

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) For Selection of System Integrator for Design, Development, Deployment, Operations, Maintenance & Dataset On boarding of AI Sangrah Platform for Directorate of ICT and e-Governance, Gandhinagar (Bid no. GEM/2026/B/7932263 dated 20.08.2026)				
Response to Pre-bid queries				
Sr. No.	Bidding Document Reference (Clause/Page)	Content of RFP requiring Clarification	Points of Clarification required	Response to Queries
1	1.3 Fact Sheet -> Pg. 12->Sl. No. 5->Proposal Security/Earnest Money Deposit (EMD)	NR 14,00,000/- (NRN fourteen lakhs only) either through DD OR By a Bank Guarantee (as per format attached in Annexure-15 of RFP) and should be valid for 180 days from the due date of the RFP	Kindly provide EMD exemption to MSE bidders in accordance with the applicable GEM procurement guidelines and the General Financial Rules (GFR) provisions.	As per RFP
2	1.3 Fact Sheet -> Pg. 12->Sl. No. 5->Proposal Security/Earnest Money Deposit (EMD)	NR 14,00,000/- (NRN Fourteen lakhs only) either through DD OR By a Bank Guarantee (as per format attached in Annexure-15 of RFP) and should be valid for 180 days from the due date of the RFP	Kindly accept EMD in Form of FDR (Fixed Deposit Receipt) also.	As per RFP
3	4.3 Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) -> Pg. 37->Sl. No. 4.3.1	The Successful Bidder shall at his own expense submit to Tender Inviting Authority unconditional, irrevocable and continuing Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) from banks, in the format prescribed in Annexure 16, payable on demand, for the due performance and fulfillment of the contract by the bidder. The proceeds of the PBG shall be payable to the Tender Inviting Authority as compensation for any loss (including loss of opportunity, time or cost, etc.) resulting from the Supplier's/ Bidder's failure to comply with its obligations under the Contract.	Kindly accept Performance Guarantee (Performance Security Deposit) in form of FDR (Fixed Deposit Receipt) also.	As per RFP
4	Cl. 5.6.2 / Pg. 43	AI Models Module – catalog and publish AI models; upload/classification, metadata and format support, version control, licensing, tagging, access settings, view/download, version history, and integration with code repositories/CU/CD pipeline for deployment.	Is AI Sangrah only a repository/catalogue for AI models, or is it also required to execute/serve uploaded AI models for inference?	As per RFP. Clarification: only a repository and catalogue for AI models
5	Cl. 5.6.2 / Pg. 43	AI Models Module – requires the solution to have the ability to integrate with code repositories/CU/CD pipeline for deployment of AI models.	The RFP mentions integration with code repositories/CU/CD pipelines for deployment. Does this mean only CU/CD integration, or should AI Sangrah actually deploy and run models?	As per RFP
6	Cl. 5.5.1 / Pg. 39-40	Data Storage Architecture – secure, scalable and resilient storage for structured, semi-structured and unstructured datasets and AI artefacts, including massive-scale storage, concurrent access, heterogeneous formats, elastic scaling, durability, backup/DR and future expansion.	What is the expected initial storage capacity and expected data growth over the 5-year period for datasets, models and artefacts?	The exact volume, number, type, and growth of datasets may vary depending on participation by Government Departments, data onboarding plans, and future requirements. Therefore, no representative datasets or fixed storage estimates are being provided at this stage. Bidders are expected to design a distributed, cloud-native, horizontally scalable, and modular storage architecture capable of supporting datasets of varying sizes and formats, with seamless scalability to accommodate future growth without requiring major architectural changes.
7	Cl. 5.5.1 - Data Storage Architecture & Data Ingestion / Pg. 40	Data Ingestion – scalable upload/download of large datasets using intelligent chunking/partitioning, encrypted segments, parallel and resumable uploads, checksum/hash-based integrity validation, concurrent uploads/downloads and reliable distributed storage.	What is the maximum individual file size expected for dataset/model/artefact uploads?	The exact volume, number, type, and growth of datasets may vary depending on participation by Government Departments, data onboarding plans, and future requirements. Therefore, no representative datasets or fixed storage estimates are being provided at this stage. Bidders are expected to design a distributed, cloud-native, horizontally scalable, and modular storage architecture capable of supporting datasets of varying sizes and formats, with seamless scalability to accommodate future growth without requiring major architectural changes.
