Consolidated Pre-Application Conference Queries and their Responses

<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>From</th><th>Document / Topic</th><th>Clause No. and Existing Provision</th><th>Clarification Required</th><th>Rationale for Clarification or Amendment</th><th>Response from MoC</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>M/sAdani dated 23.07.2026</td><td>RFP</td><td>Annexure I (Product Classification)</td><td>Annexure I provides an indicative list of eligible products. If new products are proposed, would it be approved before the final submission?</td><td>To ensure compliance and eligibility of alternative value-added products.</td><td>The list of products provided at Annexure I is only indicative. An applicant can propose any other product not forming the part of the list along with a written justification for addition of the intended product.

However, MoC reserves the right to determine whether a product qualifies having regard to the definition of the "Product". Such determination shall be made prior to declaration of Selected Applicant for that round and for that Product.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026</td><td>RFP</td><td>General Policy</td><td>Is the applicant allowed to change the proposed product post selection / qualification?</td><td>To provide flexibility in case of changing market dynamics.</td><td>Any addition, deletion, or substitution of a Product after execution of Project Agreement shall mean Project Modification and shall be governed as per provisions of Annexure XI.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026</td><td>RFP</td><td>Appendix C, read with Clause 1.3.1(d) and (e)</td><td>Appendix C, Clause B.1 provides for net worth computation under three categories… There is no express provision addressing a wholly-owned subsidiary of a single corporate promoter.</td><td>Large corporate groups frequently implement new projects through project-specific subsidiaries for reasons of liability ring-fencing and governance.</td><td rowspan="2">Net worth shall be computed in accordance with clause (57) of Section 2 of the Companies Act,2013, based on the latest audited financial statements. The net worth of the newly incorporated and/ or wholly owned subsidiary shall be computed on a standalone basis.</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026</td><td>RFP</td><td>Appendix C, read with Clause 1.3.1(d) and (e)</td><td>Kindly clarify whether a newly incorporated and/or wholly-owned subsidiary company of an eligible corporate entity is permitted to submit an Application as the sole ‘Applicant’ under Clause 1.3.1, by relying on the consolidated/standalone net worth of its holding company, backed by a Corporate Guarantee (Annexure XII).</td><td>Large corporate groups frequently implement new projects through project-specific subsidiaries for reasons of liability ring-fencing and governance.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>From</th><th>Document / Topic</th><th>Clause No. and Existing Provision</th><th>Clarification Required</th><th>Rationale for Clarification or Amendment</th><th>Response from MoC</th></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026</td><td>RFP</td><td>Clause 1.9.1(a) and Annexure XII</td><td>Clause 1.9.1(a) provides that a Selected Applicant 'may' implement the Project directly or through an SPV.</td><td rowspan="2">This clarification will remove ambiguity regarding the sequence of an Applicant bidding on its own net worth and subsequently forming a wholly owned SPV.</td><td rowspan="2">As per the provisions of the RFP, the Selected Applicant may implement the Project either directly or through a Special Purpose Vehicle incorporated under the Companies Act, 2013. Where the Selected Applicant is a JV or a consortium, incorporation of an SPV shall be mandatory and such SPV shall maintain the same shareholding pattern as specified in the Application.

Further, in case of any company registered outside India, they shall have to mandatorily incorporate a SPV in India for implementation of the Project.

The Project Agreement shall be executed with the Project Developer i.e. the company itself or SPV, as applicable.</td></tr>
<tr><td>6</td><td>M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026</td><td>RFP</td><td>Clause 1.9.1(a) and Annexure XII</td><td>Kindly confirm that where a single corporate entity is the Applicant and is Selected, it may incorporate a wholly-owned SPV after declaration as Selected Applicant/issuance of LoA, without any requirement of fresh demonstration of net worth or re-evaluation.</td></tr>
<tr><td>7</td><td>M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026</td><td>RFP</td><td>Clause 1.10.1 (Disbursement of Financial Incentive)</td><td>For the 2nd installment, 30% infusion of "equity contribution" is required. Will the 30% equity infusion threshold be calculated based on the total estimated project equity, or the net equity required after accounting for the VGF grant?</td><td>Clarity needed for financial planning and structuring.</td><td>The amount of equity infusion shall be calculated on the total project cost.</td></tr>
<tr><td>8</td><td>M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026</td><td>RFP</td><td>Clause 1.10.2 (Timelines and Milestones)</td><td>The financial incentive is reduced if the project commissioning is delayed beyond 5 years. Is it possible to get an extension on this timeline without a penalty in cases where delays are caused by unforeseen regulatory hurdles or government agency delays, not attributable to the project developer?</td><td>To protect developers from penalties due to delays outside of their control.</td><td>As per the provisions of Clause 1.10.2 of the RFP.</td></tr>
<tr><td>9</td><td>M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026</td><td>RFP / P&M Costs</td><td>Cost of Plant and Machinery - Technology License Fees</td><td>Does this include both one-time fees and any royalty payments during the project life?</td><td>Need clarity on allowable scope for technology license costs.</td><td>Only the one-time fees forming part of project cost, shall be considered towards cost of P&M.</td></tr>
</table>

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
10	M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026	RFP / P&M Costs	Cost of Plant and Machinery - Engineering Fees & PMC	Need clarity on whether Basic Engineering, Detail Engineering, FEED costs, and PMC costs are included under P&M.	Need clarity on allowable project management and engineering costs.	These items are covered under exclusions as per definition 9(f) of the RFP.
