

Corrigendum**Name of Work: Request for Proposal (RFP) for Selection of Service Provider for Development, Customization and Deployment of State wide Online Development Permission System (ODPS) for the State of Gujarat.**

| Sr. No. | Page No. | Clause No. in RFP | Existing Provision | Modified Provision |
|---------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Page no 18 | SECTION – 2: Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders Financial Turnover | The Bidder should have an average annual turnover from IT Software related services (Software Development/ Software Customization/ Implementation and O&M) of at least Rs. 17 cr. during each of the last three financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24 25). | The Bidder should have an average annual turnover from IT Software related services (Software Development/ Software Customization/ Implementation and O&M) of at least Rs. 10 cr. during each of the last three financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24 25). Other conditions shall remain as it is |
| 2 | Page no 18 | SECTION – 2: Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders, Table 1: Similar experience | The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission. (1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or (2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore Or (2) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore Note: The Project Experience should be related to Development/ Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files. | The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value (inclusive of taxes) for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission. (1) One project with the value of at least 16 crore (2) Two projects with the value of at least 12 crore or (3) Three projects with the value of at least 8 crore Note: The Project Experience should be related to Development/ Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files. Other conditions shall remain as it is. |
| 3 | Page no 18 | SECTION – 2: Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders, Table B: Similar experience Financial Turnover | The manufacturer/ authorized dealer/ licensee of the manufacturer of the proposed COTS product should have an average annual turnover of minimum INR 85 cr. in the last three audited financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24-25). | The manufacturer/ authorized dealer/ licensee of the manufacturer of the proposed COTS product should have an average annual turnover of minimum INR 50 cr. in the last three audited financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24-25). Other conditions shall remain as it is. |
| 4 | 2.2 (II) 1 | The bidder average annual turnover during the last three years ending as on 31st March 2025 from IT Software related services (Software Development / Software Customization/ Implementation and O&M). a) Turnover ≥ 17 Crore and < 34 Cr = 3 marks b) Turnover ≥ 34 and < 51 Cr. = 4 marks c) Turnover ≥ 51 Cr. = 5 marks | Turnover criteria should be reduced so that more companies can bid and get level playing field | The bidder average annual turnover during the last three years ending as on 31st March 2025 from IT Software related services (Software Development / Software Customization/ Implementation and O&M). a) Turnover ≥ 10 Crore and < 20 Cr = 3 marks b) Turnover ≥ 20 and < 30 Cr. = 4 marks c) Turnover ≥ 30 Cr. = 5 marks |
| 5 | Clause No. 2.2 - 3 /Page No. 26 | The bidder should have an experience in successfully executing building permissions (for any type of building through deployed application in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The cumulative count of approved cases through deployed system under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Cases ≥ 1,00,000 and < 1,50,000 = 5 marks b) Cases ≥ 1,50,000 and < 2,00,000 = 7.5 marks c) Cases ≥ 2,00,000 = 10 marks | This clause appears to be favouring a particular agency. As this tender is for software development, we respectfully request the authority to relax this clause so that all bidders can participate and the authority may receive more qualified bidders. | The bidder should have an experience in successfully executing building permissions (for any type of building) through deployed application in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The cumulative count of processed cases through deployed system under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Cases ≥ 1,00,000 and < 1,50,000 = 5 marks b) Cases ≥ 1,50,000 and < 2,00,000 = 7.5 marks c) Cases ≥ 2,00,000 = 10 marks |
| 6 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work, Page no 63 | The Service Provider shall supply, design, customize, implement, integrate, operate, support, and maintain an enterprise-level online development permission solution. This includes all necessary software's, operating systems, hypervisors, APIs, add-ons, tools, and appropriate licenses needed for the solution's functionality and completeness of ODPS solution and shall maintain it throughout the contract period. | The clause states that the Service Provider shall supply, design, customize, implement, integrate, operate, support, and maintain the ODPS solution, including all necessary software, operating systems, hypervisors, APIs, add-ons, tools, and licenses. We Kindly request clarification on the following points: 1. Considering this tender scope is limited to Software Solution only, please confirm whether OS, hypervisors, and other system-level tools/licenses are also required. 2. If yes, kindly specify the details, specifications, and versions of such required components. 3. Please provide a list of mandated/preferred tools to avoid assumptions during bid preparation. 4. Please confirm if the cost of such licenses should be factored into the bidder's financial proposal or will be provisioned separately by the State Authority. | Notwithstanding anything contained in this RFP document, following condition is hereby inserted with overriding effect. Service Provider is responsible for the complete setup of UAT and Staging environment. For production environment at the State Data Center, all necessary hardware shall be provided by the GSDC/ State Authority. Moreover, hardware upgradation, if required, and all related activities shall be done by the Service Provider. On the software side, certain basic tools like OS, Database related software, etc. are made available by the SDC, however the enterprise support of the software made available by the GSDC shall be borne by the service provider. Service Provider is advised to make their own asesement regarding the softwarerequired for technology proposed in their proposal. In case any specialised software is required for better service delivery, the service provider may need to procure the same. Moreover, Service Provider is advised to conduct detailed joint meeting i.e. a meeting between State Authority, GSDC, DIT and Service Provider for better understanding at Implementation Stage. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 7 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work. Page No. 63 | 2. The new ODPS solution shall be versioned as 3.0 and the solution shall be compatible with all popular web browsers (comprising but not limited to Microsoft Edge, Chrome, Mozilla Firefox, Safari, Opera etc.). It should support all modern mobile devices with latest OS (android, iOS and windows). | As per current market trends, Android and iOS are the widely adopted mobile operating systems. Windows OS compatibility for mobile devices is not commonly used. Therefore we request you to kindly consider only Android and iOS-based mobile devices for this project. | The new ODPS solution shall be versioned as 3.0 and the solution shall be compatible with all popular web browsers (comprising but not limited to Microsoft Edge, Chrome, Mozilla Firefox, Safari, Opera etc.). It should support all modern mobile devices with latest OS (android and iOS only). Although it is preferable that same code base (omni- deployable) shall be utilised. |
| 8 | 4.3.6 General Conditions for IT Development, Page 116 | Service Provider shall be responsible for the implementation of Back-up and Disaster Recovery | Kindly confirm. Hardware and software required for backup services will be provided by state authority | GSDC will take care of data back up. However, in case of any adverse eventuality, GSDC/State Authority shall provide necessary hardware and software for data recovery. Furthermore, service provider shall render all necessary support and effort to address such eventuality and ensure smooth flow of ODPS solution. |
| 9 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format | Unit rates without GST | As we can see In the shared financial bid format, the unit price is asked without GST, but in the Grand Total section, it is including GST and there is no separate column in the financial bid format to mention the GST value. Hence we kindly request you amend the financial bid format accordingly. | Section 6, Clause v (pg. 132) The Bidder should read the complete RFP carefully and quote for the price exclusive of all taxes and duties in the financial bid. Any Govt. Taxes / Duties would be applicable as on actual at the time of invoice processing. Clarification:The Bidders are advised to quote financial bid in the stipulated annexure without GST and with GST. The Financial Bid comparison shall be made based on prices discovered with GST / applicable taxes. |
| 10 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format/ Page 132 | The successful bidder shall have to resubmit the revised detailed BOM with price breakup meeting the final L1 Price after RA (reverse auction) within 7 days after completion of RA. | Since Reverse auction is not applicable for this RFP, this clause will be not be applicable, Kindly clarify? | Reverse Auction won't be applicable to this bid. Moreover, BOM shall be submitted by the selected bidder only. |
| 11 | Price Bid | Opex 2.1 - Cost of ATS (Annual Technical Support) of COTS product (per year) - 5 | In the Price Bid, ATS is mentioned for 5 years, whereas in the ATS section it is specified as 7 years. This seems to be a discrepancy and may cause confusion in the price calculation. Kindly confirm the correct duration of ATS. | Please read the Table-B Sr. No. 2.1 - as 28 Quarters in place of 5 years at page no 134 of RFP. |
| 12 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment. Page No. 138 | Point No. 2.3 - Maintenance and Support during O&M for AI Modules as per RFP section 4.3.2 (17A) – Quarterly | These payment for these items are not mentioned in the payment terms table. Our understanding is that the payment for these items shall follow the same terms as applicable during the warranty and support period, i.e., quarterly payments over 28 quarters. Kindly confirm the same. | Please read Added clause of AI Module in O&M Phase; Maintenance and Support during O&M for AI Modules as per RFP section 4.3.2 (17A) – Quarterly- OPEX Value of the Project as per Point 2.3 of Financial Bid equated as quarterly payments, after the end of each quarter from the date of Issuance of SIC |
| | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment. Page No. 138 | Point No. 2.4 Maintenance and Support during O&M for blockchain based modules as per RFP section 4.3.2 (17B) – Quarterly | These payment for these items are not mentioned in the payment terms table. Our understanding is that the payment for these items shall follow the same terms as applicable during the warranty and support period, i.e., quarterly payments over 28 quarters. Kindly confirm the same. | Please read Added clause of Blockchain Module in O&M Phase; Maintenance and Support during O&M for blockchain based modules as per RFP section 4.3.2 (17B) – Quarterly- OPEX Value of the Project as per Point 2.4 of Financial Bid equated as quarterly payments, after the end of each quarter from the date of Issuance of SIC |
| 13 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment, Point 9, Page 138 | 9 Annual Technical Support of COTS product "OPEX Value of the Project as per Point 2.1 of Financial Bid equated as yearly payments, after the end of each year from the date of Issuance of SIC" | The RFP specifies ATS payment on a yearly basis at the end of each year, whereas generally OEMs require ATS payment at the start of the year; this deviation may adversely impact the bidder's cash flow, Hence it should be revised as "OPEX Value of the Project as per Point 2.1 of Financial Bid equated as yearly payments, at the start of each year from the date of Issuance of SIC" | Annual Technical support of COTS product-OPEX value of the project as per point 2.1 of financial bid equated as quarterly payments, after the end of each quarter from the date of issuance of SIC. |
| 14 | 1.2 Purpose of this Document, Page No 10 | There will be no minimum commitment of business in respect of the development of application by the department at present or in future. Bidder may make their own assessment before submission of bids. No communication with respect to business/profit shall be entertained by State Authority during the currency of contract | Kindly confirm, how this clause will be applicable to this RFP. | "There will be no minimum commitment of business.....state Authority during the currency of contract". This paragraph is to be deleted. |
| 15 | 3.8 Preparation and Submission of Bid/ Page no. 38 | (a) Part 1: EMD. (Online and hard Copy) (b) Part 2: Technical Bid. (Online only and 02 hard copies for reference*) (c) Part 3: Financial Bid (Online only) | Different bidder will have office in different state, hence request authority to allow two working days after bid submission date for hard copy submission. | The hardcopies of EMD and Technical bid only required to submit at GIL as required within 4 working days after bid due date. No delay will be entertained after that time. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|--|
| 16 | 3.30 Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights Page no 53 | I. The TENDERER shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights including, but not limited to, patents, copyrights, and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how, or documents and other materials which the Bidder has developed for the performance of services under this RFP and which bear a direct relation to or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of services under this RFP, and the Bidder acknowledges and agrees that such products, documents and other materials constitute works made for hire for the TENDERER. ii.At the request of TENDERER, the Bidder shall take all necessary steps, execute all necessary documents and generally assist in securing all such proprietary rights and transferring or licensing them to the TENDERER in compliance with the requirements of the applicable law and this RFP. iii.All IPR in relation to project documents, assets, resources, designs, drawings, estimates, recommendations, source codes, application, IEC material, etc. shall vest with the TENDERER, and the bidder shall not use any such for any other purpose. | In case of the Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) product being proposed, we request the following clarification and modification to the clause: The IPR of the core COTS product, including its source code, design, architecture, patents, trademarks, etc shall remain with the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) and shall not be transferred to the TENDERER. This is a complex and sensitive application and OEM would not agree transferring of IPR of any sort. | Notwithstanding anything contained in this RFP document, following condition is hereby inserted with overriding effect. Proposed ODPS 3.0 Solution involves three core components - Portal, Scrutiny Engine and Mobile Application. Out of above, bidders may propose COTS/ Open Source based Scrutiny Engine. However, Portal and Mobile Application components are to be based on opensource platform. If at the stage of development, any component of Portal, Mobile Application and any of their ancillary support software / support system are required to be based on OEM in the interest of good quality service delivery, then such decision shall be taken by the State Authority as an exception. For COTS Scrutiny Engine product and related coding/ documentation / assets, the Service Provider may retain its IPR rights, however for all other customization, source code, documentation (Technical and functional) etc. shall remain with the State Authority, as required under this RFP. |
| 17 | 3.36.2 Transfer of Assets/ Page 58 | The Service Provider may continue work on the assets for the duration of the exit management period which may be 45 days period from the date of expiry or termination of the contract, | Kindly confirm, 45 days which is after expiry or termination of the contract will be additionally paid to the bidder. | The Service Provider shall continue to work on the assets for the duration of the exit management period which may be 45 days period from the date of expiry or termination of the contract, if required, by the State Authority to do so without any additional cost to the State Authority. |
| 18 | 3.36.3 Training, Handholding and Knowledge Transfer/ Page 62 | The Service Provider shall hold technical knowledge transfer sessions with designated technical team of the State Authority in the last 45 days of the project duration. | As per our understanding, KT will be done for 45 days before expiry of contract | On receiving directions from the State Authority the Service Provider shall hold technical knowledge transfer sessions with designated technical team without any additional cost to the State Authority. |
| 19 | Schedule 2 – Description of Profiles i.e. Minimum Qualification, Skills Required, Experience, etc. | Project Manager Qualification : ☐ Bachelors / Masters from Computer / IT / IT related engineering background from recognized University AND ☐ MBA from recognized University with majors in any discipline except HR | We request you to consider qualification as B.E / B.Tech / BSC in CS / BCA / MCA in IT or Civil or Architect with MBA qualification for the project manager. This will help bidder to identify more suitable profile for successful execution of the project | Essestial Qualification Qualification of Project Manager Bachelors / Masters in Computer / IT / EC/ IT related engineering background from recognized University OR Bachelors / Masters in Civil Engineering / Architecture background from recognized university Desired Qualification PMP Certification /Prince 2 Certificate/MBA from recognized University with majors in any discipline except HR |
| 20 | 9.1.5 Form 5: Not Terminated, Not Being Insolvent or In Receivership or Bankrupt | In response to the Tender Ref. No. _____ dated _____ for “Selection of the agency for providing Conception and Crafting of a Booking Website, alongside the Development of Various Web Modules, Coupled with the Design and Implementation of a Comprehensive Mobile Application.”, | We have noticed that the name of the RFP mentioned in the document pertains to another RFP. We kindly request you to correct the same. | Please read as "Request for Proposal (RFP) for Selection of Service Provider for Development, Customization and Deployment of State wide Online Development Permission System (ODPS) for the State of Gujarat. " |
| 21 | 4.3.3 (iv) (b) (ii) page No. 100 | 4.3.3. (iv)(b) (Implementation Plan- Successful implementation certificate bechmark includes) | Demonstration / Proof of Concept for modules as per 4.3.2 (17A), | Implementation of Modules as per 4.3.2 (17A) |

