F. No 2/17/2026-PIU
Government of India
Ministry of Finance
Department of Economic Affairs
Infrastructure Finance Secretariat
ISD Division
(PIU)
*****

4th Floor, STC Building,
Janpath, New Delhi
12th November, 2026

Record of Discussion

Subject: Record of Discussion of 153rd meeting of the PPPAC for considering two road project proposals by Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) on PPP mode.

Reference: i. 150th meeting of the PPPAC held on 08.08.2026
ii. 153rd meeting of the PPPAC held on 24.10.2026

Sir/Madam,

The undersigned is directed to forward the Record of Discussion of the 153rd Meeting of the PPPAC held on 24.10.2026 under the Chairmanship of Secretary (EA), for information and necessary action.

2. This issues with the approval of the Competent Authority.

(Jai Patil)
Deputy Secretary

To,

1. Secretary, Department of Expenditure, North block, New Delhi-01
2. CEO, NITI Aayog, Yojana Bhawan, New Delhi-01
3. Secretary, Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Transport Bhawan, New Delhi
4. Secretary, Department of Legal Affairs, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-01

Copy to:

1. Sr. PPS to Secretary (EA)
2. Sr. PPS to JS (IFS)

Subject: Record of Discussion of 153rd meeting of the PPPAC for considering the following two road project proposals:

I. **Construction of Six lane Access Controlled Amaravati Outer Ring Road including Spur from Guntur to Narakodur- 4 lane on Hybrid Annuity Mode in the state of Andhra Pradesh**
II. **Construction of a 4-lane Greenfield High-Speed Access-Controlled Corridor from Gorakhpur to Siliguri, Design Length of 568.700 Km (including 43 Km Spur length), in the States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar & West Bengal on Hybrid Annuity Mode under NH (O).**

1. The 153rd meeting of the PPPAC was held on 24.10.2026 at 10.00 AM to consider the above-mentioned project proposal. List of attendees is placed at **Annexure-I**.

2. With the permission of Secretary (EA) Joint Secretary (IFS) welcomed all the attendees to the meeting. NHAI officials made detailed presentation on the project at S. No. I and II.

Project 1: Construction of Six lane Access Controlled Amaravati Outer Ring Road including Spur from Guntur to Narakodur- 4 lane on Hybrid Annuity Mode in the state of Andhra Pradesh

1. The details of the proposal are as given below:

SN	Item	Description
1.	Name of the Project	Construction of Six lane Access Controlled Amaravati Outer Ring Road including Spur from Guntur to Narakodur- 4 lane on Hybrid Annuity Mode in the state of Andhra Pradesh
2.	Type of PPP (BOT, BOOT, BOLT, OMT etc)	Hybrid Annuity Mode (HAM)
3.	Location (State/ District/ Town)	State: Andhra Pradesh Districts: NTR, Eluru, Krishna, Guntur & Palnadu
4.	Administrative Ministry/ Department	Ministry of Road, Transport and Highways, Government of India
5.	Name of Sponsoring Authority	Ministry of Road, Transport and Highways, Government of India
6.	Name of the Implementing Agency	National Highways Authority of India

7.	Brief description of the project	The details of the Project Road are as under: **The Salient features of the Project Highway are**:

SN	Project Features	Pkg-I (Km. 0+000 to Km. 27+000 & Km. 189+000 to Km. 189+93)	Pkg-2 (Km. 27+000 to Km. 83+000)	Pkg-3 (Km. 83+000 to Km. 133+500)	Pkg-4 (Km. 133+500 to Km. 189+000)
1	Length (km)	27.93	56	50.5	55.5
2	Construction Period (in months)	36	36	36	36
3	Major bridge (No.)	1 no. (9x30 = 270 m)	2 nos. (19x30 = 570 m; 1x20 + 8x42 + 1x20 =378 m)	1no. (84x60+1x50+1x30+1x60+2x30+1x60 = 5300m Krishna bridge)	1 no. (48x60+1x20= 2900 m Krishna bridge)
4	Tunnels	2 nos. (T1: 2.780 km & T2: 1.690 km)	Nil	Nil	1 no. (T3: 0.510 km)
5	ROB	2 nos. (1x20+1x37.280+1x20 = 77.280m and 1x35+1x37.28+1x19.08+1x20.0= 111.36 m)	2 nos. (1x20+1x19.08+1x37.28+1x19.08+1x20.0 =115.44 m 1x30+1x37.28+ 1x19.08+1x30.0=116.3)	2nos. (1x20+1x37.28+1x19.08+1x20.0 = 96.36 m and 1x20+1x37.28+1x25 = 82.28 m)	2nos. (1x20+1x37.28+ 1x20.0 = 77.28 m 1x30+1x37.28+1x19.08+1x30.0 = 116.36 m)
6	Number of Structures (VUP, MNB, LVUP, Box Culverts, Structure at Interchange)	130	240	185	203
7	Via Duct (No)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
9	SVUP (No)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
10	AUP (No)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
11	PUP (No)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
13	FOB (No.)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