8	Cl. 5.5.1 & Cl. 5.7.1 / Pg. 40, 48-49	Object Storage and GSDC Support – the platform shall use S3-compatible distributed object storage or equivalent; GSDC provides specified production infrastructure, while other licensing/support and non-GSDC components are the bidder's/SDA responsibility.	Will GSDC provide the actual S3-compatible object storage and capacity, or is the bidder expected to provide/procure it?	GSDC will provide
9	Cl. 5.6.8 / Pg. 44	User, Role, Privilege Management – integration with DigLocker, CitizenSSO, Office SSO, MeriPehchaan, and Panchay.	Will DIT provide sandbox/test credentials and API access for all listed SSO/identity platforms during the development phase, or must the bidder independently arrange test access? What are the expected timelines for obtaining production API credentials?	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
10	Cl. 5.7.1 / Pg. 47	GSDC Support – hardware and infrastructure for production environment provided based on 'finalized hardware sizing.'	When will the hardware sizing specification template or minimum baseline configuration (CPU, RAM, storage, network) be shared with bidders? Will GSDC provide a site visit or technical briefing to validate proposed sizing before bid submission?	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
11	Cl. 5.8(c) / Pg. 49	Performance and Load Testing – system must support a minimum of 1,000 concurrent users with zero-latency degradation.	What is the expected total registered user base, number of datasets/models at go-live, and average dataset file size? Are there defined API throughput targets (requests per second) for metadata search and dataset download endpoints?	Accordingly, bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
12	Cl. 5.5(g) / Pg. 36 Cl. 5.8.1 / Pg. 49	Multi-lingual Support – Gujarati, Hindi, and English UI; GIGW 3.0 and WCAG 2.1 compliance.	Will DIT provide a government-approved translation API or NLP engine for Gujarati language support, or must the bidder procure/build the translation layer independently? Is machine-translated UI acceptable for v1.0, or is human-reviewed translation mandatory before go-live?	As per RFP
13	Cl. 5.6.1 - Dataset Repository Module / Pg. 42	Dataset Repository Module – AI Readiness Score implementation and display across domains for model development; the methodology and evaluation framework are to be proposed by the Selected Bidder based on industry standards and best practices.	Is the AI Readiness Score expected to be calculated automatically by the platform, or will users/administrators provide the assessment?	As per RFP
14	Cl. 5.6.1 - Dataset Repository Module / Pg. 42	Dataset Repository Module – the AI Readiness Score methodology and evaluation framework shall be proposed by the Selected Bidder based on industry standards and best practices and submitted to the tenderer for review and approval during the Solution Design phase.	What parameters/criteria does DIT expect for the AI Readiness Score methodology?	As per RFP
15	Cl. 5.5 / Pg. 39-36 Cl. 5.7 / Pg. 46-47	System Architecture and Solution Design – final architecture and technology stack subject to DIT review and approval.	What is DIT's committed turnaround time (SLA) for reviewing and approving the proposed architecture, HLD, LLD, and technology stack after submission? Will provisional approvals be provided to avoid blocking development timelines?	As per RFP
16	Cl. 5.6.1 / Pg. 41-42	Dataset Repository Module – federated and real-time dataset access via APIs/data connectors, enabling departments to share datasets without physical upload.	Is there an existing government API gateway or data connector standard that federated access must integrate with? Will DIT provide a list of source department systems (formats, protocols) that must be supported at go-live, or is this scoped as a post-go-live phase?	Details shall be shared to successful bidder as and when such integration is required.
