ALL INDIA FOOTBALL FEDERATION

CLARIFICATIONS IN RELATION TO THE REQUEST FOR QUOTATION (RFQ) FOR SELECTION OF AN AGENCY FOR MANAGING THE PROCESS RELATING TO AWARDING THE RIGHT TO MONETISE COMMERCIAL RIGHTS BELONGING TO THE ALL INDIA FOOTBALL FEDERATION (AIFF) FOR A LIMITED TERM ISSUED ON 7 SEPTEMBER 2025

Date: 11 September 2025

ALL INDIA FOOTBALL FEDERATION
Football House, Sector 19,
Dwarka, New Delhi – 110 075

RFQ FOR SELECTION OF AN AGENCY FOR MANAGING THE PROCESS RELATING TO AWARDING THE RIGHT TO MONETISE COMMERCIAL RIGHTS BELONGING TO THE AIFF FOR A LIMITED TERM

The RFQ was issued on 7 September 2025 by AIFF, by way of publication on the Website. Interested bidders were provided with time until 9 September 2025 to seek clarifications. In light of the clarifications sought by interested bidders from AIFF, the following amendments/modifications/clarifications to the RFQ are being issued:

S No	Clause	Query	Response
1.	Clause 5.1 (a)(4)	We request that the eligibility criteria be broadened to encompass experience in the sports consulting domain, including valuation-related assignments undertaken within the past fifteen (15) years. This will allow participation from firms with deep and relevant expertise, foster a more inclusive and competitive bidding environment	The parameter under Clause 5.1(a)(4) of the RFQ shall stand revised and be hereinafter read as "*The Bidder must have experience in executing at least five (5) similar assignments from at least three (3) distinct clients over the past ten (10) years, which clients may be governments, sports federations and/or leagues in India.*"
2.	Clause 5.1(a)(4)	(a) While the eligibility criteria mentions that the clients may be government, sports federations and/or leagues, we understand that if the client is a corporate entity, wherein the underlying work is done on a league/teams participating in a sports league (like the IPL, ISL, PKL or others), that would also be considered relevant. Kindly Confirm. (b) With reference to Clause 5.3 of the RFQ, we understand that international experience would be accorded additional weightage. We would appreciate further clarification on the extent of such weightage. For instance, would one international assignment be treated as equivalent to two domestic projects? (c) Given that the typical rights cycle (commercial/Media rights) for major sporting bodies in India varies from 5-15 years, we request an extension of the project eligibility criteria from the current 'Past 5 years' to 'Past 10 years'.	(a) Interested Bidders may submit projects relating to clients other than those described in this clause as well. However, in evaluating such Bids, the BEC reserves the right to determine if such experience is relevant in light of the scope of services required to be provided under this RFQ. (b) Clause 5.3 of the RFQ shall stand deleted in its entirety. Further, the Note contained below the table in Clause 13.5 of this RFQ shall stand deleted in its entirety and be replaced with the following, "****Note**: For the purposes of this clause, a "project" shall mean an assignment or engagement involving advisory services to organisations in relation to the award of rights comparable to the Commercial Rights, and which is of a comparable scale.*" (c) The parameter under Clause 5.1(a)(4) of the RFQ shall stand revised and be hereinafter read as "*The Bidder must have experience in executing at least five (5) similar assignments from at least three (3) distinct clients over the past ten (10) years, which clients may be governments, sports federations and/or leagues in India.*"

S No	Clause	Query	Response
3.	Section 5.1(b)(2)	The Bidder must have a minimum qualification of a Masters degree, with atleast twenty (20) years of total professional experience, including sports consulting experience.	The suggestion/proposal has been duly considered, and no change is proposed.
4.	Section 5.1(b)(4)	The Bidder must have experience in executing at least five (5) sports strategy/marketing/business/Technology/events assignments from at least three (3) distinct clients over the past five (5) years, which clients may be governments, sports federations or leagues, out of which atleast one should be related to commercial rights.	The suggestion/proposal has been duly considered, and no change is proposed.
5.	Clause 7.1	The (individual) Bidder shall furnish, along with its Bid, a Bid Security for an amount of INR 2,00,000/- (Indian Rupees Two Lakhs Only).	The suggestion/proposal has been duly considered, and no change is proposed.
6.	Clause 13.3	Can you please provide us with further clarity on the evaluation mechanism, and can QCBS method with weightage of 80:20 be applied to the identification of the Selected Bidder?	The method of identification of the Selected Bidder shall be on the basis of Quality & Cost Based Selection (QCBS 80:20). AIFF shall identify the Selected Bidder in accordance with the Quality & Cost Based Selection method set out hereinbelow: In identifying the Selected Bidder, the technical quality of the Bid will be given a weightage of eighty per cent (80%) on the basis of the criteria for evaluation set out in the RFQ (*Clause 13.5*). The financial proposals of eligible Bidders, after being ranked in a manner described in the RFQ (*Clause 13.3(d)*) shall be allocated a weightage of twenty per cent (20%). To determine the total score allotted to the eligible Bidders, the following formula shall be employed: Total Score: (0.8 x Technical Score) + (0.2 x Financial Score), where Technical Score shall stand for the total marks awarded

