Sector work, and to amend the clause accordingly.	
4	**Clause 3.2.3.1 Pg: 46/170** Provided that the estimated capital cost of the project exceeds Rs.2300 crores (Rupees Two thousand three hundred crores only) completed in last 10 years prior to Bid Due Date. For conversion purpose the foreign exchange rates as on Bid Due Date shall be applicable.	We kindly request you to consider reducing the threshold to Rs. [500] crore per project, or alternatively allowing the threshold to be met by the cumulative capital cost of eligible projects.	**RFP Condition Prevails.**
5	**Clause 3.2 (Preamble); Clause 3.2.3.2 to 3.2.3.4** Provided that the construction of the Eligible Assignment has been at least 90% completed. In respect of executed works/assignments, if completion certificates from client is not available, the bidder should enclose a certificate, for the work/assignment, duly certified by a statutory auditor, indicating the details as specified above.	We request you to kindly confirm that the following shall be accepted as Eligible Assignments for Non-Core Sector projects: (a) Project Management Consultancy, Independent Engineer, Authority's Engineer, Construction Supervision / Engineer-in-Charge, Technical Audit and Quality Assurance services. (b) assignments executed as a Member of a JV / Consortium or as a sub-consultant, with credit in proportion to the Applicant's share, supported by the client certificate or work order; and (c) ongoing assignments where the project is at least 90% complete as on the Proposal Due Date.	**RFP Condition Prevails.**
6	**Clause 1.6.18 and Clause 3.2.3.1 Pg: 8/170, 46/170** Clause 1.6.18: Currency conversion rate and payment For the purposes of technical evaluation of Applicants [Rs. 72 (Rupees Seventy two)] per US$ shall be considered as the applicable currency conversion rate.	The two clauses prescribe different conversion bases for foreign currency project costs. We request you to kindly clarify which conversion rate and date shall apply for converting project costs and professional fees of foreign assignments.	**Refer to 02 of the Corrigendum below.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	In case of any other currency, the same shall first be converted to US$ as on the date 60 (sixty) days prior to the PDD, and the amount so derived in US$ shall be converted into INR at the aforesaid rate. The conversion rate of such currencies shall be the daily representative exchange rates published by the International Monetary Fund for the relevant date. Clause 3.2.3.1: Provided that the estimated capital cost of the project exceeds Rs.2300 crores (Rupees Two thousand three hundred crores only) completed in last 10 years prior to Bid Due Date. For conversion purpose the foreign exchange rates as on Bid Due Date shall be applicable		
7	**Clause 2.4.4(B) Pg: 18/170** Financial Capacity: The Applicant shall have received a minimum Income of Rs.23.03 (Twenty-Three crore Three Lakhs) per annum from professional fees during each of the 3 (three) financial years in the previous 5 years preceding the Proposal Due Date.	We request you to kindly clarify that the requirement is Rs. 23.03 crore per annum, whether it is in last 3 Years or in last 5 years.	Clause 2.4.4(B) and the Financial Capacity may be read as below: Financial Capacity: The Applicant shall have received a minimum Income of Rs.23.03 (Twenty-Three crore Three Lakhs) per annum from professional fees during any 3 years out of the last 5 financial years preceding the Proposal Due Date.
8	**Clause 1.7 Schedule of Selection Process S. No.6 Pg: 9/170** End date of Online submission of Bids	We kindly request you to extend the submission date for three weeks from the date of release of pre bid query.	**Refer to 03 of the Corrigendum below.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	envelopes I & II on ape-procurement portal 18.11.2026 at 03.30 PM		
9	**General Condition** With reference to the subject tender, the start date for submission of pre-bid queries is mentioned as 04.11.2026, and the last date for submission of queries through email is mentioned as 16.11.2026 at 02:00 PM. However, no details regarding the pre-bid meeting have been provided in the tender document.	We kindly request you to arrange a pre-bid meeting to provide an opportunity for bidders to discuss their queries and seek necessary clarifications regarding the tender.	**RFP condition prevails.** Clause 1.8.1 and Section 5 expressly provide that there is no Pre-bid meeting. Queries shall be submitted by email and the replies published on the APADCL website.
10	**2. Instruction to Applicants** **A. General 2.1 Scope of Proposal 2.1.4 Eligibility of Consortium S. No. d Pg: 12/170** The Lead Member shall independently satisfy at least 50% (fifty per cent) of the Financial Capacity requirement specified in Clause 2.2.2(B).	We kindly request you to consider deleting this sub-clause and allowing the Financial Capacity criteria to be satisfied collectively by the Consortium Member.	**RFP condition prevails.**
11	**2. Instruction to Applicants** **A. General 2.1 Scope of Proposal 2.1.4 Eligibility of Consortium S. No. e Pg: 12/170** The Lead Member shall independently have completed or substantially performed at least 1 (one) Core Sector Airport Assignment meeting the requirements of Clause 3.1.3	We kindly request you to consider these criteria to be satisfied collectively by the Consortium Members..	**RFP condition prevails.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
12	**2. Instruction to Applicants** **A. General 2.1 Scope of Proposal 2.1.4 Eligibility of Consortium S. No. h Pg. 13/170** Experience of an Associate, parent company, subsidiary, affiliate or group company shall not be considered unless such entity is itself a Member of the Consortium, except where expressly permitted under this RFP	We request you to kindly consider the experience credential and turnover credentials of sister/group/affiliated companies for eligibility assessment, technical evaluation, financial qualification and scoring purpose without bringing the entity itself a member of the consortium.	**RFP condition prevails.**
13	**2.3.1 – Deployment Conditions Pg. 17/170** Seven other experts (except Team Leader and Airport Operations Expert) deployed as per approved work programme; 138 man-months in aggregate.	Please confirm that remaining seven Key Personnel may be deployed through planned intermittent site visits and off-site technical reviews/meetings, and that approved off-site working days will count toward their stipulated man-months.	Clause 2.3.1 Deployment Conditions may be read as below: Except for the Team Leader and Airport Operations Expert, the remaining seven Key Personnel may be deployed through intermittent site visits and off-site technical inputs in accordance with the approved Deployment Schedule and work programme. Approved off-site inputs directly attributable to the Services shall count towards the prescribed person-months, subject to submission of timesheets and corresponding deliverables and verification by APADCL. The relevant Key Personnel shall remain available for site inspections, audits, meetings, incident reviews, testing, commissioning and other activities whenever required by APADCL. The prescribed position-wise person-months and aggregate minimum deployment of 138 person-months shall not be reduced.
14	**2.3.1 – Deployment Conditions Pg. 17/170**	Please clarify whether 210 man months are mandatory minimum physical deployment or indicative inputs, and whether expert-wise	**RFP condition prevails.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	Nine experts, 210 anticipated man months; minimum deployment and payment linked to actual deployment.	deployment schedule may be adjusted with prior approval based on actual workload while meeting all deliverables.	The 210 person-months and the expert-wise inputs in Clause 2.3.1 are minimum requirements, not optional estimates. Appendix-II, Form-2 expressly prohibits reducing the prescribed deployment of any Key Personnel. Deployment phasing shall follow the approved schedule while preserving these minimum inputs and all deliverables
15	**2.3.1 – Deployment Conditions Pg. 17/170** Additional inputs to be provided wherever required for satisfactory services.	Where Authority requires additional specialist inputs or man months beyond stated 210, please confirm mechanism for prior approval and separate payment, including applicable rates.	**RFP condition prevails.** Additional inputs required to complete the existing TOR satisfactorily are included in the quoted lump-sum fee; they do not automatically attract extra payment (Clause 2.3.1 and Appendix-II, Form-3, Note 6). Additional services beyond the TOR require written instruction/agreement and agreed financial terms under Schedule-2, Clauses 2.6, 4.2.3 and 6.1.3. No automatic rate entitlement is provided..
16	**2.4.4(D) – Team Leader Eligibility Pg. 18/170** Civil Engineering graduate with postgraduate degree in Engineering/Management; airport assignment leadership experience.	Considering multidisciplinary airport O&M scope, kindly allow a graduate in Electrical or Mechanical Engineering, with prescribed postgraduate qualification and relevant airport leadership experience, to qualify as Team Leader.	**RFP condition prevails.**
17	**2.4.4(D) – Airport Operations Expert Pg. 19/170** Experience on an Eligible Airport Assignment at an airport of at least 5 MPPA.	Kindly consider equivalent airport operations experience at airports below 5 MPPA with comparable operational complexity, or combined experience at multiple airports, for Airport Operations Expert eligibility requirement.	**RFP condition prevails.**
18	**2.4.4(A); 3.2.4 Pg. 18/170 Pg. 47/170**	Please clarify whether airport design, PMC, commissioning and technical advisory assignments can be considered Eligible/Core Sector Airport Assignments where they meet scope and thresholds defined in Clause 3.1.3.	Airport PMC, Independent Engineer, Authority's Engineer, construction supervision, operational-readiness, testing and commissioning assignments may qualify, subject to meeting the qualifying

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	Minimum two Eligible Assignments, including one Core Sector Airport Assignment; documentary evidence prescribed.		scope under Clauses 3.2 and 3.2.2.1 to 3.2.2.5, Airport-capacity and professional-fee thresholds, completion or service-period requirements, and documentary-evidence requirements under Clause 3.2.4. Airport design or technical-advisory assignments shall not qualify solely based on their title; the actual scope must be multidisciplinary and substantially comparable to the Services under this RFP. Standalone design, feasibility, proof-checking, advisory or single-discipline assignments shall not qualify. **RFP conditions prevail.**
19	**2.30 – Substitution of Key Personnel Pg. 38/170** Substitution largely restricted to health reasons, with deductions and special restrictions for Team Leader.	Kindly permit substitution of Key Personnel in cases of resignation, retirement or prolonged unavailability beyond Consultant's control, subject to prior approval and an equally or better qualified replacement, without automatic deductions where continuity is maintained.	**RFP condition prevails.**
20	**Schedule 1 – TOR; 6.7 Pg. 54 & 80/170 Pg. 70/170 onwards** Monitoring includes O&M, residual works, capital works and technical reviews.	Please provide current list, scope, approximate value and expected schedule of Residual Works, Capital Works and planned airport expansion during 36-month period, and clarify whether substantial additional packages will entail revised staffing and fees.	**RFP condition Prevails**. The RFP does not specify a definitive package-wise list, value and schedule. Available project data may be inspected under Clause 1.7.1. Clauses 6.1.5 and 6.1.9 of Schedule-1 cover works during the appointment; the Capital Works Register is due within 30 days under Clause 6.7.10. Such works do not automatically revise fees. Services beyond the TOR require written agreement under Schedule-2, Clauses 2.6, 4.2.3 and 6.1.3.
21	**Schedule 1 – TOR; 6.7.3–6.7.5 Pg. 70–71/170**	Please confirm that laboratory/field tests, specialist testing (including AGL photometry, pavement surveys and IT/security audits), third-party agencies and equipment are arranged and paid for by Concessionaire/Authority, with IE responsible for specifying, witnessing and reviewing tests.	**RFP condition Prevails**. Under Schedule-1, Clauses 6.4.6 and 6.7.3 to 6.7.6, the Concessionaire shall carry out or cause the specified tests to be carried out; IE specifies, monitors and reviews them. This is not a blanket

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	Independent Engineer specifies and monitors sample quality-control tests.		allocation of every specialist testing cost to the Authority/Concessionaire. Tests, surveys and investigations to be undertaken by IE within the TOR are included in the lump-sum fee under Appendix-II, Form-2, Item C.5.
22	**Clause 1.1.4 / 1.5; Agreement – variations Pg. 4-5/170** 36-month assignment, extendable subject to applicable provisions.	Please confirm that extension beyond 36 months, including extensions arising from delayed works or decisions beyond IE's control, will be compensated at agreed expert rates with provision for escalation and site establishment expenses.	**RFP condition Prevails**. The initial term is 36 months. Any extension is subject to the applicable provisions and mutual consent under Schedule-2, Clause 2.4. Changes to scope, duration and Agreement Value must be agreed in writing under Clauses 2.6 and 6.1.3, as applicable. The RFP provides no automatic escalation or separate site-establishment reimbursement for an extension; express contractual entitlements remain applicable.
23	**Schedule 1, Cl. 6.3.1, 6.4 Pg. 57–60/170** Comprehensive O&M review, annual maintenance plans, KPI reports and asset-performance monitoring.	Please provide executed Concession Agreement and relevant schedules, O&M requirements, KPI/service-quality standards, and available asset registers and reporting formats before financial bid submission to enable assessment of scope.	Applicants may inspect available project data through the nodal officer under Clause 1.7.1, with at least two days' notice, and identify the Concession Agreement, schedules and records required for review. Schedule-1 sets out the TOR; Schedule-2, Annex-8 provides indicative reporting formats, with final formats approved upon commencement. Availability of the requested records should be checked during this inspection.
24	**Schedule 1, Cl. 6.3.1, 6.7.21–22 Pg. 57–58/170 Pg. 75/170** IE to verify airport service-quality KPIs, source data and calculations**.**	Please confirm that IE will be provided access to Concessionaire operational and maintenance records, KPI source data and relevant airport IT/CMMS reports, and is not required to procure independent live-monitoring systems.	**RFP condition Prevails**. Schedule-1, Clauses 6.3.1, 6.4.16 and 6.7.22 require the Independent Engineer to review Airport O&M performance, examine relevant Concessionaire records and source systems, and verify the source data, methodology, exclusions and calculations used for KPI and service-quality reporting. Accordingly, the Concessionaire shall provide reasonable and timely access to relevant CMMS,