17	Section 5.5(d)	"Development, Testing, Staging, UAT, and Training environments on bidder-hosted Cloud, subject to compliance with the DPDP Act, MeitY guidelines, and prior approval of the Tenderer."	Please confirm whether non-production environments must be hosted specifically on a MeitY-empanelled cloud service provider, or whether any DPDP-compliant, DIT-approved cloud provider is acceptable.	As per RFP
18	Section 5.7	GSDC clearance required prior to hosting; production hosted exclusively at GSDC	Please share the expected timeline for GSDC clearance and infrastructure provisioning and confirm at what stage of the 6-month implementation window this process is expected to begin.	Production hardware infrastructure will be provided as per approved architecture post security audit of application. However, further details shall be shared to successful bidder by the Tenderer.
19	Section 5.6.1 (Dataset Repository Module – Federated access)	"Live data connectors to source departmental databases for secure, periodic synchronization..."	Please indicate how many departmental systems/data sources are expected to be integrated via live data connectors within the initial 6-month implementation phase, to help size the integration effort.	As per RFP
20	Section 5.1 / General Scope	Platform intended to host datasets across government departments, academia, startups and industry	Please confirm whether DIT will provide an initial set of pilot datasets/departments ready for onboarding at Go-Live, or whether dataset sourcing and onboarding is expected to begin only after the platform is live.	As per RFP
21	Section 5.6.1	"AI Readiness Score methodology and evaluation framework shall be proposed by the Selected Bidder..."	Please confirm whether DIT has any preferred reference framework, minimum evaluation parameters, or existing benchmark (e.g., alignment with AIKosh) that the proposed AI-readiness scoring methodology should be measured against.	As per RFP
22	Annexure 3, Table C	Manpower rate card for additional resources during ramp-up/ramp-down	Please clarify whether the manpower rates quoted in Table C are fixed for the entire 5-year O&M period, or whether an annual escalation mechanism is permissible or expected.	As per RFP
23	Section 8.3, Payment Milestones, Annexure 3, Table B	CAPEX milestones (M1-M5) vs. OPEX (Table B1: Year-1 license, B2: quarterly O&M)	Please confirm when the first OPEX invoice (software license costs) may be raised relative to the CAPEX milestone schedule, since Table B separates the Year-1 license (CAPEX) from 2nd-year onward license and manpower costs (OPEX).	As per RFP
24	Section 5.8.2, Item 16	"The Successful Bidder shall execute the Government-prescribed Data Processing Addendum (DPA)..." The DPA shall be shared to the successful bidder	Please confirm whether a draft DPA is available for bidder review prior to bid submission, to allow assessment of its terms ahead of contract signing.	As per RFP. The DPA shall be shared to the successful bidder.
25	3.2.2.3.1 Proposal Evaluation Committee (PEC) Page no 26	Least Cost Selection (LCS) method will be used among technically qualified bidders. The bidder with lowest quote (L1 bidder) will be selected from the technically qualified bidders.	We recommend that QCBS evaluation process to be adopted for evaluation so as it is ensured that Bidder with requisite credentials gets selected who will be able to deliver.	As per RFP
26	5.10 Software License Page no 53	The use of 'internal only' or 'vendor-proprietary' development frameworks that are not commercially available to the public is strictly discouraged.	AI being niche and new technology, giving appropriate weightage to quality will ensure better shortlisting. If there are pre-existing IP components of the bidder which are commercially available can be used in the solution. For all such components the IP rights will rest with the bidder, who can provide prepatent licenses for the same.	As per RFP
27	7.6 Project Implementation Timeline Page no 65	Capping of Penalties i. Penalties shall be capped at 15% of the total contract value/implementation-phase milestone-based payments/ quarterly O&M payable amount.	Requests for capping of penalties and liquidated damages be capped to 10% of the total contract value/implementation-phase milestone-based payments/ quarterly O&M payable amount.	As per RFP
28	7.8 SLA in breach of Supply of Manpower Page no 67	7.8.2 The agency is not allowed to replace those resources whose profile has been submitted at the time of Technical Presentation. Further in the event where the bidder is not able to retain the resources quoted in the bid, then the replacement must be pre-approved. Before replacing a resource, minimum two months' time to TENDERER along with panel has to be given to choose the substitution from the panel else penalties and pro-rata deduction in the quarterly fees will be made. We encourage the successful bidder to have a preapproved backup of resources for substitution for each of the positions.	As significant time gap may exist between bid submission and actual deployment, holding/availability of the proposed resources would be difficult. Therefore, the bidder requests that replacement with an equivalent or higher qualified resource be permitted at the time of deployment.	As per RFP