11	M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026	RFP / P&M Costs	Cost of Plant and Machinery - Erection, GST, Contingency & Insurance	Confirmation that Erection & Installation includes all direct/indirect costs. Confirmation that GST, Contingency, and Insurance are included in P&M. LSTK bids are always inclusive of contingency.	Ensure alignment of EPC / LSTK cost heads with allowable P&M costs.	Any charges/ taxes/ fees payable to the government during erection and installation shall be considered under cost of P&M. However, contingency and/ or insurance or any such other expenditure shall be governed as per Annexure XI (4) i.e. disbursement of financial incentives under the Scheme.
12	M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026	RFP / P&M Costs	Spares, Catalyst, Chemicals, Commissioning & Pre-Commissioning	Need clarity on whether Spares, Catalyst, Chemicals, and Commissioning / pre-commissioning expenses are included.	Provide exact definition of allowable P&M scope.	Catalyst, chemicals and commissioning/ pre-commissioning expenses shall not be covered under cost of P&M. In respect of the spares, it shall be decided on a case to case basis.
13	M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026	RFP / P&M Costs	Building and Civil Works	The RFP clarifies that control rooms, cooling towers, product warehouses, workshops, and civil structures required for supporting equipment, machinery and piping are included. Please clarify for any other civil works inside plant battery limit required to run the plant successfully need to be included, e.g. fire water storage pond, raw water reservoir, contaminated water storage pit, laboratory etc.	To accurately estimate the eligible subset of civil works vital for core plant operations.	A Project may include associated infrastructure, utilities and ancillary facilities. The eligibility of any facility shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of the Scheme and the RFP. In case of cluster-based development or where more than one project is proposed at the same site involving sharing of common facilities, for ensuring cost optimisation, the approvals, clearances, agreements, and relevant project documents should clearly bring out the proposed arrangement for the distinct project.
14	M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026	RFP / P&M Costs	Other soft costs	Please provide a definition and examples of “other soft costs”.		Soft costs are the non-physical, indirect expenses of a project as opposed to the direct costs.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
15	M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026	RFP / P&M Costs	Pre-Operative Expenses	Please provide the scope of "pre-operative expenses"		Some of the pre-operative expenses are as follows: (i) preparation of feasibility report; (ii) preparation of project report; (iii) conducting market survey or any other survey necessary for the business; (iv) engineering services relating to the business; (v) legal expenses etc. It may be noted that the above list is only indicative and not exhaustive.
16	M/s Adani dated 23.07.2026	RFP / P&M Costs	Site Development	Please provide clarification on what specific activities are covered under "site development"		Site development refers to the physical preparation of land to make it ready for construction or use.
17	M/s Vedanta Dated 21.07.2026	RFP	Definitions S. No.9	As per Annexure-I, the "List of Products that Qualify under the Scheme" at S. No "13. Power (from Syngas)" is included. Therefore, clarification may please be given if the Cost of P&M will also include the cost incurred towards modification in the existing power plants for utilization of Syngas for production of "Power" as downstream product	As Power (from Syngas) is an eligible downstream product, the following clarification is paramount for the purposes of determining the Cost of P&M.	Any cost incurred towards setting up coal/ lignite gasification project for use in power generation is permitted. This cost should be towards setting up new surface coal/lignite gasification projects. Any modification in the existing power plant shall not be eligible for any financial incentive under the Scheme.
18	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.2.11- Project Developer may utilise the coal/lignite from their own mines/arrangements. The responsibility of arrangement of coal/lignite and any other raw material shall lie with the Project Developer. Also, no explicit provision is there requiring domestic certification for coal.	If there are any restrictions on use of imported coal?	Clause 1.2.11 provides that the Project Developer may utilise coal/lignite from their own mines/arrangements and that responsibility for arranging coal/lignite and other raw material lies with the Developer; no provision expressly requires domestic certification. An explicit confirmation would remove ambiguity on the eligibility of imported coal.	India's Foreign Trade Policy regarding coal allows free imports under the Open General License (OGL).

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
19	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	Annexure IIA(SI. No. 14)- Tech tie-up details. Appendix B(SI. No. 4)- Technology details.	In the application stage, is technology tie-up required only for Coal Gasification or for all packages?	Annexure IIA (Sl. No. 14) seeks tech tie-up details and Appendix B (Sl. No. 4) seeks technology details, but neither specifies whether the tie-up requirement is limited to coal gasification or covers all packages. Clarity is needed to structure the application correctly.	Technology tie-up is required for the coal gasification unit.
20	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	Scheme name- 'Scheme For Promotion of Surface Coal/Lignite Gasification'	Whether "Surface coal" in the scheme name refers to coal type OR a type of gasification technology?	The scheme is titled 'Scheme for Promotion of Surface Coal/Lignite Gasification'. The term "Surface" can be read either as a coal type or as a type of gasification technology. A definition would avoid misinterpretation of scope.	The term "Surface Coal/Lignite Gasification Projects" refers to the location of the gasification process i.e., gasification is carried out above ground. There is no restriction on method of extraction of coal.