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
			asset, maintenance, AODB, KPI, system-log, incident, Test, availability and downtime records, subject to applicable security, cybersecurity, confidentiality and data-access restrictions. Access may be provided through reports, extracts, read-only access or other controlled means approved by APADCL. The Independent Engineer is not required to procure or establish a separate parallel live-monitoring, CMMS, AODB or KPI-measurement system. Ordinary computers, analytical and reporting software, connectivity and document-management resources required for the Independent Engineer's review and reporting shall remain included in the quoted fee under Clause 2.19.2(A) and Appendix-II, Form-2. Any specialised monitoring platform, proprietary interface, system integration or dedicated data-acquisition equipment not expressly included in the TOR shall require APADCL's prior written instruction and shall be dealt with under the Additional Services provisions.
25	**Schedule 1, Cl. 6.7.18–20 Pg. 73–75/170** Monitoring of passenger terminal, baggage, airport IT, communication, security and other operational systems.	Please clarify whether Airport IT and Systems Expert's scope is limited to independent technical audit and review of records/performance, or includes live monitoring, OEM-level diagnostics or penetration testing; confirm who bears any specialist testing costs..	**RFP condition Prevails**. Routine inspection, technical review, log analysis, witnessing and reporting by the Independent Engineer are included in the quoted fee. Tests required under the Agreement, Specifications and Standards, OEM requirements or Applicable Law shall be arranged and paid for by the Concessionaire. Specialised independent testing or audits procured directly by the Independent Engineer shall require APADCL's prior written instruction.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
26	**Schedule 1, Cl. 6.7.16–17 Pg. 72–73/170** IE may support operational acceptance and quarterly reporting of commissioning and capital works.	Please confirm whether IE attendance at FAT/SAT, commissioning and integrated trials is required for all equipment or only agreed risk-based tests, and whether outstation/overseas inspection travel and associated costs will be reimbursed separately.	**RFP condition Prevails**. FAT, SAT, commissioning and integrated-trial attendance is event-based. The Independent Engineer shall review all relevant Test documentation but physically witness only contractual hold points, safety-critical or operationally critical Tests, major integration/failover Tests, significant retests and Tests specifically directed by APADCL. Attendance at every routine FAT is not mandatory. Approved travel required for performance of the Services shall remain included in the quoted fee in accordance with the RFP.
27	**Schedule 1, Cl. 6.7.18–23 Pg. 73–76/170** Monitoring includes operational and security-sensitive airport systems.	Please confirm that Authority/Concessionaire will facilitate airport entry permits, airside passes, security clearances and access to technical records for IE personnel, and clarify responsibility for related charges.	**RFP condition Prevails**. Under Schedule-2, Clause 5.1, the Authority shall make best efforts to assist the Independent Engineer in obtaining necessary permissions, work permits and documents, while Clause 5.2 provides access to the Project site for performance of the Services. The Authority and Concessionaire shall accordingly facilitate applications for Airport Entry Permits, airside access, security clearances, escorts where required, and controlled access to relevant technical records. Issuance of permits and clearances shall remain subject to BCAS, CISF, Airport Operator and other competent-authority requirements and is not guaranteed. The Consultant shall comply with all applicable documentation, verification, training and security requirements. Routine licence, permit, pass and compliance costs shall be included in the quoted fee under Appendix-II, Form-2, Item C.6, unless waived by the issuing authority. Security-

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
			sensitive information shall be accessed only through approved restricted channels under Schedule-1, Clause 6.7.20.
28	**Pg 45, 3.2 Eligible Assignments** 3.2.2 A Core Sector Project: A "Core Sector Airport Assignment" means an Eligible Assignment undertaken in relation to a commercial civil airport satisfying either of the following: (a) a design passenger-handling capacity of not less than 5 (five) million passengers per annum (5 MPPA); or (b) actual passenger traffic of not less than 5 (five) million passengers in any one financial year during the period of the assignment.	3.2.2 A Core Sector Project: A "Core Sector Airport Assignment" means an Eligible Assignment undertaken in relation to a commercial civil airport satisfying either of the following: (a) a design passenger-handling capacity of not less than 2 (two) million passengers per annum (2 MPPA); or (b) actual passenger traffic of not less than 2 (two) million passengers in any one financial year during the period of the assignment.	**RFP condition prevails.**
29	**Pg 12, 2.1.4 Eligibility of consortium** The Lead Member shall independently have completed or substantially performed at least 1 (one) Core Sector Airport Assignment meeting the requirements of Clause 3.1.3.	It is requested that the eligibility requirement under Clause 3.1.3 may kindly be modified to allow any member of the Consortium/JV, individually or collectively, to fulfil the requirement of having completed or substantially performed at least one (1) Core Sector Airport Assignment, instead of restricting the same exclusively to the Lead Member. This would provide greater flexibility in consortium formation and encourage wider participation by technically qualified members.	**RFP condition prevails.**
30	**Pg 135, SCHEDULE-3** Authority and consultants: 1. Potential consultant should not be privy to information from the Authority which is not available to others;	We understand that any firm that has undertaken the TEFR/DPR stage of an airport project on behalf of the concerned Authority shall not be considered to have any conflict of interest and should therefore be deemed eligible to participate in the bidding process. We request confirmation of the above understanding.	**RFP condition prevails.** Prior TEFR/DPR engagement does not confer automatic eligibility or exemption from conflict-of-interest provisions. Relevant past/current assignments, relationships and access to non-public information must be disclosed. Eligibility will be assessed under Clause 2.5 and Schedule-3,

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	2. potential consultant should not have defined the project when earlier working for the Authority; 3. potential consultant should not have recently worked for the Authority overseeing the project.		including the restrictions concerning prior project definition and oversight.
31	**Pg 120 Annexure 6 Payment Schedule** The Authority shall pay the Independent Engineer on a quarterly basis against the lump-sum price quoted by the Independent Engineer. The Agreement Value shall be paid in 12 (twelve) equal quarterly instalments during the Consultancy Period of 36 (thirty-six) months, as set out below:	We request that the payment schedule be revised from quarterly payments to monthly payments to ensure smooth cash flow and uninterrupted project execution.	**RFP condition prevails.** Payment shall be quarterly in 12 equal instalments over 36 months, subject to approved deployment, satisfactory performance, prescribed deliverables and a complete invoice, as specified in Schedule-2, Clause 6.3 and Annex-6. Monthly payment is not provided for.
32	**Pg 32 2.24 Bid Security** The Applicant shall furnish the Bid Security in the form of an unconditional and irrevocable Bank Guarantee issued by a Scheduled Commercial Bank, excluding cooperative banks and regional rural banks, in favour of the Managing Director, Andhra Pradesh Airports Development Corporation Limited, in the format prescribed in Appendix-I, form 16.	We request that the Bid Security may also be permitted in the form of an Insurance Surety Bond, in addition to the Bank Guarantee, to provide bidders with an alternative mode of furnishing bid security.	**RFP condition prevails.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
33	**Pg 34 2.25 Performance Security** The Performance Security shall be equal to 10% (ten per cent) of the Contract Value. The Selected Applicant shall furnish a Performance Bank Guarantee equal to 5% (five per cent) of the Contract Value in the form set forth in Annexure-7, issued by a Scheduled Commercial Bank, excluding cooperative banks and regional rural banks, in favour of the Managing Director, APADCL. The balance 5% (five per cent) of the Contract Value shall be recovered proportionately from the quarterly payments due to the Independent Engineer until the cumulative recovery reaches 5% (five per cent) of the Contract Value.	We request that the Performance Security may also be permitted in the form of an Insurance Surety Bond, in addition to the Performance Bank Guarantee. Further, the Selected Applicant may be given the option to furnish the entire 10% (ten per cent) Performance Security upfront in the form of a Bank Guarantee/Insurance Surety Bond, in lieu of the proposed 5% retention from quarterly payments, so that no further deductions are made from the periodic payments towards Performance Security.	**RFP condition prevails.**
34	**Pg 7, Date of submission** End date of Online submission of Bids envelopes I & II on ape-procurement portal : 18.11.2026, 3:30PM	Considering the importance and complexity of the project, we request that a minimum extension of 21 days from the date of issuance of the pre-bid query responses/clarifications be granted to allow bidders sufficient time to review the clarifications and prepare their proposals accordingly.	**Refer to 03 of the Corrigendum below.**
35	An Eligible Assignment undertaken by a Consortium Member shall be considered only where such Member was directly responsible for a material part of the relevant consultancy services and its scope and participation are supported by documentary evidence.	**Kindly clarify** can we submit credentials of Core & Non-core eligible assignment from Consortium. Is it acceptable ?	It is to be clarified that Core and Non-Core Eligible Assignments of Consortium Members may be considered collectively, subject to Clause 2.1.4. However, the Lead Member must independently demonstrate at least one qualifying Core Sector Airport Assignment. The second Eligible Assignment may be submitted by the Lead Member or another Consortium Member. Each assignment