S No	Clause	Query	Response
			to the technical bid of a Bidder by the BEC under Clause 13.5 of the RFQ, and the Financial Score shall stand for the marks awarded to the financial bid of a Bidder by the BEC under Clause 13.3(d) of the RFQ. The Bids will then be ranked in descending order, on the basis of the total points scored. The proposal with the highest points will be ranked highest and be identified as the Selected Bidder. For example, if the technical bid of a Bidder has been awarded thirty (30) marks, and the said Bidder's financial bid is also the lowest amount quoted to AIFF, then the formula shall be applied in the following manner: Total Score = (0.8 x 30) + (0.2 x 100) Total Score = 44
7.	Clause 13.5(1)	We request you to kindly consider projects related to bid process management services and not limiting it to commercial rights which significantly narrows eligibility to only one (1) or two (2) organizations, thereby restricting opportunities for other qualified organizations with relevant experience.	Potential bidders may submit projects relating to bid process management services in other sectors as well. However, in evaluation of the Bids, the BEC reserves the right to determine if such experience is relevant in light of the scope of services required to be provided under this RFQ.
8.	Clause 13.5(2)	We request that the criteria be expanded to include experience in providing financial and strategic services such as bid process management, business planning, sponsorship support, budgeting, and valuation etc. This would broader spectrum of expertise required for successful rights management and ensure a more inclusive and competitive bidding process. The current criteria significantly narrows eligibility to only one (1) or two (2) organizations, thereby restricting opportunities for other qualified organizations with relevant experience.	Potential bidders may submit general experience for evaluation by the BEC under Clause 13.5(1) of the RFQ. However, only experience in the sports industry may be considered and evaluated under Clause 13.5(2) of the RFQ.

S No	Clause	Query	Response
9.	Clause 13.5(1) and (2)	(a) We understand that the projects referenced under S.No. 1 are not limited to the sports sector and may pertain to any domain, provided they involve the award and procurement of commercial rights. For example, a project involving the grant of toll collection rights to an operator for a newly constructed road would be considered relevant. Kindly confirm if our understanding is correct. (b) We seek clarification on whether a project can be considered under both S. No. 1 and S. No. 2 for scoring purposes. For instance, if a project involves the award of commercial sporting rights, would it be eligible for scoring under both criteria, thereby earning one point each under S. No. 1 and S. No. 2. (c) With reference to the query under point 1(c) above, we seek clarification on whether international experience is evaluated differently in quantitative terms compared to domestic experience. If so, we would appreciate a detailed outline of the corresponding scoring methodology.	(a) Potential bidders may submit projects relating to clients other than those described in this clause as well. However, in evaluation of the Bids, the BEC reserves the right to determine if such experience is relevant in light of the scope of services required to be provided under this RFQ. (b) Yes, a project can be considered for scoring under both Clauses 13.5(1) and (2), provided that in relation to Clause 13.5(2) it fulfils both criteria of being a project relating to award of rights like the Commercial Rights, and is within the sports industry. (c) In light of the clarification issued at S No 2(b) above, there is no difference in treatment of international and domestic experience.
10.	Clause 13.5(1) and (2)	Combine 1 and 2: Experience in providing advisory services to sports organisations/Federations/governments in areas of commercial rights, league operations, procurement, strategy, sports development, events, marketing, sponsorships, etc. For individuals: 8 or more projects: 24 marks 7 projects: 21 marks 6 projects: 18 marks 5 projects: 15 marks	The suggestion/proposal has been duly considered. Bidders are requested to kindly refer to the clarifications already provided under Serial Nos. 7 and 8.

