

Response to the PreBid Queries for RFP for Provision of Google Gemini Services, Government of Gujarat for Gujarat Informatics Limited Gandhinagar, Gujarat				
Sr No	Bid clause /Page no/	Bid clause	Query from bidder	Response to the vendor
1	Financial BOQ (Section 3.7)	Name of Service - Google Vision API(OCR) Unit Rate (Without GST) - Per 1000 Pages	The Financial BOQ (Section 3.7) lists 'Google Vision API (OCR)' billed at 'Per 1000 Pages'. However, Google Vision API does not offer OCR billed per 1000 pages instead Google Vision API bills per image/feature . For example, if you apply Face Detection and Label Detection to the same image, you are billed for one unit of Label Detection and one unit for Face Detection. Google Document AI bills 'Per 1000 Pages' , is also explicitly referenced in the Scope of Work Section 3. Kindly clarify whether the BOQ line item should read 'Google Document AI (OCR Processor)' so we can quote accurately and the BOQ reflects the correct Google product.	The required OCR service is Google Cloud Vision API using the DOCUMENT_TEXT_DETECTION feature, invoked per single page-image (the system submits one image per page, with one OCR feature per image). Vision API bills one unit per image per feature 1,000 pages = 1,000 image-OCR units Bidders shall <u>quote the rate per 1,000 pages</u> for <u>Google Cloud Vision API OCR</u> . Google Document AI is not required."
2	Scope of Work (Section 3)	Mentions 'Google Document AI' for OCR processing, while the Financial BOQ mentions 'Google Vision API (OCR)'	Are we free to use Google Document AI as the OCR service, or is Google Vision API specifically mandated? These are two distinct Google Cloud products with different capabilities and pricing structures.	Google Cloud Vision API (DOCUMENT_TEXT_DETECTION) is the required OCR service. Bidders shall quote for Vision API. Google Document AI is not required;
3	Financial BOQ (Section 3.7)	No development/professional services line item in BOQ	The Scope of Work includes significant professional services deliverables — hybrid architecture design, API integration layer, Vector DB integration, RBAC module, audit logging system, usage dashboard, and officer training. However, the Financial BOQ has no line item for development or professional services cost. Should these costs be included within the API unit rates, or will a separate BOQ line item be permitted for <i>nonprofessional/integration services</i> ?	The on-premise application is already developed and owned by GIL; no application development is required from the bidder. The bidder's scope is limited to (a) provisioning the Google Cloud API services [Need access of dashboard to show the actual usage]
4	Financial BOQ (Section 3.7)	Input vs output token billing for Gemini	Google Gemini 2.5 Flash charges input and output tokens at different rates (\$0.30 and \$2.50 per 1M tokens respectively). The BOQ has a single line item 'LLM per 1M tokens' with one rate column. Should bidders quote a blended rate combining input and output, or will two separate line items be added for input tokens and output tokens?	Separate input and output token rates are required. Input and output are priced very differently , so the LLM line will be split into two sub-items (Input tokens / Output tokens), billed on actual usage.
5	Scope of Work (Section 4.2-4.3)	DOCX and TEXT file handling	The scope requires support for DOCX and TEXT file formats. These formats contain machine-readable text and do not require OCR processing. Can GIL confirm that text extraction from DOCX and TEXT files will be handled on-premise without Document AI API calls , and that the OCR BOQ line item applies only to PDF and image-based documents?	-Document AI is not being used. -DOCX / TXT format are not in the system only the Images (extracted from the PDFs) goes for OCR
6	Eligibility Criteria/ Pre-Qualification Criteria: (Section 1.2)	Authorization letter from Google	Eligibility Criterion 9 requires 'Manufacturing Authorization of Google'. This criterion is typically applicable to hardware/product resellers on GeM. Since this tender is for Google Cloud API services (software), can GIL clarify what specific document from Google is acceptable — for example, Google Cloud Partner Advantage certificate, Google Cloud reseller authorization letter, or a letter from Google India confirming <i>authorized API service provision</i> ?"	Yes, Google India is authorized a bidder for providing the service Google Gemini by Authorization letter for this tender
7	Payment Terms (2.20.1.1)	The RFP states payment will be made quarterly based on actual API usage	Payment on actual consumption - "The RFP states payment will be made quarterly based on actual API usage. Can GIL clarify the minimum guaranteed consumption, if any? If actual usage is near zero in a quarter due to low adoption by government officers, will the bidder still be compensated for the development and integration work already delivered?"	No Change
8	Extension of Contract (2.20)	Section 2.20 states the contract may be extended for one more year at the same financial rate	Google Cloud API prices may change during the contract period. If Google increases its API pricing during the extension/current year, will the bidder be permitted to revise rates accordingly, or will the original quoted rates be strictly enforced?	No Change
9	Penalty Clause (Section 2.20.1.2.1)	Section 2.20.1.2.1 states a penalty of 0.5% of order value per week for delay in deliverables.	Can GIL clarify what constitutes the 'order value' for penalty calculation — is it the total estimated contract value based on indicative quantities, or the actual consumption value billed to date?	10% penalty of actual consumption.
