

№	Question	Answer
1.	<p>Thank you for your response to question 145 above (see previous Q and A below in italics) - please confirm why the EIB charge cancellation did not impact these airlines as much as the other airline carriers as we would expect PAX volume not to impact revenue per PAX?</p> <p>Question: "We have estimated revenue (gross and net) per PAX for the top 10 airlines, calculated as the annual revenue from the airline (as per file provided in physical data room) divided by annual number of PAX for the respective airline (as per Appendix 2.1.7 in the virtual data room). We note significant drops in both gross and net revenue per PAX for Bulgaria Air, Lufthansa, Austrian, Turkish, LOT, British Airways, Qatar in 2017 compared to 2016, but minimal changes for Wizz Air, Ryanair and EasyJet over the same period. Please confirm why certain airlines suffered a decrease but the low cost carriers did not."</p> <p>Answer: "Low-cost carriers maintain a very high percentage of passenger traffic compared to the traditional airlines and therefore have no significant changes occurred over the years."</p>	<p>In 2016 Bulgaria Air, Lufthansa, Austrian Airlines, Turkish Airlines, LOT, British Airways and Qatar Airways operated on Terminal 2 at passenger fee of 11.50 euro and Wizz Air, Ryanair and EasyJet operated on Terminal 1 at passenger fee of 5.50 euro. The amount of the passenger fee for 2017 is the same for both Terminal 1 and Terminal 2 – 5.50 euro.</p>
2.	<p>In relation to a response to question 204 (see the question and answer below in italics) above please confirm whether the increase in ground handling revenue was over-performance due to improved natural indicators or over-charging which will need to be refunded to Austrian Airlines.</p> <p>Question: "In reference to question 2499, please explain how the overcharging of revenues from ground handling services compensates for the non-recurring revenue from Austrian Airlines?"</p> <p>Answer: "The increase in natural indicators leads to over-performance of groundhandling revenue, which offset the terminated contract with Austrian Airlines."</p>	<p>The increase in ground handling revenue is due to improved natural indicators.</p>

<p>3.</p>	<p>In relation to response 206 on the accounting for discounts (see the question and answer below in italics) please confirm whether the business plan is prepared in the same way as the actual results for the 8 months to Aug-18, i.e. that discounts are mostly recognised at the end of the year and are not recognised in the monthly business plan to Aug-18?</p> <p>Question: "We understand that discounts are accounted for in the second half of the year once customers have achieved the discount criteria - please confirm this understanding.</p> <p>In relation to Q222 please confirm what year-to date Aug-18 and Sep-18 (and Aug-17 and Sep-17) aero revenues would have been if discounts had been recognised on an ongoing basis - i.e. recognised during the year based on estimates instead of being recognised after the discount criteria had been achieved (per above comment).</p> <p>Please also confirm that the accounting for discounts in FY17 and FY18 is consistent."</p> <p>Answer: "Under the traffic incentive program, discounts for volume and new routes are calculated after the end of the relevant period and after certain criteria have been met. The reason for this is that carriers often do not meet these criteria to obtain a discount by timely terminating a route or reducing initially announced frequencies. The calculation of discounts relates to additional analysis and taking into account all the criteria set in the traffic incentive program for which we have information only after the end of the relevant period. For these reasons, it will not be realistic and true if discounts are calculated on a monthly basis."</p>	<p>In 2018 Business plan discounts are mostly planned towards July 2018, but they'll be recognized at the end of the year.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>In relation to response 205 on the EIB loan repayment (see the question and answer below in italics) please confirm how any of the FY17 aero charges relate to the EIB loan repayment costs given the passenger charge was at normal levels in FY17 (EUR 5.5)? Our understanding was that the passenger charge was higher in FY15 and FY16 (EUR 11.5) due to the airport charging more to recover costs relating to the EIB loan repayment and therefore we would expect any additional aero charges to relate to these two years and not FY17?</p>	<p>The repayment of the EIB loan for 2017 does not reflect on airport charges since the 2016 airport charges revenues covered the prepayment of the EIB loan.</p>