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
			shall be supported by documentary evidence establishing the concerned Member's material scope, role, participation, period of involvement and attributable professional fees. Only the experience attributable to that Consortium Member shall be counted. No amendment to the RFP is required. **RFP condition prevails**
36	A Core Sector Project: A "Core Sector Airport Assignment" means an Eligible Assignment undertaken in relation to a commercial civil airport satisfying either of the following: (a) a design passenger handling capacity of not less than 5 (five) million passengers per annum (5 MPPA); or (b) actual passenger traffic of not less than 5 (five) million passengers in any one financial year during the period of the assignment.	**Kindly accept:** A Core Sector Project: A "Core Sector Airport Assignment" means an Eligible Assignment undertaken in relation to a commercial civil airport satisfying either of the following: (a) a design passenger-handling capacity of not less than 3 (three) million passengers per annum (3 MPPA); or (b) actual passenger traffic of not less than 3 (three) million passengers in any one financial year during the period of the assignment.	**RFP condition prevails.**
37	3.2.2.2 Provided that, in the case of an assignment relating to development, construction, expansion, modernization or Capital Works, the relevant works shall have been completed or at least 90% (ninety per cent) completed as on the Proposal Due Date. 3.2.2.3 Provided further that, in the case of an assignment relating to operation and maintenance monitoring, concession-compliance monitoring, asset management or technical	**Kindly accept:** 3.2.2.2 Provided that, in the case of an assignment relating to development, construction, expansion, modernization or Capital Works, the relevant works shall have been completed or at least 70% (seventy percent) completed as on the Proposal Due Date. 3.2.2.3 Provided further that, in the case of an assignment relating to Project management consultancy, operation and maintenance monitoring, concession-compliance monitoring, asset management or technical audit, the Applicant shall have completed at least 24 (twenty-four) months of services as on the Proposal Due Date or the entire prescribed duration of the assignment, where such duration was less than 24 (twenty-four)	**RFP condition prevails.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	audit, the Applicant shall have completed at least 24 (twenty-four) months of services as on the Proposal Due Date or the entire prescribed duration of the assignment, where such duration was less than 24 (twenty-four) months	months. Can we submit the LOA & Agreement if the project is ongoing.	
38	**Non-Core Sector work:** Any other infrastructure projects comprising Commercial/ institutional buildings/retail/offices/hotels/ Logistic Park/ Hospital/Residential township undertaken by the Applicant shall be considered: 3.2.3.1 Provided that the estimated capital cost of the project exceeds Rs.2300 crores (Rupees Two thousand three hundred crores) completed in last 10 years prior to Bid Due Date. For conversion purposes the foreign exchange rates as on Bid Due Date shall be applicable	**Kindly accept this:** Non-Core Sector work: Any other infrastructure projects comprising Commercial/ institutional buildings/retail/offices/hotels/ Logistic Park/bridges/Industrial Project/ Hospital/Residential township undertaken by the Applicant shall be considered: 3.2.3.1 Provided that the estimated capital cost of the project exceeds Rs. 1000 crores (Rupees one thousand three hundred crores) completed in last 15 years prior to Bid Due Date. For conversion purposes the foreign exchange rates as on Bid Due Date shall be applicable. For private projects, kindly accept PO & CA certificate.	**Refer to 09 of the Corrigendum below.**
39	**Technical Capacity:** The Applicant shall have, over the past 10 (Ten) years preceding the PDD, undertaken a minimum of 2 (two) Eligible Assignments. Out of the minimum two Eligible Assignments, at least one Eligible Assignment shall be a Core Sector Airport Assignment as specified in Clause 3.1.3.	**Kindly accept this:** Technical Capacity: The Applicant shall have, over the past 15 (fifteen) years preceding the PDD, undertaken a minimum of 2 (two) Eligible Assignments. Out of the minimum two Eligible Assignments, at least one Eligible Assignment shall be a Core Sector Airport Assignment as specified in Clause 3.1.3.	**RFP condition prevails.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
40	End date of Online submission of Bids Envelopes I & II on ape procurement portal 18.11.2026 at 03.30 PM Last date to submit original Bank Guarantee of Tender Fees/EMD and letter of unconditional acceptance of 18.11.2026 at 05.00 PM AUTHORITY's terms and conditions Opening of Pre-Qualification cum Technical bids on the ape procurement portal Opening of Financial Bid on ape-procurement portal 18.11.2026 at 05.00 PM 20.11.2026 at 04.00 PM	**Kindly extend the bid submission date:** End date of Online submission of Bids Envelopes I & II on ape procurement portal 28.11.2026 at 03.30 PM Last date to submit original Bank Guarantee of Tender Fees/EMD and letter of unconditional acceptance of 28.11.2026 at 05.00 PM AUTHORITY's terms and conditions Opening of Pre-Qualification cum Technical bids on the ape procurement portal 28.11.2026 at 05.00 PM Opening of Financial Bid on ape-procurement portal 30.11.2026 at 04.00 PM	**Refer to 03 of the Corrigendum below.**
41	Introduction, Clause 1.2 Brief Details, Sl. No. 3 & 4 (Pg no. 4) & Clause 1.6.14 Bid Processing Fee (Page no. 6)	Clause 1.2 lists "Cost of RFP" as Rs. 11,800/- (Non-Refundable) and "Bid Processing Fee" as Rs. 20,000 + 18% GST (i.e., Rs. 23,600/-). However, Clause 1.6.14 states: Prior to submission of the Bid, the Bidder shall pay to the Authority a sum of Rs. 23,600/- including GST as the cost of the RFP as tender processing fee. In lieu of the above, we kindly clarify whether the Bidder is required to pay both fees separately (Rs. 11,800/- towards Cost of RFP + Rs. 23,600/- towards Bid Processing Fee = Rs. 35,400/-) or a single consolidated fee of Rs. 23,600/- (inclusive of GST) on the AP e-Procurement portal.	**It is clarified that:** Both amounts are payable separately: Rs.11,800 as non-refundable Cost of RFP and Rs.23,600 inclusive of GST as Bid Processing Fee, through the AP e-Procurement portal. Clause 1.6.14 shall be read accordingly. **Refer to 12 of corrigendum** for account details for paying Bid processing Fee.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
42	Clause 1.7 Schedule of Selection Process, Sl. No 3 & 6 (Page no. 9)	The last date for consultants to submit queries and for APADCL to issue clarifications is November 16, 2026, while the bid submission deadline is November 18, 2026. This schedule allows prospective bidders only two (2) days to review the clarifications and incorporate them into their final submissions. In addition, given the higher eligibility criteria prescribed in the RFP for key personnel, we require additional time to identify suitably qualified and experienced professionals who meet these requirements and to prepare a comprehensive, high-quality bid. We therefore request APADCL to extend the bid submission deadline to allow at least one month (30 days) from the date of issuance of clarifications. This additional time would enable bidders to identify suitably qualified key experts who meet the RFP requirements, compile the requisite documentation, and prepare comprehensive, technically sound and compliant proposals. It would also encourage wider participation and greater competition among qualified consulting firms.	**Refer to 09 of the Corrigendum below.**
43	Clause 1.6.18 Currency conversion rate and payment (Page No. 8) & Clause 3.2.3 Non Core Sector work, Sub clause 3.2.3.1 (Page No. 46) **1.6.18 Currency conversion rate and payment:** For the purposes of technical evaluation of Applicants [Rs. 72 (Rupees Seventy two)] per US$ shall be considered as the applicable currency conversion rate. In case of any other currency, the same shall first be converted to US$ as on the date 60 (sixty) days prior to	**Clause 1.6.18 (page no.8 of RFP**) prescribes a fixed exchange rate of Rs. 72 per USD for technical evaluation of Applicants (with other currencies converted to USD as on 60 days prior to PDD). **Conversely, Clause 3.2.3.1** states that for Non-Core Sector project cost conversion, the foreign exchange rates as on Bid Due Date shall be applicable. We kindly request client to confirm which exchange rate mechanism shall govern both Financial Capacity (annual professional fees in foreign currency) and Project Capital Cost / Consultancy Fee thresholds for Eligible Assignments—the fixed Rs. 72/USD rate under Clause 1.6.18 or the prevailing conversion rate on PDD.	**Refer to 03 of the Corrigendum below.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	the PDD, and the amount so derived in US$ shall be converted into INR at the aforesaid rate. The conversion rate of such currencies shall be the daily representative exchange rates published by the International Monetary Fund for the relevant date. **3.2.3 Non-Core Sector work:** 3.2.3.1 Provided that the estimated capital cost of the project exceeds Rs.2300 crores (Rupees Two thousand three hundred crores only) completed in last 10 years prior to Bid Due Date. For conversion purpose the foreign exchange rates as on Bid Due Date shall be applicable.		
44	Clause 2.1.4 Eligibility of Consortium, (d) (Page No. 12) **Clause 2.1.4 Eligibility of Consortium** (d). The Lead Member shall independently satisfy at least 50% (fifty per cent) of the Financial Capacity requirement specified in **Clause 2.2.2(B).**	Clause 2.1.4(b) currently references Clause 2.2.2(B), which does not exist in the RFP document. This appears to be a typographical error, as the Financial Capacity requirements are detailed under Clause 2.4.4(B). We kindly request the client to modify is as follows: (d) The Lead Member shall independently satisfy at least 50% (fifty per cent) of the Financial Capacity requirement specified in Clause 2.4.4 (B).	Confirmed. The reference to Clause 2.2.2(B) in Clause 2.1.4(d) is a typographical error. The correct reference is Clause 2.4.4(B). Accordingly, Clause 2.1.4(d) shall be read as follows: "The Lead Member shall independently satisfy at least 50% (fifty per cent) of the Financial Capacity requirement specified in Clause 2.4.4(B)."
45	Clause 2.1.4 Eligibility of Consortium, (e) (Page No. 12)	Clause 2.1.4(e) currently references Clause 3.1.3, which appears to be a typographical error as its provisions do not correspond to the subject matter of Clause 2.1.4(e). We kindly request the client to	**Refer to 09 of the Corrigendum below.** Confirmed. The reference to Clause 3.1.3 in Clause 2.1.4(e) is a typographical error. It shall be replaced with Clause 3.2.2, read with Clauses 3.2.2.1 to 3.2.2.5 and 3.2.4.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	Clause 2.1.4 Eligibility of Consortium (e) The Lead Member shall independently have completed or substantially performed at least 1 (one) Core Sector Airport Assignment meeting the requirements of Clause 3.1.3.	kindly clarify the intended clause reference and amend it accordingly.	Clause 2.1.4(e) shall accordingly read: "The Lead Member shall independently have completed or substantially performed at least one Core Sector Airport Assignment meeting the requirements of Clause 3.2.2, read with Clauses 3.2.2.1 to 3.2.2.5 and Clause 3.2.4." A corrigendum shall be issued.
46	Clause 2.4.4 (B) Financial Capacity (Page no. 18) **B. Financial Capacity**: The Applicant shall have received a minimum Income of Rs.23.03 (Twenty Three crore Three Lakhs) per annum from professional fees during each of the 3 (three) financial years in the previous 5 years preceding the Proposal Due Date. **For the purpose of evaluation, Applicants having comparatively larger revenues from professional fees shall be given added weightage**. For the avoidance of doubt, professional fees hereunder refers to fees received by the Applicant for providing advisory or consultancy services to its client.	Clause 2.4.4(B) requires minimum income of Rs. 23.03 Crore per annum from professional fees during each of 3 financial years in the previous 5 years preceding PDD, noting that 'Applicants having comparatively larger revenues from professional fees shall be given added weightage.' However, Section 3 (Criteria for Evaluation of clause 3.1.8, page no.41) allocates 30 marks strictly to Eligible Assignments (3 x 10 marks) with no marks allocated to financial turnover. Given that Financial Capacity is evaluated strictly on a pass/fail basis under Section 3 (Technical Evaluation), kindly confirm that the reference to "added weightage" for larger revenues is redundant and will not carry any incremental scoring.	Financial Capacity under Clause 2.4.4(B) shall be evaluated on a pass/fail basis. No additional marks or weightage shall be awarded for professional-fee income exceeding the prescribed minimum. Accordingly, **the sentence, "For the purpose of evaluation, Applicants having comparatively larger revenues from professional fees shall be given added weightage," stands deleted.** Except for this deletion, the remaining provisions of Clause 2.4.4(B) shall continue to apply. Technical scoring shall be strictly in accordance with Clauses 3.1.8 to 3.1.11. No separate or additional marks are allocated for higher professional-fee revenues. The Financial Capacity requirement under Clause 2.4.4(B) remains an eligibility requirement.
47	Clause 2.4 (D) Conditions of Eligibility of Key personnel, Column 3 of the table – Experience (Page no. 18 & 19) **Experience:**	For all Key Positions listed under the Experience Criteria of the table (Clause 2.4 D), the **"Other Eligible Projects"** requirement currently references **Clause 3.1.3**, which appears to be a typographical error as its provisions do not pertain to this criterion. We kindly request the client to kindly this clause as follows:	**Confirmed.** References to Clause 3.1.3 in the Experience column of Clause 2.4.4(D) are typographical errors. For Key Personnel positions where both Airport and Non-Core Sector experience is permitted, the reference shall be replaced with Clauses 3.2.2, 3.2.3 and 3.2.4. For the

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	Min. XX years "experience in Airports or other eligible projects as defined in Clause 3.1.3		Airport Operations Expert and Airport IT and Systems Expert, airport-sector experience remains mandatory, and the relevant reference shall be Clauses 3.2.2 and 3.2.4 only. Non-Core Sector Assignments shall not be considered for these two positions. The position-specific requirements and scoring provisions shall continue to apply. Corrigendum shall be issued. The references to Clause 3.1.3 for Eligible Assignments in the Key Personnel eligibility table shall be read as Clause 3.2. The position-specific qualifications, airport-experience requirements and scoring provisions under Clauses 2.4.4(D), 3.1.10 and 3.1.11 shall continue to apply.
48	Clause 2.18 Technical proposal, Sub clause 2.18.2 (G) (Page no. 29) 2.18.2 While submitting the Technical Proposal, the Applicant shall, in particular, ensure that: (G) The CVs have been recently signed and dated in blue ink by the respective Personnel and countersigned by the Applicant. Photocopy or unsigned / countersigned CVs shall be rejected;	Considering the short bid submission window and the logistical challenges involved in obtaining physical signatures from all Key Experts—particularly if expatriate personnel are proposed—we kindly request the client to permit the use of scanned signatures on CVs at the proposal stage/ bidding stage. Upon confirming the successful bidder, they shall undertake to submit the original wet-ink signed CVs and supporting documents for verification prior to the issuance of the Letter of Award (LOA).	**Refer to 07 of the Corrigendum below.**
49	Clause 2.30 Substitution of Key Personnel (page No. 38)	**2.30 Substitution of Key Personnel** 2.30.1 The Authority and APADCL will not normally consider any request of the Selected Applicant for substitution of Key Personnel as the ranking of the Applicant is based on the evaluation of Key Personnel and any change therein may upset the ranking.	**May be read as :** Clause 2.30 is intended to prevent substitution of evaluated Key Personnel after award. Substitution shall not be permitted as a matter of right and shall