		17	Major junctions (No.)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
		18	Minor junctions (No.)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
		19	Bus bays/ Bus Shelter (No.)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
		20	Truck lay bye (No.)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
		21	Wayside amenities (No.)				4
		22	Interchanges	3	6	4	4
		23	Toll Plaza	(MLFF is proposed)			
		The project is scheduled to be completed in 1095 days (36 months) from the appointed date					

		#	Cost Particular	Formula used	Total(in Cr.) (With iconic bridge)	Total(in Cr.) (Without iconic bridge)
8.	Estimated Capital Costs with breakup under major heads of expenditure. Also indicate the basis of cost estimation	**1**	Civil Construction Cost	*A 1*	10,442.06	10,222.06
		2	Utility shifting cost	*A2*	254.24	254.24
		3	Total Cost including Utility shifting	*A=(A1+A2)*	10,696.32	10,476.32
		4	Civil Construction Cost with GST @18%	*A1 + 0.18 X A1*	12,621.66	12,062.03
		5	IC/ Pre-operative Expenses	*B = 1% of A*	106.96	104.76
		6	Financing Cost	*C = 0.75% of Debt Amount if A1 is less than Rs. 2000 Cr., 0.5% of Debt Amount if A1> Rs. 2000 Cr. subject to*	60	60

				Minimum Rs. 15 Cr.		
		7	Interest during construction	*D (as per Financial Model)*	625.52	660.22
		8	Estimated Project Cost (EPC)	*E (ΣA:D)*	11,488.79	11,301.28
		9	Bid Project Cost (BPC)	*F =As per Financial Model*	13,202.55	12,831.98
		10	Contingencies	*G = 1% of A1 subject to minimum of Rs. 15 Cr.*	104.42	102.22
		11	Price Escalation during construction period	*H =% of A defined below*	962.67	942.87
		12	>=3 years construction Period	*9% of A*	962.67	942.87
		13	Maintenance charges including price escalation	*I =%of E defined below*	1,723.32	1695.19
		14	15 years Maintenance period (flexible pavement)	*15% of E*	1,723.32	1695.19
		15	NPV of Maintenance charges including escalation	*J*	547.18	535.91
		16	Interest on Annuity	*K = 50% of E*	5,744.39	5,650.64
		17	NPV of Interest on Annuity	*L*	1,796.48	1,759.53

		18	Supervision charges	*M = 1% of E*	114.89	113.01
		19	Agency charges	*N = 1% of A subject to minimum Rs. 12 Cr*	-	-
		20	GST	*O = 18 % of (F + G+ H+I+K+M)*	3,933.40	3,840.46
		21	LA and other pre-construction charges	*P*	5,314.96	5,314.96
		22	Total Capital Cost	*Q = F+G+H+I+K+(Σ M:P)*	31,100.60	30,491.34
		23	NPV of Total Capital Cost	*R = {(F+G+H+J+L+ M)*1.18}+N+P*	25,054.23	24,531.87

9.	Financial Viability		**Pkg-I**	**Pkg-II**	**Pkg-III**	**Pkg-IV**
		PIRR	10.66%	10.66%	10.66%	10.68%
		EIRR	12%	12%	12%	12%

10.	Clearances	**SN**	**Approvals/Clearances**	**Status**
		1	Land Acquisition Status	3A Completed
		2	Environmental clearance	Yet to be Initiated
		3	Status of ROB clearance	In progress
		4	Cutting of Live Trees	Yet to be Initiated
		5	Utility Shifting Estimates	In-progress
		6	Forest Clearance	Yet to be Initiated
11.	Bidding Process	Single stage two- part system of bidding		
12.	Bidding Parameter	Lowest Bid Project Cost		

2. In continuation of the discussions held during the 150th meeting of the PPPAC, NHAI officials presented the revised proposal for the Amaravati Outer Ring Road (ORR) project.