| Response to pre-bid queries | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Name of Work: Request for Proposal (RFP) for Selection of Service Provider for Development, Customization and Deployment of State wide Online Development Permission System (ODPS) for the State of Gujarat. | | | | |
| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
| 1 | Page 14, Fact Sheet, Point 17 | Joint Ventures / Consortium: No Consortium is Allowed | We request you to allow Consortium. | No change. As per RFP. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|---|---|--|
| 2 | Page 14, Fact Sheet, Point 17 | Joint Ventures / Consortium: No Consortium is Allowed | We request you to allow Consortium & Sub- contracting. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 3 | 1.5 Fact Sheet (Page No.14) | Joint Ventures / Consortium | Please allow consortium bids with a designated Lead Bidder responsible for end-to-end delivery, SLAs, and contractual obligations; members to be under joint and several liability. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 4 | P-14, Fact sheet pt 17 | Joint Ventures / Consortium | JV/Consortium may be allowed to enable larger participation by more entities. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 5 | 3.33 Consortium, Page No-53 | No Consortium participation is permitted for this bid | It has always been seen in large scale projects such as Voter ID or UID or GST that when a principal company gets into consortium with a local entity then their outreach in terms of implementation and support at statewide level increases many folds. This ensures efficiency in terms of adoption of software applications developed for Government by the end users across the state for which Government is actually developing such software. Therefore, Consortium is a very welcoming and positive approach by the Government for encouraging better adoption and use of its applications across the state. So, Consortium should be allowed. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 6 | 3.33 Consortium | No Consortium participation is permitted for this bid. | This is a complex project wherein the expertise & experience in both software as well as operations support are required, therefore allowing for Consortium of two companies will encourage participation of more number bidders. Hence we request your office to allow for a Consortium / JV of two companies. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 7 | 3.33 | No Consortium participation is permitted for this bid. | Consortium should be allowed so that more companies can participate and expertise of different companies can be utilised to develop more reliable system. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 8 | P-18, Section 2.1, Pt 1 | The Bidder should be an Indian firm – Should be registered under the Companies Act 1956 or 2013 in India or Proprietorship or Partnership or an Agency should be a Firm/ LLP at the time of the bidding. Should have a registered number of GST, Income Tax/ PAN Number | Please allow global companies to participate. This clause maybe amended to read as "The bidders may be any Indian or Globally registered firms with relevant experience. For firms with Permanent Establishments in India - Documents including copy of PAN and GST certificate For firms not currently having Permanent Establishments in India - an Undertaking that the firm will set up a PE within 90 days from the date of signing of letter of Award (LOA)" | No change. As per RFP. |
| 9 | Clause No. 2.1 - 2 /Page No. 18 | The Bidder should have an average annual turnover from IT Software related services (Software Development/ Software Customization/ Implementation and O&M) of at least Rs. 17 cr. during each of the last three financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24- 25). | We request the tender authority to kindly reconsider and decrease the average annual turnover criteria in order to encourage wider participation and ensure fair competition. | Please refer Sr no 1 of corrigendum document |
| 10 | P-18, Section 2.1, Pt 2 | The Bidder should have an average annual turnover from IT Softwarerelated services (Software Development/ Software Customisation/ Implementation and O&M) of at least Rs. 17 cr. during each of the last three financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24-25). | This clause may please be amended to read as " the turnover of the bidders and/or their Indian subsidiaries" to enable global participation. | Please refer Sr no 1 of corrigendum document |
| 11 | 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders Pg.no. 18 | 3. The Bidder should have Positive Net Worth in the last three financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY2425) as per the audited Balance Sheet | 3. The Bidder should have Positive Net Worth in the last three financial years (FY21-22, FY 22-23 & FY23-24) as per the audited Balance Sheet | If FY2024-25 's audited details are not available, bidder shall submit details of last three (03) audited years i.e. FY2021-22, FY2022-23 & FY2023-24) |
| 12 | P-19, Section 2.1, Pt 3 | The Bidder should have Positive Net Worth in last three financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24- 25) as per the audited Balance Sheet | This clause may please be amended to read as " the positive network of the bidders and/or their Indian subsidiaries" to enable global participation. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 13 | Page 19, PQ Criteria, Point 04 | Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Dev/Customization, Implementation & O&M for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last 10 years from the date of bid submission. - 01 project with value of at least 27 Cr or - 02 projects with value of at least 17 Cr or - 03 projects with value of at least 14 Cr Note: The Project Experience should be related to Dev/Customization, Testing, Implementation & O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files. | We request to broaden the project experience criteria of building development permission systems in India and internationally and to also include other types of permission systems such as ILMS (Integrated Lease Management System), CLMS (Contract/License Management System) and other similar solutions. Further, as emerging technologies like AI/ML/Blockchain are to be integral to the new system, past projects from 10 years ago may not reflect these capabilities. Hence, we suggest reconsidering the evaluation parameters accordingly. | Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|---|--|
| 14 | Page 19, PQ Criteria, Point 04 | <p>Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Dev/Customization, Implementation & O&M for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last 10 years from the date of bid submission.</p> <p>- 01 project with value of at least 27 Cr or</p> <p>- 02 projects with value of at least 17 Cr or</p> <p>- 03 projects with value of at least 14 Cr</p> <p>Note: The Project Experience should be related to Dev/Customization, Testing, Implementation & O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files.</p> | <p>We request to broaden the project experience criteria of building development permission systems in India and internationally and to also include other types of permission systems such as ILMS (Integrated Lease Management System), CLMS (Contract/License Management System) and other similar solutions.</p> <p>Further, as emerging technologies like AI/ML/Blockchain are to be integral to the new system, past projects from 10 years ago may not reflect these capabilities. Hence, we suggest reconsidering the evaluation parameters accordingly.</p> | Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document |
| 15 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders/ Page no. 18 | <p>Similar Experience</p> <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./State Govt./PSUs* during last ten (10) years from the date of bid submission:</p> <p>(1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore OR</p> <p>(2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore each OR</p> <p>(3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore each</p> <p>Note: The Project Experience should be related to Development/Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files.</p> <p>The Bidder should submit below documents for each Project:</p> <p>a) Copy of the Work Order/Purchase Order.</p> <p>b) Completion Certificate/Go-Live/On-Going certificate issued by the client.</p> <p>c) Project Citation with scope and Client details (Name, Designation, Contact Number, Email ID, etc.)</p> <p>The solution shall have been successfully implemented covering at least 10 authorities and/or ULBs for the purpose of development permission system with auto-scrutiny of CAD files under the project.</p> | <p>We have successfully implemented Building Permission Systems across multiple states such as , Himachal Pradesh, Odisha, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh and more. Based on our extensive experience, we submit that project value alone should not be considered as the primary criteria to assess a bidder's capability. For example, the Haryana OBPAS project that was done by one of the SIs, valued at ₹11Cr, covered 87 ULBs with comparatively lower manpower requirements, whereas the Madhya Pradesh project, valued at ₹30 Cr, covered 370+ ULBs and was manpower-intensive. Despite the significant difference in project value, the core software scope for both projects was similar, and the cost variation was largely due other items in scope like Manpower, Infrastructure etc. rather than solution complexity. Hence, it is more appropriate and fair to evaluate bidders based on the number of projects successfully implemented rather than only on the monetary value of projects. This approach ensures that proven experience in delivering similar solutions at scale is duly recognized.</p> <p>Hence Request to Change the clause as:</p> <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned criteria for any Central Govt./State Govt./PSUs* during last ten (10) years from the date of bid submission:</p> <p>(1) One project with the value of at least 11 crore OR</p> <p>(2) Two projects with the cumulative value of projects at least 14 crore OR</p> <p>(3) Three projects with the cumulative value of projects at least 17 crore</p> <p>Note: The Project Experience should be related to Development/Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files.</p> <p>The Bidder should submit below documents for each Project:</p> <p>a) Copy of the Work Order/Purchase Order.</p> <p>b) Completion Certificate/Go-Live/On-Going certificate issued by the client.</p> <p>c) Project Citation with scope and Client details (Name, Designation, Contact Number, Email ID, etc.)</p> | Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document |
| 16 | 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders | <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission. (1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or</p> <p>(2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore or</p> <p>(3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore</p> | To enable more participation we request you to consider the project value including GST and all other taxes as applicable. | Please refer Sr no 3 of corrigendum document |
| 17 | 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders | <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission.</p> <p>(1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or</p> <p>(2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore or</p> <p>(3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore</p> | For this criteria, will the total project value inclusive of all taxes shall be considered? | Please refer Sr no 3 of corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders/ Page no. 18 | <p>Similar Experience</p> <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./State Govt./PSUs* during last ten (10) years from the date of bid submission:</p> <p>(1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore OR</p> <p>(2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore each OR</p> <p>(3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore each</p> <p>Note: The Project Experience should be related to Development/Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files.</p> <p>The Bidder should submit below documents for each Project:</p> <p>a) Copy of the Work Order/Purchase Order.</p> <p>b) Completion Certificate/Go-Live/On-Going certificate issued by the client.</p> <p>c) Project Citation with scope and Client details (Name, Designation, Contact Number, Email ID, etc.)</p> <p>The solution shall have been successfully implemented covering at least 10 authorities and/or ULBs for the purpose of development permission system with auto-scrutiny of CAD files under the project.</p> | <p>We kindly request that the eligibility clause be revised to evaluate bidders on number of successfully implemented projects, not solely project value.</p> <p>Proposed Clause:</p> <p>One project ≥ ₹5 Cr, OR</p> <p>Two projects with cumulative value ≥ ₹3 Cr, OR</p> <p>Three projects with cumulative value ≥ ₹2 Cr</p> <p>(Mandatory: Project scope must cover Development/Customization, Testing, Implementation, and O&M of Building Permission Systems with Auto-Scrutiny of CAD files across at least 10 ULBs.)</p> <p>Alternative Suggestion:</p> <p>Consider reducing qualification thresholds by counting only the value specific to Building Plan Approval & Scrutiny Engine (excluding manpower, infra, etc.):</p> <p>One project ≥ ₹4 Cr, OR</p> <p>Two projects ≥ ₹3 Cr each, OR</p> <p>Three projects ≥ ₹2 Cr each.</p> | <p>Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document</p> |
| 19 | 2. 1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders, Point No: 4, Page No: 19 | <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission. (1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or (2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore or (3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore Note: The Project Experience should be related to Development/ Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files.</p> | <p>Number of companies in India, with such criteria as currently mentioned in the tender document, is kind of a hardly found combination. That means government will be in a way restricting the competitive advantage by not allowing those companies to submit bid in this tender even if they have all the capabilities to provide such solution as desired. Further such restricting criteria also means that companies with monopolistic combinations will be the only one to bid for this project and other such capable companies who can develop such solutions will not be able to participate in the tender. Therefore, in line with Government of India’s objective to encourage more Indian software companies to participate in public sector bids and show their capabilities, it is our sincere request to change this criteria as below:</p> <p>1) Company should have Central/ State Government/ Union Territories Single Project of Software development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance since last 10 years totaling upto to the value of 20 crore and such company should have a Central/State Government/Union Territories Work order pertaining to Online Development Permission System (ODPS) or</p> <p>2) Company should have Central/ State Government/ Union Territories Two Projects of Software development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance since last 10 years totaling upto to the value of 10 crore and such company should also have a Central/State Government/Union Territories Work order pertaining to Online Development Permission System (ODPS) Or</p> <p>3) Company should have Central/ State Government/ Union Territories Three Projects of Software development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance since last 10 years totaling upto to the value of 7 crore and such company should also have a Central/State Government/Union</p> | <p>Please refer Sr no 3 of corrigendum document</p> |
| 20 | 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders | <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission.</p> <p>(1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or</p> <p>(2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore or</p> <p>(3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore</p> | <p>We understand that the total project value mentioned here is including all applicable taxes, Kindly confirm</p> | <p>Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document</p> |
| 21 | 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders | <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission. (1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or</p> <p>(2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore or</p> <p>(3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore</p> | <p>We request you to confirm that the project value inclusive of all taxes will be considered for this criteria?</p> | <p>Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document</p> |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| 22 | Page no 19, Pre-qualification Criteria, Similar Experience | <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission.</p> <p>(1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or (2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore or (3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>The Project Experience should be related to Development/ Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files.</p> | <p>We are keen to participate in this bid and have implemented similar products across multiple states. The project value may vary from state to state depending on the scale of implementation.</p> <p>We kindly request you to amend the clause as follows to enable our participation:</p> <p>1) One project with a value of at least ₹20 Crore</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Consider experience in any kind of software development project, with at least one project valued at ₹27 Crore or more.</p> | Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document |
| 23 | Clause No. 2.1 - 4 /Page No. 19 | <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission.</p> <p>(1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or (2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore or (3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>The Project Experience should be related to Development/ Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files.</p> | <p>As per this clause, it appears that the authority may be favouring a particular agency, since such specific work has only been executed by limited agencies. As this project relates to software development, we respectfully request the authority to provide relaxation in this clause, so that all eligible bidders can participate and ensure fair competition.</p> | Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document |
| 24 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders/ Page no. 18 | <p>Similar Experience</p> <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./State Govt./PSUs* during last ten (10) years from the date of bid submission:</p> <p>(1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore OR (2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore each OR (3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore each</p> <p>Note: The Project Experience should be related to Development/Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files.</p> <p>The Bidder should submit below documents for each Project:</p> <p>a) Copy of the Work Order/Purchase Order. b) Completion Certificate/Go-Live/On-Going certificate issued by the client. c) Project Citation with scope and Client details (Name, Designation, Contact Number, Email ID, etc.)</p> <p>The solution shall have been successfully implemented covering at least 10 authorities and/or ULBs for the purpose of development permission system with auto-scrutiny of CAD files under the project.</p> | <p>We have successfully implemented Building Permission Systems across multiple states, including Himachal Pradesh, Odisha, Haryana, and Uttar Pradesh. Based on our experience, we submit that project value alone should not be the primary criterion to evaluate a bidder's capability. For instance, the Haryana OBPAS project (₹11 Cr, 87 ULBs) had relatively lower manpower requirements compared to the Madhya Pradesh project (₹30 Cr, 370+ ULBs), yet the core software solution scope was similar. The difference in cost primarily arose from manpower and infrastructure rather than solution complexity.</p> <p>Hence, we request that the evaluation criteria emphasize the number of successfully implemented projects rather than purely monetary value, ensuring that proven delivery experience at scale is duly recognized.</p> <p>Request for Amendment:</p> <p>The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/Customization, Implementation, and Maintenance for any Central Govt./State Govt./PSUs during the past ten (10) years, with the following criteria:</p> <p>One project with a value of at least ₹11 Cr, OR Two projects with cumulative value of at least ₹14 Cr, OR Three projects with cumulative value of at least ₹17 Cr</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>The project experience must relate to Development/Customization, Testing, Implementation, and O&M of Building Permission Systems with Auto-Scrutiny of CAD files.</p> <p>The solution should cover at least 10 authorities/ULBs.</p> <p>Supporting Documents Required:</p> <p>a) Copy of Work Order/Purchase Order</p> | Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|--|--|--|
| 25 | 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders. Page No. 19 | The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission. (1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or (2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore or (3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore | Our understanding is that the total project value inclusive of all taxes shall be considered for this criteria. Kindly confirm. | Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document |
| 26 | P-19, Section 2.1, Pt 4 | The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customisation, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs during last ten(10)years from the date of bid submission. (1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or (2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore or (3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore Note:The Project Experience should be related to Development/ Customisation, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files. | We request an amendment to this clause to read as "the bidders and/or their Indian subsidiaries should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customisation, Implementation and Maintenance "to allow global project experience" and enable global parti In view of the project duration the ability of the service provider to engage in similar projects on a long term basis may too be considered. | Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document |
| 27 | 2.1 A (4) | The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/ Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./ State Govt. /PSUs* during last ten(10) years from the date of bid submission. (1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore or (2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore or (3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore Note: The Project Experience should be related to Development/ Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files. | Turnover criteria should be reduced keeping MSME/Startup in mind and experience can be of software development and should be able to demonstrate the autoscrutiny and building permissioning capabilities. The current requirement is restricting companies to participate as very rare companies have experience of auto scrutiny. We found that companies who do not have auto scrutiny are using auto scrutiny from the same company. | Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document |
| 28 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders/ Page no. 18 | Similar Experience The Bidder should have successfully executed projects for Software Development/Customization, Implementation and Maintenance with below mentioned value for any Central Govt./State Govt./PSUs* during last ten (10) years from the date of bid submission: (1) One project with the value of at least 27 crore OR (2) Two projects with the value of at least 17 crore each OR (3) Three projects with the value of at least 14 crore each Note: The Project Experience should be related to Development/Customization, Testing, Implementation and O&M for building development permission system with Auto Scrutiny of CAD files. The Bidder should submit below documents for each Project: a) Copy of the Work Order/Purchase Order. b) Completion Certificate/Go-Live/On-Going certificate issued by the client. c) Project Citation with scope and Client details (Name, Designation, Contact Number, Email ID, etc.) The solution shall have been successfully implemented covering at least 10 authorities and/or ULBs for the purpose of development permission system with auto-scrutiny of CAD files under the project. | SMART DCR our Successful implementation are already running at WEST BENGAL , PUNJAB, MADHYA PRADESH , GOA, Andaman,GIDC, UPSIDA, LIDA, YAMUNA, HARYANA,AURIC, NOIDA, GREATER NOIDA and more to add , All the said installation based on subjectivity of the product and the support extended to stakeholders and to the Authorities for more than decade. Therefore we request here to change the requirements in tender based on order value. Suggesting that the value of order then refer 2 crores as eligibility and may say as around 5 orders operational. Kindly request you to amend so that the opportunity will help us to serve entire GUJARAT successfully and many bidders to participate | Please refer Sr no 2 of corrigendum document |
| 29 | Page no 19, Pre-qualification Criteria, Certification | The Bidder should possess below valid certifications as on date of bid submission - (a) ISO 9001:2015 (b) CMMI -L3 or above | We request you to kindly add CMMi L5 certification as project with such a large scale of implementation requires organization capabilities with CMMi L5. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 30 | Clause No. 2.1 - 5 /Page No. 20 | The Bidder should possess below valid certifications as on date of bid submission - (a) ISO 9001:2015 (b) CMMI -L3 or above | As per the mentioned clause, in most tenders the authority allows participation if the bidder possesses either an ISO Certificate or a CMMI Level 3 Certificate. However, this clause appears to be favouring a particular agency. Therefore, we respectfully request the authority to provide relaxation in this clause to ensure fair and wider participation. | No change. As per RFP. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|--|---|--|
| 31 | P-20, Section 2.1, Pt 5 | The Bidder should possess below valid certifications as on date of bid submission - (a) ISO 9001:2015 (b) CMMI -L3 or above | Please amend to include the following certification too to ensure data security and data standards compliance ISO 9001, ISO 14001, ISO 45001, ISO 27001 and General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) | No change. As per RFP. |
| 32 | P-21, Section 2.1, Pt 9 | Bidder/ OEM from a country which shares a land border with India will be eligible to bid in this tender, only if bidder is registered with Competent Authority. The Competent authority for the purpose of registration shall be the Registration Committee constituted by the Department of Promotion of Internal Trade (DPIIT) of Govt. of India | Please amend to include countries having FTA with India to enable global participation. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 33 | Pre-Qualification Criteria for OEM | (In case of System Integrator bidding with COTS Scrutiny Engine of another OEM) | Please clarify whether this PQ criteria is not applicable when the OEM of the COTS Scrutiny Engine itself is participating as the Bidder /System Integrator in the bid. | The understanding is appropriate. No change. As per RFP. |
| 34 | Pre-Qualification Criteria for OEM | In case of System Integrator bidding with COTS Scrutiny Engine of another OEM | As per our understanding, a bidder proposing its own COTS product is not required to meet this criterion, as it is applicable only to third-party OEMs. Kindly confirm | The understanding is appropriate. No change. As per RFP. |
| 35 | B Pre-Qualification Criteria for OEM Pg.no. 22 | (In case of System Integrator bidding with COTS Scrutiny Engine of another OEM) | PwC has an open-source Online Development Permissions System. Hence the Pre-Qualification Criteria may not be applicable in our case. We request you consider a self- declaration regarding the available solution details. | The understanding is appropriate. No change. As per RFP. |
| 36 | Pre-Qualification Criteria for OEM | The manufacturer/ authorized dealer/ licensee of the manufacturer of the proposed COTS product should have an average annual turnover of minimum INR 85 cr. in the last three audited financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24-25). | As per our knowledge there are very few OEMs in this specific field, so we request you to reduce the average turnover criteria of OEM from Rs. 85 cr to Rs 40 cr, as this will allow more OEMs to participate. | Please refer Sr no 3 of corrigendum document |
| 37 | Pre-Qualification Criteria for OEM | The manufacturer/ authorized dealer/ licensee of the manufacturer of the proposed COTS product should have an average annual turnover of minimum INR 85 cr. in the last three audited financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24-25). | To encourage more OEMs and bidders to participate, we request you to reduce the average turnover criteria of OEM from Rs. 85 cr to between Rs 50 cr. | Please refer Sr no 3 of corrigendum document |
| 38 | Pre-Qualification Criteria for OEM | The manufacturer/ authorized dealer/ licensee of the manufacturer of the proposed COTS product should have an average annual turnover of minimum INR 85 cr. in the last three audited financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24-25). | In order to encourage wider participation and ensure fair competition, we request you to reduce the average turnover criteria for OEMs from Rs. 85 crore to Rs. 40–60 crore. This revision will enable more qualified OEMs to participate in the bidding process. | Please refer Sr no 3 of corrigendum document |
| 39 | Pre-Qualification Criteria for OEM | The manufacturer/ authorized dealer/ licensee of the manufacturer of the proposed COTS product should have an average annual turnover of minimum INR 85 cr. in the last three audited financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24-25). | We kindly request you to reduce the average turnover criteria for COTS manufacturers to Rs. 50 crore. This adjustment will encourage greater participation from OEMs and bidders, promoting a more competitive and fair tender process. | Please refer Sr no 3 of corrigendum document |
| 40 | Clause No. 2.1 (B) - 10 /Page No. 22 | The manufacturer/ authorized dealer/ licensee of the manufacturer of the proposed COTS product should have an average annual turnover of minimum INR 85 cr. in the last three audited financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24-25). | Again, this clause reflects the same concern of favouring a particular agency. Since this project is purely related to software development, we respectfully request the authority to reconsider why COTS-based and OEM criteria are being asked. Further, the annual OEM turnover criteria of ₹85 Crore may kindly be reduced to ₹20 Crore, so that wider participation from capable bidders can be ensured. | Please refer Sr no 3 of corrigendum document |
| 41 | B - Pre-Qualification Criteria for OEM. Page No. 22 | Financial Turnover - The manufacturer/ authorized dealer/ licensee of the manufacturer of the proposed COTS product should have an average annual turnover of minimum INR 85 cr. in the last three audited financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24-25). | We kindly request you to reduce the average annual turnover criteria for the COTS product manufacturer to ₹60 Crores, in order to encourage wider participation and enhance competition in the tender. | Please refer Sr no 3 of corrigendum document |
| 42 | 2.1 B (10) | The manufacturer/ authorized dealer/ licensee of the manufacturer of the proposed COTS product should have an average annual turnover of minimum INR 85 cr. in the last three audited financial years (FY22-23, FY 23-24 & FY24-25). | This restriction should be removed as long as the bidder has agreement with full rights to utilize COTS from OEM. | Please refer Sr no 3 of corrigendum document |
| 43 | GeM bid Notification document | The bidder seeking EMD exemption, must submit the valid supporting document for the relevant category as per GeM GTC with the bid. Under MSE category, only manufacturers for goods and Service Providers for Services are eligible for exemption from EMD. Traders are excluded from the purview of this Policy. | We kindly request you to provide exemption to Micro & Small Enterprises (MSEs) registered under the Government of India's MSME scheme from the requirement of submitting EMD." | EMD not exempted. As per RFP. |