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
		Substitution will, however, be permitted if the Key Personnel is not available for reasons of health, subject to equally or better qualified and experienced personnel being provided to the satisfaction of the Authority and APADCL. The Authority expects all the Key Personnel to be available during implementation of the Agreement. The Authority will not consider substitution of Key Personnel except for reasons of any due to health. Such substitution shall ordinarily be limited to one Key Personnel subject to equally or better qualified and experienced personnel being provided to the satisfaction of the Authority**. As a condition to such substitution, a sum equal to 20% (twenty per cent) of the remuneration specified for the original Key Personnel shall be deducted from the payments due to the Consultant. In the case of a second substitution hereunder, such deduction shall be 50% (fifty per cent) of the remuneration specified for the original Key Personnel.** Any further substitution may lead to disqualification of the Applicant or termination of the Agreement.	require APADCL's prior written approval and an equally or better-qualified replacement. APADCL may consider substitution in exceptional circumstances beyond the Consultant's reasonable control, including death, prolonged medical incapacity, resignation despite reasonable retention efforts, retirement, loss of required statutory or security clearance, or force majeure, subject to satisfactory documentary evidence. Approval of a replacement shall not automatically waive the deductions prescribed in Clause 2.30. Any waiver or reduction may be considered only in exceptional circumstances through a reasoned written decision of APADCL. The special restrictions applicable to substitution of the Team Leader shall continue to apply.
50	Clause 2.19 Financial Proposal, Sub Clause 2.19.2 (C) **2.19.2 While submitting the Financial Proposal, the Applicant shall ensure the following**: C. The rates quoted shall be firm throughout the period of performance of the assignment upto and including acceptance of the Feasibility Report by the Authority and discharge of all obligations of the Consultant under the Agreement.	The specified clause states that quoted rates shall remain firm 'upto and including acceptance of the Feasibility Report by the Authority and discharge of all obligations of the Consultant under the Agreement.' Since the current assignment pertains to **Independent Engineer services during the operational phase** rather than the preparation of a **Feasibility Report**, the reference to a Feasibility Report appears inadvertent. We kindly request the Authority to amend the clause accordingly.	**Confirmed.** The reference to the "Feasibility Report" in Clause 2.19.2(C) is inadvertent and is not applicable to this Independent Engineer assignment and stands deleted.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
51	Clause 2.12 Disqualification or Termination, Sub clause 2.12.1 (Page No. 25) 2.12.1 In case it is found during the evaluation or at any time before signing of the Concession Agreement or after its execution and during the period of subsistence thereof, including the concession thereby granted by the Authority, that one or more of the qualification conditions have not been met by the Applicant, or the Applicant has made material misrepresentation or has given any materially incorrect or false information, the Applicant shall be disqualified forthwith if not yet appointed as the Concessionaire either by issue of the LOA or entering into of the Concession Agreement, and if the Applicant/SPV has already been issued the LOA or has entered into the Concession Agreement, as the case may be, the same shall, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained therein or in this RFP, be liable to be terminated, by a communication in writing by the Authority to the Applicant, without the Authority/ APADCL being liable in any manner whatsoever to the Applicant and without prejudice to	Kindly confirm that references to "Concessionaire" and "Concession Agreement" in Clause 2.12.1 are typographical carry-overs and shall be read as **"Independent Engineer / Consultant" and "Independent Engineer Agreement".**	**Confirmed.** References to "Concessionaire," "Applicant/SPV" and "Concession Agreement" in Clause 2.12.1, insofar as they relate to appointment and contracting under this RFP, are inadvertent carry-over references. They shall be replaced by "Selected Applicant/Consultant" and "Independent Engineer Agreement," as applicable. Clause 2.12.1 All rights and remedies relating to disqualification, cancellation of the Letter of Award, termination, Bid Security, Performance Security and Applicable Law shall continue to apply.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	any other right or remedy which the Authority/APADCL may have under this RFP, the Bidding Documents, the Concession Agreement or under applicable laws.		
52	Form 1, Letter of proposal (Page No. 139) 7. I/We declare that: (b) I/We do not have any Conflict of Interest in accordance with Clause 2.3 of the RFP Document (d) I/We have not directly or indirectly or through an agent engaged or indulged in any corrupt practice, fraudulent practice, coercive practice, undesirable practice or restrictive practice, as defined in Clause 4.3 of the RFP document, in respect of any tender or request for proposal issued by or any agreement entered into with the Authority or any other public sector enterprise or any government, Central or State; and 8. I/We understand that you may cancel the Selection Process at any time and that you are neither bound to accept any Proposal that you may receive nor to select the Consultant, without incurring any liability to the Applicants in accordance with Clause 2.8 of the RFP document. 14. The Bid Security of Rs. ..... (Rupees	The cross-references cited in the Letter of Proposal appear to misalign with the corresponding clauses of the RFP. To ensure consistency and clarity regarding the tender specifications and conditions, we kindly request the client to amend them as follows: 7. **I/We declare that:** (b) I/We do not have any Conflict of Interest in accordance with Clause 2.3 **2.5 of the RFP Document** (d) I/We have not directly or indirectly or through an agent engaged or indulged in any corrupt practice, fraudulent practice, coercive practice, undesirable practice or restrictive practice, as defined in Clause 4.3 **Clause 4.13** of the RFP document, in respect of any tender or request for proposal issued by or any agreement entered into with the Authority or any other public sector enterprise or any government, Central or State; and 8. I/We understand that you may cancel the Selection Process at any time and that you are neither bound to accept any Proposal that you may receive nor to select the Consultant, without incurring any liability to the Applicants in accordance with Clause 2.8 **Clause 3.4** of the RFP document. 14. The Bid Security of Rs. ..... (Rupees .....) in the form of a unconditional and irrevocable Bank Guarantee, has been furnished in accordance with Clause 2.22 **Clause 2.24 of the RFP.**	**Confirmed in part.** The references in Appendix-I, Form-1 shall be corrected as follows: Paragraph 7(b): **Clause 2.5**; Paragraph 7(d): **Section 4, including Clauses 4.1.1 to 4.1.9**, as applicable; Paragraph 8: **Clause 2.11.1**; and Paragraph 14: **Clause 2.24**. The bidder's proposed references to Clause 4.13 and Clause 3.4 are not applicable. **Refer to 10 of the Corrigendum below.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	.....) in the form of a unconditional and irrevocable Bank Guarantee, has been furnished in accordance with Clause 2.22 of the RFP.		
53	Clause 2.4.4 (D) Conditions of Eligibility of Key Personnel, Airport IT & Systems Expert (Page no. 19) & Clause 1.1.12 Scoring of Non Core Assignments (page No. 43) Clause 2.4.4 (D) Conditions of Eligibility of Key Personnel Airport IT and Systems Expert: Min. 7 years‟ experience in Airports or other eligible projects as defined in Clause 3.1.3 & 1.1.12. Scoring of Non-Core Assignments: An Eligible Assignment undertaken in a Non-Core Sector shall be awarded marks as specified in the Key Personnel Evaluation table. Non-Core Assignments shall not be considered for the Airport Operations Expert and the Airport IT and Systems Expert, for whom airport-sector experience is mandatory.	As per Clause 1.1.12, Non-Core Assignments pertaining to Airport IT and Systems are excluded from technical evaluation. To maintain consistency with this provision, we kindly request the Authority to amend the experience criteria for the Airport IT and Systems Expert under Clause 2.4.4 as follows: Airport IT and Systems Expert: Min. 7 years‟ experience in Airports or other eligible projects as defined in Clause 3.1.3	**Clarified.** The reference to “other eligible projects as defined in Clause 3.1.3” under Clause 2.4.4(D) is an inadvertent cross-reference error. For the Airport IT and Systems Expert, airport-sector experience is mandatory and Non-Core Sector Assignments shall not be considered, in accordance with Clauses 3.1.10 and 3.1.11. The experience requirement shall be read as: **“Minimum 7 years’ professional experience in Airport IT, communication, baggage-handling, passenger-processing, security or other Airport operational systems.”** The expert shall also have worked in the specified or equivalent role on at least one Core Sector Airport Assignment satisfying Clauses 3.2.2 and 3.2.4. This clarification shall form part of the RFP and prevail over the inconsistent wording. All other RFP provisions remain unchanged.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
54	Clause 2.19 Financial Proposal, Sub Clause 2.19.2 (A) (Page No. 31) & Clause 6.5, Sub Clause 6.5.2 (Page No. 65) 2.19.2 While submitting the Financial Proposal, the Applicant shall ensure the following: A. All the costs associated with the assignment shall be included in the Financial Proposal. These shall normally cover remuneration for all the Personnel (Expatriate and Resident, in the field, office etc.), accommodation, air fare, equipment, printing of documents, surveys, geo - technical investigations etc. The total amount indicated in the Financial Proposal shall be without any condition attached or subject to any assumption, and shall be final and binding. In case any assumption or condition is indicated in the Financial Proposal, it shall be considered non-responsive and liable to be rejected. & 6.5.2 The Independent Engineer shall review the supporting data and documents, including:	Pursuant to Clause 6.5.2 of the Terms of Reference (TOR), the Independent Engineer (IE) is responsible solely for reviewing supporting data and documents—such as Design Basis Reports (DBRs), topographical surveys, and geotechnical investigation reports etc.—submitted by the Concessionaire. Based on this scope definition, we understand that the IE is not required to conduct any independent field surveys or investigations, and consequently, no costs toward executing such surveys need to be factored into our financial proposal. In this context, the stipulation under Clause 2.19.2(A) requiring the inclusion of survey costs appears to be an inadvertent misstatement or cross-referencing discrepancy. We kindly request the Authority to confirm our understanding that conducting field surveys falls outside the IE's scope of work and modify the clause accordingly.	**Clarified.** Schedule-1, Clause 6.5.2 requires the Independent Engineer to review the surveys, investigations, reports and supporting data furnished by the Concessionaire, Authority or concerned executing agency. The Independent Engineer is not required under the routine lump-sum Services to independently conduct fresh topographical, obstacle, geotechnical, hydrological, pavement or comparable specialist field investigations through external agencies. The IE's quoted fee shall include review of the available information, site inspection, routine measurements and verification using ordinary resources, identification of data gaps, recommendation of additional investigations, and witnessing and review of investigations conducted by the responsible party. Any specialized survey or investigation required under the Agreement shall ordinarily be arranged and paid for by the Concessionaire or concerned executing agency. If APADCL specifically instructs the IE to directly procure an additional independent survey or investigation, the same shall require prior written approval specifying scope and payment responsibility.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	(a) design basis reports; (b) topographical and obstacle surveys; (c) geotechnical investigations; (d) hydrological and drainage investigations; …… …….. (p) operational-readiness and handback documents.		The reference to surveys and geotechnical investigations in Clause 2.19.2(A) shall be read accordingly.
55	Clause 3.2.3 & Clause 3.2.3.1 Non Core Sector Work (Pange no. 46) 3.2.3 Non-Core Sector work: Any other infrastructure projects comprising Commercial/ institutional buildings/retail/offices/hotels/ Logistic Park/ Hospital/Residential township undertaken by the Applicant shall be considered: 3.2.3.1 Provided that the estimated capital cost of the project exceeds Rs.2300 crores (Rupees Two thousand three hundred crores only) completed in last 10 years prior to Bid Due Date. For conversion purpose the foreign exchange rates as on Bid Due Date shall be applicable.	1. We request the client to kindly clarify whether consultancy services such as Detailed Design / Project Management Consultancy (PMC) / Construction Supervision/ etc. (any other services) qualify under Non-Core Sector assignments, or if Non Core Sector experience is strictly restricted to the specific service categories as prescribed for Core Sector assignments. We kindly request the client to confirm this and clearly define if any other specific consultancy services are eligible under Non Core Sector assignments 2. The stipulated capital cost of Rs. 2,300 Crore for Eligible Non Core Assignments is substantially high and in major infrastructure sectors, numerous complex projects with an identical nature and scope of works are executed below this capital cost threshold. Restricting non-core project experience solely to assignments exceeding Rs. 2,300 Crore would unduly narrow the pool of qualified specialists/ bidders without adding technical value to the Independent Engineer's oversight. Accordingly, we kindly request the client to waive the minimum capital cost requirement of Rs. 2,300 Crore for evaluating experience under Non-Core Assignments and instead consider all projects demonstrating a similar nature and relevant scope of works, irrespective of project capital cost.	**Accepted in part.** In addition to the presently listed categories, qualifying assignments involving Metro Rail, Regional Rapid Transit Systems, major railway stations or railway infrastructure, multimodal transport hubs and other large, complex and multidisciplinary transport or public-infrastructure projects comparable in scale and technical complexity to Metro Rail projects may be considered as Non-Core Sector Assignments. Eligible services may include PMC, Independent Engineer, Authority's Engineer, Engineer-in-Charge, Construction Supervision and other comparable multidisciplinary consultancy services. Detailed Design shall qualify only where it includes material project-implementation or construction-stage responsibilities. Standalone feasibility, DPR, design-only, proof-checking, audit-only, testing-only, manpower-supply and single-discipline

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
			assignments shall not qualify. - **Refer to 02 of the Corrigendum below.** The request to waive the **₹2,300 crore** minimum project capital-cost requirement is not accepted. All applicable completion, professional-fee and documentary-evidence requirements shall continue to apply. Clause 3.2.3 shall be read accordingly.
56	Clause 2.4.4 (D) Conditions of Eligibility of Key Personnel (Page No. 18 & 19) & Clause 3.1.10 Key Personnel Evaluation (Page No. 42 & 43) Clause 2.4.4 (D.) Conditions of Eligibility for Key Personnel: Each of the Key Personnel must fulfil the Conditions of Eligibility1 specified below: Experience on Eligible Assignments: They should have been worked as an …….. Expert for not less than one Eligible Assignments. & 3.1.10 Key Personnel Evaluation: A maximum of three Eligible Assignments shall be considered for each Key Personnel.	In Clause 2.4.4(D), under the column titled "Experience on Eligible Assignments," it is stipulated that the Key Expert must have worked as an [Expert Title] on not less than 1 (one) Eligible Assignment. We understand that this minimum requirement of 1 (one) Eligible Assignment may be satisfied through either a Core Sector Assignment or a Non-Core Sector Assignment. We kindly request the Authority to confirm our understanding. There is an inconsistency between the eligibility criteria in Clause 2.4.4(D), the evaluation matrix in Clause 3.1.10 (Key Personnel Evaluation), and the minimum passing threshold in Clause 1.1.6: 1. Eligibility (Clause 2.4.4(D)): Allows Key Experts satisfying that Key Expert must have worked as an [Expert Title] on not less than 1 (one) Eligible Assignment (Core or Non Core Sector assignments). 2. Scoring Anomaly (Clause 3.1.10): Awards full marks including 1 additional mark satisfying specific experience criteria out of 3 eligible/ preferred assignments. 3. For example, if a bidder proposes a Civil, Structural & Airfield Pavement Expert who satisfies the eligibility requirement under Clause 2.4.4(D) through Non-Core Sector experience, the expert can score a maximum of only 3 out of 7 marks (42.86%) as per	Minimum eligibility under Clause 2.4.4(D) and technical scoring under Clauses 3.1.10 and 3.1.11 are separate. Meeting the eligibility requirement does not automatically entitle a Key Personnel to the minimum technical score. Subject to the position-specific criteria, Core or eligible Non-Core Sector Assignments may satisfy the minimum assignment requirement, except for the Airport Operations Expert and Airport IT and Systems Expert, for whom airport-sector experience is mandatory. The request to guarantee at least 50% marks upon meeting the minimum eligibility criteria is not accepted. The minimum-scoring and rejection requirements under Clauses 3.1.5 and 3.1.6 shall continue to apply. References presently appearing as 1.1.5 to 1.1.8 shall be read as the corresponding provisions under Clauses 3.1.5 and 3.1.6. **RFP conditions prevail.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
		Clause 3.1.10 (at 1 mark per Non-Core assignment, subject to a maximum of 3 assignments) 4. Clause 1.1.6: Mandates a minimum score of 50% for Key Experts, thereby rendering any Non-Core Sector candidate ineligible despite meeting Clause 2.4.4(D). We kindly request the Authority to harmonize Clause 3.1.10 and Clause 1.1.6 so that Key Experts qualifying via Non-Core Sector experience are awarded at least the minimum 50% qualifying score upon meeting the baseline criteria.	
57	Clause 2.19 Financial Proposal, Sub Clause 2.19.2 (B) (Page No. 31) & Appendix-II Form-2 (Page No. 163) & Schedule-2 Annex 6, Note 9 (Page No. 123) 2.19.2 While submitting the Financial Proposal, the Applicant shall ensure the following: B. The Financial Proposal shall take into account all expenses and tax liabilities. For the avoidance of doubt, it is clarified that all taxes shall be deemed to be included in the costs shown under different items of the Costs (including break down of costs) shall be expressed in INR. & Schedule-2, Annex-6, Note 9: 9. GST shall be paid additionally at the applicable rate. Payments shall be subject to applicable statutory deductions, recovery towards Performance Security, penalties and	Clause 2.19.2(B) states that "all taxes shall be deemed to be included in the costs shown under different items of the Costs," whereas Schedule-2 Annex-6 Note 9 and Appendix-II Form-2 (Item D) exclude Goods and Services Tax (GST), stipulating that GST shall be paid additionally at applicable rates and excluded from financial evaluation. To avoid any ambiguity during financial evaluation and billing, we kindly request APADCL to confirm that the evaluated financial quote (Form-2 Item D) shall be exclusive of GST, that GST will be reimbursed/paid extra at applicable statutory rates, and to amend Clause 2.19.2(B) accordingly.	**Confirmed.** The Financial Proposal and the amount considered for financial evaluation shall be exclusive of GST. GST shall be paid additionally at the applicable statutory rate in accordance with Schedule-2, Annex-6, Note 9, subject to submission of a valid tax invoice, statutory compliance and applicable deductions. All other taxes, duties, cess, levies and expenses shall be included in the quoted Financial Proposal unless expressly stated otherwise in the RFP. Clause 2.19.2(B) shall be read accordingly. Except as clarified above, all other RFP conditions remain unchanged.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	other recoveries under the Agreement.		
58	Clause 1.6 Instructions for online Bidding, Sub Clause 1.6.15 Validity of the Proposal (Page No. 8) & Appendix-II Form-1 (Page No. 162) 1.6.15 Validity of the Proposal: The Proposal shall be valid for a period of not less than 180 days from the Proposal Due Date (the "PDD").	Clause 1.6.15 specifies that the Proposal shall remain valid for not less than 180 days from the Proposal Due Date (PDD), whereas the Financial Proposal Covering Letter (Appendix-II, Form-1) states a validity period of 90 (ninety) days. Kindly confirm that the 180-day validity period under Clause 1.6.15 governs both the Technical and Financial Proposals, and issue a revised Form-1 so that bidders submitting the prescribed format remain fully compliant.	**Confirmed.** The Proposal Validity Period of **180 days from the Proposal Due Date** under Clause 1.6.15 shall apply to both the Technical Proposal and the Financial Proposal. The reference to 90 days in Appendix-II, Form-1 shall be read as 180 days. Applicants may submit Form-1 with the corrected validity period. This clarification shall form part of the RFP and prevail over the inconsistent wording in Form-1. All other RFP provisions remain unchanged.
59	Section 1 Introduction, Clause 1.2 Brief Details, Sl. No. 5 Bid Security (Page No. 4) 1.2 Brief Details — Sl. No. 5 (Bid Security): ...refundable no later than 60 (Sixty) days from the Bid Due Date, except in the case of the selected Bidder whose Bid Security shall be retained till it has provided a Performance Security under the Concession Agreement.	Clause 1.2 (Sl. No. 5) states that the Selected Bidder's Bid Security shall be retained until it furnishes Performance Security under the "Concession Agreement." Since the Independent Engineer furnishes Performance Security under the Independent Engineer Agreement rather than the Concession Agreement, this appears to be an inadvertent reference. We kindly request the Authority to amend the reference in Clause 1.2 (Sl. No. 5) to read "Independent Engineer Agreement."	**Confirmed.** The reference to the "Concession Agreement" in Clause 1.2, Sl. No. 5 is inadvertent and shall be read as the **"Independent Engineer Agreement."** The Bid Security of the Selected Applicant shall be retained until execution of the Independent Engineer Agreement and furnishing of the Performance Security required thereunder, consistent with Clause 2.24.4. All other Bid Security provisions remain unchanged.
60	Clause 2.25 Performance Security, Sub Clause 2.25.2 (Page No. 34) & Schedule-2 Clause 7.1.1 (Page No.	Clause 2.25.2 and Schedule-2 Clause 7.1.1 refer to recovering the balance 5% Performance Security "proportionately" from quarterly payments, while Annex-6 Clause 6.12.10 states "by deducting 5%	Clarified. The Selected Applicant shall furnish a Performance Bank Guarantee equal to 5% of the Contract Value. A further 5% shall be deducted from each certified quarterly payment, excluding