21	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.8.1- Selected Applicant having UBO outside India will be required to obtain requisite clearances/approvals and submit the same to the MoC.	What are details of permits required by applicants having UBO (Ultimate Beneficial Ownership) outside India as they have not been specified explicitly in the RFP?	Clause 1.8.1 requires a Selected Applicant having UBO outside India to obtain requisite clearances/approvals and submit the same to MoC, but does not specify which. An indicative list would help such applicants plan compliance.	As per Applicable Laws.
22	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.2.11- MoC will also facilitate the grant of coal linkage to Projects through NRS linkage subsector under 'Production of Syn-Gas leading to coal gasification'.	Please elaborate what is meant by 'MoC will facilitate grant of coal linkage' in Clause 1.2.11? What will be the quantum, quality, timeline of supply contract, procedure etc.?	Clause 1.2.11 states that MoC will facilitate the grant of coal linkage to Projects through the NRS linkage sub-sector under 'Production of Syn-Gas leading to coal gasification', but the quantum, quality, contract timeline and procedure are unspecified. These parameters materially affect feedstock planning and project economics.	The Ministry of Coal has a policy of granting coal linkage to gasification projects under sub-sector "Production of syn gas leading to coal gasification" of NRS linkage policy. Every effort would be made to ensure grant of coal linkage to the gasification projects so that appropriate quantum and quality of coal is available to such Projects.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
23	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	Clause 2.1.2(d)- Upon conclusion of evaluation of each round, Financial Incentive shall be committed against the total Financial Outlay, in respect of all Selected Applicants of that round. Each subsequent round shall be open only to the extent of the residual Financial Outlay remaining after conclusion of preceding round.	Will MoC publish the residual Financial Outlay remaining after each round's evaluation (Clause 2.1.2(d)) before the next round's Application Due Date, so that Applicants can gauge likelihood of full vs. partial earmarking?	Clause 2.1.2(d) provides that, upon conclusion of each round, Financial Incentive is committed against the total Financial Outlay for all Selected Applicants, and each subsequent round is open only to the extent of the residual Outlay remaining after the preceding round. Prior visibility of the residual amount would let applicants assess the likelihood of full vs. partial earmarking before bidding.	The residual Financial Outlay will be informed prior to the Application Due Date.
24	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	Annexure XI- procedure of Project Modification Clause 1.9.2- If developer decides not to proceed with the Project, it may surrender the Project prior to disbursement of 1st instalment by submitting a detailed written justification. In such case, the earmarked Financial Incentive shall stand withdrawn & 5% of the Performance Security shall be forfeited.	If Cost of P&M changes pursuant to an approved Project Modification (as per Annexure XI), does the Performance Security amount (3% of Cost of P&M) get revised?	Annexure XI sets out the Project Modification procedure and Clause 1.9.2 addresses surrender of the Project (with forfeiture of 5% of the Performance Security), but neither states whether a change in Cost of P&M revises the 3% Performance Security. Explicit linkage would avoid disputes on the security amount after a modification.	The Performance Security amount shall remain as per the Cost of P&M determined at the time of selection.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
25	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	No explicit provision.	Can foreign company bid as separate entity or does it have to form SPV?	The RFP contains no explicit provision on whether a foreign company may bid directly or must form an SPV. Express guidance is needed to structure the bidding entity correctly.	A foreign company may submit an Application as an Applicant in its own name and formation of an SPV is not mandatory at the application stage. Clause 1.3.1(g)(i) expressly permits an Applicant to be either a company incorporated in India under the Companies Act, 2013 or a company incorporated outside India in accordance with the laws of its jurisdiction of incorporation. In case of any company registered outside India, they shall have to mandatorily incorporate a SPV in India for implementation of the Project. Further, where the Ultimate Beneficial Ownership (UBO) is outside India, the Selected Applicant will be required to obtain applicable approvals/clearances prior to issuance of the Letter of Award.
26	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	Annexure IIA(SI. No. 14)- Tech tie-up details. Appendix B(SI. No. 4)- Technology details.	Can we add two licensors instead of one for gasification technology in our bid application?	Annexure IIA (Sl. No. 14) and Appendix B (Sl. No. 4) seek tech tie-up and technology details but appear to contemplate a single licensor. Confirmation that two licensors may be included would allow assured access to technology in case other licensor withdraws.	Yes. An Applicant may propose more than one technology licensor/provider in its Application. However, for evaluation under the "Technology Tie-up" parameter, the Applicant should clearly specify the scope, role, and technology contribution of each licensor/provider and furnish supporting agreements/documents.
27	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.3.1(h)(iii)- Companies constituting the consortium shall have entered into a Joint Application Agreement, in the format specified at	Can we incorporate JV/SPV now and add on minority stake partners at a later stage?	Clause 1.3.1(h)(iii) requires companies constituting the consortium to have entered into a Joint Application Agreement in the Annexure V format for submitting the Application. Clarity is sought on whether minority partners can be	An Applicant may submit its Application through an existing company/JV/SPV. However, any change in shareholding, consortium composition, ownership structure or control after submission of the Application shall be governed by the provisions of the RFP. Further, where the Project is

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
			Annexure V, for the purpose of submitting the Application. Annexure V- Joint Application Agreement		inducted after application without breaching the consortium/JAA requirement.	implemented through an SPV, the shareholding pattern is required to be maintained as specified in the Application.