| 44 | GeM bid Notification document | The bidder seeking EMD exemption, must submit the valid supporting document for the relevant category as per GeM GTC with the bid. Under MSE category, only manufacturers for goods and Service Providers for Services are eligible for exemption from EMD. Traders are excluded from the purview of this Policy. | As per our understanding the MSE companies are exempted from submission of EMD. Please confirm | EMD not exempted. As per RFP. |
| 45 | GeM bid Notification document | The bidder seeking EMD exemption, must submit the valid supporting document for the relevant category as per GeM GTC with the bid. Under MSE category, only manufacturers for goods and Service Providers for Services are eligible for exemption from EMD. Traders are excluded from the purview of this Policy. | As per the GeM GTC, MSE (Micro & Small Enterprises) companies registered under MSME Act are eligible for exemption of EMD. Please confirm the same. | EMD not exempted. As per RFP. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|--|---|
| 47 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.2 Methodology of Selection, II. Technical Bid Evaluation/ Page 25 | The Bidder's Certification as on date of bid submission: 1. ISO/IEC 27000 series = 2 marks 2. ISO/IEC 20000 (IT Service Management – ITSM) = 1.5 marks 3. ISO 22301 (Business Continuity Management System – BCMS) = 1.5 marks. The Bidder should submit copy of valid certificates. 5 marks | ISO 22301 focuses mainly on business continuity aspects such as theft, natural disasters, and disease outbreaks, which, while important, are not directly relevant to the primary scope of this RFP that emphasizes software/application development and implementation. In contrast, CMMI Level 5 is a globally recognized framework specifically designed to assess and ensure maturity, quality, and continuous improvement in software development processes. Given that the RFP is largely cantered around software development Hence request dept to replace ISO 22301 to CMMi L5 Certification | No change. As per RFP. |
| 48 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.2 Methodology of Selection, II. Technical Bid Evaluation/ Page 25 | The Bidder's Certification as on date of bid submission: 1. ISO/IEC 27000 series = 2 marks 2. ISO/IEC 20000 (IT Service Management – ITSM) = 1.5 marks 3. ISO 22301 (Business Continuity Management System – BCMS) = 1.5 marks. The Bidder should submit copy of valid certificates. 5 marks | We would like to request a change in the requirements. ISO 22301 primarily focuses on business continuity (disaster recovery, theft, epidemics), which is not directly relevant to the software/application development scope of this RFP. CMMI Level 5, however, directly measures maturity and quality in software development. Therefore, we kindly request that the requirement for ISO 22301 be replaced with CMMI Level 5 certification to ensure better alignment with the project scope. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 49 | Page no 25, Technical Evaluation criteria, Certification | The Bidder's Certification as on date of bid submission - 1. ISO/ IEC 27000 series = 2 marks 2. ISO/ IEC 20000 (IT Service Management – ITSM) = 1.5 marks 3. ISO 22301 (Business Continuity Management System BCMS) = 1.5 marks | We request you to kindly add marks for CMMi L5 certification as project with such a large scale of implementation requires organization capabilities with CMMi L5. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 50 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.2 Methodology of Selection, II. Technical Bid Evaluation/ Page 25 | The Bidder's Certification as on date of bid submission: 1. ISO/IEC 27000 series = 2 marks 2. ISO/IEC 20000 (IT Service Management – ITSM) = 1.5 marks 3. ISO 22301 (Business Continuity Management System – BCMS) = 1.5 marks. The Bidder should submit copy of valid certificates. 5 marks | The requirement for ISO 22301 certification primarily addresses business continuity aspects such as theft, natural disasters, and disease outbreaks. While these are important, they are not directly relevant to the core scope of this RFP, which is centered on software/application development and implementation. In contrast, CMMI Level 5 is a globally recognized framework designed specifically to assess and ensure maturity, quality, and continuous improvement in software development processes. Considering the nature of this project, CMMI Level 5 certification would be a more appropriate and effective benchmark for assessing bidder capability. Request: We therefore request the department to replace the requirement of ISO 22301 with CMMI Level 5 certification. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 51 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.2 Methodology of Selection, II. Technical Bid Evaluation/ Page 25 | The Bidder's Certification as on date of bid submission: 1. ISO/IEC 27000 series = 2 marks 2. ISO/IEC 20000 (IT Service Management – ITSM) = 1.5 marks 3. ISO 22301 (Business Continuity Management System – BCMS) = 1.5 marks. The Bidder should submit copy of valid certificates. | Request to change ISO basic ISO 9001:2015 and minimum level of CMM - L3 for better participation | No change. As per RFP. |
| 52 | P-25, Section 2.2 | Technical evaluation will be done only for those bidders who have been found to be in compliance with the Eligibility Criteria. The Technical Evaluation Committee shall evaluate each proposal based on technical evaluation framework and allot technical score as per the technical evaluation criteria mentioned below | Please clarify if the technical evaluation will be done based on demo of an Automatic scrutiny of High rise building, generation of scrutiny report and complete floor-by-floor PDF generation of the drawing without any manual intervention from start to end will be considered | Technical evaluation shall be done based on criteria mentioned in RFP. However, any technology demonstration by the bidder is encouraged. |
| 53 | Clause No. 2.2 - 1 /Page No. 25 | The bidder average annual turnover during the last three years ending as on 31st March 2025 from IT Software related services (Software Development / Software Customization/ Implementation and O&M). a) Turnover ≥ 17 Crore and < 34 Cr = 3 marks b) Turnover ≥ 34 and < 51 Cr. = 4 marks c) Turnover ≥ 51 Cr. = 5 marks | Instead of considering average annual turnover, we respectfully suggest that the authority should use total turnover of the last 3 years as the eligibility criteria. The mentioned clause again appears to be favouring a particular agency. We therefore request the authority to kindly revise this clause to allow wider participation. | Please refer Sr no 4 of corrigendum document |
| 54 | 2.2 (II) 1 | The bidder average annual turnover during the last three years ending as on 31st March 2025 from IT Software related services (Software Development / Software Customization/ Implementation and O&M). a) Turnover ≥ 17 Crore and < 34 Cr = 3 marks b) Turnover ≥ 34 and < 51 Cr. = 4 marks c) Turnover ≥ 51 Cr. = 5 marks | Turnover criteria should be reduced so that more companies can bid and get level playing field | Please refer Sr no 4 of corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|--|---|--|
| 55 | Page 26, TQ Criteria, Point 03 | Bidder should have an exp. in successfully executing building permissions (for any type of building) through deployed application in India during past 10 Yrs. from the date of bid submission. - Cases ≥ 1,00,000 and < 1,50,000 = 5 marks - Cases ≥ 1,50,000 and < 2,00,000 = 7.5 marks - Cases ≥ 2,00,000 = 10 marks | We request to broaden the project experience criteria of building development permission systems in India and internationally and to also include other types of permission systems such as ILMS (Integrated Lease Management System), CLMS (Contract/License Management System) and other similar solutions. Further, as emerging technologies like AI/ML/Blockchain are to be integral to the new system, past projects from 10 years ago may not reflect these capabilities. Hence, we suggest reconsidering the evaluation parameters accordingly. | Query is not relevant to the RFP criteria. |
| 56 | Page 26, TQ Criteria, Point 03 | Bidder should have an exp. in successfully executing building permissions (for any type of building) through deployed application in India during past 10 Yrs. from the date of bid submission. - Cases ≥ 1,00,000 and < 1,50,000 = 5 marks - Cases ≥ 1,50,000 and < 2,00,000 = 7.5 marks - Cases ≥ 2,00,000 = 10 marks | We request to broaden the project experience criteria of building development permission systems in India and internationally and to also include other types of permission systems such as ILMS (Integrated Lease Management System), CLMS (Contract/License Management System) and other similar solutions. Further, as emerging technologies like AI/ML/Blockchain are to be integral to the new system, past projects from 10 years ago may not reflect these capabilities. Hence, we suggest reconsidering the evaluation parameters accordingly. | Query is not relevant to the RFP criteria. |
| 57 | Technical Evaluation Criteria, Point No: 3, Page No: 26 | The bidder should have an experience in successfully executing building permissions (for any type of building) through deployed application in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The cumulative count of approved cases through deployed system under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Cases ≥ 1,00,000 and < 1,50,000 = 5 marks b) Cases ≥ 1,50,000 and < 2,00,000 = 7.5 marks c) Cases ≥ 2,00,000 = 10 marks | Ideally the successfully deployed ODPS software in any Central/State/Union Territories Government office should be appropriately demonstrated rather than seeking how many files or cases have been processed till date by such software in any of the Government offices. Therefore the 10 marks should be given against the successfully demonstrated ODPS software. | Please refer Sr no 5 of corrigendum document |
| 58 | Clause No. 2.2 - 3 /Page No. 26 | The bidder should have an experience in successfully executing building permissions (for any type of building) through deployed application in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The cumulative count of approved cases through deployed system under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Cases ≥ 1,00,000 and < 1,50,000 = 5 marks b) Cases ≥ 1,50,000 and < 2,00,000 = 7.5 marks c) Cases ≥ 2,00,000 = 10 marks | This clause appears to be favouring a particular agency. As this tender is for software development, we respectfully request the authority to relax this clause so that all bidders can participate and the authority may receive more qualified bidders. | Please refer Sr no 5 of corrigendum document |
| 59 | 2.1 Eligibility / Pre-Qualification Criteria for Bidders Pg.no. 18 | 3. The bidder should have an experience in successfully executing building permissions (for any type of building) through deployed application in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The cumulative count of approved cases through deployed system under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Cases ≥ 1,00,000 and < 1,50,000 = 5 marks b) Cases ≥ 1,50,000 and < 2,00,000 = 7.5 marks c) Cases ≥ 2,00,000 = 10 marks | The Bidder should have an average annual turnover from IT Software related services (Software Development/ Software Customization/ Implementation and O&M) of at least Rs. 150 cr. during each of the last three financial years (FY21-22, FY 22-23 & FY23-24). The MeitY guidelines too recommends turnover of 3 to 4 times of the project value | Query is not relevant to the RFP criteria. |
| 60 | II. Technical Bid Evaluation Pg.no. 26 | 3. The bidder should have an experience in successfully executing building permissions (for any type of building) through deployed application in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The cumulative count of approved cases through deployed system under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Cases ≥ 1,00,000 and <1,50,000 = 5 marks b) Cases ≥ 1,50,000 and <2,00,000 = 7.5 marks c) Cases ≥ 2,00,000 = 10 marks | Request you to kindly include the below scrutiny numbers instead of approved applications 3. The bidder should have an experience in building plans scrutiny via EDCR (for any type of building) through deployed application in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The cumulative count of building plan scrutiny through deployed system should be as below: a) Scrutiny ≥ 2,00,000 and < 3,00,000 = 5 marks b) Scrutiny ≥ 3,00,000 and < 4,00,000 = 7.5 marks c) Scrutiny ≥ 4,00,000 = 10 marks | Please refer Sr no 5 of corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| 61 | P-26, Section 2.2, II-Pt 3 | The bidder should have an experience in successfully executing buildingpermissions (for any type of building) through deployed application in Indiaduring past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The cumulativecount of approved cases through deployed system under projects asdeclared for PQ are as below: a) Cases ≥ 1,00,000 and < 1,50,000 = 5 marks b) Cases ≥ 1,50,000 and < 2,00,000 = 7.5 marks c) Cases ≥ 2,00,000 = 10 marks | This clause may please be amended to read as " the bidders and/or their Indian subsidiaries should have experience in successfully executing building permissions (for any type of building - including Hi rise group development) through deployed application in India or overseas during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. ", to enable global participation. | Please refer Sr no 5 of corrigendum document |
| 62 | 2.2 (II) 3 | The bidder should have an experience in successfully executing building permissions (for any type of building) through deployed application in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The cumulative count of approved cases through deployed system under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Cases ≥ 1,00,000 and < 1,50,000 = 5 marks b) Cases ≥ 1,50,000 and < 2,00,000 = 7.5 marks c) Cases ≥ 2,00,000 = 10 marks | This criteria should be removed. Bidders should demonstrate the software to prove their ability. Instead consider the ability of the bidder to execute and deliver substantial projects. The department can provide 500-1000 drawings and the bidder should convert and generate scrutiny in department's presence. | Please refer Sr no 5 of corrigendum document |
| 63 | Page 26, TQ Criteria, Point 04 | Past Exp. in implementing State-wide development permit solutions shall be considered if > 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given State under single or multiple projects during past 10 Yrs. - In 01 state= 3 mark - In 02 states= 4 marks - In more than 02 states = 5 marks | We request to broaden the project experience criteria of building development permission systems in India and internationally and to also include other types of permission systems such as ILMS (Integrated Lease Management System), CLMS (Contract/License Management System) and other similar solutions. Further, as emerging technologies like AI/ML/Blockchain are to be integral to the new system, past projects from 10 years ago may not reflect these capabilities. Hence, we suggest reconsidering the evaluation parameters accordingly. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 64 | Page 26, TQ Criteria, Point 04 | Past Exp. in implementing State-wide development permit solutions shall be considered if > 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given State under single or multiple projects during past 10 Yrs. - In 01 state= 3 mark - In 02 states= 4 marks - In more than 02 states = 5 marks | We request to broaden the project experience criteria of building development permission systems in India and internationally and to also include other types of permission systems such as ILMS (Integrated Lease Management System), CLMS (Contract/License Management System) and other similar solutions. Further, as emerging technologies like AI/ML/Blockchain are to be integral to the new system, past projects from 10 years ago may not reflect these capabilities. Hence, we suggest reconsidering the evaluation parameters accordingly. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 65 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.2 Methodology of Selection, II. Technical Bid Evaluation/ Page 26 | Past experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given state under single or multiple projects during the past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria is as below: a) In any one state = 3 marks b) In two states = 4 marks c) In more than two states = 5 marks. Regarding State-wide implementation, the bidder should submit a duly signed and stamped letter from the respective State Government. 5 Marks. | Since the core requirement of this RFP is a Building Permission System with Auto-Scrutiny, which demands the OEM that have high domain expertise and demonstrates prior experience in successfully implementing State-wide Development Permit solutions; this ensures that only capable and experienced OEMs with a reliable, field-tested solution participate, thereby reducing project risks, ensuring quality delivery, and aligning the eligibility criteria with the strategic importance of the project. Hence Request to Change the clause as: OEM should have past experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given state under single or multiple projects during the past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria is as below: a) In any one state = 3 marks b) In two states = 4 marks c) In more than two states = 5 marks. Regarding State-wide implementation, (the OEM should submit a duly signed and stamped letter from the respective State Government.) | No change. As per RFP. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|--|--|-------------------------|
| 66 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.2 Methodology of Selection, II. Technical Bid Evaluation/ Page 26 | <p>Past experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given state under single or multiple projects during the past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria is as below: a) In any one state = 3 marks b) In two states = 4 marks c) In more than two states = 5 marks. Regarding State-wide implementation, the bidder should submit a duly signed and stamped letter from the respective State Government. 5 Marks.</p> | <p>Given that the RFP’s primary focus is on a Building Permission System with Auto-Scrutiny, it is essential that the participating OEMs possess deep domain knowledge and proven expertise in executing State-wide Development Permit systems. Such experience ensures that only vendors with mature, field-tested solutions participate, which minimizes risks, guarantees quality delivery, and aligns the eligibility criteria with the significance of this project.</p> <p>Request for Change in Eligibility Clause: We kindly request modification of the clause as under:</p> <p>The OEM must have successfully implemented State-wide development permit solutions.</p> <p>For the purpose of this requirement, a project shall qualify as “State-wide” if more than 50,000 development permit applications have been successfully processed in a state, under one or multiple projects, within the past ten (10) years from bid submission.</p> <p>Evaluation Criteria for Marking:</p> <p>Implementation in one state = 3 marks Implementation in two states = 4 marks Implementation in more than two states = 5 marks</p> <p>As evidence, the OEM should provide a signed and stamped letter from the respective State Government certifying the State-wide</p> | No change. As per RFP. |
| 67 | Technical Evaluation Criteria, Point No: 4, Page No: 26 | <p>Past Experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given State under single or multiple projects during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria is as below.</p> <p>a) In any one state= 3 mark b) In two states= 4 marks c) In more than 2 states = 5 marks</p> | <p>If the software is successfully deployed and working in any of the Central/State/Union Territories, then why are we restricting the markings and allowing the monopolistic entities to score more marks. Ideally an Indian MSME software company if has delivered and deployed such ODPS software successfully at any of the government offices in Central/State or Union Territory then they should be given 5 marks. Kindly therefore modify this clause and make it more inclusive.</p> | No change. As per RFP. |
| 68 | Page no 25, Technical Evaluation criteria, Certification | <p>Past Experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given State under single or multiple projects during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria is as below.</p> <p>a) In any one state= 3 mark b) In two states= 4 marks c) In more than 2 states = 5 marks</p> | <p>We request you to kindly amend the clause as below :</p> <p>State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 25,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given State under single or multiple projects during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission.</p> | No change. As per RFP. |
| 69 | Clause No. 2.2 - 4 /Page No. 26 | <p>Past Experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given State under single or multiple projects during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria is as below.</p> <p>a) In any one state= 3 mark b) In two states= 4 marks c) In more than 2 states = 5 marks</p> | <p>In the mentioned clause, it is unclear why the authority has restricted eligibility by asking for past experience specifically in statewide development permits. As this tender is for a software development project, such restrictive criteria seem to favour a particular agency. We therefore request the authority to kindly relax this clause to ensure wider participation and fair competition.</p> | No change. As per RFP. |
| 70 | II. Technical Bid Evaluation Pg.no. 26 | <p>4. Past Experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permits are successfully processed in the given State under single or multiple projects during the past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria are as below.</p> <p>a) In any one state= 3 mark b) In two states= 4 marks c) In more than 2 states = 5 marks</p> | <p>4. Past Experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 20,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given State under single or multiple projects during the past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria are as below.</p> <p>a) In any one state = 5 marks</p> | No change. As per RFP. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| 71 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.2 Methodology of Selection, II. Technical Bid Evaluation/ Page 26 | Past experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given state under single or multiple projects during the past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria is as below: a) In any one state = 3 marks b) In two states = 4 marks c) In more than two states = 5 marks. Regarding State-wide implementation, the bidder should submit a duly signed and stamped letter from the respective State Government. 5 Marks. | Request for Amendment: We kindly propose that the clause be revised as follows: The OEM should have prior experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered valid if more than 50,000 development permit applications have been successfully processed in a given state under one or more projects during the past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. Proposed Evaluation Matrix: a) One state implementation = 3 marks b) Two states implementation = 4 marks c) More than two states implementation = 5 marks Additionally, the OEM should submit a duly signed and stamped certificate/letter from the respective State Government as proof of State-wide implementation. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 72 | P-26, Section 2.2, II-Pt 4 | Past Experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given State under single or multiple projects during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria is as below. a) In any one state= 3 mark b) In two states= 4 marks c) In more than 2 states = 5 marks | This clause may please be amended to include " the bidders and/or their Indian subsidiaries should have past experience", to enable global participation. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 73 | 2.2 (II) 4 | Past Experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given State under single or multiple projects during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria is as below. a) In any one state= 3 mark b) In two states= 4 marks c) In more than 2 states = 5 marks | This criteria should be removed. Bidders should demonstrate the software to prove their ability. Instead consider the ability of the bidder to execute and deliver substantial projects. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 74 | SECTION – 2: Evaluation of Bid, 2.2 Methodology of Selection, II. Technical Bid Evaluation/ Page 26 | Past experience in implementing State-wide development permit solutions. State-wide implementation shall be considered if more than 50,000 applications for development permit are successfully processed in the given state under single or multiple projects during the past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria is as below: a) In any one state = 3 marks b) In two states = 4 marks c) In more than two states = 5 marks. Regarding State-wide implementation, the bidder should submit a duly signed and stamped letter from the respective State Government. 5 Marks. | Agreeing, however the screenshot of concerned currently running system MIS can be accepted as a evidence which is equivalent to signed and stamped letter from the respective authority/State Government. Kindly amend to the request of MIS page | No change. As per RFP. |
| 75 | Page 26, TQ Criteria, Point 05 | Bidder should have exp. in development/ customization & successfully implementation of building permission systems in multiple authorities or ULBs in single project in India during past 10 years. - Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 25 and < 50 = 5 Marks - Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 50 and < 75 = 7.5 Marks - Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 75 = 10 Marks | We request to broaden the project experience criteria of building development permission systems in India and internationally and to also include other types of permission systems such as ILMS (Integrated Lease Management System), CLMS (Contract/License Management System) and other similar solutions. Further, as emerging technologies like AI/ML/Blockchain are to be integral to the new system, past projects from 10 years ago may not reflect these capabilities. Hence, we suggest reconsidering the evaluation parameters accordingly. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 76 | Page 26, TQ Criteria, Point 05 | Bidder should have exp. in development/ customization & successfully implementation of building permission systems in multiple authorities or ULBs in single project in India during past 10 years. - Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 25 and < 50 = 5 Marks - Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 50 and < 75 = 7.5 Marks - Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 75 = 10 Marks | We request to broaden the project experience criteria of building development permission systems in India and internationally and to also include other types of permission systems such as ILMS (Integrated Lease Management System), CLMS (Contract/License Management System) and other similar solutions. Further, as emerging technologies like AI/ML/Blockchain are to be integral to the new system, past projects from 10 years ago may not reflect these capabilities. Hence, we suggest reconsidering the evaluation parameters accordingly. | No change. As per RFP. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|--|---|--|
| 77 | Technical Evaluation Criteria, Point No: 5, Page No: 26 | The bidder should have experience in development/ customization and successfully implementation of building permission systems in multiple authorities or ULBs in single project in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria for the count of authorities and/or ULBs under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 25 and < 50 = 5 Marks b) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 50 and < 75 = 7.5 Marks c) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 75 = 10 Marks | If the software is successfully deployed and working in any of the Central/State/Union Territories, then why are we restricting the markings and allowing the monopolistic entities to score more marks. Ideally an Indian MSME software company if has delivered and deployed such ODPS software successfully at any of the government offices in Central/State or Union Territory then they should be given 10 marks. Kindly therefore modify this clause and make it more inclusive. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 78 | Clause No. 2.2 - 5 /Page No. 26 to 27 | The bidder should have experience in development/ customization and successfully implementation of building permission systems in multiple authorities or ULBs in single project in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria for the count of authorities and/or ULBs under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 25 and < 50 = 5 Marks b) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 50 and < 75 = 7.5 Marks c) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 75 = 10 Marks | In the mentioned clause, it is unclear why the authority has restricted eligibility by asking for past experience specifically with multiple authorities. As this tender is for a software development project, such restrictive criteria seem to favour a particular agency. We therefore request the authority to kindly relax this clause to ensure wider participation and fair competition. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 79 | P-26-27, Section 2.2, II-Pt 5 | The bidder should have experience in development/ customisation and successfully implementation of building permission systems in multiple authorities or ULBs in single project in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria for the count of authorities and/or ULBs under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 25 and < 50 = 5 Marks b) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 50 and < 75 = 7.5 Marks c) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 75 = 10 Marks | This clause may please be amended to include " the bidders and/or their Indian subsidiaries should have experience in development/ customisation and successful implementation of building permission systems in multiple authorities or ULBs in single project in India or overseas ", to enable global participation. Apart from this the ability to process High rise complex building drawings in an automated manner should also may be evaluated. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 80 | 2.2 (II) 5 | The bidder should have experience in development/ customization and successfully implementation of building permission systems in multiple authorities or ULBs in single project in India during past ten (10) years from the date of bid submission. The criteria for the count of authorities and/or ULBs under projects as declared for PQ are as below: a) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 25 and < 50 = 5 Marks b) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 50 and < 75 = 7.5 Marks c) Authorities and/or ULBs ≥ 75 = 10 Marks | This criteria should be removed. Bidders should demonstrate the software to prove their ability. Instead consider the ability of the bidder to execute and deliver substantial projects. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 81 | Page no 25, Technical Evaluation criteria, Certification | Bidder has edge in terms of technology like AI/ ML/ Blockchain/ other new advanced technologies, whereby the bidder has capability to deploy i.e. available of developed product/ successfully deployed in some project, a) AI/ML/ new advanced technology enabled Scrutiny Engine = 3 marks b) AI/ML/blockchain/ new advanced technology enabled Process Flow/ complimentary activities related to development permits, but not just limited to scrutiny engine = 2 marks | Since AI/ML has an emerging technologies, all projects may not have used AI/ML enabled scrutiny engine for similar projects. However, bidders may have used AI/ML/Blockchain technology in other projects and products. For giving fare chances to every bidder, request you to allow technical marks for using AI/ML/Blockchain in any other projects. | The bidder should have implemented AI/ML/Blockchain /New advanced technology in any other project. But the application of such AI/ML/Blockchain /New advanced technology shall be useful in proposed ODPS scrutiny system. Furthermore, the applicability of implemented AI/ML shall be reviewed and ascertained by the Bid Evaluation Committee. Moreover, the bidder shall submit the covering letter from client side showcasing the implementation of AI/ML/Blockchain /New advanced technology in their project and the value addition thereupon. |