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	111) & Annex-6 Clause 6.12.10 (Page No. 122) 2.25.2 Performance Security: The Performance Security shall be equal to 10% (ten per cent) of the Contract Value. The Selected Applicant shall furnish a Performance Bank Guarantee equal to 5% (five per cent) of the Contract Value in the form set forth in Annexure-7... The balance 5% (five per cent) of the Contract Value shall be recovered proportionately from the quarterly payments due to the Independent Engineer until the cumulative recovery reaches 5% (five per cent) of the Contract Value.	(five per cent) from each quarterly payment until the cumulative recovery reaches 5% (five per cent) of the Contract Value." Deducting 5% from each of the 12 quarterly instalments means the cumulative recovery reaches 5% of the Contract Value only in the 12th quarter at the end of the contract. Kindly confirm the exact recovery mechanism (i.e., 5% deducted from each quarterly invoice across all 12 quarters) and further consider permitting the Consultant to furnish a single 10% Performance Bank Guarantee upfront in lieu of quarterly cash retention.	GST, until the cumulative recovery reaches 5% of the Contract Value. Any unrecovered balance shall be deducted from the final payment or other amounts due. The Performance Bank Guarantee and cumulative recovery shall together constitute the total Performance Security of 10% of the Contract Value. The request to furnish a single 10% Performance Bank Guarantee in lieu of quarterly recovery is not accepted. RFP conditions prevail.
61	Schedule-2 Independent Engineer Agreement, Clause 7.1.1 vs. Clause 7.1.3 (Page No. 111) **7.1 Performance Security:** 7.1.1 ...The balance remaining out of the Performance Security shall be returned to the Consultant at the end of 3 (three) months after the expiry of this Agreement pursuant to Clause 2.4 hereof. 7.1.3 The balance of the Performance Security remaining after adjustment of all recoveries shall be released within 180 days after expiry or termination	Schedule-2 Clauses 7.1.1 and 7.1.3 stipulate two conflicting release timelines for the Performance Security: 3 months (90 days) after expiry under Clause 7.1.1 versus 180 days after expiry or termination under Clause 7.1.3. We kindly request APADCL to harmonize both clauses and confirm that both the 5% Performance Bank Guarantee and the 5% recovered retention component shall be released within 3 months (90 days) from the expiry or completion of the Agreement.	**Confirmed.** Clauses 7.1.1 and 7.1.3 contain inconsistent release timelines. Clause 7.1.3 shall prevail. The Performance Bank Guarantee and the amount recovered from quarterly payments, after adjustment of all recoveries, claims and amounts due, shall be released within **180 days after expiry or termination of the Agreement and completion of all contractual obligations**. The reference to three months in Clause 7.1.1 shall be read accordingly. The request for release within 90 days is not accepted.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	of the Agreement and completion of all contractual obligations.		
62	Clause 3.4 Evaluation of Financial Proposal, Sub Clause 3.4.3 (Page No. 48) & Schedule-2 Clauses 1.2.1(a) & 6.1.2 (Pages 86 & 109) 3.4.3 Evaluation of Financial Proposal: For financial evaluation, the total cost indicated in the Financial Proposal, excluding Additional Costs, will be considered. Additional Costs shall include items specified as such in Form-2 of Appendix-II.	Clause 3.4.3 states that financial evaluation excludes "Additional Costs" specified in Form-2 of Appendix-II, and Schedule-2 Clauses 1.2.1(a) and 6.1.2 also define Additional Costs. However, Form-2 of Appendix-II does not contain a separate line item for Additional Costs. Kindly confirm that no Additional Costs apply under this RFP (other than GST), or specify the relavant items to be treated as Additional Costs.	For the Purpose of the Clarification Clause 3.4.3 may be read as For financial evaluation, the amount stated under Item D of Appendix-II, Form-2, being the Total Lump-Sum Professional Fee excluding GST, shall be considered. GST shall not form part of the evaluated Financial Proposal. No other amount shall be excluded unless expressly identified as an Additional Cost in Appendix-II, Form-2.
63	Appendix-II Financial Proposal, Form-2 (Head C) (Page No. 163) Appendix-II, Form-2 — Financial Proposal (Head C): The phrase "2-man days each of:" appears above items C.1–C.7.	In Appendix-II, Form-2 (Head C), the phrase "2-man days each of: "appears above items C.1 to C.7. Since items C.1 to C.7 represent fixed lump-sum out-of-pocket expenses for the assignment, the man-day reference appears to be disregarded, and that items C.1 to C.7 are to be quoted as lump sums covering the entire 36-month Consultancy Period. residual text. Kindly confirm that the phrase "2-man days each of:" may be	**Confirmed.** The phrase **“2-man days each of:”** under Head C of Appendix-II, Form-2 is residual text and shall be disregarded. Items C.1 to C.7 shall be quoted as lump-sum amounts for the entire 36-month Consultancy Period. The references to “Paragraph 5.5” in Schedule-1, Clauses 6.7.3 to 6.7.5 are residual cross-reference errors. In Clause 6.7.3, the reference shall be read as **Clause 6.7.3**, and in Clauses 6.7.4 and 6.7.5, it shall be read as a reference to **Clause 6.7.3**. Tests specified under these clauses shall be carried out or caused to be carried out, and paid for, by the Concessionaire, including laboratory, field, specialist and third-party testing and required

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
			retesting. The Independent Engineer shall specify, witness, monitor and review such Tests, and the cost of its routine witnessing, review and reporting shall be included in the quoted fee. Item C.5 shall not include Test costs that are the contractual responsibility of the Concessionaire. Any independent specialist Test directly procured by the Independent Engineer shall require APADCL's prior written instruction specifying the scope and payment responsibility.
64	Schedule-1 Terms of Reference, Clauses 6.7.3 – 6.7.5 (Page No. 70) 6.7.3 & 6.7.4 Contractual and Other Functions: 6.7.3 For determining that the Construction Works conform to Specifications and Standards, the Independent Engineer shall require the Concessionaire to carry out, or cause to be carried out, tests on a sample basis, to be specified by the Independent Engineer in accordance with Good Industry Practice for quality assurance. For purposes of this Paragraph 5.5, the tests specified in the relevant manuals... 6.7.4 The sample size of the tests, to be specified by the Independent	1. Clauses 6.7.3, 6.7.4, and 6.7.5 refer to "this Paragraph 5.5," which does not exist in Schedule-1 as all TOR clauses are numbered under Section 6. Kindly confirm that "Paragraph 5.5" should be read as "Clause 6.7.3. " Further, in conjunction with Form-2 Head C.5, kindly confirm that the cost of all laboratory, field, and third-party quality control tests directed by the IE shall be borne directly by the Concessionaire under the Concession Agreement, and not by the Independent Engineer.	**Confirmed.** References to "Paragraph 5.5" in Schedule-1, Clauses 6.7.3 to 6.7.5 are inadvertent cross-reference errors. In Clause 6.7.3, the reference shall be read as Clause 6.7.3, and in Clauses 6.7.4 and 6.7.5, it shall be read as referring to Clause 6.7.3. The Concessionaire shall carry out or cause to be carried out, and shall bear the cost of, all laboratory, field, specialist and third-party quality-control Tests specified by the Independent Engineer under these clauses, including required retesting. The Independent Engineer shall specify, witness, monitor and review such Tests, and the cost of routine witnessing, review and reporting shall be included in its quoted fee. Appendix-II, Form-2, Item C.5 shall not include testing costs that are the contractual responsibility of the Concessionaire. Any independent specialist Test directly procured by the Independent Engineer

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	Engineer under Paragraph 5.5, shall comprise 10% (ten percent) of the quantity or number of tests prescribed...		shall require APADCL's prior written instruction specifying the scope and payment responsibility.
65	Appendix-I Form-13 (Deployment of Personnel) & Form 14 (Survey and Field Investigations) (Page No. 156) Appendix-I, Form-13 & Form-14: Form-13 displays personnel deployment in man-days across Weeks 1–20, and Form-14 provides a format for Survey and Field Investigations.	1. Since the Consultancy Period is 36 months with Key Personnel inputs specified in man-months (Clause 2.3.1) and priced in man-months in Appendix-II Form-3, a 20 week man-day table in Form-13 does not align with the assignment duration. We kindly request permission to submit Form-13 on a month-wise basis (Months 1–36) in man-months. Further, as the IE is not required to execute field surveys or geotechnical investigations during the operational phase, kindly confirm that Form-14 (Survey and Field Investigations) may be marked "Not Applicable."	**Accepted.** Form-13 may be submitted month-wise for Months 1–36, showing site and off-site deployment in person-months. Form-14 may be marked "Not Applicable" for routine surveys/field investigations, with a note describing any inspection, test or investigation approach proposed under the TOR.
66	Schedule-2 Independent Engineer Agreement, Clause 3.5.2(a) & Footnote 3 (Page No. 103) 3.5.2 Insurance to be taken out by the Consultant: (a) Third Party liability insurance as required under Applicable Laws, with a minimum coverage of [Rs. 1 (one) crore]3; Footnote 3: This amount may be fixed at 1% (one per cent) of the indicative capital cost of the Project, but subject to a maximum of Rs. 20 (twenty) crore.	Clause 3.5.2(a) specifies Third-Party liability insurance with a minimum coverage of Rs. 1 (one) Crore, whereas Footnote 3 states that the amount may be fixed at 1% of the indicative capital cost of the Project up to Rs. 20 Crore. To enable bidders to accurately price insurance premiums in the Financial Proposal, kindly confirm that the mandatory Third Party liability insurance coverage required from the Independent Engineer is fixed at Rs. 1 (one) Crore as stated in the body of Clause 3.5.2(a).	**RFP Condition Prevails.** The stated minimum Third-Party liability insurance coverage under Schedule-2, Clause 3.5.2(a) is Rs. 1 crore, subject to the requirements of Applicable Laws. This is a minimum coverage requirement, not a cap. The other insurance requirements under Clause 3.5 shall also be complied with.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
67	Clause 1.3.1 & Schedule-1 TOR Clauses 6.4.7, 6.5.10, 6.8.1 (Pages 5, 60, 67 & 78) 1.3.1 Request for Proposals: 1.3.1 APADCL on behalf of Authority hereby invite proposals... who shall perform the duty of an Independent Engineer in accordance with the TOR and specific clause wise functions as detailed in the Concession Agreement appended herewith.	Clause 1.3.1 and Schedule-1 (TOR) refer to specific functions and obligations under the Concession Agreement dated 12.06.2020 (including Article 23, Schedule I, Schedule J, Clause 35, Clause 37.2, Maintenance Requirements, KPIs, Service Quality Requirements, and Safety Requirements), which is not appended to the RFP. We respectfully request APADCL to share/upload the relevant extracts of the Concession Agreement and its technical/O&M Schedules so that bidders can accurately assess the monitoring effort and compliance requirements.	The Independent Engineer's scope shall be as specified in Schedule-1 and the applicable provisions of the Concession Agreement. Bidders may approach APADCL for inspection of relevant Project records and specific clarifications under Clauses 1.4.1, 2.9 and 2.14. No reduction or exclusion of the TOR is provided by this clarification.
68	Schedule-1 Terms of Reference, Clauses 6.1.5(m), 6.3.2(e) & 6.7.13 (Trigger-Based Expansion) (Pages 56, 58 & 72) 6.7.13 Trigger-Based Expansion: Where any traffic, capacity, service-level or other expansion trigger specified in the Agreement is achieved or is likely to be achieved during the term of appointment of the Independent Engineer, the Independent Engineer shall: ... (viii) monitor the design, procurement, construction, testing, commissioning and operational readiness of expansion works undertaken during the Independent Engineer's term.	Because trigger-based phase-wise expansion depends on future passenger traffic thresholds, the quantum of design review and construction supervision effort cannot be quantified at the bidding stage within a fixed lump-sum fee. Kindly: (a) share the current Phase-1 design capacity, traffic expansion trigger thresholds, and confirm whether any expansion trigger is anticipated within the 36-month IE tenure; and (b) confirm that if Phase-2 expansion works commence during the IE's tenure, full-time design review and construction supervision shall be remunerated as Additional Services based on Appendix-II Form-3 man-month rates.	**Refer to 13 of the Corrigendum below** for design capacities, Traffic expansion trigger thresholds.
69	Schedule-1 Terms of Reference, Clauses 6.7.10 – 6.7.12 (Capital Works Register) (Pages 71 & 72)	Since the Airport achieved Commercial Operation Date (COD) on 17.08.2026, knowing the volume of post-COD punch-list items and planned works is essential for planning specialist inputs.	**RFP Condition Prevails**. The punch list and residual works list No quantified list or estimated values of these works are specified