10	Scope of Work (Section 3)	The scope states the bidder must integrate with GIL's existing on-premise document management application and existing chat UI	Will GIL provide complete technical documentation, API specifications, and source code access for the existing application after work order issuance, so that we can design the integration accurately?	GIL team developed the application in-house so bidder needs to provide required APIs as requested as per RFP.
11	Section 2.20.1.1 – Payment Terms, Page 11	"The payment will be released quarterly on actual usage of Service as mentioned in Detailed BOQ of Financial table."	Since the underlying Google Cloud services (Google Vision API / OCR, Gemini LLM, and Embedding APIs) are billed by Google to the service provider on a monthly basis, a quarterly payment cycle creates a structural cash flow mismatch for the bidder. The bidder is required to pre-fund Google API costs for up to three months before receiving any reimbursement from GIL, which increases working capital burden and financial risk — particularly given that consumption volumes are not guaranteed. It is therefore requested that the payment cycle be revised from quarterly to monthly , based on actual usage reported and verified at the end of each calendar month. This will bring the payment terms in alignment with the billing cycle of the underlying cloud platform and reduce the financial risk premium that bidders would otherwise be required to build into their quoted rates.	No Change
12	Section 6.4 – Performance and Reliability, Page 18	"One dashboard will be developed/provided to see the actual usage of Google Gemini Service."	The RFP explicitly mandates development and provisioning of a usage monitoring dashboard as part of the deliverables. However, the Detailed BOQ contains no separate line item for this deliverable. It is unclear whether the dashboard development, hosting, and maintenance cost is expected to be absorbed within the API consumption rates quoted in the BOQ, or whether a separate line item will be added to the BOQ for this deliverable. Pricing a development deliverable within a per-unit API consumption rate is technically inappropriate and would result in non-transparent pricing. It is therefore requested that GIL either add a separate line item in the BOQ for the Usage Monitoring Dashboard , or explicitly clarify in a corrigendum that this deliverable is to be provided at no additional cost and is included within the API service rates.	Need access of dashboard/console to show the actual usage.

13	Section 3 – Scope of Work, Page 14-15	"The bidder must provide the following professional services to deliver the project: Hybrid Architecture Design — Create a detailed design of the secure data flow between the on-premise environment and Google Cloud APIs."	The RFP scope of work clearly requires the bidder to provide professional services including hybrid architecture design, secure data flow documentation, and integration services between the on-premise GSDC environment and Google Cloud APIs. These are one-time professional service deliverables distinct from ongoing API consumption. However, the Detailed BOQ contains only three line items — all of which are recurring API usage costs (OCR per 1000 pages, LLM per 1 million tokens, Embedding per 1 million tokens). There is no line item for professional or implementation services. Embedding one-time professional service costs within per-unit API rates will distort pricing, make evaluation non-comparable across bidders, and create disputes during contract execution. It is therefore requested that GIL add a separate line item in the BOQ for Professional / Implementation Services , or explicitly clarify that all professional services including architecture design, integration, and deployment are to be delivered at no additional cost and are included within the API consumption rates.	GIL team developed the application in-house so bidder needs to provide required APIs as requested as per RFP.
14	Clause 1.1.4 – General Instructions, Page 3 and Clause 3.7 – Financial Bid, Page 19	The RFP states that quantities mentioned in the Financial Bid are indicative estimates for financial evaluation and GIL does not guarantee the volume of work. The successful bidder shall be paid for actual units consumed.	We request the department to kindly provide the estimated monthly and annual consumption volume for OCR pages, Gemini LLM tokens, and Embedding tokens for better price estimation and capacity planning. Also, kindly clarify whether any minimum committed quantity or minimum billing commitment will be applicable during the contract period, since pricing of cloud/API services may vary based on expected usage volumes. Without indicative quantities, it is not possible to compute a meaningful Grand Total in the BOQ or quote commercially viable per-unit rates.	No Change
15	Clause 3.7 – Financial Bid, Page 19	The BOQ provides unit-rate-based items for Google Vision API (OCR), LLM Gemini 2.5 Flash or updated, and Embedding. However, the RFP does not specify the expected input/output token split, document volume, document size, average pages per document, or expected number of users.	Kindly provide indicative assumptions for: (a) expected number of concurrent and total users, (b) monthly document volume and average document size/pages, (c) expected OCR page volume per month, (d) expected input and output token consumption split for LLM per month, and (e) expected embedding token volume per month. This will help bidders quote realistic and commercially viable rates for the BOQ line items and plan API capacity accordingly.	Roughly Document size : mostly between 0-30 range
16	Clause 1.2 – Eligibility Criteria, Sr. No. 4 and 5, Pages 3–4	The RFP requires experience with Central Government / State Government / PSU project on proposed cloud platform and experience with AI/ML features within last 3 years.	Kindly clarify: (a) whether projects executed for Government departments, PSUs, Government undertakings, smart city SPVs, statutory bodies, or public sector institutions through SI / implementation partner arrangements will be considered valid experience; (b) whether Work Orders / LOA / LOI along with client certificates / go-live confirmation / completion certificates will be accepted as supporting documents for experience claims; and (c) whether experience of the parent company or group entity may be considered for eligibility purposes.	Accepted except Point C