| 82 | II. Technical Bid Evaluation Pg.no. 27 | 6. Bidder has edge in terms of technology like AI/ ML/ Blockchain/ other new advanced technologies, whereby the bidder has capability to deploy i.e. available of developed product/ successfully deployed in some project, a) AI/ML/ new advanced technology enabled Scrutiny Engine = 3 marks b) AI/ML/blockchain/ new advanced technology enabled Process Flow/ complimentary activities related to development permits, but not just limited to scrutiny engine = 2 marks | 6. Bidder has edge in terms of technology like AI/ ML/ Blockchain/ other new advanced technologies, whereby the bidder has capability to deploy such capabilities in the solution. a) AI/ML/ new advanced technology enabled Scrutiny Engine = 3 marks b) AI/ML/blockchain/ new advanced technology enabled Process Flow/ complimentary activities related to development permits, but not just limited to scrutiny engine = 2 marks | The bidder should have implemented AI/ML/Blockchain /New advanced technology in any other project. But the application of such AI/ML/Blockchain /New advanced technology shall be useful in proposed ODPS scrutiny system. Furthermore, the applicability of implemented AI/ML/New advanced technology shall be reviewed and ascertained by the Bid Evaluation Committee. Moreover, the bidder shall submit the covering letter from client side showcasing the implementation of AI/ML/Blockchain /New advanced technology in their project and the value addition thereupon. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| 83 | P-26, Section 2.2, II-Pt 6 | Bidder has edge in terms of technology like AI/ ML/ Blockchain/ other new advanced technologies, whereby the bidder has capability to deploy i.e. available of developed product/successfully deployed in some project, a) AI/ML/ new advanced technology enabled Scrutiny Engine = 3 marks b) AI/ML/blockchain/ new advanced technology enabled Process Flow/ complimentaryactivities related to development permits, but not just limited to scrutiny engine = 2 marks | Please clarify if it is intended to implement Block chain technologies for the workflow process itself or enabling post approval process immutability of approved documents for storage and data security. This information define the integratiom methodology of Blockchain technology, in the process. | The bidder should have implemented AI/ML/Blockchain /New advanced technology in any other project. But the application of such AI/ML/Blockchain /New advanced technology shall be useful in proposed ODPS scrutiny system. Furthermore, the applicability of implemented AI/ML/New advanced technology shall be reviewed and ascertained by the Bid Evaluation Committee. Moreover, the bidder shall submit the covering letter from client side showcasing the implementation of AI/ML/Blockchain /New advanced technology in their project and the value addition thereupon. |
| 84 | II. Technical Bid Evaluation: Personnel with relevant experience supported by certificates. Page No. 28 | Personnel with relevant experience supported by certificates. These personnel are supposed to be part of the Core Team, working onsite/ offsite as per requirements in this RFP for this Project. | Our understanding is that the proposed resources should be on payroll of bidder. Please confirm the same. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 85 | II. Technical Bid Evaluation: Personnel with relevant experience supported by certificates | Technical Lead with overall experience of more than 10 years (1 marks for 1 personnel, max 2 marks) = 2 marks | We kindly request you to consider submission of only one CV for the role of Technical Lead and accordingly amend the marking scheme to allocate 2 marks for one personnel.” | No change. As per RFP. |
| 86 | II. Technical Bid Evaluation: Personnel with relevant experience supported by certificates | Database Administrator with domain experience and overall experience of more than 10 years (1 marks for 1 personnel, max 2 marks) = 2 marks | We kindly request you to consider submission of only one CV for the role of Database Administrator and accordingly amend the marking scheme to allocate 2 marks for one personnel.” | No change. As per RFP. |
| 87 | II. Technical Bid Evaluation: Personnel with relevant experience supported by certificates | Solution Architect with domain experience of more than 10 years (0.5 marks for 1 personnel, max. 1.5 marks) = 1.5 marks | We kindly request you to consider submission of only one CV for the role of Solution Architect and accordingly amend the marking scheme to allocate 1.5 marks for one personnel.” | No change. As per RFP. |
| 88 | II. Technical Bid Evaluation: Personnel with relevant experience supported by certificates Page No. 29 | Solution Architect with domain experience of more than 10 years (0.5 marks for 1 personnel, max. 1.5 marks) = 1.5 marks | As per the technical evaluation criteria, bidders are required to submit three (3) CVs of Solution Architects with more than 10 years of domain experience. However, based on the solution architecture and deployment scope, only one Solution Architect is required for actual implementation. Kindly consider revising the marking scheme to award 1.5 marks for one qualified Solution Architect, as this aligns with the actual deployment requirement and avoids redundancy in resource documentation. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 89 | Technical Bid Evaluation: | Personnel with relevant experience b. Technical Lead with overall experience of more than 10 years (1 marks for 1 personnel, max 2 marks) = 2 marks c. Database Administrator with domain experience and overall experience of more than 10 years (1 marks for 1 personnel, max 2 marks) = 2 marks d. Business Analyst with domain experience and overall experience of more than 10 years (1 marks for 1 personnel, max. 2 marks) = 2 marks e. Solution Architect with domain experience of more than 10 years (0.5 marks for 1 personnel, max. 1.5 marks) = 1.5 marks | We kindly request you to consider an overall experience of more than 5 years for the positions of Technical Lead, Database Administrator, and Business Analyst. This relaxation will provide bidders with wider options to propose suitable resources for the successful execution of the project | No change. As per RFP. |
| 90 | Section4, 4.2 Point 3 Page 63 | Bi lingual Support | Is this English and Gujarati / Hindi | English and Gujarati are preferred versions for user interface. However, this details shall be worked out at the time of Implementation Stage. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|--|--|---|
| 91 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work/ Page 66 | Service Provider shall ensure that there shall be no limitation/requirement/additional charges for any user to utilize particular drawing tool or otherwise, to avail the services of the proposed ODPS Solution. Any direct or indirect stipulation for preferred tools/plugins/software which require incurring of additional costs on part of any applicant/user may lead to rejection of bid or termination of contract and may be fortification of Performance Guarantee, either fully or partially. Additionally, the State Authority may take further actions, including blacklisting and/or debarment of the Service Provider. Moreover, the Service Provider shall submit undertaking (as per the format mentioned in Form 17) as part of technical bid evaluation. | We request the State Authority to kindly clarify: Whether the Service Provider is expected to support all third-party drawing tools available in the market, or only commonly used/standard ones (e.g., AutoCAD). If additional third-party tools or plugins are required beyond the initially agreed scope, can the separate cost for customization/integration be considered and approved by the State Authority? Whether the undertaking in Form 17 applies only to the proposed solution stack or also extends to any future third-party integrations introduced by applicants/users. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 92 | P-69 4.3.1 Note after point 4 | iii. The system should develop check to vet individual officials and generate unique id for further reference i.e. traceability of former officials, such that the system should disallow Officials from Public Authority / Other Agency to apply for POR license and vice versa. | Please clarify whether a database of working officers and retired officers are available with their Aadhar ID so that when a POR is applying for registration, we can cross check this condition | This shall be worked out at development stage. |
| 93 | 4.3.2 point 2. IV, page 76 | The system may allow for pre-scrutiny of layers to make it comply with online server based scrutiny engine in such a way that it promotes ease of compliance and reduce unwarranted burden on system. | This has to be desktop based application or server based application? | Whichever option is more suitable from users perspective may be explored. |
| 94 | P-72 4.3.2 2 iv | iv. The system may allow for pre-scrutiny of layers to make it comply with online server based scrutiny engine in such a way that it promotes ease of compliance and reduce unwarranted burden on system. | In latest systems, Drawings are directly submitted in the Cloud. Our Software system checks the drawing and if no drafting errors are found, further automatically forwards to the Scrutiny system, or otherwise returns to the Client with errors marked in the drawing itself. This system was brought in to avoid multiple versions for Windows / CAD / System Architecture and other frequent installation issues. Further, Client has freedom to prepare submission drawings in affordable CAD software. Please amend the requirement as needed. | Whichever option is more suitable from users perspective may be explored. |
| 95 | Page 74, 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements | The system should allow Applicant/ POR to submit necessary documents in various predefined formats such as JPG, PDF, etc. | What should be the maximum permissible file size for each document upload (e.g., 5 MB, 10 MB, 25 MB) and should this limit vary by document type? | This shall be worked out at development stage. |
| 96 | P-81 Section 4.3.2 - 8 | ii. The system should allow for Interactive CGDCR i.e. Interactive Regulations Mapping Module. It means based on inputs provided by a user pertaining to any case, the applicable regulations shall be listed accordingly. a. To explain above with example, if Any User opts for D1 category area,DW1 use, Agriculture Zone and site is affected by HT line; CGDCR issupposed to list down the relevant provisions for above situation and listdown all the applicable regulations and clearances required. | Please clarify the following, 1) Zoning plan of entire state is available in digital format and the usage righs will be provided to us. The GIS database should indicate in which type of Zone/Land use the plot exisits and this should be available for the entire state of Gujarat. 2) Geo Database of Electrical transmission towers, their Latitude, longitude etc will be available in the above database? Also additionally presence of Railway lines, water ways, Government assets etc. are readily available so that the user interface can fetch and match the data. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 97 | 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements,13.Information, Education and Communication (IEC), page no 87 | Virtual & In-Person Hands on Training Sessions at Gandhinagar or at District level i. It is expected that State Authority in consultation with Service Provider will prepare Training Calendar for specific period/s. ii. For Implementation Phase, the Service Provider is supposed to provide around 30 on-site training at prominent cities of Gujarat, whereas in O&M phase, it is supposed to provide training support as per requirement of State Authority at field level. iii. However, availability of training support at Gandhinagar is expected across the Project Period. d. Flyers, Presentations, Graphics, Explanatory Notes, SOPs, etc. | Please clarify the expected number of participants per training session, duration of each session, Also travel, accommodation, and venue arrangements for the on-site trainings at district/city level will be provided by the Client during O&M period. | Taking refrence - '13. IEC (pg. 86-87)'; 4.3.3-vii (pg. 101-102) & 4.3.5-iii (pg. 105-108) along with the context and content of RFP; Venue, Training Mode and No. of Participants are to be decided by the State Authority, as and when required. Travel & Accomodation for Trainers during the Implementation Phase shall be borne by the Service Provider, without any cost to the State Authority. However, during O&M phase, travel and accomodation details for the staff of Service Provider shall be mutually decided at the time of training i.e. as and when required. |
| 98 | 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements,13.Information, Education and Communication (IEC), page no 87 | Virtual & In-Person Hands on Training Sessions at Gandhinagar or at District level i. It is expected that State Authority in consultation with Service Provider will prepare Training Calendar for specific period/s. ii. For Implementation Phase, the Service Provider is supposed to provide around 30 on-site training at prominent cities of Gujarat, whereas in O&M phase, it is supposed to provide training support as per requirement of State Authority at field level. iii. However, availability of training support at Gandhinagar is expected across the Project Period. d. Flyers, Presentations, Graphics, Explanatory Notes, SOPs, etc. | Could you kindly clarify the expected number of participants per training session and the duration of each session? This will help us plan the training structure and allocate resources accordingly. Additionally, please confirm whether the Client/Department will provide travel, accommodation, and venue arrangements for on-site trainings at the district/city level during the O&M period, or if these responsibilities will fall to the Service Provider. | Taking refrence - '13. IEC (pg. 86-87)'; 4.3.3-vii (pg. 101-102) & 4.3.5-iii (pg. 105-108) along with the context and content of RFP; Venue, Training Mode and No. of Participants are to be decided by the State Authority, as and when required. Travel & Accomodation for Trainers during the Implementation Phase shall be borne by the Service Provider, without any cost to the State Authority. However, during O&M phase, travel and accomodation details for the staff of Service Provider shall be mutually decided at the time of training i.e. as and when required. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|--|---|---|
| 99 | 13. Information, Education and Communication (IEC) Pg. no.87 | vii. Moreover, as soon as system is made live, a mandatory in- person hands-on-training is to be provided to all categories of Users at regional/ district level as prescribed by State Authority. | vii. Moreover, as soon as the system is made live, mandatory in-person/Online hands-on-training is to be provided to all categories of Users at regional/ district level as prescribed by the State Authority. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 100 | 14. Grievance Redressal System /Page 87 | The Service Provider should develop Master Grievance Module (Helpdesk Application) for Helpdesk Team at State Authority level to reply/ transfer/escalate/ initiate/ track/ close grievance. | Do we need to develop additional module of Grievance or need to integrate with e-nagar grievance module, kindly confirm | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 101 | 14. Grievance Redressal System /Page 87 | The Service Provider should develop Master Grievance Module (Helpdesk Application) for Helpdesk Team at State Authority level to reply/ transfer/ escalate/ initiate/ track/ close grievance. | Usually all tghese things are executed however if you require any specific integration kindly inform and amend | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 102 | P-91 4.3.2 - 17 A | The system shall provide the facility to the applicant/POR to select predesigned template using AI for building permission up to 150 sq mt built up area. Alternately, on the basis of inputs (area, type of permission, category, etc.) regarding building unit, AI can also generate template/ building volume and tentative floor plans which are in accordance with the applicable regulations for that particular building unit. | Please clarify whether already submitted drawings under or equal 150 sq mt by the previous applicants / POR can be used to form the database of suggestions. Copy rights for user submissions should be sorted out so that new applications can use existing drawings | This shall be worked out at development stage. |
| 103 | P-95 4.3.2 18 ii | ii. The system should allow State Authority for creation of new appropriateauthority/ merger/ demerger/ modification/ migration/ deactivation of existing appropriate authorities. Moreover any minor changes like activation or deactivation or modification in mapping for any Appropriate Authority shall be executed by the State Authority's master console itself, preferably without/ with minimum support from Service Provider | Please clarify whethr this will happen at the beginning of Golive or anytime after that. | This activity is expected to take place during the entire project duration. |
| 104 | 18.3 Point iii. | In ODPS 2.0 regime, 92% of development permits are processed online. In ODPS 3.0, it is expected to further increase the online processing of development permits. | The system should not allow any manual intervention in drawing. It should be automated on-line. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 105 | 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirement, 18.Other Instructions regarding Design & Development Page 96 | ODPS 2.0 learning indicates about heavy quantum of junk files, which has not been applied to Appropriate Authority over the years. Hence, system should develop SOP whereby an unattended file i.e. file post auto-scrutiny and not applied shall be deleted from the server after specified time period. | Please confirm the time period after which unattended files (post auto-scrutiny but not applied) should be auto-deleted. Should there be a notification/reminder mechanism before deleting such files to avoid accidental data loss? | This shall be worked out at development stage. |
| 106 | P-96 4.3.2 18 xiii | xiii. The system shall have capability to manage and facilitate multiple sets of regulations for same authority as per applicability. a. To explain above with example, Gandhinagar Municipal Corporation's jurisdiction comprises of Sectors and area developed through TPS. Further area developed through TPS falls under jurisdiction of AUDA and GUDA. Therefore there are three sets of regulations for different areas within GMC | Please clarify this and how to identify such issues and which rule to prevail as Scrutiny engine will apply one set of rules for scrutiny. Officers may return the appliation advising the POR to submit according to the correct authority. | This shall be worked out at development stage. |
| 107 | 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirement, 18.Other Instructions regarding Design & Development Page 97 | Any other services or functionalities identified by the State Authority or otherwise, which are implicit to be developed or modified and implemented for seamless operational efficiency and timely deliverance of services as described in this Scope of Work, shall be considered as part of this Scope of Work. | Any services which is not specified in the RFP, considering such changes will be managed through a change request mechanism with associated timelines and cost implications, Kindly Confirm | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 108 | P-97 4.3.2 18 xviii | xviii. Proposed Scope of Work envisages CAD based scrutiny of development permits. However considering gaining popularity of other methods such as BIM, the system should be capable enough to handle such additional load, if required in future. Particular request, if any made by State Authority in future shall be treated as a change request. | As software development for BIM submissions is a new and full development process, it cannot be brought inside as a change request. It involves complete rewriting of the scrutiny engine. Kindly clarify. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 109 | 4.3.3 Implementation Plan, Page 101 | Minimum required manpower shall be deployed at the premises of the State Authority at earliest after assigning work order, at no additional cost to the State Authority | As per our understanding, Implementation will be done at different phases (e.g. requirement gathering, designing, etc) different key personal will be required, hence at each stage required manpower will be deployed onsite or they will work offsite. Also, kindly confirm all the required IT, Non IT infrastructure will be provided by department. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|---|--|---|
| 110 | 4.3.3 Implementation Plan, Page 101 | Minimum required manpower shall be deployed at the premises of the State Authority at earliest after assigning work order, at no additional cost to the State Authority | As per our understanding, the implementation will be carried out in different phases (e.g., requirement gathering, designing, development, testing, etc.), and different key personnel will be required at each stage. The necessary manpower will be deployed either onsite or offsite, depending on the requirements of each phase. We kindly request confirmation on the following points: 1. Whether our understanding of the phased deployment of manpower (onsite/offsite as per stage requirements) is acceptable. 2. That all required IT and Non-IT infrastructure (e.g., workspace, desktops/laptops, internet connectivity, server environment, etc.) will be provisioned by the Department to ensure the smooth execution of the project. | With regards to manpower deployemnt, the RFP is self explanatory. The State Authority shall provide System (Desktop/ Laptop) and internet connectivity. However, any software requirements shall be addressed by the Service Provider. |
| 111 | 4.3.3 Implementation Plan, Page 101 | Minimum required manpower shall be deployed at the premises of the State Authority at earliest after assigning work order, at no additional cost to the State Authority | As per our understanding, the implementation will be executed in different phases (e.g., requirement gathering, designing, development, testing, etc.), and accordingly, different key personnel will be required. At each stage, the necessary manpower will be deployed either onsite or offsite, depending on the requirements. We kindly request confirmation on the following points: 1. Whether our understanding of the phased deployment of manpower (onsite/offsite as per stage requirements) is acceptable. 2. Confirmation that all required IT and Non-IT infrastructure (e.g., workspace, desktops/laptops, internet connectivity, server environment, etc.) will be provisioned by the Department for the smooth execution of the project. | With regards to manpower deployemnt, the RFP is self explanatory. The State Authority shall provide System (Desktop/ Laptop) and internet connectivity. However, any software requirements shall be addressed by the Service Provider. |
| 112 | 4.3.3 Implementation Plan, Page 101 | Service Provider shall deploy core team professionals, as described and as committed at the time of technical evaluation stage for this project, at no additional cost to the State Authority. | Kindly confirm, which core team is required during demonstration and presentation, (e.g. project manager, tech lead only) | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 113 | 4.3.3 Implementation Plan, Page 101 | Service Provider shall deploy Business Analyst, Quality Analyst, and other necessary staff as per onsite situation or as per the requirement of the State Authority at no additional cost to the State Authority, d. The key team members of Service Provider such as Project Manager, Project Technical Lead, Solution Architect, Database Administrator, Business Analyst, Infrastructure & Network Expert and others core team members should be at onsite during the key phases such as requirement gathering, designing, testing, statewide rollout, important project meetings, etc | As per our understanding, Implementation will be done at different phases (e.g. requirement gathering, designing, etc) different key personal will be required, hence at each stage required manpower will be deployed onsite or they will work offsite. Also, kindly confirm all the required IT, Non IT infrastructure will be provided by department. | With regards to manpower deployemnt, the RFP is self explanatory. The State Authority shall provide System (Desktop/ Laptop) and internet connectivity. However, any software requirements shall be addressed by the Service Provider. |
| 114 | 4.3.3 Implementation Plan, Page 101 | Service Provider shall deploy Business Analyst, Quality Analyst, and other necessary staff as per onsite situation or as per the requirement of the State Authority at no additional cost to the State Authority, d. The key team members of Service Provider such as Project Manager, Project Technical Lead, Solution Architect, Database Administrator, Business Analyst, Infrastructure & Network Expert and others core team members should be at onsite during the key phases such as requirement gathering, designing, testing, statewide rollout, important project meetings, etc | As per our understanding, the implementation will be carried out in different phases (e.g., requirement gathering, design, development, testing, etc.), and accordingly, different key personnel will be required. Hence, manpower will be deployed onsite or will work offsite depending on the phase and requirement. Additionally, we kindly request confirmation that all required IT and non-IT infrastructure (such as office space, furniture, internet connectivity, power supply, etc.) will be provided by the Department. | With regards to manpower deployemnt, the RFP is self explanatory. The State Authority shall provide System (Desktop/ Laptop) and internet connectivity. However, any software requirements shall be addressed by the Service Provider. |
| 115 | 4.3.3 Implementation Plan Pg.no. 101 | e. State Authority intends to test around 1000 CAD based scrutiny cases before statewide rollout. | We suggest defining the acceptance criteria of the solution ready for go-live as below. e. The State Authority intends to test around 500 CAD based scrutiny cases (Accepted/Not accepted) before statewide rollout. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 116 | Page no 102, Data Migration | The Service Provider should ensure that all the data migration is done from ODPS 1.0 and existing ODPS 2.0 database to ODPS 3.0 in time bound manner without any data loss or any hindrance to the access of data. | Request you to please share Service Provider and OEM details for ODPS 1.0 & ODPS 2.0 | This details will be shared with the successful bidder. |
| 117 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase (iii) © | Manpower deployed shall be fluent in communication in Gujarati, Hindi & English | Either two of the languages can be sanctioned rather than all the 3 languages | No change. As per RFP. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| 118 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 106 | Project Manager (1 Nos.), Master Trainer (1 Nos.) and Manpower for Helpdesk (1 Nos.) shall form minimum manpower to be deployed throughout the ODPS Project. This minimum required manpower shall be deployed at the State Authority premises during Implementation Phase at no additional cost to the State Authority. However, State Authority will bear cost of minimum required manpower at the rate quoted by Service Provider from O&M phase. Moreover, State Authority may request Service Provider to deploy additional manpower from schedule and at rate quoted by the Service Provider, as and when required. | As per our understanding, Cost for 3 key people shall be included in financial bid, and later, during O&M period department will start paying for them. Also if need of more manpower, it will be paid at agreed rates, Kindly confirm | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 119 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 106 | Project Manager (1 Nos.), Master Trainer (1 Nos.) and Manpower for Helpdesk (1 Nos.) shall form minimum manpower to be deployed throughout the ODPS Project. This minimum required manpower shall be deployed at the State Authority premises during Implementation Phase at no additional cost to the State Authority. However, State Authority will bear cost of minimum required manpower at the rate quoted by Service Provider from O&M phase. Moreover, State Authority may request Service Provider to deploy additional manpower from schedule and at rate quoted by the Service Provider, as and when required. | Could you kindly confirm our understanding of the following points: 1. The cost of 3 key resources shall be included in the financial bid. 2. During the O&M period, their cost will be paid by the department. 3. Any additional manpower, if required, will be compensated at agreed rates. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 120 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 106 | Project Manager (1 Nos.), Master Trainer (1 Nos.) and Manpower for Helpdesk (1 Nos.) shall form minimum manpower to be deployed throughout the ODPS Project. This minimum required manpower shall be deployed at the State Authority premises during Implementation Phase at no additional cost to the State Authority. However, State Authority will bear cost of minimum required manpower at the rate quoted by Service Provider from O&M phase. Moreover, State Authority may request Service Provider to deploy additional manpower from schedule and at rate quoted by the Service Provider, as and when required. | As per our understanding, the cost for 3 key resources is to be included in the financial bid. Thereafter, during the O&M period, the department will bear the cost of these resources. Additionally, in case more manpower is required, the same will be paid at the agreed rates. Kindly confirm our understanding. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 121 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 106 | Project Manager (1 Nos.), Master Trainer (1 Nos.) and Manpower for Helpdesk (1 Nos.) shall form minimum manpower to be deployed throughout the ODPS Project. This minimum required manpower shall be deployed at the State Authority premises during Implementation Phase at no additional cost to the State Authority. However, State Authority will bear cost of minimum required manpower at the rate quoted by Service Provider from O&M phase. Moreover, State Authority may request Service Provider to deploy additional manpower from schedule and at rate quoted by the Service Provider, as and when required. | Kindly confirm the need of Manpower. Since our product is Automated on Online , So no need of Man Power other than initial discussion. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 122 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 106 | In particular case, State Authority shall specify profile, quantum, and location of manpower to be deployed and tentative duration for which additional manpower needs to be deployed. | As per our understanding, deployed manpower will be paid at agreed rates, kindly confirm | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 123 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 106 | In particular case, State Authority shall specify profile, quantum, and location of manpower to be deployed and tentative duration for which additional manpower needs to be deployed. | Please confirm if deployed manpower costs will be paid at the agreed rates during the project period. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 124 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 106 | In particular case, State Authority shall specify profile, quantum, and location of manpower to be deployed and tentative duration for which additional manpower needs to be deployed. | As per our understanding, the deployed manpower shall be compensated at the agreed rates as per the contract terms. Kindly confirm. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 125 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 106 | In particular case, State Authority shall specify profile, quantum, and location of manpower to be deployed and tentative duration for which additional manpower needs to be deployed. | No need of manpower , since our product is Automated online and the meaning of ODPS of TPVD will have meaning to implement . Kindly amend it without man power | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 126 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 108 | a) For sake of clarity, any services or functionalities identified by the State Authority, which are implicit to be developed or modified and implemented for seamless operational efficiency and timely deliverance of services as described in the Scope of Design and Development, Implementation Phase, Data Migration and O&M Phase shall be considered as part of this Scope of Work and in no case shall be considered as a Change Request. b) Furthermore, any modification/ change in prevailing regulations shall be considered as part of this Scope of Work and in no case shall be considered as a Change Request. | Any services or scope which is not specified in the RFP, considering such changes will be managed through a change request mechanism with associated timelines and cost implications, Also any new services/scope/functionalities which required during O&M phase will be consider as a change request. Kindly Confirm | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|---|--|--|