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	6.7.10 Capital Works Register: Within 30 days of commencement of its appointment, the Independent Engineer shall, in consultation with the Authority and the Concessionaire, prepare a consolidated register of: a. ongoing Capital Works; b. planned Capital Works; c. Residual Works; d. outstanding punch-list items; e. pending Tests; f. warranty and defect-liability matters.	We kindly request the Authority to share an indicative list and estimated value of Residual Works (post-COD punch list), State Support Works, and Planned Capital Works scheduled for FY 2026–27 to FY 2029–30.	in the RFP. The Independent Engineer shall prepare the consolidated Capital Works Register, in consultation with the Authority and Concessionaire, within 30 days of commencement and update it monthly under Clauses 6.7.10 to 6.7.12. The scope includes the Residual Works, State Support Works and Capital Works specified in the TOR.
70	Section 1 Introduction, Clauses 1.1.4 & 1.2.1 (Pages 4 & 5) 1.1.4 Introduction: With the commencement of commercial operations and the Project having entered the operations and maintenance phase, the Authority intends to appoint an Independent Engineer to monitor, review and oversee the performance of the Concessionaire... The appointment of the Independent Engineer is proposed for a period of Thirty-Six (36) months from the date of commencement of services...	To ensure seamless continuity from the construction/commissioning phase into operational monitoring, kindly confirm: (a) whether an Independent Engineer was engaged during the construction phase and whether their baseline registers, completion certificates, and open punch-list/issue logs will be handed over to the incoming IE upon mobilization; and (b) the tentative Commencement Date anticipated by APADCL for this assignment.	The authority will make all efforts to ensures the records data baseline registers are handovered and Knowledge transfer to the newly appointed IE from the previous IE. Review of available Project records, baseline status and outstanding matters forms part of the Inception Report under Schedule-2, Annex-6. The Commencement Date shall be the date specified in the Letter of Award or otherwise notified in writing by the Authority under Clause 2.34.1.
71	Schedule-1 Terms of Reference, Clause 6.4.11 (Page No. 61)	Clause 6.4.11 requires the Independent Engineer to conduct a monthly audit of "the systems installed by the Concessionaire, to check its accuracy." Because "systems" could span a wide range of operational, IT, or financial platforms, kindly define which specific	**RFP Condition Prevails.** The monthly audit under Clause 6.4.11 shall verify the accuracy of systems and records relevant to the operational, maintenance, KPI and service-quality

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	6.4.11 Operation & Maintenance Period: The Independent Engineer shall, at least once every month, conduct an audit of the systems installed by the Concessionaire, to check its accuracy.	systems are covered under this monthly audit (e.g., KPI measurement systems, AODB/BHS/FIDS logs, or passenger/traffic counting systems) and clarify the expected scope of the monthly audit.	obligations within the TOR. The scope shall be read with Clauses 6.4.13 to 6.4.16, including maintenance systems, equipment logs, Airport Operational Database records, service-quality measurement systems and test/calibration records.
72	Schedule-1 Terms of Reference, Clause 6.4.12 (Page No. 61) **6.4.12 Operation & Maintenance Period:** The Independent Engineer shall at the end of the Concession Period (including, extension, if any) provide assistance on transfer of the Project Assets from the Concessionaire to the Authority and assist the Authority in undertaking all necessary activities required for issuance of Vesting Certificate to the Concessionaire in accordance with the terms of the Agreement.	Given that the Airport achieved COD on 17.08.2026 and the Concession Period extends well beyond this 36-month IE appointment, we kindly request APADCL to confirm that Clause 6.4.12 (and Divestment/Termination handback duties under Clauses 6.8.1–6.8.2) shall apply during the current tenure only in the event of an early termination of the Concession Agreement, and will not extend the IE's 36-month term without a mutually agreed extension and fee.	The appointment is for 36 months under Clause 1.5.1 and TOR Clause 6.1.8, subject to the Agreement. Event-based transfer and termination duties apply where the relevant event arises during the appointment; these clauses do not automatically extend its duration. The annual handback-readiness assessment under Clause 6.8.3 remains applicable. Any extension shall be in accordance with the Agreement, including written mutual consent under Schedule-2, Clause 2.4.
73	Clause 2.3.1 Deployment Conditions 1 & 4 (Page No. 17) & Schedule-2 Clause 4.5 (Page No. 107) **2.3.1 Deployment Conditions**: 1. The Team Leader and Airport Operations Expert shall be stationed at the Airport on a regular basis throughout the assignment. 4. Payment shall be subject to actual deployment and satisfactory	To establish clear administrative norms for site attendance and billing over the 36-month tenure, kindly: (a) define "stationed at the Airport on a regular basis" in terms of standard working days per month (e.g., 22–26 working days/month excluding Sundays and declared Airport/Public holidays); (b) confirm that admissible annual/statutory leave (up to 30 days per year, subject to prior approval for leave exceeding 7 days per Clause 4.5) and public holidays shall not be treated as "short deployment" or attract pro-rata fee deductions; and	**RFP Condition Prevails.** (a) The Team Leader and Airport Operations Expert shall be stationed at the Airport regularly throughout the assignment in accordance with the approved deployment schedule under Clause 2.3.1. The RFP does not prescribe a fixed working month of 22–26 days. Payment shall be subject to actual deployment and satisfactory performance.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	performance in accordance with the approved deployment schedule.	(c) confirm that an approved stand-in from the IE team during authorized leave satisfies deployment requirements.	b) Leave shall be governed by Schedule-2, Clause 4.5, and excluded from service man-days. Leave exceeding seven days shall require prior approval of the Authority. However, statutory/public holidays notified by the Government of Andhra Pradesh shall apply.
74	Clause 2.3.1 Deployment Condition 2 & Schedule-2 Annex-6 Note 6 (Pages 17 & 122) 2.3.1 Deployment Condition 2: 2. Other Key Personnel shall be deployed according to the approved work programme and requirements of O&M inspections, technical audits, Residual Works, Capital Works and determinations.	To ensure uniform financial quoting across all bidders for the remaining 7 intermittent Key Personnel (whose inputs range from 12 to 24 man-months over the 36-month tenure), kindly confirm that: (a) intermittent Key Personnel inputs will be tracked month-wise against the approved Form-13 deployment schedule; and (b) one (1) person-month for an intermittent Key Expert corresponds to 22–26 working days (including site inspections, off-site design/document reviews, and report preparation).	**RFP Condition Prevails.** Actual inputs shall be recorded against the approved deployment schedule and work programme, preserving the position-wise minimum inputs under Clause 2.3.1. Site and off-site inputs shall follow the approved schedule and be supported by deployment and attendance records. The RFP does not prescribe a fixed conversion of one person-month into 22-26 working days.
75	Appendix-II Form-2 (Items C.1–C.3) & Schedule-2 Clause 3.11 (Pages 105 & 163) & Schedule-2 Annex-6 Note 10 (Page No. 123) Schedule-2, Annex-6, Note 10: 10. All costs and expenses required for performance of the Services, including Personnel costs, travel, accommodation, office establishment, equipment, communication, inspections, reports and documentation, shall be deemed to be included in the quoted lump-sum price unless expressly	Under standard Airport Concession Agreements, the Concessionaire facilitates on-site workspace and security clearances for the Independent Engineer. Kindly confirm: a) whether APADCL or the Concessionaire (GVIAL) will provide furnished on-site office space, utilities, and internet connectivity at Bhogapuram Airport free of cost to the IE's site team, or whether the Consultant must rent external office premises and include such cost under Form-2 Head C; and (b) that APADCL/GVIAL will facilitate timely issuance of Airport Entry Passes (AEPs), airside driving/vehicle permits, and BCAS security clearances at no administrative fee to the IE.	**RFP Condition Prevails.** Office establishment, rent, equipment, communication and transport costs shall be included under Form-2, Items C.1 to C.3 and Annex-6, Note 10; free furnished office facilities are not assured in the RFP. Assistance with necessary permits and access shall be governed by Schedule-2, Clauses 5.1 and 5.2, subject to applicable security requirements. No blanket waiver of statutory or security-clearance fees is provided.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	provided otherwise in the Agreement.		
76	Clause 2.19.2(C) & Schedule-2 Clause 5.3 (Change in Applicable Law) (Pages 31 & 109) Schedule-2, Clause 5.3 Change in Applicable Law: If, after the date of this Agreement, there is any change in the Applicable Laws with respect to taxes and duties which increases or decreases the cost or reimbursable expenses incurred by the Consultant in performing the Services, by an amount exceeding 2% (two per cent) of the Agreement Value specified in Clause 6.1.2, then the remuneration and reimbursable expenses otherwise payable to the Consultant under this Agreement shall be increased or decreased accordingly...	1. Given that the Consultancy Period spans 36 months (3 years) and annual professional remuneration increments average 7–8%, we kindly request APADCL to introduce an annual price-adjustment/escalation clause from Month 13 onward (e.g., linked to CPI/WPI on the personnel remuneration component), or confirm that rates remain strictly fixed so all bidders factor inflation uniformly. Further, since GST is payable additionally at applicable rates (Annex-6 Note 9), kindly confirm that any statutory change in the GST rate will be adjusted at actuals without being subject to the 2% threshold under Clause 5.3.	**RFP Condition Prevails.** (a) Price escalation: RFP Condition Prevails. Under Clause 2.19.2(C), quoted rates shall remain firm throughout the 36-month Consultancy Period. No annual escalation linked to CPI/WPI or salary increments is provided. Bidders shall factor anticipated inflation and remuneration increases into their quoted lump-sum fee. (b) GST: GST shall be paid additionally at the applicable rate under Annex-6, Note 9 and Appendix-II, Form-2. Adjustments to remuneration and reimbursable expenses arising from changes in tax laws shall remain governed by Schedule-2, Clause 5.3, including the cost-impact threshold exceeding 2% of the Agreement Value and agreement between the Parties. The requested exemption of GST-rate changes from this threshold is not expressly provided in the RFP.
77	Schedule-2 Clause 6.3(a)–(e) & Annex 6 (Payment Schedule) (Pages 110 & 120) Schedule-2, Clause 6.3 Mode of billing and payment: (a) The Consultant shall be paid on a quarterly basis against the lump-sum Agreement Value in accordance with	Quarterly billing in arrears without a mobilization advance requires the Independent Engineer to fund nearly four months of full site mobilization and operations prior to receiving the first payout. To ensure smooth cash flow, we respectfully request APADCL to: (a) consider monthly billing in arrears (1/36th per month) or provide a 10% mobilization advance against a Bank Guarantee; (b) confirm that the 30-day payment period runs from the date of submission of the quarterly invoice and deliverables; and	**RFP Condition Prevails.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	the Payment Schedule set forth in Annex-6 (c) The Authority shall pay the undisputed amount within 30 days from receipt of a complete and correct invoice together with the supporting documents prescribed in Annex-6. (e) No Mobilization Advance shall be payable under this Agreement.	(c) include a standard provision for interest on undisputed invoice amounts delayed beyond 30 days.	
78	Schedule-2 Annex-6 Notes 6 & 7 (Page No. 122) Schedule-2, Annex-6, Notes 6 & 7: 6. In case of non-deployment, short deployment or unauthorized absence of any Key Personnel or other Personnel, the corresponding remuneration shall be deducted proportionately from the respective quarterly payment. 7. The Authority may withhold an appropriate amount from the quarterly payment on account of non- performance or part-performance of the Services, delay in submission of reports, non-deployment of Personnel or submission of incomplete or deficient deliverables.	Annex-6 Notes 6 and 7 pair a lump-sum payment structure with pro-rata deductions and additional withholding for short deployment, while offering no additional compensation if extra man-months are required. To prevent double deduction for a single shortfall event, kindly confirm that any deduction for short deployment of a Key Expert shall be calculated strictly on a pro-rata basis using the person month rate quoted in Appendix-II Form-3, and that such pro-rata adjustment shall constitute the sole recovery without simultaneous withholding or Liquidated Damages.	**RFP Condition Prevails.**
79	Clause 2.31.1 & Schedule-2 Clauses 3.4.3 – 3.4.4 & 7.2.1 (Liability & LD Caps) (Pages 39, 101, 102 & 111)	In an advisory and monitoring consultancy assignment, multi fold liability exposure (up to 3× Agreement Value) and deemed	**RFP Condition Prevails.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	Schedule-2, Clauses 3.4.3, 3.4.4 & 7.2.1: 3.4.3 ...shall not be liable to the Authority: (b) for any direct loss or damage that exceeds (a) the Agreement Value set forth in Clause 6.1.2 of this Agreement, or (b) the proceeds the Consultant may be entitled to receive from any insurance... 3.4.4 This limitation of liability specified in Clause 3.4.3 shall not affect the Consultant's liability, if any, for damage to Third Parties... subject, however, to a limit equal to 3 (three) times the Agreement Value. 7.2.1 ...recovered from the Consultant by way of deemed liquidated damages, subject to a maximum of 50% (fifty per cent) of the Agreement Value.	Liquidated Damages up to 50% of Agreement Value create disproportionate financial risk. In line with standard MoCA / NITI Aayog consultancy agreements, we respectfully request APADCL to: (a) cap the Independent Engineer's total aggregate liability under the Agreement (inclusive of all Liquidated Damages under Clauses 7.2.1 and 7.2.2) at 100% (1×) of the Agreement Value (with total LDs capped at 10% of Agreement Value); and (b) cap third-party liability at the required Third-Party insurance cover under Clause 3.5.2(a).	Liability and liquidated damages shall be governed by Schedule-2, Clauses 3.4 and 7.2, read with Clause 2.31.1. The requested aggregate liability cap, reduction of all liquidated damages to 10%, and restriction of Third-Party liability to the insurance cover are not accepted. The respective contractual limits remain unchanged.
80	Schedule-2 Independent Engineer Agreement, Clause 3.5.2(c) (Professional Liability Insurance) (Page No. 103) **3.5.2 Insurance to be taken out by the Consultant:** (c) professional liability insurance for an amount no less than the Agreement Value. The indemnity limit in terms of "Any One Accident" (AOA) and "Aggregate limit on the policy period" (AOP) should not be	Established international and domestic engineering consultancies maintain comprehensive annual company-wide / global Professional Indemnity (PI) insurance policies rather than project-specific policies. Kindly confirm that: (a) an existing annual company-wide Professional Indemnity policy held by the Lead Member with AOA and AOP coverage equal to or exceeding the Agreement Value (renewed annually throughout the 36-month term) is acceptable in compliance with Clause 3.5.2(c); and (b) a certificate from the insurer/broker confirming coverage for this assignment satisfies Clause 3.5.1(b) without requiring disclosure of confidential global master policy terms.	**RFP Condition Prevails.** A company-wide policy must satisfy the prescribed risks, coverage, AOA/AOP limits, continuous validity, Lead Member and Authority-approval requirements. Where the general-policy exemption from naming the Authority as beneficiary is sought, Clause 3.5(d) requires three times the prescribed cover. Clause 3.5(b) requires policy certificates, policy copies and proof of premium payment; an insurer/broker certificate alone does not replace these documents.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	less than the amount stated in Clause 6.1.2 of the Agreement. In case of consortium, the policy should be in the name of Lead Member and not in the name of individual Members of the consortium.		
81	**Pg 135, SCHEDULE-3** Authority and consultants: 1. Potential consultant should not be privy to information from the Authority which is not available to others; 2. potential consultant should not have defined the project when earlier working for the Authority; 3. potential consultant should not have recently worked for the Authority overseeing the project**.**	We understand that any firm that has undertaken the TEFR/DPR stage of an airport project on behalf of the concerned Authority shall not be considered to have any conflict of interest and should therefore be deemed eligible to participate in the bidding process. Please confirm the above understanding.	**RFP condition prevails.** Prior TEFR/DPR engagement does not confer automatic eligibility or exemption from conflict-of-interest provisions. Relevant past/current assignments, relationships and access to non-public information must be disclosed. Eligibility will be assessed under Clause 2.5 and Schedule-3, including the restrictions concerning prior project definition and oversight.
82	**Pg 46** 3.2.2.3 Provided further that, in the case of an assignment relating to operation and maintenance monitoring, concession compliance monitoring, asset management or technical audit, the Applicant shall have completed at least 24 (twenty-four) months of services as on the Proposal Due Date or the entire prescribed duration of the assignment, where such duration	We requested that the clause may be modify as under: In the case of an assignment relating to operation and maintenance monitoring, concession-compliance monitoring, asset management or technical audit, the Applicant shall have completed at least 23 months of services as on the Proposal Due Date or the entire prescribed duration of the assignment, where such duration was less than 24 (twenty-four) months. 24 months period reduced to	**RFP condition prevails.** The minimum 24 months of completed services under Clause 3.2.2.3 is retained. An assignment whose prescribed total duration was less than 24 months may qualify only after that entire duration has been completed. A general reduction to 23 months is not accepted.