29	7.8 SLA in breach of Supply of Manpower Page no 67	7.8.3 Replacement of a profile by the agency (only one replacement per technical profile with equal or higher qualification and experience – would be permitted per year)	Bidder Requests following modification: Replacement of a profile by the agency only one replacement per technical profile with equal or higher qualification and experience – would be permitted per year .	As per RFP
30	Annexure 10: Not Terminated, Not Being Insolvent or Bankrupt / Page No. 92	a. has not been terminated by any Government/Semi-Government or Public Authority or Public Institution in India or abroad, before the completion of respective Contract period for which it has executed the project or in process of execution of such project, on account of its poor performance, delay or abandonment of work by it.	Large Organisations execute 100s of projects and it is practically impossible to check and confirm on this. It is the termination reasons could be subjective and contextual to respective project. It is. Also different teams execute different projects and termination of one project does not define the whole organization. Hence we request to remove this clause.	As per RFP

31	4.6.1 Termination for Default: / Page No. 38	Upon termination for default, the Tender Inviting Authority may procure the required Services from any other source, upon such terms and in such manner as it deems appropriate.	There should be a cap on services being procured from any other source.	As per RFP
32	4.6.1 Termination for Default: / Page No. 39	In addition to the foregoing remedies, where the default or breach is found to be serious or of such nature as to warrant such action, the Tender Inviting Authority shall have the right to blacklist the Selected Bidder from participating in future tenders, bids, or procurement processes of the Tender Inviting Authority.	This clause is not in sync with Govt Finance Rules 2017. We request modification as per the GFR rules. GFR from Govt of India has specified conditions under which a bidder can be blacklisted.	As per RFP
33	Annexure 9: No Blacklisting / Page No. 91	9.9 Annexure 9: No Blacklisting (To be printed on INR 300/- Stamp Paper)	We request to accept this letter on a company letterhead. Bidder is bound and responsible for whole response. Getting this on Stamp Paper does not create any additional assurance. This increases the overheads on bidders side due to multi-geography team. Nowadays, almost all the states and Central Govt accepts undertakings on company letterheads by authorized signatory.	As per RFP
34	9.10 Annexure 10: Not Terminated, Not Being Insolvent or Bankrupt / Page No. 92	9.10 Annexure 10: Not Terminated, Not Being Insolvent or Bankrupt (To be printed on INR 300/- Stamp Paper)	We request to accept this letter on a company letterhead. Bidder is bound and responsible for whole response. Getting this on Stamp Paper does not create any additional assurance. This increases the overheads on bidders side due to multi-geography team. Nowadays, almost all the states and Central Govt accepts undertakings on company letterheads by authorized signatory.	As per RFP
35	9.17 Annexure 17: Format for Power of Attorney / Page No. 104		Most large companies respond to 100s of RFPs and preparing PoA for each RFP is not feasible. As long as there is no material difference, we request Govt to accept PoA as a standard format.	As per RFP
36	3.2.1 Pre-qualification Criteria Sl 1.7 Page 34	1. PF/ESC details of all such employees on payroll, and	Bidder requests to remove this point as this PF data and as per latest DPDP act, this is not allowed.	As per RFP
37	3.2.3.1 Pre-qualification Criteria Sl 1.3 Page 33	The Bidder should submit below document for each Project: a) Copy of the Work order/Purchase Order. b) Completion Certificate/Go-Live Certificate issued by the client. c) Project Citation with Client details (Name, Designation, Contact Number, Email Id etc.)	As some of the projects are under NDA, it may not be feasible to share client details and the customer artifacts (completion certificate from client and PO / WO / Agreement Copy etc.). Hence - 1. Please allow the bidder to submit anonymize project citations. 2. Please accept self-certificate signed by authorized signatory / Company Secretary stating the relevant experience details as documentary evidence.	As per RFP