| 127 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 108 | a) For sake of clarity, any services or functionalities identified by the State Authority, which are implicit to be developed or modified and implemented for seamless operational efficiency and timely deliverance of services as described in the Scope of Design and Development, Implementation Phase, Data Migration and O&M Phase shall be considered as part of this Scope of Work and in no case shall be considered as a Change Request. b) Furthermore, any modification/ change in prevailing regulations shall be considered as part of this Scope of Work and in no case shall be considered as a Change Request. | Change Request to be adopted for mutual better results and for upgradation of customization. Even on AMC period to maintain the supplied software and amendments small or big to be us chargable Change Request . Kindly Amend | No change. As per RFP. |
| 128 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment. Page No. 138 | b. Issuance of Preliminary Implementation Certificate | Kindly provide the criteria and evaluation parameters for issuance of the Preliminary Implementation Certificate. | As per RFP page No. 99. |
| 129 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work, Page no 63 | The Service Provider shall supply, design, customize, implement, integrate, operate, support, and maintain an enterprise-level online development permission solution. This includes all necessary software's, operating systems, hypervisors, APIs, add-ons, tools, and appropriate licenses needed for the solution's functionality and completeness of ODPS solution and shall maintain it throughout the contract period. | <p>The clause states that the Service Provider shall supply, design, customize, implement, integrate, operate, support, and maintain the ODPS solution, including all necessary software, operating systems, hypervisors, APIs, add-ons, tools, and licenses.</p> <p>We Kindly request clarification on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considering this tender scope is limited to Software Solution only, please confirm whether OS, hypervisors, and other system-level tools/licenses are also required. 2. If yes, kindly specify the details, specifications, and versions of such required components. 3. Please provide a list of mandated/preferred tools to avoid assumptions during bid preparation. 4. Please confirm if the cost of such licenses should be factored into the bidder's financial proposal or will be provisioned separately by the State Authority. | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 130 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work, Page no 63 | The Service Provider shall supply, design, customize, implement, integrate, operate, support, and maintain an enterprise-level online development permission solution. This includes all necessary software's, operating systems, hypervisors, APIs, add-ons, tools, and appropriate licenses needed for the solution's functionality and completeness of ODPS solution and shall maintain it throughout the contract period. | <p>We kindly request clarification on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since the tender scope is primarily limited to the software solution, could you please confirm whether operating systems, hypervisors, and other system-level tools/licenses are also included in the scope? 2. If they are included, could you kindly provide details regarding the required components, specifications, and versions (e.g., OS type, DBMS version, virtualization platform, etc.)? 3. Please share a list of any mandated or preferred tools/licenses (if applicable) to help avoid assumptions during the bid preparation. 4. Lastly, could you confirm whether the cost of such system-level licenses should be factored into the bidder's financial proposal, or if these will be provisioned separately by the State Authority under hosting arrangements? | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 131 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work. Page No. 63 | 2. The new ODPS solution shall be versioned as 3.0 and the solution shall be compatible with all popular web browsers (comprising but not limited to Microsoft Edge, Chrome, Mozilla Firefox, Safari, Opera etc.). It should support all modern mobile devices with latest OS (android, iOS and windows). | As per current market trends, Android and iOS are the widely adopted mobile operating systems. Windows OS compatibility for mobile devices is not commonly used. Therefore we request you to kindly consider only Android and iOS-based mobile devices for this project. | Please refer the Sr no 7 of Corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|---|--|
| 132 | Page 63, 4.2 Broad Scope of Work | The proposed solution should have user friendly interface, dynamic workflows, comprehensive search, Bi-lingual support, in-build audit trail, document storage, access-based control, dynamic dashboard and reporting with real-time data and graphical representation, secure data exchange using APIs and should not have any kind of technology locking. | What is the proposed technology stack (frontend, backend, database, middleware, APIs, hypervisors, etc.)? | No change. As per RFP. |
| 133 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work/ Page 64 | The proposed solution shall be hosted at Gujarat State Data Centre located in Gandhinagar. The Service Provider shall submit the pre-requisite with details on required infrastructure, OS, connectivity, port access, etc. for deployment of ODPS 3.0 at Data Centre and DR in production environment. The bidder has to maintain the staging environment at their premises for support during O&M. Moreover, Service Provider should ensure compliance with prevailing directions/ policies of SDC. | As per our understanding, Development, testing, staging environment will be in the scope of bidder. | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 134 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work pg. 64 | The bidder has to maintain the staging environment at their premises for support during O&M. | As the staging environment should be a close replica of the production environment, we recommend that the client provide the staging environment infrastructure at the State Data Centre, at par with production environment to maintain the synchronicity between two environments. | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 135 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work. Page No. 64 | 7 The proposed solution shall be hosted at Gujarat State Data Centre located in Gandhinagar. The Service Provider shall submit the pre-requisite with details on required infrastructure, OS, connectivity, port access, etc. for deployment of ODPS 3.0 at Data Centre and DR in production environment. | As the proposed solution is to be hosted at the Gujarat State Data Centre (GSDC), our understanding is that the responsibility for data backup and recovery lies with the Agency managing the State Data Centre. Kindly confirm if this understanding is acceptable | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 136 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work. Page No. 64 | 7 The proposed solution shall be hosted at Gujarat State Data Centre located in Gandhinagar. The Service Provider shall submit the pre-requisite with details on required infrastructure, OS, connectivity, port access, etc. for deployment of ODPS 3.0 at Data Centre and DR in production environment. | Our understanding is that both DC and DR shall be with Gujarat State Data Center. Please confirm the same. | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 137 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work. Page No. 64 | 7 The proposed solution shall be hosted at Gujarat State Data Centre located in Gandhinagar. The Service Provider shall submit the pre-requisite with details on required infrastructure, OS, connectivity, port access, etc. for deployment of ODPS 3.0 at Data Centre and DR in production environment. | Our understanding is that the responsibility for provisioning system software, operating systems, and third-party software licenses (such as CAD or BIM) required to run the main ODPS application lies with the Authority. Please confirm the same. | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 138 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work. Page No. 64 | 7. The bidder has to maintain the staging environment at their premises for support during O&M. | We request you to consider that the staging server for the O&M project duration shall be provided by the authority at SDC. For a bidder to provide staging server for O&M project duration of more than 7 years will entail huge costs which will increase the total cost of project significantly. | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| 139 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work/ Page 64 | The proposed solution shall be hosted at Gujarat State Data Centre located in Gandhinagar. The Service Provider shall submit the pre-requisite with details on required infrastructure, OS, connectivity, port access, etc. for deployment of ODPS 3.0 at Data Centre and DR in production environment. The bidder has to maintain the staging environment at their premises for support during O&M. Moreover, Service Provider should ensure compliance with prevailing directions/ policies of SDC. | scope of TPVD / any investment by the authority | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 140 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work, Page no 64 | The Service Provider and respective product OEM shall directly be responsible to implement the solution and migrate data from existing solution to new ODPS solution seamlessly without any data loss. | <p>Please confirm the technology stack, database type, and schema details of ODPS 1.0 and ODPS 2.0 to help us assess the migration complexity.</p> <p>Kindly clarify whether the Department will provide clean data in the requested Excel format to enable proper migration.</p> <p>Please confirm if data cleansing, deduplication, or transformation will be done by dept</p> | <p>1.) Front and backend: C# ASP.NET 4.0 & 4.6 with support of various libraries like bootstrap 3.3.7, Switchery, SweetAlert. Database : Microsoft SQL Server 2014, DB Size: ~3.2TB (structured) & ~7TB (Unstructured) Hosted in Windows Server 2016 Standard.</p> <p>2.) Access will be given to UAT environment to successful bidder only. State Authority will provide read only access to database from designated system, if feasible, with NDA.</p> <p>3.) State Authoriy will decide regarding downtime at data migration stage.</p> <p>4.) All strategies, like data cleansing, deduplication, transformation and all others related to data migration will be carried out by Service Provider. State Authority will not provide clean data.</p> |
| 141 | Page no 64, Scope of Work | The Service Provider and respective product OEM shall directly be responsible to implement the solution and migrate data from existing solution to new ODPS solution seamlessly without any data loss. | <p>1) Please provide detailed documentation of the existing solution, including data structure and technology stack, to assess migration feasibility.</p> <p>2) Will the service provider be given access to the existing system for a technical assessment before migration begins?</p> <p>3) Is the migration limited to structured data only, or does it include unstructured data, metadata, logs, and historical backups?</p> <p>4) Will there be a defined downtime window for migration? What is the expected cutover strategy?</p> | <p>1.) Front and backend: C# ASP.NET 4.0 & 4.6 with support of various libraries like bootstrap 3.3.7, Switchery, SweetAlert. Database : Microsoft SQL Server 2014, DB Size: ~3.2TB (structured) & ~7TB (Unstructured) Hosted in Windows Server 2016 Standard.</p> <p>2.) Access will be given to UAT environment to successful bidder only. State Authority will provide read only access to database from designated system, if feasible, with NDA.</p> <p>3.) State Authoriy will decide regarding downtime at data migration stage.</p> <p>4.) All strategies, like data cleansing, deduplication, transformation and all others related to data migration will be carried out by Service Provider. State Authority will not provide clean data.</p> |
| 142 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work, Page no 64 | The Service Provider and respective product OEM shall directly be responsible to implement the solution and migrate data from existing solution to new ODPS solution seamlessly without any data loss. | <p>Please confirm the technology stack, database type, and schema details of ODPS 1.0 and ODPS 2.0, as this information is essential to assess the migration complexity.</p> <p>Kindly clarify whether the Department will provide clean data in the requested Excel format to enable smooth migration.</p> <p>Please confirm if data cleansing, deduplication, and transformation activities will be undertaken by the Department.</p> | <p>1.) Front and backend: C# ASP.NET 4.0 & 4.6 with support of various libraries like bootstrap 3.3.7, Switchery, SweetAlert. Database : Microsoft SQL Server 2014, DB Size: ~3.2TB (structured) & ~7TB (Unstructured) Hosted in Windows Server 2016 Standard.</p> <p>2.) Access will be given to UAT environment to successful bidder only. State Authority will provide read only access to database from designated system, if feasible, with NDA.</p> <p>3.) State Authoriy will decide regarding downtime at data migration stage.</p> <p>4.) All strategies, like data cleansing, deduplication, transformation and all others related to data migration will be carried out by Service Provider. State Authority will not provide clean data.</p> |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|--|---|
| 143 | Section 4.2 point, Page 64 | Detailed migration plan shall also include the strategy to migrate the operation existing data of ODPS solution, activity timeline, and granular details to complete the migration to the ODPS 3.0. The migration strategy shall be presented to the evaluation committee members under Technical Presentation for understanding. | 1.API and Data structure documents from existing vendors will be required to migrate the data 2. In case of approved building permit, will we be provided the building permit Sanction Letters or the raw data as well. | 1.) Front and backend: C# ASP.NET 4.0 & 4.6 with support of various libraries like bootstrap 3.3.7, Switchery, SweetAlert. Database : Microsoft SQL Server 2014, DB Size: ~3.2TB (structured) & ~7TB (Unstructured) Hosted in Windows Server 2016 Standard. 2.) Access will be given to UAT environment to successful bidder only. State Authority will provide read only access to database from designated system, if feasible, with NDA. 3.) State Authoriy will decide regarding downtime at data migration stage. 4.) All strategies, like data cleansing, deduplication, transformation and all others related to data migration will be carried out by Service Provider. State Authority will not provide clean data. |
| 144 | 4.1, point 11, page 65 | The bidder shall have a back-to-back agreement with the Product OEMs for providing premium or highest level of support applicable during implementation and O&M Period. If the performance issue is observed with the deployed solution, then the Service Provider shall provide extensive support for RCA and conduct required configuration optimization, code optimization, database optimization, load balancing, caching strategy, etc. to meet the requirement as per SLA, at no extra cost to the Tenderer. | This is with assumption that total files per day will not exceed 1000 and concurrent users 5000. If they exceed, additional hardware and licensees will be required, to be provisioned by department | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 145 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work, Page no 65 | The solution should be scalable i.e. both Horizontally and Vertically. The solution shall be operational throughout the state and the Tenderer may request the Service Provider for addition of any newly formed authority and/or ULBs for using the facilities of the ODPS solution. The Service Provider along with OEM shall be responsible for providing support for training, customization, dash boarding and operational support to newly added heads. The Service Provider shall also upgrade solution (optimize software and database, add required components, load balancing, etc.) to handle additional users without effecting the performance. The upgradation should be performed with minimal downtime. | Kindly confirm, as per the RFP, the hosting infrastructure will be provided by the State Authority . We understand that in such a case, scalability of the infrastructure (both horizontal and vertical) will be the State Authority's responsibility, while the Service Provider will ensure that the application is designed to support such scalability. Please confirm if this understanding is correct. also, the RFP mentions that the provider shall enable the addition of any newly formed authority and/or ULBs for using the ODPS solution. Kindly clarify whether such additions will be covered under the existing cost quoted by the bidder or if they will be treated as a separate Change Request (CR) with additional cost implications. | Regarding the hosting infrastructure, the understanding is appropriate. Reagrding addition of any newly formed Authority and/or ULBs, such additions shall be covered under the existing cost and shall not be considered as change request. |
| 146 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work/ Page 65 | The Service Provider shall also upgrade solution (optimize software and database, add required components, load balancing, etc.) to handle additional users without effecting the performance. | Load balancing and hardware required at SDC will be provided by authority, hence required any upgrade required for performance, should be provided by authority. | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 147 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work, Page no 65 | The solution should be scalable i.e. both Horizontally and Vertically. The solution shall be operational throughout the state and the Tenderer may request the Service Provider for addition of any newly formed authority and/or ULBs for using the facilities of the ODPS solution. The Service Provider along with OEM shall be responsible for providing support for training, customization, dash boarding and operational support to newly added heads. The Service Provider shall also upgrade solution (optimize software and database, add required components, load balancing, etc.) to handle additional users without effecting the performance. The upgradation should be performed with minimal downtime. | Could you kindly confirm whether, since the hosting infrastructure will be provided by the State Authority, the responsibility for scalability (horizontal/vertical) will also remain with the Authority, while the Service Provider will ensure that the application supports scalability? Additionally, please clarify whether the inclusion of newly formed authorities/ULBs under the ODPS solution will be covered in the quoted cost, or if it will be treated as a separate Change Request (CR) with an additional cost. | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 148 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work. Page No. 65 | 12. The solution shall be operational throughout the state and the Tenderer may request the Service Provider for addition of any newly formed authority and/or ULBs for using the facilities of the ODPS solution. | Our understanding is that the geographical scope of this RFP is limited to the ULBs or UDAs explicitly mentioned in the RFP document. Any addition of new ULBs or expansion beyond the defined scope during the contract period shall be treated as a Change Request and will be charged additionally as per applicable terms | No change. As per RFP. |
| 149 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work/ Page 65 | The Service Provider shall also upgrade solution (optimize software and database, add required components, load balancing, etc.) to handle additional users without effecting the performance. | Kindly Refer the load now as amendment plan | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 150 | 4.2 Broad Scope of Work/ Page 66 | Any required Software / Hardware updates, patch management, connectivity, etc., will be the sole responsibility of the Service Provider for the entire contract period at no extra cost to the Tenderer. The required updates / services packs / bug fixes for the entire stack has to be implemented within 15 days of release / general availability. The proposed ODPS 3.0 solution should not include any individual components running on beta version. | As per our understanding, the scope of work is limited to the software solution, and no hardware deployment is under the Service Provider's scope. Considering this, we request confirmation that hardware-related updates, patch management, and connectivity will remain the State Authority's responsibility, while the Service Provider will manage only the software-related updates, patches, and bug fixes within the stipulated timelines at no extra cost to the Tenderer. Please confirm. | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|--|---|--|
| 151 | Page 65, 4.2 Broad Scope of Work | 14 The proposed COTS Solution (if utilized) should be of Enterprise Grade with valid premium or highest level licenses only and should not be a free software or community version without support. | Are all software licenses enterprise-grade and in the name of the State Authority? | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 152 | Page no 65 ,14 | The proposed COTS Solution (if utilized) should be of Enterprise Grade with valid premium or highest level licenses only and should not be a free software or community version without support. | we respectfully request that the department consider allowing the inclusion of NUDM's product "UpyoG" as a valid option within the scope of the proposed solution. This product is mandated by the Government of India under the National Urban Digital Mission (NUDM) framework and aligns with the broader objectives of digital governance and interoperability. Permitting UpyoG's participation will not only ensure compliance with national mandates but also foster greater competition and enable fair participation among bidders. This will ultimately support the selection of the most robust and future-ready solution for the department. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 153 | Page 66, 4.2 Broad Scope of Work | 21 Considering past experience and new scope, peak concurrent users is expected at 5000 for Portal, whereas at peak time it is expected to process 1000 CAD files in a day | What caching, load balancing strategies are proposed? | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 154 | Section4, 4.3 / 4.3.2 / Point 14 / vii | State Authority will provide office space, helpline number and email id, where Any User can interact for feedback. However, helpdesk manpower shall be provided by the Service Provider as per the requirement of State Authority. | Laptop / AutoCAD License for Helpdesk Manpower - To be provided by the Vendor or State Authority | The State Authority shall provide System (Desktop/ Laptop) and internet connectivity. However, any software requirements shall be addressed by the Service Provider. |
| 155 | 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirement, 15.Dashboard & MIS, Page 89 | The system should allow linking of data sets with GIS platform as decided by the State Authority or Appropriate Authority in consultation with State Authority. | Kindly confirm the platform will be provide the state authority | The platform shall be provided by the State Authority. |
| 156 | P-89 4.3.2 16 | i. The agility of ODPS Project depends on modes of access granted to it. Ability to update simpler details or track basic information through Mobile Application, can create a lot of difference in terms of user satisfaction. Considering its utility, it is required to develop, update and maintain a mobile application on Android & iOS platforms. | Please clarify if Mobile app is mandatory for this requirement. If the web application is optimised for any screen viewing (Pprogressive Web design - PWA) and meeting this requirement, then the process of managing a separate application for different versions of Mobile OS may be avoided. | Mobile Application is mandatory under this RFP. Moreover, responsive web application for diferent screen sizes is part of basic software development fulfilments. |
| 157 | Page 99, 4.3.3 Implementation Plan | ix. Load Testing Report i.e. twice of envisaged peak load, | Is there a preferred tool for load testing (e.g., JMeter, LoadRunner)? | No prefernce. However, This should not lead to any extra cost during implementation statge at the end of the state authority. |
| 158 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 110 | State Authority may opt for Third Party Inspection or/ and Self Verification for performance audit or vulnerability audit or specific audit for the smooth functioning of the ODPS Solution. a) Any shortfall identified in particular audit shall be resolved on priority basis by the Service Provider without any additional cost to the Tenderer/ State Authority. | Any third party Inspection/Audit will be borne by state authority, kindly confirm | Any kind of Third Party Inspection/ Audit expenses shall be borne by the State Authority. |
| 159 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 110 | State Authority may opt for Third Party Inspection or/ and Self Verification for performance audit or vulnerability audit or specific audit for the smooth functioning of the ODPS Solution. a) Any shortfall identified in particular audit shall be resolved on priority basis by the Service Provider without any additional cost to the Tenderer/ State Authority. | Could you kindly confirm if the expenses for third-party inspection/audit will be covered by the State Authority? | Any kind of Third Party Inspection/ Audit expenses shall be borne by the State Authority. |
| 160 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 110 | State Authority may opt for Third Party Inspection or/ and Self Verification for performance audit or vulnerability audit or specific audit for the smooth functioning of the ODPS Solution. a) Any shortfall identified in particular audit shall be resolved on priority basis by the Service Provider without any additional cost to the Tenderer/ State Authority. | Kindly confirm that the cost of any third-party inspection or audit required under the project will be borne by the State Authority. | Any kind of Third Party Inspection/ Audit expenses shall be borne by the State Authority. |
| 161 | 4.3.5 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Phase/ Page 110 | State Authority may opt for Third Party Inspection or/ and Self Verification for performance audit or vulnerability audit or specific audit for the smooth functioning of the ODPS Solution. a) Any shortfall identified in particular audit shall be resolved on priority basis by the Service Provider without any additional cost to the Tenderer/ State Authority. | We may coordinate but charges to be bourne by authority. | Any kind of Third Party Inspection/ Audit expenses shall be borne by the State Authority. |
| 162 | 4.3.6 General Conditions for IT Development. Page No. 111 | e. To maintain information security during transaction the developed system should support both HTTP and HTTPS, all internal data communication shall be done through encrypted mode using latest version of TLS (Transport Layer Security)/ SSL (Secure Socket Layer). | As per our understanding the cost of SSL certificate will be borne by the Authority. Kindly confirm. | The understanding is appropriate. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|---|---|--|
| 163 | 4.3.6 General Conditions for IT Development Pg. no.115 | vii. Hosting in UAT environment: a. Service Provider shall be responsible for hosting the entire application and all ancillary in- scope applications on their system. b. Service Provider shall ensure that UAT environment is pre- qualified equally as per production environment. c. State Authority may issue specific/ general condition as it deems fit for this purpose and it shall be binding on Service Provider. | As the staging environment should be a close replica of the production environment, we recommend that the client provide the staging environment infrastructure at the State Data Centre, at par with the production environment to maintain the synchronicity between the two environments. | Please refer the Sr no 6 of Corrigendum document |
| 164 | 4.3.6 General Conditions for IT Development, Page 116 | Service Provider shall be responsible for the implementation of Back-up and Disaster Recovery | Kindly confirm. Hardware and software required for backup services will be provided by state authority | Please refer the Sr no 8 of Corrigendum document |
| 165 | 4.3.6 General Conditions for IT Development, Page 116 | Service Provider shall be responsible for the implementation of Back-up and Disaster Recovery | We may agreed to that, But all infrastructure investment to be & by the authority | Please refer the Sr no 8 of Corrigendum document |
| 166 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format | ix. For 4.3.2.(17A and 17B) of scope of work, the necessary hardware will be provided by the State Authority. The bidder shall specify the minimum required hardware specifications for smooth functioning of application, deployment, networking and other necessary components. | We understand that the minimum required hardware specifications for smooth functioning of the application, deployment, networking, and other necessary components may be included as part of the unpriced Bill of Material and uploaded along with the Technical Bid. We kindly request you to confirm this. | The understanding is appropriate. However, there is no need to upload it with technical bid at present. |
| 167 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format Page no. 133 | IX. For 4.3.2.(17A and 17B) of scope of work, the necessary hardware will be provided by the State Authority. The bidder shall specify the minimum required hardware specifications for smooth functioning of application, deployment, networking and other necessary components. | Our understanding is that the Bidder shall specify the minimum required hardware specifications for smooth functioning of application, deployment, networking and other necessary components in the upriced Bill of Material and upload it with Technical Bid. Kindly Confirm | The understanding is appropriate. However, only selected bidder needs to submit it. |
| 168 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment | SQTC Audit – Third Party Security Audit | We request your clarification on who will bear the cost of the security audit — the Department or the selected bidder | The State Authority shall borne the Standardisation Testing and Quality Certification (STQC) Audit / Third Party Security Audit |
| 169 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment | SQTC Audit – Third Party Security Audit | Who will bear the cost of STQC or third-party security audit—whether it will be borne by the bidder or by the Authority | The State Authority shall borne the Standardisation Testing and Quality Certification (STQC) Audit / Third Party Security Audit |
| 170 | e. Payment Schedule Pg. no. 137 | 5. f. SQTC Audit – Third Party Security Audit | We suggest Cert-in security audit or STQC audit | The State Authority shall borne the Standardisation Testing and Quality Certification (STQC) Audit / Third Party Security Audit |
| 171 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment. Page No. 138 | SQTC Audit – Third Party Security Audit | As per our understanding the cost of STQC or third-party security audit will be borne by the Authority. Kindly confirm. | The State Authority shall borne the Standardisation Testing and Quality Certification (STQC) Audit / Third Party Security Audit |