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	was less than 24 (twenty-four) months.		
83	**Pg 46 3.2.3 Non-Core Sector work:** Any other infrastructure projects comprising Commercial/ institutional buildings/ retail/ offices/ hotels/ Logistic Park/ Hospital/ Residential township undertaken by the Applicant shall be considered:	We requested that the clause may be modify as under: Any other infrastructure projects comprising Commercial/ institutional buildings/ retail/ offices/ hotels/ Logistic Park/ Hospital/ Residential township/**Metro Rail Project /Highway Project/Express way Project** undertaken by the Applicant shall be considered:	**Refer to 09 of Corrigendum below.**
84	Bid Submission End Date 18.11.2026	We requested that the bid submission end date may be extend at least 15 days from the issue of the clarifications	**Refer to 03 of Corrigendum below.**
85	Bid submission extension	Allow at least 3 weeks from issue of APADCL's pre-bid replies before bid submission due to due to upcoming holidays on the occasion of Chhath Puja and others , procuring Bid Security in the form of Bank Guarantee and other legal documents & contacting proposed key experts and getting details of experience certificates etc.	**Refer to 03 of Corrigendum below.**
86	**Page no. 9 Clause no. 6 & 7** End date of Online submission of Bids envelopes I & II on ape-procurement portal – 18.11.2026 at 3.30 pm Last date to submit original Bank Guarantee of Tender Fees/EMD and letter of unconditional acceptance of AUTHORITY's terms and conditions at 05.00 pm	We kindly request you to extend the date of submission by two weeks from the date of uploading the pre-bid replies to prepare a comprehensive and responsive bid.	**Refer to 03 of Corrigendum below.**
87	**Page no. 18 Clause no. A** **Technical Capacity:**	We request you to modify the clause as under: The Applicant shall have, over the past 15 (Fifteen) years preceding the PDD, undertaken a minimum of 2 (two) Eligible	**RFP Condition prevails.**

SL No	Item Description	Clarification sought	Reply/ Clarification by APADCL
	The Applicant shall have, over the past 10 (Ten) years preceding the PDD, undertaken a minimum of 2 (two) Eligible Assignments. Out of the minimum two Eligible Assignments, at least one Eligible Assignment shall be a Core Sector Airport Assignment as specified in Clause 3.1.3	Assignments. Out of the minimum two Eligible Assignments, at least one Eligible Assignment shall be a Core Sector Airport Assignment as specified in Clause 3.1.3	

Corrigendum No. 01 Date.18.11.2026

Subject: Selection of Independent Engineer for Monitoring the Concession Agreement in Respect of Operations, Management and Development of Alluri Sitaramaraju International Airport at Bhogapuram, Vizianagaram District, Andhra Pradesh

Reference RFP Notice No. 04/APADCL/IE/Bhogapuram/2026-27 dated 02.11.2026, published on 04.11.2026, and the related responses to pre-bid queries.

In accordance with Clause 2.15 of the RFP and the decisions recorded in the responses to pre-bid queries, the following amendments are made to the RFP. The replacement provisions set out below shall be read as an integral part of the RFP and shall apply uniformly to all Applicants.

<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>RFP reference</th><th>Existing provision</th><th>Amended provision / decision</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>1 Separate RFP cost and bid processing fee

RFP references Clause 1.2, Sl. Nos. 3 and 4, page 4; Clause 1.6.14, page 8. Pre-bid reply Sl. No. 41.</td><td>Clause 1.2, Sl. No. 3: Cost of RFP - Rs. 11,800 (Non-Refundable).

Clause 1.2, Sl. No. 4: Bid Processing Fee - Rs. 20,000 plus 18% GST, i.e. Rs. 23,600.

1.6.14 Bid Processing Fee: Prior to submission of the Bid, the Bidder shall pay to the Authority a sum of Rs. 23,600 (Rupees Twenty-Three Thousand and Six Hundred Only) including GST as the cost of the RFP as tender processing fee to be paid through AP e-Procurement portal.</td><td>Clause 1.6.14 shall be replaced by the following:

1.6.14 Prior to submission of the Bid, the Bidder shall pay the following amounts separately through the AP e-Procurement portal in accordance with the prescribed procedure:

<table><tr><th>Fee</th><th>Amount payable</th></tr><tr><td>Non-refundable Cost of RFP</td><td>Rs. 11,800</td></tr><tr><td>Bid Processing Fee</td><td>Rs. 20,000 plus 18% GST, aggregating to Rs. 23,600</td></tr><tr><td>Total of the above two charges</td><td>Rs. 35,400</td></tr></table>
The Cost of RFP and the Bid Processing Fee are separate charges. Clause 1.2, Sl. Nos. 3 and 4 shall be read accordingly.</td></tr>
</table>

Sl. No.	RFP reference	Existing provision	Amended provision / decision
2	**2 Uniform conversion of foreign currency credentials** RFP references Clause 1.6.18, page 8; final sentence of Clause 3.2.3.1, page 46. Pre-bid replies Sl. Nos. 6 and 43; related Sl. No. 38.	1.6.18 Currency conversion rate and payment For the purposes of technical evaluation of Applicants [Rs. 72 (Rupees Seventy two)] per US$ shall be considered as the applicable currency conversion rate. In case of any other currency, the same shall first be converted to US$ as on the date 60 (sixty) days prior to the PDD, and the amount so derived in US$ shall be converted into INR at the aforesaid rate. The conversion rate of such currencies shall be the daily representative exchange rates published by the International Monetary Fund for the relevant date. Clause 3.2.3.1: "For conversion purpose the foreign exchange rates as on Bid Due Date shall be applicable."	Clause 1.6.18 shall be replaced by the following: **1.6.18** For conversion of US Dollars to Rupees, the rate of conversion shall be Rupees ____ to a US Dollar. In case of any other currency, the same shall first be converted to US Dollars as on the date 60 (sixty) days prior to the Bid Due Date, and the amount so derived in US Dollars shall be converted into Rupees at the aforesaid rate. The conversion rate of such currencies shall be the daily representative exchange rates published by the International Monetary Fund for the relevant date. [1] The conversion rate of USD into Rupees shall be the daily representative exchange rates published by the Reserve Bank of India for the relevant date. Where relevant date should be as on the date ___ days prior to the Bid Due Date.
3	**3 Revised schedule of the selection process** RFP reference Clause 1.7, page 9. Pre-bid replies Sl. Nos. 8, 34, 40, 42, 84, 85 and 86.	4 Publication of replies to pre-bid queries on the APADCL website 16.11.2026 at 03.30 PM 6 End date for online submission of Bids, Envelopes I and II 18.11.2026 at 03.30 PM	The following entries in the Schedule of Selection Process shall be read with the revised dates and times set out below. The remaining entries in Clause 1.7 remain unchanged.

<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>RFP reference</th><th>Existing provision</th><th>Amended provision / decision</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>7 Submission of original Bank Guarantee of Tender Fees/EMD and letter of unconditional acceptance 18.11.2026 at 05.00 PM

8 Opening of Pre-Qualification cum Technical Bids on the e-procurement portal 18.11.2026 at 05.00 PM

9 Opening of Financial Bids on the e-procurement portal 20.11.2026 at 04.00 PM</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>RFP item and event</th><th>Existing date and time</th><th>Revised date and time</th></tr>
<tr><td>6 End date for online submission of Bids, Envelopes I and II</td><td>18.11.2026 at 03.30 PM</td><td>02.12.2026 at 03.30 PM</td></tr>
<tr><td>7 Submission of original Bank Guarantee of Tender Fees/EMD and letter of unconditional acceptance</td><td>18.11.2026 at 05.00 PM</td><td>02.12.2026 @ 05:00 PM</td></tr>
<tr><td>8 Opening of Pre-Qualification cum Technical Bids on the e-procurement portal</td><td>18.11.2026 at 05.00 PM</td><td>02.12.2026 @ 05:00 PM</td></tr>
<tr><td>9 Opening of Financial Bids on the e-procurement portal</td><td>20.11.2026 at 04.00 PM</td><td>04.12.2026 at 04.00 PM</td></tr>
</table>

All times are Indian Standard Time. The revised online bid submission deadline shall constitute the Proposal Due Date. Bid validity, Bid Security validity and other periods expressly linked to the Proposal Due Date shall be reckoned from the revised Proposal Due Date in accordance with the RFP.</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>4 Core Sector experience of the Lead Member

RFP reference Clause 2.1.4(e), page 12. Pre-bid reply Sl. No. 45.</td><td>Clause 2.1.4(e): The Lead Member shall independently have completed or substantially performed at least 1 (one) Core Sector Airport</td><td>Clause 2.1.4(e) shall be replaced by the following:

2.1.4(e) The Lead Member shall independently have completed or substantially performed at least 1 (one) Core Sector Airport Assignment meeting the requirements of Clause 3.2.2, read with Clauses 3.2.2.1 to 3.2.2.5 and Clause 3.2.4.</td></tr>
</table>

Sl. No.	RFP reference	Existing provision	Amended provision / decision
		Assignment meeting the requirements of Clause 3.1.3.	The requirement for the Lead Member to independently demonstrate the prescribed Core Sector Airport Assignment remains unchanged. This amendment corrects the reference to Clause 3.1.3.
5	**5 Disqualification and termination of the consultancy appointment** RFP reference Clause 2.12.1, page 25. Pre-bid reply Sl. No. 51.	2.12.1 In case it is found during the evaluation or at any time before signing of the Concession Agreement or after its execution and during the period of subsistence thereof, including the concession thereby granted by the Authority, that one or more of the qual ification conditions have not been met by the Applicant, or the Applicant has made material misrepresentation or has given any materially incorrect or false information, the Applicant shall be disqualified forthwith if not yet appointed as the Concessionaire either by issue of the LOA or entering into of the Concession Agreement, and if the Applicant/SPV has already been issued the LOA or has entered into the Concession Agreement, as the case may be, the same shall, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained therein or in this RFP, be liable to be terminated, by a communication in	Clause 2.12.1 shall be replaced by the following: **2.12.1** In case it is found during evaluation or at any time before execution of the Independent Engineer Agreement, or after its execution and during its subsistence, that one or more qualification conditions have not been met by the Applicant, or that the Applicant has made a material misrepresentation or furnished materially incorrect or false information, the Applicant shall be disqualified forthwith if the Letter of Award has not been issued and the Independent Engineer Agreement has not been executed. Where the Letter of Award has already been issued to the Selected Applicant or the Independent Engineer Agreement has been executed by the Consultant, the Letter of Award or the Independent Engineer Agreement, as applicable, shall, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained therein or in this RFP, be liable to cancellation or termination by a communication in writing from the Authority to the Selected Applicant or Consultant. The Authority/APADCL shall not be liable in any manner whatsoever to the Applicant, Selected Applicant or Consultant on this account. This shall be without prejudice to any other right or remedy available to the Authority/APADCL under this RFP, the Bidding Documents, the Letter of Award, the Independent Engineer Agreement or Applicable Laws, including rights and remedies relating to Bid Security and Performance Security. The substitutions in this amendment apply to Clause 2.12.1. References to the project Concession Agreement in the TOR and the Independent Engineer's monitoring obligations retain their existing meaning.

