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## Subject no: Yif

> Sub: VWD, Visadapatuam - Fstablishment of Circular Ioy Irain on Kalasa Hili- Development of project under Private Paticipation Project Consultancy with M/S Ferguson \& Co, Hyderabad Evahution Repor Furnished - perusal - Regarding.

## Sgenda Note:-

The GODA has proposed to estabhish Circular Toy Train on Kailasa Iills under private participation. The mater has been placed before the VLDA Board and the VLDA Boari in its Resolution No. 60 datei 09.11 .2002 has resolved to peruse the ation taken on Establishment of the Toy Train at Kalasa Hills and authorized to go ahead with execution of the project through MS Sarada Road Ways, Hyderabad subject to the recommendotion of the consultant. The evaluation and appraisal work of this project was entrusted to a privato consultnncy N'S A.E Ferguson and Co, Hyderabad. Subsequently bids called from the two active companies came fonvand to set up the Toy Train on the Kailasa Fills namery M/S Haigreeva Jngg. Co, Visadhapatnam and M/S Sarada Road Ways, Hyderabad.

The sealed tenders pertaining to the financial bids by the said firms have been opened by the Secretary, VLDA in their presence, wide Sri Prakasam of M/S Ferguson \& Co (Technical Consultant to VUDA for Circular Toy Train on Kailasa Hills) have read over the contents to them theroafter:

The repoits given by the said firms including the financial bids, sent to MS AF Ferguson \& Co, Hyderabad in VUDA leller Rc.No.2460/02/F4, dated 17.01 .2003 and requested to submit evaluation report pertaining to the Circular Toy Train between the two firms.

In gist, the consultint has reported that, both the bidders do not have any past experience in development, operation and maintenance of Tourism project. However, the project is conceptially and technically more stronger in case of Sarada Road Ways as compared to Hagreeva Engg. Co ( $79 \%$ for SRW as against 54\% for HEC)

Similaly, the business model as presented by Haigreeva Engg. Co is very pessimistic, indicating poor quality in projecting and planning a business model. Business model in case of Sarada Road Ways is comparatively better, however the project demands professionai support for realizing a fair return out of this venture.

## VUDA Resolution No. 86 dated 14.5.2003

Resolved to approve the proposals of entrustment of the Circular Toy Train Project at Kailasa Hills to M/s Sarada Road Ways on BOT system in accordance with the terms and conditions suggested in the evaluation report of $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{s}$ Feruguson \& Co. Hyderabad.

Taken note of letter of intention issued to the developer as recommended by the consultants and to finalise the alignment soon to step up progress. Performance of the developer to be watched at regular intervals.

The Board have also taken note of and recorded the expression of interest by $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{s}$ Gold Stone, Hospitality Inc Ramda Inn Conference Center, Macon VS for the facility to be reserved to Art Gallery at Kailasa Hills - on NRI project and connected infrastructure development.
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They have further reported that "for Haigreeva Engg. Co, the business proposal is not viable even in the $20^{\text {th }}$ year (IRR of $5.90 \%$ and negative NPV of Rs. 95.00 lakhs). The break even period of the project is estimated at 12 years by Haigreeva Engg. Co as against 9 years in case of Sarada Road Ways. Also, return to VUDA for equal concession period in case of Sarada Road Ways is higher than Haigreeva Engg. Co..

Based on above, M/SA.F. FERGUSON \& CO has recommended VUDA, to enter in to a BOT agreement with Sarada Road Ways, after obtaining necessary support documents as to tie up with the technical consultants, supplier and financial institutions. Also, personal commitment of Mr. VGK Prasad, representing the venture undertaking the project, is desired."

The NPV and IRR figures of Sarada Road Ways are comparatively sound and reasonable. The concession period for BOT can be 13 to 15 years, after considering a fair return to the private developer during the said period.
Returns ton the 1 st is Componat-why givam herenden.

| Name of the <br> Fim | Project <br> Duration in <br> years | Return to <br> VUDA upfront <br> foc | Development <br> premium per <br> year | Total <br> (Rs.in Lakhs) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sarada Road <br> Ways | 12 to 22 | 1.00 lakh | 6.76 lakhs | 7.76 |
| Haigreeva <br> Engg. Co | 12 to 20 | 1.00 lakh | 4.80 lakhs | 5.80 |
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Since the returns to VUDA andeta Sarada Road ways (as per their business
 further negotiate with Sarada Road Ways on the concession period vis-à-vis additional development premium proposed in the financial proposal.

In view of the recommendation of the M/S Ferguson and Co, Hyderabad and in terms of the evaluation report submitted by the above firm the matter is submitted for favor of perusal of the VUDA Board and to take a decision for entrustment of the Circular Toy Train Project at Kailasa Hills to M/S Sarada Road Ways on BOT system in accordance with the terms \& condilions suggested in the evaluation report of M/S Fergusond Co, Hyderabad.