3. NHAI officials apprised the Committee of the financial and other support to be extended by the State Government for the project, including reimbursement of the State's share of GST (9%) and seigniorage charges, a contribution of ₹1,000 crore towards land acquisition costs, and provision of 1.35 crore cubic metres of fly ash, along with reimbursement of the associated transportation costs ~INR 469 Cr.

4. NHAI officials highlighted that the additional cost associated with the proposed iconic bridge over the river is approximately ₹200 crore, which, in the context of the overall project cost, represents a relatively modest incremental expenditure considering the project's scale and the potential value addition of the iconic structure.

5. After and during the presentation, the Chair and the PPPAC members further made their observation. DoE and DoLA supported the proposal and stated that there were no comments to offer.

6. The observations raised by the **PD, Niti Aayog** and the responses thereto are given below:

    i. **Drawing a parallel with the Hyderabad Outer Ring Road, which has a RoW of approximately 150 m, how does the proposed RoW of 140 m for the Amaravati Outer Ring Road account for future traffic growth and infrastructure requirements over the next 30 years? What measures are proposed to safeguard the required land and ensure its availability for future expansion?**

    Response: NHAI officials explained that the proposed alignment has been planned to safeguard the corridor and facilitate potential future infrastructure development. The alignment has been positioned along one side of the proposed fenced boundary, rather than through the middle of the corridor, to enable more efficient utilisation of the available land. They further clarified that, in the event of a future railway requirement, a dedicated rail corridor would need to be accommodated. Accordingly, the rail corridor may be planned on the city-facing side of the alignment, with the highway positioned towards the outer side. This arrangement would facilitate connectivity to railway stations located towards the city and help minimise the need for additional crossings, while preserving the outer corridor for the proposed road infrastructure.

7. The observations/ suggestion made by the **Secretary, MoRTH** which the committee agreed to are given below:

    i. The project may be implemented on BOT (Toll cum& annuity) mode through two packages

    ii. An appropriate provision may be considered for sharing a portion of the revenue accruing from development licensing with the State Government, in line with the value capture approach.

iii. The cost of fencing the acquired land, as a measure to prevent encroachment and safeguard the corridor for future use, may be borne by the State Government rather than NHAI.

8. The observations raised by the **Chair** and the responses thereto by MoRTH / NHAI officials are given below:

i. The proposed Right of Way (RoW) of 140 m appears to be on the higher side. What is the minimum land requirement for the highway, including a reasonable provision for future expansion, and what would be the potential reduction in land acquisition costs if the RoW were rationalised?

Response: NHAI officials informed the Committee that, based on the assessment undertaken, a reduction in the proposed RoW from 140 m to 100 m could bring down the land acquisition cost to approximately ₹3,200 crore. They further apprised the Committee of the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) policy framework for ring road and bypass projects in the vicinity of cities, which provides for four options for State Government support:

- **Option A:** 50% contribution towards land acquisition (LA) costs.
- **Option B:** 25% contribution towards LA costs, along with a waiver of the State Goods and Services Tax (SGST).
- **Option C:** Land pooling, with the State Government arranging the required land.
- **Option D:** SGST waiver, along with value capture over a period of 15 years.

NHAI officials further explained that the policy provides for three categories of RoW, namely 45 m, 60 m and 90 m, based on the population of the city. They also cited projects involving integrated road and ring road development, where land acquisition arrangements are being undertaken by MoRTH, including the Amaravati project, the Wadhawan project (which also involves land acquisition for rail infrastructure), and the Ahmedabad–Dholera project.