| 172 | Page no 64, Scope of Work | General | We understand that - The department shall provide API details or documentation for the eNagar Portal, IFP Portal, Aadhaar authentication, and PAN authentication - please confirm if the understanding is correct | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 173 | Page 70, 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements | The system should have functionality for Aadhaar based authentication of an applicant and integration with various government repository such as Digilocker for fetching necessary educational credentials from it. | Will the department provide access/credentials to Aadhaar and PAN authentication APIs, or is the vendor expected to arrange this? Is offline Aadhaar KYC acceptable, or do require only online Aadhaar authentication? Will integration APIs/credentials (integration with various government repository such as Digilocker) be arranged by the department or vendor? | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 174 | 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements, page no 70 | The system should have functionality for Aadhaar based authentication of an applicant and integration with various government repository such as Digi locker for fetching necessary educational credentials from it. | The application will support integration with various government repositories; however, the required approvals and associated costs will be handled by the department. | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|--|--|--|
| 175 | 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements, page no 70 | The system should have functionality for Aadhaar based authentication of an applicant and integration with various government repository such as Digilocker for fetching necessary educational credentials from it. | Could you kindly confirm if the department will be responsible for managing the approvals and associated costs related to the integration with government repositories? | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 176 | 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements, page no 70 | The system should have functionality for Aadhaar based authentication of an applicant and integration with various government repository such as Digilocker for fetching necessary educational credentials from it. | The application will support integration with various government repositories. However, we understand that all necessary approvals and associated costs for such integrations will be borne by the department. Kindly confirm. | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 177 | 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements. Page No. 70 | iv. The system should have functionality for Aadhaar based authentication of an applicant and integration with various government repository such as Digi locker for fetching necessary educational credentials from it. | Our understanding is that bidder's scope is limited to integration with Digi locker. Any third party hardware/ software and necessary API for integration shall be provided by Authority. Kindly confirm. | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 178 | Page 71, 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements | The system should have functionality to send notifications to Applicant through WhatsApp (optional), SMS, Email and Mobile App. Moreover there should be notification icon at POR's console for any update. | Will the department provide/arrange the SMS gateway services ? For WhatsApp notifications, is the department arranging a verified business account, or is the vendor responsible for setup and associated costs? | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 179 | Page no 71, Design & Development Requirements | The system should have functionality to send notifications to Applicant through WhatsApp (optional), SMS, Email and Mobile App. Moreover there should be notification icon at POR's console for any update. | We understand that client will provide all integration gateways (SMS, Email, WhatsApp, any other) related to this scope of work - Please confirm if the understanding is correct. | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 180 | Page 71, 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements | The system should allow Public Authorities to levy fees and require Applicant/ POR to pay necessary fees through online modes such as Net Banking, UPI, RTGS, NEFT, etc. Moreover system should allow Applicant/ POR to view and download payment history. | Does the department have a preferred payment gateway (e.g., BharatKosh, BBPS, SBlePay, PayGov) or should vendors propose one? Are refunds and partial payments required, or only full payment processing? | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 181 | Page no 71, Design & Development Requirements | The system should allow Public Authorities to levy fees and require Applicant/ POR to pay necessary fees through online modes such as Net Banking, UPI, RTGS, NEFT, etc. Moreover system should allow Applicant/ POR to view and download payment history. | We understand that client will provide payment gateway related to this scope of work - Please confirm if the understanding is correct. | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 182 | Page 71, 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements | Once fees are paid, the user should be allowed to download digital signed Registration Certificate from the portal and the same shall be shared via digilocker | Should digital certificates be signed via DSC (Digital Signature Certificate), eSign, or HSM-based signing? | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 183 | Page no 71, Design & Development Requirements | Once fees are paid, the user should be allowed to download digital signed Registration Certificate from the portal and the same shall be shared via Digi locker. | We understand that client will provision and manage the digital signing infrastructure (e.g., DSC/eSign service) and Digi Locker integration- Please confirm if the understanding is correct. | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 184 | 4.3.2 Design & Development Requirements. Page No. 74 | ix. The system should have functionality to send notifications to Applicant through WhatsApp (optional), SMS, Email and Mobile App. | Our understanding is that the SMS gateway, Email gateway, Payment gateway, and WhatsApp communication pack shall be procured and provided by the Authority. The bidder's scope is limited to the integration of these components with the proposed ODPS system. Please confirm the same. | Bidder may suggest required information / details required from various agencies. The State Authority shall facilitate availing of API details along with necessary approvals from the concerned agencies. However, all other tasks related to integration with ODPS solution shall be undertaken by the Service Provider. |
| 185 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format | Unit rates without GST | As we can see in the shared financial bid format, the unit price is asked without GST, but in the Grand Total section, it is including GST and there is no separate column in the financial bid format to mention the GST value. Hence we kindly request you amend the financial bid format accordingly. | Please refer the Sr no 9 of Corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|--|--|---|
| 186 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format | Unit rates without GST | We have observed a contradiction in the BOQ format — the Grand Total is required to be entered including GST, while the Unit Price is to be quoted without GST. However, no separate column has been provided to specify the GST amount or percentage. We kindly request you to rectify this in the BOQ format | Please refer the Sr no 9 of Corrigendum document |
| 187 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format | Unit rates without GST | In the Financial Bid Format, the unit price is requested without GST; however, the Grand Total section requires the price inclusive of GST. We note that there is no separate column provided to indicate the GST amount or percentage for calculating the total value with GST. Kindly confirm whether bidders are permitted to directly mention the total value inclusive of GST based on their own calculations | Please refer the Sr no 9 of Corrigendum document |
| 188 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format | Unit rates without GST | As per our understanding, the bidder is required to mention the Unit Price without GST and enter the Grand Total Amount inclusive of GST, calculated on the Unit Price. Kindly confirm. | Please refer the Sr no 9 of Corrigendum document |
| 189 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format. Page No. 133 | Unit rates without GST | In the BOQ, the unit price is requested without GST, but in the Grand Total section, it asks for the price including GST. However, we do not see a separate column in the BOQ to mention the GST amount or percentage to calculate the total value with GST. Kindly confirm if the bidder is allowed to directly mention the total value inclusive of GST based on their own calculations. Else kindly modify the BOQ accordingly. | Please refer the Sr no 9 of Corrigendum document |
| 190 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format/ Page 132 | The successful bidder shall have to resubmit the revised detailed BOM with price breakup meeting the final L1 Price after RA (reverse auction) within 7 days after completion of RA. | Since Reverse auction is not applicable for this RFP, this clause will be not be applicable, Kindly clarify? | Please refer the Sr no 10 of Corrigendum document |
| 191 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format | viii. The Bidder shall upload the detail BOM with price breakup for all quoted components along with financial bid on GEM. The price breakup should be detailed with Item description, Part/Sub-part code, License type, licensing model, quantity, unit price, total price, etc. of the quoted product. | As per our observation, bidders are required to submit only the financial bid price bifurcation/break-up provided in the Excel format with the RFP. Other details may be included in the unpriced Bill of Material and uploaded along with the Technical Bid. We kindly request you to confirm our understanding | Please refer the Sr no 10 of Corrigendum document |
| 192 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format | The successful bidder shall have to resubmit the revised detailed BOM with price breakup meeting the final L1 Price after RA (reverse auction) within 7 days after completion of RA. | As we can see the Reverse Auction (RA) is not enabled for this tender as per the GeM tender notification. So this may be a typographical error, therefore we kindly request you to remove this clause from the tender document. | Please refer the Sr no 10 of Corrigendum document |
| 193 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format | The successful bidder shall have to resubmit the revised detailed BOM with price breakup meeting the final L1 Price after RA (reverse auction) within 7 days after completion of RA. | We request you to confirm wheater the Reverse Auction (RA) is enabled or not for this tender. | Please refer the Sr no 10 of Corrigendum document |
| 194 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format | The successful bidder shall have to resubmit the revised detailed BOM with price breakup meeting the final L1 Price after RA (reverse auction) within 7 days after completion of RA. | As per the bid invitation on GeM, Reverse Auction (RA) is not enabled for this tender. We kindly request you to confirm if this understanding is correct. | Please refer the Sr no 10 of Corrigendum document |
| 195 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format Page no. 132 | VIII. The Bidder shall upload the detail BOM with price breakup for all quoted components along with financial bid on GEM. The price breakup should be detailed with Item description, Part/Sub-part code, License type, licensing model, quantity, unit price, total price, etc. of the quoted product. | Our understanding is that the Bidder will only upload the Financial Price Break up cost sheet available with the RFP online in financial Bid on GEM protal. Kindly confirm | Please refer the Sr no 10 of Corrigendum document |
| 196 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format Page no. 132 | VIII.The successful bidder shall have to resubmit the revised detailed BOM with price breakup meeting the final L1 Price after RA (reverse auction) within 7 days after completion of RA. | As per the bid evaluation criteria, reverse auction is not applicable for this RFP. Kindly confirm. | Please refer the Sr no 10 of Corrigendum document |
| 197 | SECTION - 6: Financial Bid Format/ Page 132 | The successful bidder shall have to resubmit the revised detailed BOM with price breakup meeting the final L1 Price after RA (reverse auction) within 7 days after completion of RA. | It is not a usual practise in any other tenders therefore kindly look in to change or remove . | Please refer the Sr no 10 of Corrigendum document |
| 198 | GeM bid invitation Page No. 2 | Bid to RA enabled No | As per the bid evaluation criteria, reverse auction is not applicable for this RFP. Kindly confirm. | Please refer the Sr no 10 of Corrigendum document |
| 199 | Price Bid | Opex 2.1 - Cost of ATS (Annual Technical Support) of COTS product (per year) - 5 | In the Price Bid, ATS is mentioned for 5 years, whereas in the ATS section it is specified as 7 years. This seems to be a discrepancy and may cause confusion in the price calculation. Kindly confirm the correct duration of ATS. | Please refer the Sr no 11 of Corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|--|--|---|
| 200 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment | O&M Phase Annual Technical Support of COTS product 7-Years from Issuance of Successful Implementation Certificate | As we can see in the financial bid format, value for ATS of the COTS product is asked for 5 years, but in the payment terms the same period is 7 years. We kindly request you to clarify what value will be considered for the additional 2 years of ATS.” | Please refer the Sr no 11 of Corrigendum document |
| 201 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment | O&M Phase Annual Technical Support of COTS product 7-Years from Issuance of Successful Implementation Certificate | As per the Financial Bid Format, the cost for ATS of the COTS product is requested for a period of 5 years; however, the payment terms mention a duration of 7 years. We kindly request you to confirm the correct duration for the ATS period. | Please refer the Sr no 11 of Corrigendum document |
| 202 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment. Page No. 138 | O&M Phase Annual Technical Support of COTS product 7-Years from Issuance of Successful Implementation Certificate | As per the BOQ, the cost for ATS of the COTS product is requested for 5 years, but the payment terms mention a period of 7 years. As per our understanding, the ATS period should be of 7 years and not 5 years.We request you to kindly confirm. | Please refer the Sr no 11 of Corrigendum document |
| 203 | Price Bid | Opex 2.1 - Cost of ATS (Annual Technical Support) of COTS product (per year) - 5 | clarify wheather it is 5 years or 7 Years. Since mentioned in the document differently. | Please refer the Sr no 11 of Corrigendum document |
| 204 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment. Page No. 138 | Point No. 2.3 - Maintenance and Support during O&M for AI Modules as per RFP section 4.3.2 (17A) – Quarterly Point No. 2.4 Maintenance and Support during O&M for blockchain based modules as per RFP section 4.3.2 (17B) – Quarterly | These payment for these items are not mentioned in the payment terms table. Our understanding is that the payment for these items shall follow the same terms as applicable during the warranty and support period, i.e., quarterly payments over 28 quarters. Kindly confirm the same. | Please refer the Sr no 12 of Corrigendum document |
| 205 | Page no 136, Payment Schedule | Payment Schedule | All OEMs generally ask for upfront payment of the licenses and it is difficult for System Integrator to manage the cashflow in such cases. Request you to please amend payment schedule so that System Integrator can get CAPEX value release CAPEX value at the time of Data Migration and Issuance of Preliminary Implementation Certificate for better cashflow. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 206 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment pg. no.136 | 1 Project Kick-off NIL Deployment of Project Manager & Minimum Required Manpower 2 Design Documentation and Development of Regulations Mapping Module 3 Requirement Gathering, Analysis, Design Documentation for complete ODPS Solution 4 a. Delivery of COTS product with valid licenses b. Development / Customization of all modules related Scrutiny Engine and Portal as per scope mentioned in RFP c. Integration with all authentication and notification facility as per RFP d. Hosting of developed solution for testing of test cases On completion of aforementioned milestones, 40% of Total CAPEX Value | 1 Project Kick-off Deployment of Project Manager & Minimum Required Manpower On completion of aforementioned milestones, 5% of Total CAPEX Value 2 Design Documentation and Development of Regulations Mapping Module On completion of aforementioned milestones, 5% of Total CAPEX Value 3 Requirement Gathering, Analysis, Design Documentation for complete ODPS Solution On completion of aforementioned milestones, 10% of Total CAPEX Value 4 a. Delivery of COTS product with valid licenses b. Development / Customization of all modules related Scrutiny Engine and Portal as per scope mentioned in RFP c. Integration with all authentication and notification facility as per RFP d. Hosting of developed solution for testing of test cases On completion of aforementioned milestones, 20% of Total CAPEX Value | No change. As per RFP. |
| 207 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment pg. no.137 | 7. Stabilization Period of a minimum of 12 months including state-wide rollout 10% of Total CAPEX Value shall be equated into 4 quarters and paid at the end of each quarter. | 7) Stabilization Period of a minimum of 12 months including state-wide rollout 20% of Total CAPEX Value shall be equated into 4 quarters and paid at the end of each quarter. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 208 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment pg. no.137 | 8. Issuance of Successful Implementation Certificate On completion of the aforementioned milestones, 20% of Total CAPEX Value | 8) Issuance of Successful Implementation Certificate On completion of aforementioned milestones, 10% of Total CAPEX Value | No change. As per RFP. |
| 209 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment. Page No. 136 | General | Considering the substantial initial financial investment required for project mobilization—including administrative expenses such as Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) submission and procurement of essential tools and resources—we kindly request you to divide the first payment milestone of 40% of Capex into four separate milestones in the payment terms as given below: Project kick off & deployment of minimum manpower - 10% Design Documentation and Development of Regulations Mapping Module - 10% Requirement Gathering, Analysis, Design Documentation for complete ODPS Solution - 10% Delivery of COTS licenses, development & customization, integration, deployment - 10%. | No change. As per RFP. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|--|---|---|
| 210 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment. Page No. 136 | Implementation Phase Milestone 2, 3 and 4 On completion of aforementioned milestones, 40% of Total CAPEX Value | As mentioned above the delivery milestones of Milestones 1, 2, 3, and 4 are grouped into a single payment milestone amounting to 40% of the total CAPEX value, although the timelines for each milestone are distinct. We request you to bifurcate this 40% capex payment across the individual milestones as mentioned above. So that the Service Provider can submit invoices separately upon the completion of each milestone, rather than waiting for completion of the four milestones before invoicing. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 211 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment, Point 9, Page 138 | 9 Annual Technical Support of COTS product "OPEX Value of the Project as per Point 2.1 of Financial Bid equated as yearly payments, after the end of each year from the date of Issuance of SIC" | The RFP specifies ATS payment on a yearly basis at the end of each year, whereas generally OEMs require ATS payment at the start of the year; this deviation may adversely impact the bidder's cash flow, Hence it should be revised as "OPEX Value of the Project as per Point 2.1 of Financial Bid equated as yearly payments, at the start of each year from the date of Issuance of SIC" | Please refer the Sr no 13 of Corrigendum document |
| 212 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment, Point 9, Page 138 | 9 Annual Technical Support of COTS product "OPEX Value of the Project as per Point 2.1 of Financial Bid equated as yearly payments, after the end of each year from the date of Issuance of SIC" | We kindly request that the clause be revised to ensure that yearly ATS payments are released at the beginning of each year, starting from the date of issuance of the SIC. | Please refer the Sr no 13 of Corrigendum document |
| 213 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment, Point 9, Page 138 | 9 Annual Technical Support of COTS product "OPEX Value of the Project as per Point 2.1 of Financial Bid equated as yearly payments, after the end of each year from the date of Issuance of SIC" | We kindly request that the clause be revised as follows: "OPEX Value of the Project, as per Point 2.1 of the Financial Bid, shall be equated as yearly payments, to be released at the start of each year from the date of issuance of SIC." | Please refer the Sr no 13 of Corrigendum document |
| 214 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment. Page No. 138 | Annual Technical Support of COTS product- yearly payments, after the end of each year from the date of Issuance of SIC | We request you to kindly revise the payment terms for Annual Technical Support (ATS) of the COTS product to allow quarterly payments at the end of each quarter, instead of a single yearly payment. This is requested as the bidder is required to make upfront payments to OEMs for ATS support, and quarterly payments would help align cash flows with actual expenses. | Please refer the Sr no 13 of Corrigendum document |
| 215 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment, Point 9, Page 138 | 9 Annual Technical Support of COTS product "OPEX Value of the Project as per Point 2.1 of Financial Bid equated as yearly payments, after the end of each year from the date of Issuance of SIC" | Recommend for OPEX value for the project and can be a as equivated payment . Kindly amend such a way for fund flow to the bidder so that deliverable will not affect by encouraging the bidder | Please refer the Sr no 13 of Corrigendum document |
| 216 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment/ Page 139 | Procedures of Payment a. T = Date of Award of GEM Contract/ Work Order | Generally, the actual work starts after signing the contract. Hence, we request the department to change the timeline to commence from the date of signing the contract. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 217 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment/ Page 139 | Procedures of Payment a. T = Date of Award of GEM Contract/ Work Order | We kindly request that the project timeline be revised to commence from the date of contract signing, as the actual work will begin only after the contract is executed. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 218 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment/ Page 139 | Procedures of Payment a. T = Date of Award of GEM Contract/ Work Order | Generally, the actual project activities commence only after signing the contract. Hence, we kindly request the department to kindly modify the clause so that the timeline is calculated from the date of signing of the contract rather than from the issuance of the LoA/notification. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 219 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment/ Page 139 | Procedures of Payment a. T = Date of Award of GEM Contract/ Work Order | The authority can extend mobilization amount for successfull bidder as well the timeline can be changed in advance to pay to the bidder. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 220 | Page 139, Procedures of Payment, Point h | Due payments shall be made at the earliest, generally within ninety (90) days after submission of an invoice along with necessary documents as per this RFP or as prescribed by the State Authority. | We request you to rephrase the clause to: Due payments shall be made at the earliest, generally within thirty (30) days after submission of an invoice along with necessary documents as per this RFP or as prescribed by the State Authority. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 221 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment/ Page 139 | Due payments shall be made at the earliest, generally within ninety (90) days after submission of an invoice along with necessary documents as per this RFP or as prescribed by the State Authority. | The proposed payment term of 90 days after submission of invoice is too long and may create a heavy cash flow burden on the bidder. We recommend that 90% of the invoice amount be released within 30 days of submission, with the balance 10% payable after verification of SLA within 90 days, which will ensure timely cash flow while still safeguarding the State Authority's interests | No change. As per RFP. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|---|---|--|
| 222 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment/ Page 139 | Due payments shall be made at the earliest, generally within ninety (90) days after submission of an invoice along with necessary documents as per this RFP or as prescribed by the State Authority. | We kindly request that the clause be modified to specify that 90% of the invoice amount will be paid within 30 days, with the remaining 10% to be paid after SLA verification within 90 days. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 223 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment/ Page 139 | Due payments shall be made at the earliest, generally within ninety (90) days after submission of an invoice along with necessary documents as per this RFP or as prescribed by the State Authority. | We kindly recommend revising the clause as follows: “90% of the invoice amount shall be released within 30 days of submission of invoice, and the remaining 10% shall be released after verification of SLA compliance within 90 days.” | No change. As per RFP. |
| 224 | SECTION - 7: Terms of Payment/ Page 139 | Due payments shall be made at the earliest, generally within ninety (90) days after submission of an invoice along with necessary documents as per this RFP or as prescribed by the State Authority. | 90 Days is too long to survive therefore make payment withing 30 to 45 days from the date of invoice also aallow automatically to rise the invocie while the milestone succeded without prior or formal approval to rise the tax invoice | No change. As per RFP. |
| 225 | 1.2 Purpose of this Document , Page No 10 | There will be no minimum commitment of business in respect of the development of application by the department at present or in future. Bidder may make their own assessment before submission of bids. No communication with respect to business/profit shall be entertained by State Authority during the currency of contract. | Kindly confirm, how this clause will be applicable to this RFP. | Please refer the Srno 14 of Corrigendum document |
| 226 | 1.2 Purpose of this Document , Page No 10 | There will be no minimum commitment of business in respect of the development of application by the department at present or in future. Bidder may make their own assessment before submission of bids. No communication with respect to business/profit shall be entertained by State Authority during the currency of contract. | This clause may be applicable for service model as Sq.Ft /Sq.Mt or file basis . Kindly confirm the type of needs if required. Understanding of the RFP by the TPVD it is sale of software and maintenance of a software. | Please refer the Srno 14 of Corrigendum document |
| 227 | 1.2 Purpose of this Document , Page No 10 | The application platform along with services and prices discovered through this RFP may be used by State Authority and /or other clients or customers of Gujarat Government. | As per our understanding, only manpower related rates discovered through this RFP will be used. Also, Other clients or customer. PI specify how many clients and will it be covered under same cost? | No response is necessary. |
| 228 | 1.2 Purpose of this Document , Page No 10 | The application platform along with services and prices discovered through this RFP may be used by State Authority and /or other clients or customers of Gujarat Government. | How many authorities / ULb's / Municiplaities will be covered under this procurements which enabling the bidder to analyze the volume and working of cost | Schedule-1 to the RFP enlists 219 ULBs and Development Authorities, where ODPS is under implementation as on date. Moreover, Section 1.5, Note 4 - Bidders are advised to refer GTPUD Act & Rules, CGDCR, etc. to understand the context of ODPS. Aforementioned documents are available on UD&UHD and TPVD website. Said above, bidder is supposed to refer '18. Other Instructions regarding Design & Development, ii (pg.95)' and '4.3.5 O&M Phase, ii-g (pg.104)' along with the overall context and content of RFP. |
| 229 | Purpose of this document 1.2 | The application platform along with services and prices discovered through this RFP may be used by TPVD and /or other clients or customers of Gujarat Government | Kindly clarify how many departments / Authority's other than TPVD also clarify about the bye laws similar or varied. This may require for quoting purpose. We understand this tender for TPVD, therefore restrict to TPVD will help and avoid confusion | No response is necessary. |
| 230 | 3.8 Preparation and Submission of Bid/ Paga no. 38 | (a) Part 1: EMD. (Online and hard Copy) (b) Part 2: Technical Bid. (Online only and 02 hard copies for reference*) (c) Part 3: Financial Bid (Online only) | Different bidder will have office in different state, hence request authority to allow two working days after bid submission date for hard copy submission. | Please refer the Srno 15 of Corrigendum document |
| 231 | 3.8 Preparation and Submission of Bid | (b) Part 2: Technical Bid. (Online only and 02 hard copies for reference*) | As we can see in the GeM notification a bidder can submit hardcopy to the Buyer within 5 days of Bid End date / Bid Opening date. Please confirm the same | Please refer the Sr no 15 of Corrigendum document |
| 232 | 3.8 Preparation and Submission of Bid | (b) Part 2: Technical Bid. (Online only and 02 hard copies for reference*) | Request to allow bidders to submit hardcopies of bid documents within 10 days after the online bid submission. This will provide bidders sufficient time to dispatch physical documents after online bid submission. | Please refer the Sr no 15 of Corrigendum document |
| 233 | 3.8 Preparation and Submission of Bid | (b) Part 2: Technical Bid. (Online only and 02 hard copies for reference*) Bids documents shall be accepted by the GIL on behalf of the TENDERER only during office hours on Business Days, up to the Bid Due Date | We kindly request you to allow bidders to submit the hardcopies of bid documents including Affidavit and EMD within five (5) days after the online bid submission. This will enable bidders to dispatch physical documents without affecting the timely submission of the online bid. | Please refer the Sr no 15 of Corrigendum document |
| 234 | 3.8 Preparation and Submission of Bid | (b) Part 2: Technical Bid. (Online only and 02 hard copies for reference*) | Submission of hardcopies may be delayed due to unforeseen circumstances. Therefore, we kindly request that bidders be allowed to submit the hardcopies of bid documents within 10 days after the online bid submission. This will help avoid any issues related to timely submission. | Please refer the Sr no 15 of Corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|--|--|--|
| 235 | 3.8 Preparation and Submission of Bid. Page no. 38 | * Hard copies to be submitted at GIL, whereby one copy of it shall be forwarded to TPVD for reference. | As per our understanding, all copies of the Technical Bid are to be submitted only at the GIL office, and GIL will forward one copy to TPVD for reference. Kindly confirm if this is correct. | Please refer the Sr no 15 of Corrigendum document |
| 236 | 3.8 Preparation and Submission of Bid. Page no. 38 | (b) Part 2: Technical Bid. (Online only and 02 hard copies for reference*) | Request to allow bidders to submit hardcopies of bid documents within seven (7) days after the online bid submission. This will enable bidders to ensure proper compilation, internal approvals, and dispatch of physical documents by courier without impacting online bid submission. | Please refer the Sr no 15 of Corrigendum document |