	<p>Question: "In relation to the answer provided on the EIB loan passenger charge impact per question 139 above please confirm how much of the BGN 20.3m related to FY16 and how much related to FY17. Please also confirm how any of this charge related to FY17 when the FY17 passenger charge was reduced to normal levels? What was the impact on FY15 when the passenger charge was reduced?"</p> <p>Answer: "The amount of BGN 20.3m refers to the financial years as follows: - For 2016, amounting to BGN 10.4m; - For 2017, amounting to BGN 9.9m.</p> <p>The reduction in the passenger fee in 2017 is due to reduced operating costs and increased number of passengers planned. In 2015 the passenger fee was not reduced."</p>	
5.	Please provide monthly landing and take-off weights (in MTOW), separately for YTD18 (Sep-18 or latest available).	The information is available for review in the Virtual Data Room – Appendix 2.1.2.4.1.
6.	<p>Tender Document - 7 - Submission of the Application and Offer</p> <p>We understand that:</p> <p>i) The Application is required to be submitted in two Electronic Memory Devices - No physical form of the same is required to be submitted, apart from the Power of Attorney and Participation Guarantee (which are to be submitted only in original)</p> <p>ii) The Binding Proposal is required to be submitted in physical form (one original and two hard copies) - No electronic form of the same is required</p> <p>iii) The Proposal is required to be submitted in two Electronic Memory Devices - No physical form of the same is required to be submitted.</p> <p>Please confirm our understanding</p>	<p>(i) Correct.</p> <p>(ii) In addition to the hard copies, an electronic copy of the Binding Proposal (such copy to be verified by electronic signature of the Bidder’s representative) has also to be included in the electronic device containing the Proposal (ref. clause 7.1 of the Tender Documents and Article 89 of the Concessions Act).</p> <p>(iii) Correct.</p>
7.	<p>Tender Document - Schedule 3 - Part 1 - Form C - Affidavit of Independent Bid -</p> <p>"I,..... in the capacity of legal representative at the [Bidder/member of the Consortium] _____ [indicate full name</p>	Confirmed. In any case, both the name of the physical person signing the Affidavit, as well as the name of the legal entity (Bidder or Consortium member), on behalf of which the document is signed, have to be specified.

	<p>of the Bidder/member of the Consortium]_____ (the "Company")"</p> <p>We understand that the above is to be read as I, in the capacity of legal representative at the _____ [Bidder/member of the Consortium - indicate full name of the Bidder/member of the Consortium] (the "Company")</p> <p>Please confirm our understanding</p>	
8.	<p>Concession Agreement - Restrictive Environment for the Airport Operations</p> <p>i. A reading of the Concession Agreement gives close to 50 areas of operations where the Grantor permission is required for various activities</p> <p>ii. This proves to be a highly restrictive environment for a Concessionaire resulting in unnecessary interference in day to day operations, delays in decision making and affecting the efficient operations of the Concession. It also goes against the spirit of the concession of a public asset.</p> <p>iii. The requirement of Grantor's approval should instead be restricted to a few critical areas of operation for the Concession</p> <p>iii. So long as the output specifications are provided and deterrents / penalties are specified for any breach, the Concessionaire should be free to take appropriate steps to deliver on the Concession.</p>	<p>Please note that amendments to the draft Concession Agreement are planned and will be announced in accordance with the Concession Act.</p>
9.	<p>Tender Documents - Schedule 1 - Bid Data Sheet</p> <p>Last date for seeking Queries - In view of the recent extension of Bid submission deadline, please confirm that the last date of submitting a request for clarification pursuant to clause 5.2 (a) would be extended to 15th January 2019</p>	<p>Please refer to the latest published Tender Documents, where in Schedule 1 (Bid Data Sheet), item 16 (Timeline of the Tender Procedure), the Last Day for submitting a request for clarifications is 15.01.2019.</p>