9. **Recommendations**

After the detailed deliberations, the PPPAC unanimously, recommended the proposal "Construction of Six lane Access Controlled Amaravati Outer Ring Road including Spur from Guntur to Narakodur- 4 lane on Hybrid Annuity Mode in the state of Andhra Pradesh" for consideration of the Competent Authority for giving Administrative Approval subject to following recommendations:

i. The appraised Total Capital Cost of the project is INR 31,100.60 crore. The Estimated Project Cost excluding GST is INR 11,488.79 crore.
ii. The project should be taken up on BOT (Toll & Annuity) mode.
iii. The project shall be taken up in two packages.
iv. Provision shall be made for sharing a portion of the revenue accruing from development licensing with the State Government, in line with the value capture approach.
v. The cost of fencing the acquired land, as a measure to prevent encroachment and safeguard the corridor for future use, shall be borne by the State Government.

vi. The revised documents viz. financial model, RFP, DCA based on BOT (Toll & Annuity) mode to be shared with the committee
vii. Land acquisition and necessary clearances to be obtained in a timebound manner to avoid delay in the project.

10. Revalidation of its recommendation by the PPPAC is not required for following post-recommendation changes in the project costs/bid documents:

i. Any change in the date/time period for any time-bound actions like appointed date, financial close, construction period etc.
ii. Non-substantial change in risk-allocation.
iii. Any other changes/modification in the project proposal with the overall objective of making project successful.
iv. Further, MoRTH may decide whether the changes proposed post recommendations of the project proposal by the PPPAC fall within the threshold criteria as stated above.
v. All such changes falling within the threshold criteria shall be appraised at the level of Secretary MORTH, without any further need of revalidation by the PPPAC and shall proceed with the approval process accordingly.

11. The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

Project 2: Construction of a 4-lane Greenfield High-Speed Access-Controlled Corridor from Gorakhpur to Siliguri, Design Length of 568.700 Km (including 43 Km Spur length), in the States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar & West Bengal on Hybrid Annuity Mode under NH (O).

1. The details of the proposal are as given below:

<table>
<tr><th>SN</th><th>Item</th><th>Description</th></tr>
<tr><td>1.</td><td>Name of the Project</td><td>Construction of a 4-lane Greenfield High-Speed Access-Controlled Corridor from Gorakhpur to Siliguri, Design Length of 568.700 Km (including 43 Km Spur length), in the States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar & West Bengal on Hybrid Annuity Mode under NH (O)</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.</td><td>Type of PPP (BOT, BOOT, BOLT, OMT etc)</td><td>Hybrid Annuity Mode (HAM)</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.</td><td>Location (State/ District/ Town)</td><td>State: Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and West Bengal
District: Gorakhpur, Kushinagar, West Champaran, East Champaran, Sheohar, Sitamarhi, Madhubani, Supaul, Araria, Kishanganj, Darjeeling</td></tr>
<tr><td>4.</td><td>Administrative Ministry/ Department</td><td>Ministry of Road, Transport and Highways, Government of India</td></tr>
<tr><td>5.</td><td>Name of Sponsoring Authority</td><td>Ministry of Road, Transport and Highways, Government of India</td></tr>
<tr><td>6.</td><td>Name of the Implementing Agency</td><td>National Highways Authority of India</td></tr>
<tr><td>7.</td><td>Details of Proposed Project</td><td>The proposed Gorakhpur-Siliguri Greenfield High-Speed Access-Controlled Corridor is a 568.7 km (including a 43 km spur) four-lane expressway to be developed in seven packages. The corridor originates at the Gorakhpur Ring Road in Uttar Pradesh and terminates near NH-327C in Siliguri, West Bengal, traversing 11 districts across Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and West Bengal. The alignment has been approved by the Alignment Approval Committee (AAC) with a Right of Way (RoW) of 70 m. The project will provide connectivity to 18 National Highways, State Highways and key regional centers through dedicated spur connections. It aims to strengthen connectivity between mainland India and the North-Eastern Region by facilitating access to industrial clusters, agricultural markets, logistics hubs and urban centers. The corridor is expected to reduce travel time between Gorakhpur and Siliguri from approximately 14 hours to 7-8 hours, enabling faster, safer and congestion-free movement of passenger and freight traffic. Salient features of the project are detailed below:
<table>
<tr><th>Particulars</th><th>Pck-1</th><th>Pck-2</th><th>Pck-3</th><th>Pck-4</th><th>Pck-5</th><th>Pck-6</th><th>Pck-7</th><th>Total</th></tr>
<tr><td>Name of the Project</td><td colspan="8">Construction of 4-lane Greenfield High Speed Access Controlled Corridor from Gorakhpur to Siliguri, Design Length of 568.700 Km (including 43 Km Spur length),</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