28	M/s Indorama dated 20.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.2.3(b)- The Financial Incentive for any particular Product (except urea and Synthetic Natural Gas) across all approved Projects, shall be capped at ₹9,000 crore.	If the product-wise capping limit of ₹9000 cr mentioned in 1.2.3(b) is per applicant or for all applicants?	Clause 1.2.3(b) caps the Financial Incentive for any particular Product (except urea and Synthetic Natural Gas) at ₹9,000 crore across all approved Projects. The phrase 'across all approved Projects' suggests an aggregate cap, but confirmation is sought on whether it is per applicant or for all applicants collectively.	The Financial Incentive for any Particular Product (except urea and Synthetic Natural Gas) across all approved Projects, is capped at ₹9,000 crore. Capping is applicable for all applicants.

<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>From</th><th>Document / Topic</th><th>Clause No. and Existing Provision</th><th>Clarification Required</th><th>Rationale for Clarification or Amendment</th><th>Response from MoC</th></tr>
<tr><td>29</td><td>M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026</td><td>RFP</td><td>Clause 1.4.3(e) – Financial Strength/Capability (20 Score): “Financial capability of the Applicant assessed with reference to the net worth in relation to the Project Cost, with scores assigned on a pro-rata basis.” (Page 15 of 74)</td><td>With reference to the RFP issued under the Scheme for Promotion of Coal/Lignite Gasification Projects, we seek clarification regarding the methodology adopted for awarding marks under the Financial Strength/Capability Score criterion. As per the illustrative example provided in the document, the score is determined basedon the percentage of net worth available over and above the minimum eligibility requirement. While we appreciate the intent of assessing financial robustness, the current methodology appears to create a significant variation in marks between applicants who are otherwise financially capable of implementing the project.
<table>
<tr><th>Particulars</th><th>Company A</th><th>Company B</th></tr>
<tr><td>Project Cost</td><td>₹10,000 Cr</td><td>₹10,000 Cr</td></tr>
<tr><td>Minimum Net Worth Requirement (20%)</td><td>₹2,000 Cr</td><td>₹2,000 Cr</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actual Net Worth</td><td>₹8,000 Cr</td><td>₹3,000 Cr</td></tr>
<tr><td>Net Worth as % of Project Cost</td><td>80%</td><td>30%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Excess Net Worth above Minimum Requirement</td><td>60%</td><td>10%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Financial Strength / Capability</td><td>15 Score</td><td>2.5 Score</td></tr>
</table></td><td>In the given illustration, both Company A and Company B satisfy the prescribed minimum net worth requirement and, therefore, are eligible and financially capable of undertaking the project. However, the evaluation methodology results in a substantial difference in score solely on account of higher net worth, despite both applicants meeting the threshold required for project implementation. We request the Ministry to kindly clarify the objective and basis of the proposed scoring methodology so as to ensure a level playing field and alignment between financial eligibility requirements and financial evaluation criteria.</td><td>As per RFP.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>From</th><th>Document / Topic</th><th>Clause No. and Existing Provision</th><th>Clarification Required</th><th>Rationale for Clarification or Amendment</th><th>Response from MoC</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><table><tr><td>Score (as per formula)</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
30	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.2 – Key Features of the Scheme and Annexure I – List of Products that Qualify under the Scheme (Pages 12 & 29 of 74)	The proposed coal/lignite gasification projects envisaged under the Scheme would require procurement of significant quantities of coal and other inputs during the operational phase. Coal presently attracts GST at a rate of 18%, resulting in substantial input tax credit accumulation. By way of illustration, if a Project procures coal worth ₹8,000, GST at 18% would be paid on such procurement. The coal is then gasified to produce Syngas, which may subsequently be converted into downstream products such as Urea, Ammonia, Methanol, DME, Synthetic Natural Gas (SNG), Ammonium Nitrate and other eligible products under the Scheme. In several cases, the applicable GST rate on the downstream product is significantly lower than the GST paid on coal and other inputs. For example, if the downstream product is sold for ₹25,000 and attracts GST at 5%. Accordingly, despite payment of input GST at 18%, the output tax realization would be only 5%, resulting in a GST rate differential (inverted duty structure) of 13 percentage points.	Over the life of the project, such accumulation of input tax credit may become substantial due to the continuing mismatch between 18% input GST and 5% output GST, thereby impacting working capital requirements, project cash flows, and overall project economics.	As per Applicable Laws.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
31	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Annexure I – List of Products that Qualify under the Scheme (Page 29 of 74) Point No. 8 – Direct Reduced Iron (DRI) is included as an eligible product under the Scheme.	"Utilization of Coal Gasification based Syngas for Blast Furnace Ironmaking through Tuyere Injection for partial substitution of coke and/or PCI coal consumption" may also be considered as an eligible application under the Scheme.	Coal Gasification based syngas injection in Blast Furnace operations provides both thermal and reducing value through hydrogen (H_2) and carbon monoxide (CO), resulting in improved indirect reduction efficiency, lower coke rate, lower PCI consumption, reduced dependency on imported coking coal and lower greenhouse gas emissions. Syngas injection promotes domestic coal utilization through gasification while supporting decarbonization of the steel sector. Similar to DRI production, the application directly utilizes syngas generated from coal gasification and contributes to the objectives of the Coal Gasification Mission, import substitution, energy security and Green Steel initiatives. The proposed application serves as a transitional pathway towards hydrogen-assisted ironmaking and low-carbon Blast Furnace operations, thereby supporting national objectives of sustainable steel production and enhanced utilization of indigenous coal resources.	Production of Syngas through coal/ lignite gasification is an approved product. The Syngas can be used for any purpose including blast furnaces. However, Financial Incentive under the Scheme is applicable till production of Syngas.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
32	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.9.2(a) – Performance Security	Clause 1.9.2(a) provides that the Performance Security shall be furnished either through RTGS/NEFT remittance or an irrevocable and unconditional Bank Guarantee from a Scheduled Commercial Bank. However, unlike Clause 1.10.1(a), which permits submission of an Insurance Surety Bond as an alternative security instrument, no such provision has been included for Performance Security. It is requested to clarify whether an Insurance Surety Bond may also be accepted as an eligible mode for furnishing the Performance Security.	Since the RFP already recognizes Insurance Surety Bond as an acceptable security instrument under Clause 1.10.1(a) for the disbursement of the first instalment, extending the same provision to the Performance Security would ensure consistency across the RFP, provide flexibility in arranging security instruments, reduce financing costs for project developers, and align with the Government of India's policy promoting Insurance Surety Bonds as an alternative to Bank Guarantees for infrastructure and large industrial projects.	Insurance Surety Bonds are also allowed in respect of the Performance Security.