S No	Clause	Query	Response
11.	Clause 13.5(3)	Since Clause 5.1 of the RFQ already mandates a minimum turnover of ₹100 crore as an eligibility requirement, introducing an additional scoring criterion based on the highest turnover creates an inherent bias in favor of one organization. This approach undermines the principle of fair competition and restricts opportunities for other qualified bidders who meet the mandatory threshold. We strongly urge you to reconsider this evaluation parameter to ensure a level playing field and a merit-based selection process.	The consideration of a minimum turnover under Clause 5.1 of the RFQ assists in establishing a minimum standard. The additional scoring criterion in light of further clarifications relating to evaluation methodology contained in these clarifications, assist the BEC in identifying the Selected Bidder, and there shall be no change to the criteria provided in the RFQ.
12.	Clause 13.5(3)	The individual bidders will submit a proposal presentation articulating the approach and understanding of the project, with the best presentation getting a maximum marking of 6. OR Alternatively, the average annual revenue from professional services over the last 3 years for an individual. The bidder with the highest amount will get full marks, while the rest will get marks on a pro-rata basis.	For individuals, the average annual revenue from professional services in the last five (5) Financial Years shall be considered. For the purpose of applying pro-rata scoring across both categories, the highest average annual turnover of entities will be divided by forty (40) (reflecting the ratio between the minimum turnover threshold for entities Indian Rupees One Hundred Crores (INR 100,00,00,000) and for individuals Indian Rupees Two Crores and Fifty Lakhs (INR 2,50,00,000). The resulting figure shall be treated as the comparable benchmark for individuals. Therefore, an individual achieving this benchmark will receive full marks (i.e., six (6) marks), and other individuals will be marked on a pro-rata basis. For example, if the highest average annual turnover of an entity is Indian Rupees Four Hundred Crores (INR 400,00,00,000), then the comparable benchmark for individuals will be 400/40 = Indian Rupees Ten Crores (INR 10,00,00,000) (which will entitle that individual to receive six (6) marks). For the rest of the individual bidders, marks shall be awarded on a pro-rata basis, with Indian Rupees Ten Crores (INR 10,00,00,000) treated as the benchmark for securing full marks.
13.	Clause 14.4	Please specify the percentage allocation for each installment (First,	The suggestion/proposal has been duly considered, and no

S No	Clause	Query	Response
		Second, and Third) under Clause 14.4 to avoid ambiguity and ensure transparency in payment term.	change is proposed.
14.	Bid Submission Date	We request an extension of at least one week for bid submission from the date of corrigendum release to allow sufficient time for compliance and accurate submission.	The suggestion/proposal has been duly considered, and no change is proposed.
15.	Financial Bid Submission	We request you to kindly share the prescribed format for the Financial Bid proposal to ensure uniformity and compliance in submissions.	The financial bid may be submitted in a '.xls' format with a total price in words and numbers specified therein. The bidders shall also provide a split of the total price in relation to the key deliverables identified under Clause 4.1 of the RFQ.
16.	Consortium/JV	We request that the RFQ provisions be amended to allow participation through a consortium. This would enable bidders to bring together complementary expertise across domains such as sports rights management, financial advisory, sponsorship strategy, and valuation.	Bidders may submit bids as a consortium/JV. In such a scenario, each consortium shall nominate a 'Lead Member', who shall be responsible for conducting all communication with AIFF in relation to the RFQ and (if applicable), in relation to the Services. However, it is clarified that (a) the turnover of the Lead Member shall only be considered for the evaluation of the Bids; and (b) each member of the consortium shall be required to fulfill the criteria under Clauses 5.2(a) and 5.2(c) of the RFQ. It is further clarified that individual bidders are not permitted to submit bids as part of a consortium/JV.
17.	Presentation	Request to add an additional step to the evaluation process to require a proposal presentation/bid quality score and score it at five (5) marks.	The suggestion/proposal has been duly considered, and no change is proposed.

Note:

1. All capitalized terms contained herein but not specifically defined shall be deemed to have the same meaning as contained in the RFQ.
2. The amendments/modifications/clarifications contained herein are only meant to amend/modify/clarify the limited clauses of the RFQ, as described herein. Nothing shall be deemed to be an amendment of any other portion of the RFQ, and all other provisions shall continue to remain in full force and effect.
3. AIFF may have received additional queries for which, in its sole and absolute discretion, there are no amendments/modifications/clarifications required. In light of the same, such queries have not been included herein.
4. In accordance with the RFQ, any amendments/modifications/clarifications issued in response to queries received from all parties have been published for the benefit of all interested Bidders, in order to provide a level playing field for all the Bidders.
5. It is clarified that upon publication of these clarifications, no further requests for amendments/modifications/clarifications shall be entertained by AIFF.
6. AIFF reserves its right to amend/modify/further clarify the contents of this document and/or the RFQ at any time before the Bid Submission Date.