| 237 | 3.8 Preparation and Submission of Bid/ Page no. 38 | (a) Part 1: EMD. (Online and hard Copy) (b) Part 2: Technical Bid. (Online only and 02 hard copies for reference*) (c) Part 3: Financial Bid (Online only) | Allow 3 or 4 days to submit physical Hard Copies to reach the TPVD | Please refer the Sr no 15 of Corrigendum document |
| 238 | 3.8.2 Part 2: Technical Bid | A scanned copy of the Technical Bid (including all documentary evidence, required formats and declarations, copy of presentation, etc.) shall be uploaded online | We would like to clarify whether we can we submit copy of presentation at the time of presentation and submit Detailed approach and methodology and Proposed Solution Document along with Technical Bid. Please confirm | Copy of Technical Presentation, which bidder is supposed to present in front of Bid Evaluation Committee, may not be submitted while uploading other documents related to the Technical Bid. |
| 239 | 3.8.2 Part 2: Technical Bid | A scanned copy of the Technical Bid (including all documentary evidence, required formats and declarations, copy of presentation, etc.) shall be uploaded online | As per our understanding, the bidder is required to submit the Detailed Approach and Methodology along with the Proposed Solution Document as part of the Technical Bid. The copy of the presentation may be submitted at the time of the presentation. Kindly confirm. | Copy of Technical Presentation, which bidder is supposed to present in front of Bid Evaluation Committee, may not be submitted while uploading other documents related to the Technical Bid. |
| 240 | 9.1.14 Form 14: Self Declaration - AFFIDAVIT | TO BE SUBMITTED PHYSICALLY ALONG WITH EMD | As we can see in the GeM notification a bidder can submit hardcopy to the Buyer within 5 days of Bid End date / Bid Opening date. Please confirm the same | Please refer the Sr no 15 of Corrigendum document |
| 241 | 3.16 Performance Guarantee/Security | The Successful bidder has to submit Performance Bank Guarantee @ 10% of total order value within 20 days from the receipt of notification of award/Contract | We wish to bring to your notice that as per the amendment in General Financial Rules (GFR) 2017, Rule 171(i) on Performance Security dated 01.01.2024, the Performance Security to be obtained from the successful bidder should be in the range of three to five percent (3–5%) of the order value. Therefore, we kindly request you to reduce the PBG requirement to 5% of the total order value. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 242 | 3.16 Performance Guarantee/Security | The Successful bidder has to submit Performance Bank Guarantee @ 10% of total order value within 20 days from the receipt of notification of award/Contract | As per RFP, the amount of PBG is 10% - which is very high for such high value and long term project, Therefore we request you to reduce the PBG amount to 5% of contract value. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 243 | 3.16 Performance Guarantee/Security Page No. 43 | The Successful bidder has to submit Performance Bank Guarantee @ 10% of total order value within 20 days from the receipt of notification of award/Contract | We kindly request you to consider the amendment to Rule 171(i) of the General Financial Rules (GFR), 2017, as per Office Memorandum No. F.1/2/2023-PPD dated 01.01.2024, issued by the Ministry of Finance. The revised rule stipulates that the performance security for procurement of Goods, Consultancy, and Non-Consultancy Services should be in the range of 3% to 5%, instead of the earlier provision of up to 10%. In view of this, we request you to revise the performance security percentage mentioned in the tender documents accordingly | No change. As per RFP. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|---|---|---|
| 244 | 3.16 Performance Guarantee/Security Page No. 43 | The Successful bidder has to submit Performance Bank Guarantee @ 10% of total order value within 20 days from the receipt of notification of award/Contract | <p>The total contract period is divided into two parts:</p> <p>CAPEX: 1 year 9 months O&M: 7 years 3 months</p> <p>In view of this, we request consideration for separate Performance Bank Guarantees (PBGs) for each phase.</p> <p>Additionally, since banks typically issue PBGs for a maximum of 5 years, we propose the following structure:</p> <p>1st PBG for CAPEX – valid for 1 year 9 months, submitted at project start 2nd PBG for O&M – valid for 4 years, submitted at the start of the O&M phase 3rd PBG for O&M – valid for 3 years 3 months, submitted at the beginning of the 5th year</p> | No change. As per RFP. |
| 245 | 3.30 Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights Page no 53 | I. The TENDERER shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights including, but not limited to, patents, copyrights, and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how, or documents and other materials which the Bidder has developed for the performance of services under this RFP and which bear a direct relation to or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of services under this RFP, and the Bidder acknowledges and agrees that such products, documents and other materials constitute works made for hire for the TENDERER. ii.At the request of TENDERER, the Bidder shall take all necessary steps, execute all necessary documents and generally assist in securing all such proprietary rights and transferring or licensing them to the TENDERER in compliance with the requirements of the applicable law and this RFP. iii.All IPR in relation to project documents, assets, resources, designs, drawings, estimates, recommendations, source codes, application, IEC material, etc. shall vest with the TENDERER, and the bidder shall not use any such for any other purpose. | <p>In case of the Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) product being proposed, we request the following clarification and modification to the clause:</p> <p>The IPR of the core COTS product, including its source code, design, architecture, patents, trademarks, etc shall remain with the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) and shall not be transferred to the TENDERER.</p> <p>This is a complex and sensitive application and OEM would not agree transferring of IPR of any sort.</p> | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 246 | 3.30 Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights Page no 53 | i.The TENDERER shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights including, but not limited to, patents, copyrights, and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how, or documents and other materials which the Bidder has developed for the performance of services under this RFP and which bear a direct relation to or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of services under this RFP, and the Bidder acknowledges and agrees that such products, documents and other materials constitute works made for hire for the TENDERER. ii.At the request of TENDERER, the Bidder shall take all necessary steps, execute all necessary documents and generally assist in securing all such proprietary rights and transferring or licensing them to the TENDERER in compliance with the requirements of the applicable law and this RFP. iii.All IPR in relation to project documents, assets, resources, designs, drawings, estimates, recommendations, source codes, application, IEC material, etc. shall vest with the TENDERER, and the bidder shall not use any such for any other purpose. | We kindly request confirmation that the Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) of the core COTS product (including source code, design, architecture, patents, trademarks, etc.) will remain with the OEM and will not be transferred to the Tenderer, as OEMs are generally unable to agree to the transfer of such IPR. | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|--|--|---|
| 247 | 3.30 Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights Page no 53 | i.The TENDERER shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights including, but not limited to, patents, copyrights, and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how, or documents and other materials which the Bidder has developed for the performance of services under this RFP and which bear a direct relation to or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of services under this RFP, and the Bidder acknowledges and agrees that such products, documents and other materials constitute works made for hire for the TENDERER. ii.At the request of TENDERER, the Bidder shall take all necessary steps, execute all necessary documents and generally assist in securing all such proprietary rights and transferring or licensing them to the TENDERER in compliance with the requirements of the applicable law and this RFP. iii.All IPR in relation to project documents, assets, resources, designs, drawings, estimates, recommendations, source codes, application, IEC material, etc. shall vest with the TENDERER, and the bidder shall not use any such for any other purpose. | In case a Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) product is proposed, we KINDLY request clarification and amendment of the IPR clause. The Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) of the core COTS product — including but not limited to its source code, design, architecture, patents, and trademarks — shall remain with the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) and shall not be transferred to the Tenderer. Given the sensitivity and complexity of such applications, OEMs generally do not agree to transfer ownership of IPR in any form. We therefore request the department to kindly amend the clause accordingly. | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 248 | 3.30 Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights. Page No. 53 | The TENDERER shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights including, but not limited to, patents, copyrights, and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how, or documents and other materials which the Bidder has developed for the performance of services under this RFP and which bear a direct relation to or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of services under this RFP, and the Bidder acknowledges and agrees that such products, documents and other materials constitute works made for hire for the TENDERER | Our understanding is that the Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and pre-existing source code of the COTS product shall remain with the OEM. However, the Bidder is required to handover the complete source code, program files, configuration files, setup files, project documentation, and other relevant artifacts that are specifically developed for this project, on top of the COTS product. Kindly confirm. | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 249 | 3.30 Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights Page no 53 | i.The TENDERER shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights including, but not limited to, patents, copyrights, and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how, or documents and other materials which the Bidder has developed for the performance of services under this RFP and which bear a direct relation to or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of services under this RFP, and the Bidder acknowledges and agrees that such products, documents and other materials constitute works made for hire for the TENDERER. ii.At the request of TENDERER, the Bidder shall take all necessary steps, execute all necessary documents and generally assist in securing all such proprietary rights and transferring or licensing them to the TENDERER in compliance with the requirements of the applicable law and this RFP. iii.All IPR in relation to project documents, assets, resources, designs, drawings, estimates, recommendations, source codes, application, IEC material, etc. shall vest with the TENDERER, and the bidder shall not use any such for any other purpose. | An IPR right of Auto Scrutiny Engine of SMART DCR our Product of Vinzas solution India Private Limited belongs to us as we being the OEM and that's the world standard and practice of any application and implementation. OEM issues only Licenses and updates as change request / Patches/ AMC period. However the workflow the process of development of the web portion source code can be given not the Auto Scrutiny Engine of SMART DCR. Kindly amend | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 250 | P-53, 3.30. iii | Copyright and Intellectual Property Rightsiii. All IPR in relation to project documents, assets, resources, designs, drawings, estimates, recommendations, source codes, application, IEC material, etc. shall vest with the TENDERER, and the bidder shall not use any such for any other purpose | Please clarify whether the customisation work done for this Project alone needs to be transferred | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 251 | Section 3.3.61, point Xic. Page 57 | CGDCR, All IEC materials and related editable softcopies shall be Intellectual Property of State Authority and shall be handed to State Authority. | SmartDCR is a proprietary product so Source code, IPR cannot be provided for the product as well as the customization done for department in SmartDCR. Source code and all rights of the web portion will be provided. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|---|---|---|
| 252 | Section 3.36.1 -xi.c page 57 | Apart from COTS, Service Provider to hand-over the entire software including entire source code, program files, configuration files, setup files, project documentation, and other relevant documents. | SmartDCR is a proprietary product so Source code, IPR cannot be provided for the product as well as the customization done for department in SmartDCR. Source code and all rights of the web portion along with workflow will be provided. | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 253 | 3.36 Exit Management. Page No. 57 | H. Apart from COTS, Service Provider to hand-over the entire software including entire source code, program files, configuration files, setup files, project documentation, and other relevant documents | Our understanding is that the Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and pre-existing source code of the COTS product shall remain with the OEM. However, the Bidder is required to handover the complete source code, program files, configuration files, setup files, project documentation, and other relevant artifacts that are specifically developed for this project, on top of the COTS product. Kindly confirm. | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 254 | 3.36 Exit Management. Page No. 57 | H. Apart from COTS, Service Provider to hand-over the entire software including entire source code, program files, configuration files, setup files, project documentation, and other relevant documents | In case of AI based application modules and Blockchain based application modules, the bidder will have to use standard third party software components to build the modules. The source code and IPR for such 3rd party software components are owned by their OEMs. So It may kindly be confirmed that the bidder will provide licenses of such third party components along with the source code built on top of those components during exit management for the AI & Blockchain based modules. | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 255 | 3.36.2 (II) Transfer of Assets | The Service Provider, if not already done, will transfer all the Software Licenses under the name of the State Authority as desired by the procuring entity during the exit management period. (perpetual license only) | Note:Perpetual licence of smart dcr will be given but other Third party softwares mostly shifted to Rental yearly Model , Therefore amedment needed as perpetual/ as per OEM's | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 256 | 3.36.2, Via, page 60 | Documentation relating to Intellectual Property Rights | IPR rights cannot be provided or any documentation pertaining to that related to Smart DCR | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 257 | 3.36.2 (II) Transfer of Assets | Documentation relating to Intellectual Property Rights | Since Intellectual Property Rights retained by the OEM therefore no need of IPR documentation | Please refer the Sr no 16 of Corrigendum document |
| 258 | 3.36.2 Transfer of Assets/ Page 58 | The Service Provider may continue work on the assets for the duration of the exit management period which may be 45 days period from the date of expiry or termination of the contract, | Kindly confirm, 45 days which is after expiry or termination of the contract will be additionally paid to the bidder. | Please refer no Sr on 17 of Corrigendum document |
| 259 | 3.36.2 Transfer of Assets/ Page 58 | The Service Provider may continue work on the assets for the duration of the exit management period which may be 45 days period from the date of expiry or termination of the contract, | Could you kindly confirm if the 45 days following the expiry or termination of the contract will be paid additionally to the bidder? | Please refer no Sr on 17 of Corrigendum document |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|---|--|--|
| 260 | 3.36.2 Transfer of Assets/ Page 58 | The Service Provider may continue work on the assets for the duration of the exit management period which may be 45 days period from the date of expiry or termination of the contract, | Kindly confirm, 45 days which is after expiry or termination of the contract will be additionally paid to the bidder. | Please refer no Sr on 17 of Corrigendum document |
| 261 | 3.36.2 Transfer of Assets/ Page 58 | The Service Provider may continue work on the assets for the duration of the exit management period which may be 45 days period from the date of expiry or termination of the contract, | Payable or Non Payable. Please expand | Please refer no Sr on 17 of Corrigendum document |
| 262 | 3.36.3 Training, Handholding and Knowledge Transfer/ Page 62 | The Service Provider shall hold technical knowledge transfer sessions with designated technical team of the State Authority in the last 45 days of the project duration. | As per our understanding, KT will be done for 45 days before expiry of contract | Please refer no Sr on 18 of Corrigendum document |
| 263 | 3.36.3 Training, Handholding and Knowledge Transfer/ Page 62 | The Service Provider shall hold technical knowledge transfer sessions with designated technical team of the State Authority in the last 45 days of the project duration. | Agreeing however after contract period if extended it will be charagble wheather it is knowledge transfer or extension of AMC | Please refer no Sr on 18 of Corrigendum document |
| 264 | General | SLA | SLAs articulated are well, but the penalty is mentioned at various levels is very high and at some SLAs, penalties may attract up to 50% of monthly payments and would demotivate prospective bidders from participating in the bid. We request the department to reduce the penalty and that should be applicable on a working hours/days basis. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 265 | General | SLA | Penalty should be totally removed since it is evolving process by the department and by the bidder together .However it can be seriously viewed if there is substantially long delay by the bidder even after the authority's discussion and debates. A new scale factor can be adopted after the contract period ends. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 266 | Page 122, 5.4 Performance Evaluation, Table 1 : Outcome oriented SLA | Penalty is capped at 10% at implementation phase but not capped at other phases including O&M. | We request you to cap the penalty for each phase. | No change. As per RFP. |
| 267 | Schedule 2 – Description of Profiles i.e. Minimum Qualification, Skills Required, Experience, etc. | Project Manager Qualification : ☑ Bachelors / Masters from Computer / IT / IT related engineering background from recognized University AND ☑ MBA from recognized University with majors in any discipline except HR | We request you to consider qualification as B.E / B.Tech / BSC in CS / BCA / MCA in IT or Civil or Architect with MBA qualification for the project manager. This will help bidder to identify more suitable profile for successful execution of the project | Please refer the Sr no 19 of Corrigemdum Document |
| 268 | Schedule 2 – Description of Profiles i.e. Minimum Qualification, Skills Required, Experience, etc. | Project Manager Qualification : ☑ Bachelors / Masters from Computer / IT / IT related engineering background from recognized University AND ☑ MBA from recognized University with majors in any discipline except HR | for the position of project manager we request you to consider qualifications such as B.E., B.Tech., B.Sc. in Computer Science, BCA, MCA, and M.Tech or degrees in Civil Engineering or Architecture and MBA. This will helpfull to bidders to identify more suitable profiles for the successful execution of the project. | Please refer the Sr no 19 of Corrigemdum Document |
| 269 | 9.1.3 Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | In the format provided for the financial summary of the bidder, the column for Net Worth is not available. We kindly request you to either correct the format by including the Net Worth column, or please confirm if bidders may submit a separate certificate for Net Worth | The bidder is required to provide the Average Annual Turnover of the Bidder of last three financial year |
| 270 | 9.1.3 Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | We request you to consider a certificate issued by a Chartered Accountant with UDIN | No Change as per RFP |
| 271 | 9.1.3 Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | The Bidder shall submit audited annual reports (financial statements: balance sheets, profit and loss account, notes to accounts etc.) in support of the financial data duly certified by statutory auditor/s. | We kindly request you to consider only the audited Financial Statements, namely the Balance Sheet and Profit & Loss Statement, for evaluation purposes, instead of the complete audit report, as submission of the entire report would substantially increase the size of the bid document | No Change as per RFP |
| 272 | 9.1.3 Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | We have observed that the net worth column is not included in the provided format. Kindly confirm whether the bidder is permitted to add a net worth column to the existing format or, bidder can submit separate Net Worth Certificate | The bidder is required to provide the Average Annual Turnover of the Bidder of last three financial year |
| 273 | 9.1.3 Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | The bidder is allowed to submit the turnover certificate either from Chartered Accountant or from the Statutory Auditor. Kindly confirm if this is correct. | Turnover certificate from Chartered Account shall be considered |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|--|---|--|--|
| 274 | 9.1.3 Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | The Bidder shall submit audited annual reports (financial statements: balance sheets, profit and loss account, notes to accounts etc.) in support of the financial data duly certified by statutory auditor/s. | The GeM portal imposes limitations on document size and number of pages. Uploading audit reports for three financial years significantly increases the size of the bid documents, which may require compression and can compromise document quality. Therefore, we kindly request you to consider allowing the submission of only the relevant extracts of the Balance Sheet and Profit & Loss statements, instead of the full audit reports | No Change. As per RFP. Bidder may compress the file size and upload it on GEM. |
| 275 | 9.1.3 Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder. Page No. 153 | Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | We have noticed that the net worth column is not available in the provided format. Kindly confirm whether the bidder may add a net worth column in the given format or alternatively submit a separate net worth certificate. | The bidder is required to provide the Average Annual Turnover of the Bidder of last three financial year |
| 276 | 9.1.3 Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder. Page No. 153 | Form 3: Format for Financial Summary of the Bidder | As per our understanding, the bidder can submit the certificate from either a Chartered Accountant or the Statutory Auditor. Kindly confirm if this is correct. | Turnover certificate from Chartered Account shall be considered |
| 277 | 9.1.5 Form 5: Not Terminated, Not Being Insolvent or In Receivership or Bankrupt | In response to the Tender Ref. No. _____ dated _____ for "Selection of the agency for providing Conception and Crafting of a Booking Website, alongside the Development of Various Web Modules, Coupled with the Design and Implementation of a Comprehensive Mobile Application.", | We have noticed that the name of the RFP mentioned in the document pertains to another RFP. We kindly request you to correct the same. | Please refer the Sr no 20 of Corrigendum Document |
| 278 | 9.1.5 Form 5: Not Terminated, Not Being Insolvent or In Receivership or Bankrupt | In response to the Tender Ref. No. _____ dated _____ for "Selection of the agency for providing Conception and Crafting of a Booking Website, alongside the Development of Various Web Modules, Coupled with the Design and Implementation of a Comprehensive Mobile Application.", | We have observed that there is a typographical error in the sentence mentioned here. Kindly check and confirm. | Please refer the Sr no 20 of Corrigendum Document |
| 279 | Page 155, 9.1.5 Form 5 | 9.1.5 Form 5: Not Terminated, Not Being Insolvent or In Receivership or Bankrupt | We request that in the first para instead of "Owner/Partner/Director" can we have "authorised signatory" since all undertaking/annexures/forms are being signed by our authorised signatory. | No Change, As per RFP |
| 280 | Forms | To be provided in original on stamp paper of value required under law duly Signed by 'bidder | We request you to kindly confirm whether the bidder may submit Forms 14, 16, 17, and 18 on the company's letterhead | Form 14 is on stamp paper and form 16 and 17 are on bidder letter head |
| 281 | Page: 172 9.1.14 Form 14 | 9.1.14 Form 14: Self Declaration My / Our Company has not filed any Writ Petition, Court matter and there is no court matter filed by State Government and its Board Corporation, is pending against our company. | We kindly request you to removed the "My / Our Company has not filed any Writ Petition, Court matter" verbatim as the same would be very broad for an organisation at the scale of GNFC. | No change as per RFP |
| 282 | Page: 173 9.1.15 Form 15 | 5. 9.1.15 Form 15: Format for Power of Attorney | We want to understand, whether this POA execution can be negated if the organisation has an existing POA in the favour of the authorised signatory? | Organasation may submit details with existing POA untill and unless, it has not been invalidated by the Competent Authority/ Time Duration mentioned in POA. |
| 283 | GeM bid Notification document | Bid End Date/Time 02-09-2025 15:00:00 | We kindly request you to extend the bid submission date by 20 days from the current deadline. Considering the requirements outlined in the RFP. | Bid end date is extended. |
| 284 | GeM bid Notification document | Bid End Date/Time 02-09-2025 15:00:00 | We kindly request you to extend the bid submission deadline by 15 days from the current date, in view of the detailed requirements of the RFP and the time required to prepare a comprehensive and well-structured bid response." | Bid end date is extended. |
| 285 | GeM bid Notification document | Bid End Date/Time 02-09-2025 15:00:00 | We kindly request you to extend the bid submission deadline by 20 days from the current due date. As we require additional time to prepare a comprehensive and well-structured bid response. | Bid end date is extended. |
| 286 | GeM bid Notification document | Bid End Date/Time 02-09-2025 15:00:00 | We kindly request you to extend the bid submission date by 15 working days from the current Bid End Date. As very limited time is available and we need more time to prepare bid response. | Bid end date is extended. |
| 287 | GeM bid invitation | Bid End Date/Time 02-09-2025 15:00:00 | This is a complex & long term project and requires thorough preparation for bid submission. The time provided for such complex bid preparation is very short. Therefore we request you to extend the bid submission date by about three week to allow sufficient time and facilitate wider participation of bidders. | Bid end date is extended. |
| 288 | GeM Bid Document | GeM documentmentions that BidOpening is 02-09-2025 15:00, Bid End 02-09-2025 15:30 | Please provide clarification on submission date and process of extensions. The TPVD RFP Full Tender (173 pages document) does not share a tender number or dates) | Bid end date is extended. |
| 289 | General Query | On https://gil.gujarat.gov.in/TenderDetails.aspx?TenID=12537 , the bid end date shows 20-9-2025 whereas on gem.gov.in and in PDF it shows 2-9-2025. | Which one of 2-9-2025 or 20-9-2025 is the correct end date ? | Bid end date is extended. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| 46 | Suggestion | | <p>Relaxations for startups can be included if they can demonstrate the capabilities.</p> <p>Misc:</p> <p>3.16.1 The Successful bidder has to submit Performance Bank Guarantee @ 10% of total order value within 20 days from the receipt of notification of award/Contract Signing for the duration of warranty of all Nationalized Bank including the public sector bank or Private Sector Banks authorized by RBI or Commercial Bank or Regional Rural Banks of Gujarat or Co-Operative Bank of Gujarat (operating in India having branch at Ahmedabad/Gandhinagar) as per the G.R. no. EMD/4/2022/0002/DMO dated 20.05.2022 issued by Finance Department or further instruction issued by Finance department time to time. (The draft of Performance Bank Guarantee is as per Section</p> <p>3.33 Consortium No Consortium participation is permitted for this bid.</p> <p>For our reference</p> <p>4.2 (21) Considering past experience and new scope, peak concurrent users is expected at 5000 for Portal, whereas at peak time it is expected to process 1000 CAD files in a day.</p> | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 290 | Requesting for Detailed Clarifications | | <p>Scope of Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you clarify the exact functional modules expected in ODPS 3.0 (e.g., GIS integration, workflow automation, citizen portal, mobile app)? • Is there any data migration requirement from ODPS 2.0 or legacy systems? • Will the department provide the base GIS layers and maps, or is the bidder expected to prepare them? • What is the expected volume of data (documents, maps, transactions) to be migrated/handled? | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 291 | Requesting for Detailed Clarifications | | <p>Technical Specifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please confirm if there is any preferred technology stack (open-source vs proprietary). • Should hosting be on State Data Centre (SDC), cloud, or hybrid? • Is there a requirement for integration with external systems (land records, revenue, UIDAI, payment gateway, etc.)? • Is the solution expected to be multilingual (Gujarati, Hindi, English)? | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 292 | Requesting for Detailed Clarifications | | <p>Manpower & Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the minimum on-site presence of resources expected at department offices? • Are bidders expected to provide training and capacity-building programs for departmental staff? • Is there any requirement for GIS experts/urban planners in addition to IT staff | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 293 | Requesting for Detailed Clarifications | | <p>Service Level Agreements (SLA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the expected response and resolution time for support issues? • What penalties are applicable for non-compliance with SLA? | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 294 | Technology Approach (COTS vs Custom) (Page No.48) | References to “COTS solution for automated Building Permission/Scrutiny Engine” and OEM prerequisites. | <p>Request to allow custom-built solutions that meet all functional, performance, interoperability, security, audit, and SLA criteria as :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. COTS solution incurs high licensing costs and will increase additional cost in project . 2. MoHUA based OSS platform UPYOG is safe, secure and highly customizable and does not require license. 3. While using UPYOG you don't require OEM certificate and pre-requisites. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 295 | Open-Source Usage (General Conditions; AI 4.3.2(17A); Blockchain 4.3.2(17B)) (Page No.53) | No explicit cross-stack allowance (AI mentions OSS; stack-wide clarity needed). | Explicitly allow safe, secure, customizable open-source components across application/AI/blockchain under OSI-approved licenses; require SBOM, CVE remediation per SLA, CERT-In compliance. | The query is not clear. |