			in the State of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar & West Bengal on Hybrid Annuity Mode under NH (O)						
		Scheme	NH(O)						
		Mode of Execution	Hybrid Annuity Mode (HAM)						
		Alignment Type	Greenfield Alignment with general ROW 70 m						
		End lane Status	4-Lane with Paved Shoulder						
		Total Alignment Length (Km.)	568.700 Km including spur (5 Nos) length of 43.00 Km (Kushinagar Airport, Bettiah, Darbhanga Airport, Araria & Galgalia)						
		Length (km) - MCW	74.00	101.75	94.25	67.30	17.70	99.00	71.70	525.70
		Length (km) - SPUR	2.50	7.50	-	16.00	-	12.00	5.00	43.00
		Total Length (km)	76.50	109.25	94.25	83.30	17.70	111.00	76.70	568.70
		Traffic (PCUs/day)	Year-2029: 18,366 PCUs/day (max.) Year-2054: 38,242 PCUs/day (max.)							
		Design Speed	100 Km/Hr							
		Type of Pavement	Flexible (except Toll Plaza)							
		Minimum Design Traffic (MSA)	MCW - 100 CR – 20	MCW - 100 CR – 20	MCW - 115 CR – 20	MCW - 132 CR – 20	MCW - 132 CR – 20	MCW - 115 CR – 20	MCW - 115 CR – 20	
		Major Bridges (nos)/ Length	2 (Total Length - 190 m)	8 (Total Length - 4974 m)	7 (Total Length - 1485 m)	10 (Total Length - 2224 m)	1 (Total Length - 7320 m)	18 (Total Length - 2917 m)	6 (Total Length - 1890 m)	52 (Total Length - 21000 m)
		Minor Bridges (nos)	39	31	34	27	5	44	22	202
		Railway Crossing/ROB (nos)/ Length	-	3 (Total Length - 285 m)	2 (Total Length - 229 m)	2 (Total Length - 234 m)	-	3 (Total Length - 330 m)	2 (Total Length - 193 m)	12 (Total Length - 1271 m)
		Flyovers (Nos)	-	-	5	1	-	-	2	8
		Interchange (Nos)	6	7	8	3	1	3	3	31
		VUP (Nos)	9	9	5	3	1	6	2	35
		LVUP (Nos)	6 (12 x 4.5m)	20 (12 x 4.5m)	12 (12 x 4.5m)	8 (12 x 4.5m)	-	15 (12 x 4.5m)	13 (12 x 4.5m)	74
		SVUP(Nos)	35 (7 x 4.5m)	50 (7 x 4.5m)	46 (7 x 4.5m)	49 (7 x 4.5m)	9 (7 x 4.5m)	56 (7 x 4.5m)	37 (7 x 4.5m)	282
		Box Crossing	38	29	26	7	1	23	32	156

			(5m x 4.0m)	(5m x 4.0m)	(5m x 4.0m)	(5m x 4.0m)	(5m x 4.0m)	(5m x 4.0m)	(5m x4.0m)	
		Gas Pipe line Crossing	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
		Major Junction (Nos)	15	29	22	8	1	21	13	109
		Minor Junction (Nos)	73	79	74	50	5	79	69	429
		Box Culverts (Nos)	216	138	205	137	14	262	235	1207
		Length of Connecting Road (Km.)	2.81	5.29	3.11	1.75	-	4.21	4.31	21.49
		Retaining Wall (RT)/ Toe Wall (TW) BHS	RT-20.32 TW-93.36	RT-27.81 TW-95.97	RT-12.38 TW-99.34	RT-18.66 TW-64.25	RT-4.07 TW-10.38	RT-20.05 TW-94.49	RT-13.9 TW-75.30	RT-117.19 TW-533.09
		Tolling System	Closed Tolling							
		Toll Booth (Nos)	22	27	33	12	4	20	11	129
		Construction Period	3 years	3 years	3 years	3 years	4 years	3 years	3 years	
		Maintenance Period	15 Years							

8 Estimated Capital Costs with breakup under major heads of expenditure. Also indicate the basis of cost estimation

Details of Total Project Cost are as given below:

SN	Description	Pkg - 1	Pkg - 2	Pkg - 3	Pkg - 4	Pkg - 5	Pkg - 6	Pkg-7	Total Amount
	Length	76.5	109.25	94.25	83.3	17.7	111.00	76.7	568.7
		Amount (Cr.)	Amount (Cr.)	Amount (Cr.)	Amount (Cr.)	Amount (Cr.)	Amount (Cr.)	Amount (Cr.)	Amount (Cr.)
A1	**Civil Construction Cost**	3800.62	5078.75	3805.10	2934.30	1943.57	4807.72	2887.09	25257.15
A2	**Utility Shifting Cost**	107.40	65.51	144.44	119.43	6.29	89.22	84.48	616.77
A	**Total Civil Cost including Utility Shifting (A1 +A2)**	3908.02	5144.26	3949.54	3053.73	1949.86	4896.94	2971.57	25873.92
	Civil Construction Cost + 18% GST (A1+0.18*A1)	4484.73	5992.93	4490.02	3462.47	2293.41	5673.11	3406.77	29803.44
B	**I/C Pre-operative Expenses (1% of A)**	39.08	51.44	39.495	30.54	19.50	48.97	29.72	258.74
C	**Financing Cost**	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	7.63	15.00	15.00	97.63
D	**Interest during construction**	224.29	323.26	218.00	178.42	149.29	246.65	169.10	1509.01
E	**Estimated Project Cost (EPC) (A+B+C+D)**	4186.39	5533.96	4222.04	3277.69	2126.28	5207.56	3185.39	27739.30
F	**Bid Project Cost (BPC)**	4628.34	6149.34	4740.51	3671.65	2385.57	5758.82	3538.63	3
G	**Contingencies 1% of A1**	38.01	50.79	38.05	29.34	19.44	48.08	28.87	252.57

		H	**Price Escalation during construction period**	351.72	462.98	355.46	274.84	175.49	440.72	267.44	2328.65
		I	**Maintenance Charges including price escalation**	627.96	826.43	633.31	491.65	148.84	781.13	477.81	3987.13
		J	**NPV of Maintenance charges including price escalation**	199.39	406.12	219.45	133.45	79.13	284.17	151.71	1473.42
		K	**Interest on Annuity**	2093.20	2754.76	2111.02	1638.84	1063.14	2603.78	1592.69	13857.43
		L	**NPV of Interest on annuity**	654.62	1616.05	720.51	849.29	503.58	933.58	498.09	5775.72
		M	**Supervision charges**	41.86	55.10	42.22	32.78	21.26	52.08	31.85	277.15
		O	**GST (O = 18% of F+G+H+I+K+M)**	1400.60	1849.79	1425.70	1105.04	686.47	1743.23	1068.71	9279.55
		P	**LA & Other Pre construction charges**	1406.78	3729.53	1993.35	1391.48	73.21	2036.68	1615.13	12246.16
		Q	**Total Capital Cost (F+G+H+I+K+M+O+P)**	10588.46	15855.96	11339.61	8635.62	4573.42	13464.52	8621.14	73078.74
		R	**NPV of Total Capital Cost {(F+G+H+J+L+M)*1.18 +P**	8385.23	14016.32	9210.47	7281.27	3830.88	10907.27	6944.71	60576.15

9	Financial Viability	**Particulars**	**Pkg-1**	**Pkg-2**	**Pkg-3**	**Pkg-4**	**Pkg-5**	**Pkg-6**	**Pkg-7**
		Equity IRR	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%
		Project IRR	9.6%	9.10%	9.12%	10.20%	10.25%	8.99%	9.6%

10	Clearances	**Forest Clearance:** Proposal for 9.023 ha submitted to MoEF&CC; EDS response under process. **Tree Felling Permission:** To be obtained before the Appointed Date. **Utility Shifting:** Joint inspection completed; a few cost estimates awaited. **Land Acquisition:** Status presented separately. **ROB GAD Approval:** Plans for all 12 ROBs uploaded; JFR completed for 12 ROBs. **Environmental Clearance:** Exempted, subject to applicable conditions for Strategic Border Roads. **Wildlife Clearance:** Not required, as the project does not pass through any Protected Area. **National Waterway Clearance:** Under process for Gandak and Kosi Rivers.
11	Bidding Process	Single stage two- part system of bidding
12	Bidding Parameter	Lowest Bid Project Cost

2. NHAI officials apprised the committee that the proposed Gorakhpur–Siliguri Greenfield High-Speed Access-Controlled Corridor is a 568.7 km (including a 43 km spur) four-lane expressway planned to be implemented in seven packages.