33	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.3.1(d), 1.3.1(e) & Related Net Worth Provisions	Clause 1.3.1 requires that the Applicant should have a net worth exceeding 20% of the Project Cost. However, the RFP does not provide any provision permitting a subsidiary company to rely upon the net worth of its Holding Company for meeting the prescribed eligibility criteria. It is requested to clarify whether a wholly owned subsidiary or subsidiary company may utilize the net worth of its Holding Company, subject to submission of an appropriate corporate guarantee/undertaking.	Large industrial and infrastructure projects are frequently implemented through Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) or subsidiary companies, while the financial strength resides with the Holding Company. Allowing a subsidiary to utilize the net worth of its Holding Company, backed by a Corporate Guarantee, would facilitate wider participation by established business groups without compromising financial security. Such a provision is also consistent with the eligibility framework adopted in various Government of India tenders and commercial coal block auctions, where the financial	Net worth shall be computed in accordance with clause (57) of Section 2 of the Companies Act,2013, based on the latest audited financial statements. The net worth of the newly incorporated and/ or wholly owned subsidiary shall be computed on a standalone basis.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
					credentials of the Holding Company are permitted to support the eligibility of its Subsidiary Company.	
34	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Appendix A – Evaluation Framework, Clause 3– Project Cost per MT of Coal	Clause 3 provides for evaluation based on "Project Cost per MT of Coal". However, the RFP does not clarify whether the term "Coal" refers to the quantity of raw coal fed to the coal washery or the washed coal actually consumed in the gasification process. In integrated coal gasification projects producing downstream products such as Urea, raw coal undergoes beneficiation before being fed to the gasifier. For illustration: if the Project Cost is ₹20,000 crore, around 5 MT of raw coal may be required to produce 1.25 MT of washed coal, which is the actual feedstock for gasification. Accordingly, the Project Cost per MT of Coal would be ₹4,000 crore/MT (₹20,000 ÷ 5) if raw coal is considered, whereas it would be ₹16,000 crore/MT (₹20,000 ÷ 1.25) if washed coal is considered. Since both approaches result in substantially different evaluation outcomes, it is requested to clarify which quantity of coal shall be considered for the purpose of evaluation.	Since the evaluation score under this parameter directly depends upon the quantity of coal considered, absence of a clear definition may lead to different interpretations by different Applicants, thereby affecting uniformity and fairness in evaluation. Clarifying that the computation shall be based on the actual coal consumed in the gasification process will ensure a technically appropriate, transparent and equitable evaluation of all projects, irrespective of their coal preparation configuration.	Raw coal/ lignite fed into the coal washery shall be considered.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
35	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Clause 9 – Definition of "Cost of Plant and Machinery" & Clause 19 – "Project Cost"	The RFP defines the eligible components of the Cost of Plant and Machinery but does not specifically clarify whether the cost of a Coal Washery shall be considered where coal washing is an integral part of the coal gasification process. In several coal gasification projects, raw coal cannot be directly fed into the gasifier and must first undergo beneficiation to produce washed coal meeting the required quality specifications. Accordingly, it is requested to clarify whether the capital expenditure incurred towards setting up a Coal Washery, exclusively for supplying washed coal to the proposed gasification project, shall be considered as an eligible component of the Project Cost and Cost of Plant and Machinery for the purpose of computation of Financial Incentive.	Coal beneficiation is often a technical prerequisite for efficient and reliable operation of coal gasification plants, particularly for downstream products such as Urea, Methanol and SNG. Where the Coal Washery is established exclusively to serve the gasification project, it forms an integral part of the production process rather than an independent facility. A specific clarification on the eligibility of such capital expenditure will remove ambiguity, ensure uniform interpretation among Applicants, and enable accurate estimation of eligible Project Cost and Financial Incentive under the Scheme.	As per definition 17 of the RFP.