<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>RFP reference</th><th>Existing provision</th><th>Amended provision / decision</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>writing by the Authority to the Applicant, without the Authority/ APADCL being liable in any manner whatsoever to the Applicant and without prejudice to any other right or remedy which the Authority/APADCL may have under this RFP, the Bidding Documents, the Concession Agreement or under applicable laws.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>6</td><td>6 Eligibility references for Key Personnel

RFP references Clause 2.4.4(D), pages 18 and 19, read with Clauses 3.1.10 and 3.1.11. Pre-bid reply Sl. No. 47; related Sl. No. 53.</td><td>Clause 2.4.4(D) refers to Clause 3.1.3 in the Experience column for the Team Leader; Civil, Structural and Airfield Pavement Expert; Airport IT and Systems Expert; Mechanical Expert; Quality Assurance/Control Expert; and Electrical Expert.

The minimum experience periods are 15 years for the Team Leader, 10 years for the Civil, Structural and Airfield Pavement Expert, and 7 years for the other positions listed above.

The Airport IT and Systems Expert entry presently refers to experience in "Airports or other eligible projects as defined in Clause 3.1.3".</td><td>In the Experience column of Clause 2.4.4(D), the references to Clause 3.1.3 shall be corrected through the following replacement wording for the relevant positions:
<table>
<tr><th>Key Personnel</th><th>Revised wording in the Experience column</th></tr>
<tr><td>Team Leader</td><td>Minimum 15 years' experience in Airports or other eligible projects as defined in Clauses 3.2.2, 3.2.3 and 3.2.4.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Civil, Structural and Airfield Pavement Expert</td><td>Minimum 10 years' experience in Airports or other eligible projects as defined in Clauses 3.2.2, 3.2.3 and 3.2.4.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mechanical Expert</td><td>Minimum 7 years' experience in Airports or other eligible projects as defined in Clauses 3.2.2, 3.2.3 and 3.2.4.</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>RFP reference</th><th>Existing provision</th><th>Amended provision / decision</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>The EHS Expert entry refers to Clause 3.2. The position-specific qualifications and assignment requirements are set out in the same eligibility table.</td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Quality Assurance/Control Expert</td><td>Minimum 7 years' experience in Airports or other eligible projects as defined in Clauses 3.2.2, 3.2.3 and 3.2.4.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Electrical Expert</td><td>Minimum 7 years' experience in Airports or other eligible projects as defined in Clauses 3.2.2, 3.2.3 and 3.2.4.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Airport IT and Systems Expert</td><td>Minimum 7 years' professional experience in Airport IT, communication, baggage-handling, passenger-processing, security or other Airport operational systems.</td></tr>
</table>
For the Airport IT and Systems Expert, the Experience on Eligible Assignments requirement shall be read as follows:
The expert shall have worked as an Airport IT Specialist, or in the specified or equivalent role, on at least one Core Sector Airport Assignment satisfying Clauses 3.2.2 and 3.2.4.
Airport-sector experience remains mandatory for both the Airport Operations Expert and the Airport IT and Systems Expert. Non-Core Sector Assignments shall not be considered for these two positions. The applicable eligibility references for these positions are Clauses 3.2.2 and 3.2.4.
The EHS Expert's existing reference to Clause 3.2 shall be read with the applicable provisions of Clauses 3.2.2, 3.2.3 and 3.2.4. The prescribed educational qualifications, minimum experience periods, position-specific assignment requirements and scoring provisions otherwise remain unchanged. In particular, the
</td></tr>
</table>

Sl. No.	RFP reference	Existing provision	Amended provision / decision
			Team Leader shall continue to have led or managed at least one Eligible Airport Assignment.
7	**7 Signed curriculum vitae at the proposal stage** RFP reference Clause 2.18.2(G), page 29. Pre-bid reply Sl. No. 48.	Clause 2.18.2(G): The CVs have been recently signed and dated in blue ink by the respective Personnel and countersigned by the Applicant. Photocopy or unsigned / countersigned CVs shall be rejected;	Clause 2.18.2(G) shall be replaced by the following: **2.18.2(G)** The CVs shall have been recently signed and dated in blue ink by the respective Personnel and countersigned by the Applicant. At the proposal stage, legible scanned copies of such signed and countersigned CVs may be uploaded with the Technical Proposal. Unsigned CVs or CVs lacking the Applicant's countersignature shall be rejected. The Selected Applicant shall submit the corresponding original wet-ink signed and countersigned CVs, together with the supporting documents required for verification, before issuance of the Letter of Award. The requirement for an undertaking regarding availability under Clause 2.18.2(H) remains unchanged.
8	**8 Firm rates for the Independent Engineer assignment** RFP reference Clause 2.19.2(C), page 31. Pre-bid reply Sl. No. 50.	Clause 2.19.2(C): The rates quoted shall be firm throughout the period of performance of the assignment upto and including acceptance of the Feasibility Report by the Authority and discharge of all obligations of the Consultant under the Agreement.	Clause 2.19.2(C) shall be replaced by the following: **2.19.2(C)** The rates quoted shall remain firm throughout the period of performance of the Independent Engineer assignment and until discharge of all obligations of the Consultant under the Independent Engineer Agreement. **The reference to acceptance of a Feasibility Report shall stand deleted.** This correction does not introduce annual escalation or alter the express provisions of the Agreement relating to GST or changes in Applicable Law.
9	**Eligible Non Core Sector Assignments** RFP references Clause 3.2.3 and associated sub-clauses, page 46; Clause 3.2.4, page 47. Pre-bid replies Sl. Nos. 38, 55 and 83; related Sl. No. 3.	3.2.3 Non-Core Sector work: Any other infrastructure projects comprising Commercial/ institutional buildings/retail/offices/hotels/ Logistic Park/ Hospital/Residential township undertaken by the	Clause 3.2.3 shall be replaced by the following: **3.2.3** A Non-Core Sector Assignment shall mean a qualifying consultancy assignment relating to any of the following categories: (a) commercial, institutional or mixed-use buildings; (b) retail complexes;

Sl. No.	RFP reference	Existing provision	Amended provision / decision
		Applicant shall be considered: 3.2.3.1 Provided that the estimated capital cost of the project exceeds Rs.2300 crores (Rupees Two thousand three hundred crores only) completed in last 10 years prior to Bid Due Date. For conversion purpose the foreign exchange rates as on Bid Due Date shall be applicable. 3.2.3.2 Provided that the construction of the Eligible Assignment has been at least 90% completed. 3.2.3.5 Provided further that if the Applicant firm is taking credit for an Eligible Assignment which was undertaken for a private sector entity, such assignment shall have been completed prior to PDD and the Applicant shall have received professional fees of at least Rs. 4.60 (Four Crore Sixty Lakhs) crore.	(c) office complexes; (d) hotels; (e) logistics parks; (f) hospitals; (g) residential townships; (h) Metro Rail systems; (i) Regional Rapid Transit Systems; (j) major railway stations or major railway infrastructure projects; (k) multimodal transport hubs; or (l) other large, complex and multidisciplinary transport or public-infrastructure projects of a scale and technical complexity comparable to Metro Rail projects. For Non-Core Sector Assignments, eligible services shall include Project Management Consultancy, Independent Engineer, Authority's Engineer, Engineer-in-Charge, Construction Supervision or other comparable multidisciplinary consultancy services materially relevant to the Consultancy. Detailed Design shall qualify only where the assignment includes material project-implementation or construction-stage responsibilities. Standalone feasibility, DPR, design-only, proof-checking, audit-only, testing-only, manpower-supply and single-discipline assignments shall not qualify as Non-Core Sector Assignments. These exclusions do not amend the services eligible as Core Sector Airport Assignments under Clause 3.2.2. The estimated project capital cost shall continue to exceed Rs. 2,300 crore (Rupees Two Thousand Three Hundred Crore only). The existing 10-year eligibility period, applicable completion requirements, professional-fee requirements and documentary-evidence requirements under Clauses 3.2.3.1 to 3.2.3.5 and Clause

Sl. No.	RFP reference	Existing provision	Amended provision / decision
			3.2.4 remain unchanged, except for the currency-conversion correction in Amendment 2 above. Accordingly, the request for a lower or waived capital-cost threshold, an extension of the eligibility period to 15 years, or relaxation of the applicable supporting-evidence requirements is not accepted. Classification and acceptance of each assignment shall remain subject to compliance with the amended RFP.
10	**10 Corrected references in the Letter of Proposal** RFP reference Appendix-I, Form-1, paragraphs 7(b), 7(d), 8 and 14, page 139. Pre-bid reply Sl. No. 52.	Paragraph 7(b): Conflict of Interest declaration refers to Clause 2.3. Paragraph 7(d): Declaration concerning prohibited practices refers to Clause 4.3. Paragraph 8: Cancellation of the Selection Process refers to Clause 2.8. Paragraph 14: Furnishing of Bid Security refers to Clause 2.22.	The following paragraphs of Appendix-I, Form-1 shall be replaced as set out below. The remaining paragraphs of the Letter of Proposal remain unchanged. **7(b)** I/We do not have any Conflict of Interest in accordance with Clause 2.5 of the RFP Document; **7(d)** I/We have not directly or indirectly or through an agent engaged or indulged in any corrupt practice, fraudulent practice, coercive practice, undesirable practice or restrictive practice, as defined in Section 4, including Clauses 4.1.1 to 4.1.9, as applicable, of the RFP Document, in respect of any tender or request for proposal issued by or any agreement entered into with the Authority or any other public sector enterprise or any government, Central or State; and **8 I**/We understand that you may cancel the Selection Process at any time and that you are neither bound to accept any Proposal that you may receive nor to select the Consultant, without incurring any liability to the Applicants, in accordance with Clause 2.11.1 of the RFP Document. **14 The** Bid Security of Rs. [amount in figures] (Rupees [amount in words]) in the form of an unconditional and irrevocable Bank Guarantee has been furnished in accordance with Clause 2.24 of the RFP. The references proposed by the bidder to Clause 4.13 and Clause 3.4 are not adopted. The applicable references are Section 4 and Clause 2.11.1, respectively.

<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>RFP reference</th><th>Existing provision</th><th>Amended provision / decision</th></tr>
<tr><td>12</td><td>1.2 Brief Details
4. Bid Processing Fee</td><td>Rs. 20,000/+18% GST-(i.e., 23,600/-) The Bid processing fee of the RFP shall be paid as per the procedure of AP e-procurement portal.</td><td>Rs. 20,000/+18% GST-(i.e., 23,600/-) The Bid processing fee of the RFP shall be paid to in favour of “Andhra Pradesh Airports Development Corporation Limited” A/c No: 50200020235682 of HDFC Bank of India, IFSC: HDFC0000050, (APADCL), Branch: Dwarakanagar, Visakhapatnam AP. The Demand Draft shall remain valid for one month after the Bid Due Date.</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>Schedule-1 Terms of Reference, Clauses 6.1.5(m), 6.3.2(e) & 6.7.13 (Trigger-Based Expansion) (Pages 56, 58 & 72)

6.7.13 Trigger-Based Expansion: Where any traffic, capacity, service-level or other expansion trigger specified in the Agreement is achieved or is likely to be achieved during the term of appointment of the Independent Engineer, the Independent Engineer shall: ... (viii) monitor the design, procurement, construction, testing, commissioning and operational readiness of expansion works undertaken during the Independent Engineer's term.</td><td>Because trigger-based phase-wise expansion depends on future passenger traffic thresholds, the quantum of design review and construction supervision effort cannot be quantified at the bidding stage within a fixed lump-sum fee. Kindly:

(a) share the current Phase-1 design capacity, traffic expansion trigger thresholds, and confirm whether any expansion trigger is anticipated within the 36-month IE tenure; and

(b) confirm that if Phase-2 expansion works commence during the IE's tenure, full-time design review and construction supervision shall be remunerated as Additional Services based on Appendix-II Form-3 man-month rates.</td><td>Phase-1 design capacity, traffic expansion trigger thresholds as below:

Table 1: Design Capacity and Traffic Triggers for Phasing
<table><tr><th>Phasing</th><th>Traffic Design Capacity (Million Passengers Per Annum)</th><th>Trigger for Phase(s)</th></tr><tr><td>Phase I</td><td>6 Million</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>Phase II</td><td>12 Million</td><td>Expansion shall start immediately when the traffic reaches 80% of MPPA for Phase-1 i.e. 6 million</td></tr><tr><td>Phase III</td><td>18 million</td><td>Expansion shall start immediately when the traffic reaches 80% of MPPA for Phase-2 i.e. 12 million</td></tr><tr><td>Subsequent Phase(s)</td><td>As per assessed capacity</td><td>The Concessionaire shall conduct traffic studies and take up expansion when the traffic reaches 80% ofMPPA for Phase-3 i.e. 18 million</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

Application of this Corrigendum

This Corrigendum shall form an integral part of the RFP. In the event of an inconsistency between the original wording of the provisions expressly amended above and this Corrigendum, this Corrigendum shall prevail to the extent of the amendment. The RFP shall be read together with the pre-bid clarifications issued by APADCL.

Except as expressly amended above, all other terms, conditions, eligibility requirements, evaluation provisions and contractual obligations of the RFP, read with the issued pre-bid clarifications, remain unchanged.

"Content Signed"

18/11/26

Project Manager (Engg)
APADCL, Kurnool Airport

GM(A) -

PRAVEEN ADHITHYA C V, I A S
MANAGING DIRECTOR
Andhra Pradesh Airports Development Corporation Limited