3. The project originates from the Northeastern Gorakhpur Bypass (Km 0.000) at Km 20+050 of the Gorakhpur Ring Road in Gorakhpur district, Uttar Pradesh, and traverses 2 districts in Uttar Pradesh, 8 districts in Bihar, and Darjeeling district in West Bengal, terminating near NH-327C at Siliguri (Km 525.700).

4. The corridor alignment has been approved by the Alignment Approval Committee (AAC) with a 70 m Right of Way (RoW). The expressway will provide seamless connectivity with 18 National Highways, several State Highways, the upcoming Panipat–Gorakhpur Access-Controlled Highway and will include spur connections to key regional centres such as Kushinagar Airport, Bettiah, Darbhanga, Araria, and Galgalia.

5. The project is designed to strengthen connectivity between mainland India and the North-Eastern Region by improving access to industrial clusters, agricultural and livestock markets, logistics hubs, and urban centres. It is expected to reduce travel time between Gorakhpur and Siliguri from about 14 hours to 7-8 hours, while enabling faster, safer, and congestion-free movement of passenger and freight traffic.

6. After and during the detailed presentation, the Chair and the PPPAC members made their observation. DoLA supported the proposal and stated that there were no further comments to offer.

7. The observations raised by **DoE** and the responses thereto are given below:

i. It was observed that the estimated cost of Package 3 has increased by approximately INR 1,000 crore. It was further noted that the corresponding PIRR has increased from approximately 9.4% to above 10%. The basis for the increase in project cost and its corresponding impact on PIRR may be re-examined.

Response: It was clarified that the cost of Package 3 has increased by approximately ₹1,000 crore. Accordingly, the Committee observed that the Project Internal Rate of Return (PIRR) may be re-examined based on the revised cost estimates, as the reported PIRR has increased from approximately 9.4% to above the 10% benchmark. It was further observed that the increase in project cost would ordinarily be expected to exert downward pressure on the PIRR and the revised estimates may therefore be reviewed to ascertain the reasons for the reported increase.

8. The observations raised by the **PD, NITI Aayog** and the responses thereto by MoRTH / NHAI officials are given below:

i. The interest rate of 10.57% considered for one of the packages appears to be on the higher side. It was suggested that the interest rate may be reviewed to assess its appropriateness.

Response: It was agreed that the interest rate, along with other relevant financial assumptions and revisions suggested during the meeting, would be re-examined and suitably reviewed.

ii. **At certain locations along the initial, middle and terminal stretches towards Siliguri, the proposed corridor appears to run parallel and in close proximity to the existing highway. Considering the limited availability of land, particularly along the stretch towards Siliguri, the need for maintaining two separate corridors at these locations may be examined, including the feasibility of adopting a single corridor.**

Response: The minimum distance between the nearest points of the existing and proposed corridors is approximately 3 km. In the Siliguri Chicken's Neck region, the proposed corridor passes south of Sevoke, while NH-27 runs north of it. Further, merging the two corridors may pose operational challenges due to their differing access-control characteristics and could cause inconvenience to local commuters.

9. The observations raised by **JS, IFS** and the responses thereto by MoRTH / NHAI officials are given below:

i. **Why has the project been proposed for implementation under the Hybrid Annuity Model (HAM) instead of the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) model?**

Response: The financial assessment undertaken under the BOT model indicates a Viability Gap Funding (VGF) requirement of approximately 72%, rendering the project financially unviable under the prevailing assumptions. Accordingly, the proposed 31 interchanges are being reviewed to optimise project costs, including the conversion of certain interchanges into rotary interchanges and the removal of some rotary interchanges, wherever feasible. The revised financial assessment, incorporating these changes, will be presented subsequently.

ii. **What are the reasons for the variation in project cost under Package 5, particularly in view of the proposed bridge construction?**

Response: The cost variation under Package 5 is primarily attributable to the enhanced dimensions of the bridge foundations, necessitated by site-specific geotechnical conditions. While the normative well diameter is generally 7 metres, a diameter of 10 metres has been considered for Package 5. Similarly, against the normative well depth of 20 metres, a depth of 45 metres has been proposed. These enhanced specifications are required in view of the poor soil conditions, susceptibility to scour and low bearing capacity at the project location, necessitating deeper and stronger foundations.