| Sr. | Bidding Document Reference (clause/ page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of clarification required | Response to the vendors |
|-----|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 296 | General | General | <p>In the mentioned Pre-qualification and Technical Qualification criteria, it appears that the conditions have been designed in such a way that only a particular agency, which fulfills all these requirements, is able to qualify. This creates a perception of favoritism and restricts fair competition.</p> <p>As this tender relates to software development, such restrictive clauses are unnecessary and may discourage capable and competitive bidders from participating. We therefore respectfully request the authority to provide relaxation in the mentioned clauses. The criteria should not be locked in a manner that limits participation, but instead be framed to encourage wider involvement and allow more qualified bidders to compete.</p> | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |
| 297 | Suggestion | | The software supports drawing files created in any CAD software and does not depend on AUTOCAD which costs the architect for a license. Small Architects should be able to use cheaper / Free CAD software for creating their drawings. | No change. RFP is self-explanatory. |

Annexure-I

On letterhead of Bidder

**Sub : Undertaking as per Office Memorandum No.: F. No.6/18/2019-PPD dated
23.07.2020 published by Ministry of Finance, Dept. of Expenditure, Public
Procurement division**

Ref: Bid Number: _____

I have read the clause regarding restriction on procurement from a bidder of a country which shares a land border with India. I certify that we as a bidder and quoted product from following OEMs are not from such a country or, if from such a country, these quoted products OEM has been registered with competent authority. I hereby certify that these quoted product & its OEM fulfills all requirements in this regard and is eligible to be considered for procurement for Bid number_____.

| No. | Item Category | Quoted Make & Model |
|-----|---------------|---------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

In case I'm supplying material from a country which shares a land border with India, I will provide evidence for valid registration by the competent authority, otherwise GIL/End user Dept. reserves the right to take legal action on us.

(Signature)

Authorized Signatory of **M/s <<Name of Company>>**

Annexure-II

On letterhead of OEM

**Sub : Undertaking as per Office Memorandum No.: F. No.6/18/2019-PPD dated
23.07.2020 published by Ministry of Finance, Dept. of Expenditure, Public
Procurement division**

Ref: Bid Number: _____

Dear Sir,

I have read the clause regarding restriction on procurement from a bidder of a country which shares a land border with India. I certify that our quoted product and our company are not from such a country, or if from such a country, our quoted product and our company have been registered with competent authority. I hereby certify that these quoted product and our company fulfills all requirements in this regard and is eligible to be considered for procurement for Bid number_____.

| No. | Item Category | Quoted Make & Model |
|-----|---------------|---------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

In case I'm supplying material from a country which shares a land border with India, I will provide evidence for valid registration by the competent authority; otherwise GIL/End user Dept. reserves the right to take legal action on us.

(Signature)

Authorized Signatory of **M/s <<Name of Company>>**

Annexure-III

Bidder needs to provide compliance/undertaking/details for their quoted product under this bid

In response to the Request for Proposal (RFP)/GeM Bid [RFP/GeM bid reference number] issued by [Organization Name], we, [Bidder's Company Name], hereby provide the following undertaking/details regarding the software product quoted in our proposal:

| Sr. No. | Product/Software Description | Name of OEM | OEM Model/Part No. | Product ID of OEM |
|---------|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|---------|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|

We [Organization Name] agrees to provide the quoted software product(s) within the timeframes and under the conditions outlined in the bid.

(Signature and Seal)

Authorized Signatory of M/s << Bidder's Company Name >>