36	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.2.8 – Availing Benefits under Other Government Schemes	Clause 1.2.8 provides that the Financial Incentive under this Scheme shall not debar or restrict Applicants from availing benefits under schemes of other Ministries of the Central Government or State Governments. However, the RFP does not clarify whether such incentives can be availed in full or whether the incentive under another scheme would be restricted to the balance amount after considering the Financial Incentive received under the Ministry of Coal Scheme. For illustration: if a Project receives 30% Financial Incentive under the Ministry of Coal Scheme and is subsequently found eligible for a State	The existing provision permits Applicants to avail benefits under other Government schemes but does not specify the manner in which such incentives will interact. A clear clarification will eliminate ambiguity during project financing and financial modelling, ensure uniform interpretation among Applicants, and provide certainty regarding the cumulative availability of incentives. This would also align the RFP with the clarification reportedly provided by the	Applicants would be eligible to receive the benefits under both schemes, subject to the respective scheme guidelines.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
				Government incentive (e.g., Odisha Government Industrial Promotion Scheme), whether the Applicant would be entitled to receive the entire State Government incentive as per the applicable scheme, or only the differential amount after adjusting the incentive already received under the Ministry of Coal Scheme. It is further understood that during the Roadshow conducted for the Coal Gasification Scheme, the Ministry clarified that Applicants would be eligible to receive the full benefits under both schemes, subject to the respective scheme guidelines. It is requested that the same may kindly be clarified in the RFP.	Ministry during the Coal Gasification Scheme Roadshow, thereby avoiding differing interpretations at the implementation stage.	
37	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.9.2(d) – Performance Security	Clause 1.9.2(d) provides that where the Project Developer decides not to proceed with the Project prior to disbursement of the 1st instalment, the earmarked Financial Incentive shall stand withdrawn and 5% of the Performance Security shall be forfeited. However, the RFP does not specify the process and timeline for refund/release of the remaining 95% of the Performance Security. It is requested to clarify the procedure, timeline and conditions for refund of the balance Performance Security in such cases.	Since the RFP specifically provides for forfeiture of 5% of the Performance Security, it should also expressly provide the mechanism and timeline for release of the remaining 95%. A clear provision will eliminate ambiguity, provide certainty to Applicants regarding the treatment of their Performance Security, and ensure transparency and uniformity in implementation of the Scheme.	As per Clause 1.9.2(d) of the RFP. The timelines for refund/ release of the remaining Performance Security shall be decided as and when request is received.
38	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.2.11 – Coal/Lignite Arrangement & Clause 1.10.1(a)(vi) – Financial Closure	Clause 1.2.11 provides that the Ministry of Coal will facilitate the grant of coal linkage to eligible Projects through the NRS linkage sub-sector. Further, Clause 1.10.1(a)(vi) requires achievement of Financial Closure as one of the milestones for disbursement of the first instalment of Financial Incentive.	Availability of a long-term and reliable coal supply is a critical requirement for financing coal gasification projects. In practice, lenders generally seek assurance regarding fuel availability before achieving Financial Closure. Providing an in-principle coal	The Ministry of Coal has a policy of granting coal linkage to gasification projects under sub-sector "Production of syngas leading to coal gasification" of NRS linkage policy. Every effort would be made to ensure grant of coal linkage to the gasification

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
39				However, the RFP does not clarify whether any coal linkage commitment, in-principle allocation or assurance of coal availability will be issued prior to Financial Closure. Since lenders generally require assurance of long-term fuel availability before sanctioning debt, it is requested to clarify whether the Ministry of Coal will issue such commitment prior to Financial Closure.	linkage commitment or equivalent assurance would improve bankability of the Project, facilitate timely Financial Closure, and accelerate implementation of Projects under the Scheme, while remaining subject to the applicable coal linkage policy and statutory requirements.	projects so that appropriate quantum and quality of coal is available to such Projects.
39	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.4.3(a) – Viability Amount Score (Appendix A – Evaluation Framework)	Clause 1.4.3(a) provides that the Viability Amount Score shall be calculated based on the ratio of the lowest Financial Incentive (as a percentage of the Cost of Plant & Machinery) quoted by any Applicant to the Financial Incentive sought by the Applicant, multiplied by 30. Since the Applicant Score is directly linked to the percentage of Financial Incentive sought, it appears that an Applicant seeking a lower Financial Incentive may receive a higher evaluation score and thereby improve its ranking. It is requested to clarify whether Applicants are expected to optimize their ranking by voluntarily seeking a lower Financial Incentive and whether there is any minimum threshold or commercial implication associated with quoting a lower incentive than the maximum permissible under the Scheme.	The evaluation methodology directly influences the commercial strategy of Applicants while determining the Financial Incentive to be sought. An explicit clarification will eliminate ambiguity regarding the relationship between the Financial Incentive quoted and the evaluation score, enable Applicants to make informed bidding decisions, and ensure transparency, consistency and fairness in the evaluation process.	The quantum of Financial Incentive is a commercial decision of the Applicant.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
40	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.4.3(d) – Technology Tie-up (AppendixA – Evaluation Framework)	Clause 1.4.3(d) provides for evaluation of the Applicant based on Technology Tie-up. However, the RFP does not specify the nature of documentary evidence required to establish such tie-up. It is requested to clarify whether documents such as a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), Letter of Intent (LOI), Term Sheet, Technology Licence Agreement, Technology Collaboration Agreement, or any other equivalent document would be considered sufficient for evaluation under this parameter.	Coal gasification projects typically progress through multiple stages of technology engagement before execution of a definitive Technology Licence Agreement. At the application stage, many Applicants may have entered into preliminary commercial arrangements such as an MoU, LOI or Term Sheet while detailed negotiations are still in progress. A clear specification of the acceptable documentary evidence will ensure uniform evaluation, avoid differing interpretations among Applicants, and provide greater transparency and certainty in the assessment process.	For the purpose of evaluation under the Technology Tie-up parameter, the Applicant shall furnish documentary evidence demonstrating a credible and identifiable arrangement with the technology provider. The Evaluation Committee shall determine the adequacy and acceptability of such documentation.