10. The observations raised by the **Chair** and the responses thereto by MoRTH / NHAI officials are given below:

i. **Has the land acquisition been completed keeping in mind that there may be any existing habitations along the proposed lane?**

Response: The land acquisition has already been initiated. Additionally, there is not much habitation along this Greenfield project, and this heavy habitation is the reason that the already existing highway has not expanded under brownfield project. Additionally, it was stated that this project is access controlled unlike NH27.

ii. What is the rationale for providing a spur at Galgalia Town?

Response: The spur has been proposed to connect the corridor to NH-327C. Accordingly, the nomenclature will be revised to NH-327C to avoid any ambiguity.

iii. How is this helping to connect the entirety of Northeast with the other states for logistics as recently our FM has also highlighted in her visit to Meghalaya on how to evacuate the agri products from there?

Response: The Shillong-Silchar corridor, approved last year, is currently under construction, while connectivity between Guwahati and Shillong is also under development. With these corridors being progressively developed, an integrated, high-speed, access-controlled expressway network will be established across the region.

Recommendations

11. After the detailed deliberations, the PPPAC unanimously, recommended the proposal "Construction of a 4-lane Greenfield High-Speed Access-Controlled Corridor from Gorakhpur to Siliguri, Design Length of 568.700 Km (including 43 Km Spur length), in the States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar & West Bengal on Hybrid Annuity Mode under NH (O)" by Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) on PPP mode" for consideration of the Competent Authority for giving Administrative Approval subject to following recommendations:

    i. The appraised Total Capital Cost of the project is INR 73,078.74 crore. The Estimated Project Cost excluding GST is INR 27,714.86 crore.
    ii. The project should be taken up on HAM under the NH(O) scheme.
    iii. The project shall be taken up in seven packages.
    iv. The financials shall be re-worked and shared with the committee
    v. Land acquisition and necessary clearances to be obtained in a timebound manner to avoid delay in the project.

12. Revalidation of its recommendation by the PPPAC is not required for following post-recommendation changes in the project costs/bid documents:

    i. Any change in the date/time period for any time-bound actions like appointed date, financial close, construction period etc.
    ii. Non-substantial change in risk-allocation.
    iii. Any other changes/modification in the project proposal with the overall objective of making project successful.
    iv. Further, MoRTH may decide whether the changes proposed post recommendations of the project proposal by the PPPAC fall within the threshold criteria as stated above. All such changes falling within the threshold criteria shall be appraised at the level of

Secretary MoRTH, without any further need of revalidation by the PPPAC and shall proceed with the approval process accordingly.

13. The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

***

Annexure-I

List of the attendees of the 153rd meeting of the PPPAC for considering the two project proposals

a. Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance

1. Ms. Anuradha Thakur, Secretary (EA)
2. Ms. Laya Madduri JS (IFS)
3. Ms. Arya Balan Kumari JD (PIU)
4. Ms. Shraddha D Narwade, Assistant Director (PIU)
5. Shri. Deepak Meena, ASO (PIU)

b. NITI Aayog

1. Shri. Partha Sarathi Reddy, Programme Director, NITI Aayog

c. Department of Expenditure

1. Ms. Bhumika Verma, Director

d. Department of Legal Affairs

1. Ms. Prerna, Assistant Legal Adviser

e. Ministry of Road Transport and Highways

1. Shri. V. Umashankar, Secretary MoRTH
2. Shri. Puneet Agarwal, AS & FA
3. Shri. Manoj Kumar, Chief Engineer (BP&SP)
4. Shri. Udit Agarwal, JS (Highway)
5. Shri. V K Joshi, SE (BP & SP)

f. National Highway Authority of India

1. Shri. Vipnesh Sharma, Member
2. Shri. Varun Aggarwal, CGM
3. Shri. Vipin Mangla, GM
4. Shri. Prashant Saugat, Deputy Manager