17	Clause 1.2 – Eligibility Criteria, Sr. No. 9, Page 4	The RFP requires Manufacturing Authorization of Google and an authorization letter from Google as mandatory eligibility document.	Kindly clarify the exact form and scope of Google authorization required. Since Google Cloud and Gemini services are typically supplied through Google Cloud authorized partners and resellers, kindly confirm: (a) whether an authorization letter from an authorized Google Cloud Partner / Reseller will be acceptable in lieu of a direct Google authorization letter; (b) whether the authorization is required specifically for Google Gemini, Google Vision API, Embedding API, or Google Cloud services in general; and (c) the minimum validity period of such authorization letter as of bid submission date.	Yes, Google India is authorized a bidder for providing the service Google Gemini by Authorization letter for this tender
18	Clause 6.4 – Performance and Reliability, Page 18	The RFP states that the system shall be designed to handle concurrent users and large documents without material degradation in response time. However, specific performance benchmarks, SLAs, and uptime requirements are not defined in the RFP.	Kindly specify the measurable performance parameters including: (a) expected number of concurrent users and peak requests per minute; (b) maximum document size and maximum number of pages per document; (c) expected API response time for OCR, LLM, and Embedding calls; (d) uptime/availability SLA percentage; and (e) acceptable processing time for large documents. These parameters are essential to size the solution correctly, define measurable service levels, and design an appropriate architecture.	- approximate usage is for llm or ocr is not gauranted at this moment. - Document size : mostly between 0-30 range, and some document can be long as 700-800 pg or more (rare but very possible) -The bidder shall provision the highest applicable Gemini API tier with rate limits sized to sustain GIL's peak concurrent usage, under Google Cloud's published SLA (~99.9%).
19	Section 6.4 – Performance and Reliability, Page 18 and Section 3 – Scope of Work, Page 14–15	The RFP states that one dashboard will be developed/provided to see the actual usage of Google Gemini Service. The BOQ has no separate line item for dashboard development.	Kindly clarify the detailed dashboard requirements including: (a) user roles and access levels for the dashboard; (b) usage metrics to be displayed — OCR page count, input/output token count, embedding token count, API success/failure logs; (c) reporting frequency and export formats; (d) invoice reconciliation report requirements; (e) retention period for usage records; and (f) whether dashboard acceptance will be part of go-live criteria. Additionally, kindly confirm whether a separate BOQ line item will be added for dashboard development and maintenance or whether it is included within the API rates.	No saperate development required. Only provide the console of Google to showcase the usage of actual consupntion.
20	Clause 3.5 – Copyright, Page 18	The RFP states that any software, hardware, data, awards, certificates, patent, etc. shall be absolute property of GIL and the successful bidder shall transfer all IPR in the software developed, relinquishing source code within five days from acceptance.	We request clarification that pre-existing intellectual property including reusable frameworks, libraries, accelerators, connectors, tools, templates, know-how, and third-party or OEM components used by the bidder shall remain the property of the respective owner or bidder. Only project-specific custom deliverables developed exclusively for GIL under this assignment should be transferred to GIL. Kindly confirm this interpretation, as a blanket IPR transfer clause covering pre-existing IP would be commercially unacceptable and may deter qualified bidders.	No Saperate development required. Bidder needs to provide only Google Gemini API only.

21	Clause 2.20.1.6 – Performance Bank Guarantee, Page 12	The successful bidder has to submit PBG @ 10% of total order value within 15 days from receipt of notification of award. The clause states that performance security will be valid up to the end of warranty period.	Since this is a one-year consumption-based API service procurement and not a conventional software development contract with a warranty period, kindly clarify: (a) the exact validity period of PBG — whether it is one year from work order or beyond; (b) whether PBG will be released promptly after completion of the one-year contract period and settlement of all obligations; and (c) whether the PBG value will be calculated on the awarded estimated contract value or on actual consumption value at contract end. Also, kindly confirm whether the GeM bid document marking ePBG as 'No' overrides or is supplementary to the RFP PBG requirement.	A. PBG period is 15 months B. PBG will be release asap after the work completion and no dues of bidder remaining under this tender C. PBG value is based on contract value. PBG will be required to submit a 10% of contract value /work order value even if it is mentioned in gem bid document as 'NO'
22	Clause 2.20 – Extension of Contract, Page 11	The RFP states that the contract can be extended on mutual agreement for the next one year without updation/changes in financial rate.	Since Google Gemini, OCR, and Embedding API prices, model versions, applicable taxes, and OEM commercial terms are subject to change over time and are not within the bidder's control, we request the department to clarify whether the financial rates for the extended contract period may be mutually reviewed and revised based on prevailing OEM/cloud pricing and applicable taxes at the time of extension. Locking rates for an extended period on consumption-based cloud services creates unquantifiable commercial risk for bidders and may result in service disruption.	No change