41	M/s Shyam Metallics dated 23.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.6.3 – Tie-breaking Criteria	Clause 1.6.3 provides that where two or more Eligible Applicants obtain the same Applicant Score, the first tie-break criterion shall be the Project having firm tie-up with indigenous technology or acquisition of international technology. However, the RFP does not clarify the methodology where two or more Applicants have entered into a firm tie-up with the same technology provider or possess the same category of technology (e.g., both have an international technology licence). In such circumstances, it is requested to clarify how the first tie-break criterion will be evaluated.	The existing provision identifies the type of technology as the first tie-break criterion but does not address situations where competing Applicants have identical technology providers or equivalent technology arrangements. A suitable clarification will ensure transparency, eliminate ambiguity in the evaluation process, and provide certainty to all Applicants regarding the application of the tie-break mechanism.	The Clause 1.6.3 of the RFP is unambiguous.
42	M/s GNK Renewable Energy	RFP	General	Who will be the buyers of syngas, methanol, and ethanol produced under this scheme?		As per Clause 1.2.12 of the RFP, the responsibility for offtake shall rest entirely with the Project Developer.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
	dated 25.07.2026					
43	M/s GNK Renewable Energy dated 25.07.2026	RFP	General	Will the Government or its agencies act as buyers for these products?		As per Clause 1.2.12 of the RFP, the responsibility for offtake shall rest entirely with the Project Developer. Selling the product to the Government or its agencies can be explored by the Project Developer.
44	M/s GNK Renewable Energy dated 25.07.2026	RFP	General	What are the required chemical composition specifications for syngas, methanol, and ethanol?		The definition of Syngas shall be as per RFP. Further, ethanol and methanol are chemical compounds and needs no definition.
45	M/s Coal India Limited dated 25.07.2026	RFP	20. "Raw Syngas" means unprocessed or untreated fuel mixture of primarily hydrogen and carbon monoxide (containing impurities like tar, sulphur, particulates and other gases) generated directly from the gasifier through the gasification of coal or lignite. However, in case of air-blown gasifiers, there may also be substantial volume of nitrogen in Raw Syngas.	Is blending of biomass, petcoke, etc. with coal or lignite for gasification allowed? If yes, is there any restriction on the percentage of blending?	Blending biomass, petcoke, etc., with coal or lignite for gasification will determine the selection of gasifiers, project cost, and the quality and quantity of syngas generated. Hence, a clarification in this regard is necessary.	The Scheme and RFP are intended for promotion of coal/lignite gasification projects.
46	M/s Coal India Limited dated 25.07.2026	RFP	1.6.1 Selection of Projects shall be based on ranking in descending order of Applicant Score, subject to: (a) Achievement of a minimum qualifying	If only one application is received in a round, or if only one application qualifies in a round, then whether the applicant is still eligible for the incentive.	Considering the relatively short time period for submitting the application by 07/09/26, during which DPR/PFR must also be submitted, it gives undue advantage to firms that have their DPR/PFR ready or whose PFR/DPR is under preparation.	Yes.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
			Applicant Score of 40 (the “Qualifying Score”); and (b) Availability of funds under the Financial Outlay.		So, to ensure fair competition, there should be a provision for a time extension of two months if the minimum number of applications received in a round is less than five (5).	
47	M/s Coal India Limited dated 25.07.2026	RFP	17. “Project” shall mean a distinct and independently identifiable investment undertaking with separate coal/lignite gasification capacity, capital expenditure and product streams, capable of independent technical and financial appraisal and having statutory approvals, clearances and agreements, independent of any other Project. A Project may include associated infrastructure, utilities and ancillary facilities, including but not limited to coal handling systems, washeries, power supply, water supply, storage and	Washery and power supply are included within the ambit of “Project”. Whether a captive power plant based on washery rejects for powering the gasification comes within the ambit of “Project”. If yes, whether it comes within the ambit of “Project Cost” and “Cost of Plant and Machinery”	One of the major operational costs in coal gasification is power cost, and so clarification is required on whether a captive power plant based on washery rejects comes within the ambit of “Project”, “Project Cost” & “Cost of Plant and Machinery”. This helps in better submission of the application as these are directly linked with the scoring criteria.	No. Captive Power Plants does not fall under the definition of Project.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
			evacuation infrastructure.			
48	M/s Coal India Limited dated 25.07.2026	RFP	2.1.2 Application Due Date (Round Closes) on T0+60	60 days for the submission of the application along with the Board-approved PFR/DPR is too short. The firms which have their PFR/DPR ready or are in the preparation stage get undue advantage from this. Hence, at least 6 months may be given for the first round and two months thereafter for the subsequent rounds so that fair competition is ensured.	As the timeline for the submission of the application is only two months, i.e. till 07/09/26, it is very hard for the PSUs to submit the application as it also involves the submission of the Board-approved PFR/DPR. At least 6 months may be given for submission of applications so that PSUs can also submit the applications in the first round and fair competition can be ensured. Although, there is provision to submit in the subsequent rounds every two months, the advantage of submitting in the first round is lost for PSUs, and fair competition may be hindered if the time period is not extended.	As per RFP, the duration of a round is 2 months and subsequent rounds begin immediately after the Application Due Date of the earlier round.
49	M/s NSURE Reliable Power Solutions Pvt Ltd dated 25.07.2026	Application Security	Clause no 2.5	Insurance Surety Bond may please be considered	ISB is the norm for all Renewable Energy Sectors as per MOE Guidelines	Insurance Surety Bonds are also allowed in respect of the Application Security.
50	M/s NSURE Reliable Power	Performance Security	Clause no 1.9.2	Insurance Surety Bond may please be considered	ISB is the norm for all Renewable Energy Sectors as per MOE Guidelines	Insurance Surety Bonds are also allowed in respect of the Performance Security.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
	Solutions Pvt Ltd dated 25.07.2026					
51	M/s HURL dated 25.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.2.2 – Financial Incentive on Cost of Plant & Machinery	It is respectfully requested to kindly clarify whether the Air Separation Unit (ASU), Oxygen Plant, CO_2 Recovery Unit, Sulphur Recovery Unit, Utilities, Offsite Facilities, Captive Power Plant, Water Systems, and other common facilities forming an integral part of an integrated coal-to-urea project are considered eligible under the Cost of Plant & Machinery (P&M) for the purpose of determining the Financial Incentive.	This clarification would facilitate a uniform understanding of the scope of eligible Plant & Machinery among all applicants, thereby minimizing ambiguity in estimating the eligible project cost and ensuring consistency during evaluation.	The eligibility of any facility or expenditure for inclusion under Cost of Plant & Machinery (Cost of P&M) shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of the Scheme and the RFP.
52	M/s HURL dated 25.07.2026	RFP	Clause 19 (Definition of Project Cost) read with Clause 1.7.4	It is requested to kindly clarify whether, in the event the Project Cost at Financial Closure is higher than the Project Cost declared in the Application due to genuine reasons beyond the Applicant's control (such as inflation, statutory changes, exchange rate fluctuations, changes in applicable taxes and duties, or other similar factors), the Financial Incentive shall be adjusted accordingly.	This clarification would provide certainty regarding the treatment of project cost escalation, enable preparation of realistic financial estimates and ensure that applicants are not adversely affected by unavoidable increases in project cost during the implementation period.	As per the provisions of the RFP, no upward revision in earmarked Financial Incentive shall be permitted under any circumstances.
53	M/s HURL dated 25.07.2026	RFP	Clause 1.10.1(a) – Insurance Surety Bond	Kindly provide the format of the Insurance Surety Bond to be submitted under Clause 1.10.1(a), as the RFP does not include a prescribed format.	To ensure that all applicants submit the Insurance Surety Bond in a uniform format and avoid any ambiguity.	The same shall form part of Project Agreement.
54	M/s HURL dated 25.07.2026	RFP	General – Coal to Urea	Kindly clarify whether any additional subsidy or incentive scheme is proposed or under consideration for coal-based urea projects	To enable applicants to assess the overall project viability and financial planning.	No.
55	M/s HURL dated 25.07.2026	RFP	Application due date submission	Kindly consider extending the Application Due Date to allow sufficient time for PFR preparation and Board approval.	To provide sufficient time for preparation of the PFR and obtaining the necessary internal and Board approvals before submission.	As per RFP, the duration of a round is 2 months and subsequent rounds begin immediately after the Application Due Date of the earlier round.

Sl. No.	From	Document / Topic	Clause No. and Existing Provision	Clarification Required	Rationale for Clarification or Amendment	Response from MoC
56	M/s TCG Gasification dated 25.07.2026	RFP	General	Who will be the buyers of End products produced under this scheme?		As per Clause 1.2.12 of the RFP, the responsibility for offtake shall rest entirely with the Project Developer.
57	M/s TCG Gasification dated 25.07.2026	RFP	General	Will the Government or its agencies act as buyers for these products?		As per Clause 1.2.12 of the RFP, the responsibility for offtake shall rest entirely with the Project Developer.
58	M/s TCG Gasification dated 25.07.2026	RFP	General	What are the required chemical composition specifications for syngas and other products?		The definition of Syngas shall be as per RFP. Further, the RFP does not prescribe any specific chemical composition for any downstream products.
59	M/s TCG Gasification dated 25.07.2026	RFP	General	What is the expected range of Coal Grade?		The RFP does not prescribe on utilisation of coal of a particular grade, the same shall be determined by the Project Developer as per their Project requirement.
60	M/sTCG Gasification dated 25.07.2026	RFP	General	Could you please provide us with the list of price decided on the end products?		As per Clause 1.2.12 of the RFP, the responsibility for offtake shall rest entirely with the Project Developer.

Ministry of Coal