38	1.2 Definitions of Terms, -p8-11	1.2 Deliverables Products, Platform, infrastructure and services agreed to be delivered by the Bidder in pursuance of the agreement as defined more elaborately in the RFP Implementation and the Maintenance phases and includes all documents related to the user manual, technical manual, design, process and operating manuals, service mechanisms, policies and guidelines (such as security related, etc.), inter alia payment and/or process related etc., source code and all its modifications.	Deliverables <u>Reusable developed</u> Products, Platform, infrastructure and services agreed to be delivered by the Bidder in pursuance of the agreement as defined more elaborately in the RFP Implementation and the Maintenance phases and includes all documents related to the user manual, technical manual, design, process and operating manuals, service mechanisms, policies and guidelines (such as security related, etc.), inter alia payment and/or process related etc., source code of <u>Reusable developed Product or Platform</u> and all its modifications.	As per RFP
39	3. Instructions to bidders (ITB), p16-17	DIT reserves the right to extend the contract duration of the project on the terms and conditions stated in this RFP.	DIT reserves the right to <u>Both the parties with mutual agreement may</u> extend the contract duration of the project on the <u>mutually agreed</u> terms and conditions <u>stated in this RFP</u> .	As per RFP
40	3.5 Earnest Money Deposit (EMD), p18-19	The EMD may be forfeited: (a) If a Bidder withdraws the proposal or increases the quoted prices after opening of the proposal and during the period of proposal validity period or its extended period, if any (b) In the case of a Successful Bidder, if the Bidder fails to sign the Agreement in accordance with the terms and conditions (including timelines for execution of the Agreement) of this RFP or fails to furnish the Bank Guarantee in accordance with the terms and conditions (including timelines for furnishing PBG) of this RFP. (c) If the Bidder is found indulging in any corrupt, fraudulent, or other malpractice in respect of the proposal. (d) If the Bidder tries to influence the evaluation process (e) If there is a discrepancy between words and figures quoted by the Bidder and the Bidder does not accept that the amount in words prevails over amount in figure. (f) If the documents information provided by the Bidder during the proposal process is found to be incorrect, false, or misleading.	The EMD may be forfeited: (a) If a Bidder withdraws the proposal or increases the quoted prices after opening of the proposal and during the period of proposal validity period or its extended period, if any (b) In the case of a Successful Bidder, if the Bidder fails to sign the Agreement in accordance with the terms and conditions (including timelines for execution of the Agreement) of this RFP <u>in accordance with the terms and conditions (including timelines for execution of the Agreement) of this RFP mutually agreed with the Bidder</u> or fails to furnish the Bank Guarantee in accordance with the terms and conditions (including timelines for furnishing PBG) of this RFP. (c) If the Bidder is found indulging in any corrupt, fraudulent, or other malpractice in respect of the proposal. (d) If the Bidder tries to influence the evaluation process (e) If there is a discrepancy between words and figures quoted by the Bidder and the Bidder does not accept that the amount in words prevails over amount in figure. (f) If the documents information provided by the Bidder during the proposal process is found to be incorrect, false, or misleading. <u>process (e) If there is a discrepancy between words and figures quoted by the Bidder and the Bidder does not accept that the amount in words prevails over amount in figure. (f) If the documents information provided by the Bidder during the proposal process is found to be incorrect, false, or misleading.</u>	As per RFP
41	3.10.3 Commercial Proposal Format, p23-24	(a) The Bidders shall quote for the entire scope of contract on an "overall responsibility" basis such that the total contract value covers all obligations of the Bidder mentioned in or to be reasonably inferred from the Bidding documents in respect of providing the product services. (g) The prices/rates quoted shall be firm and final throughout the period of the validity of the offer and subsequently during the currency of the contract and shall not be subject to any variation/revision/upward modifications, on any account, whatsoever.	The Bidders shall quote for the entire scope of contract on an "overall responsibility" basis such that the total contract value covers all obligations of the Bidder mentioned in or to be reasonably inferred from <u>the</u> Bidding documents in respect of providing the product <u>or</u> services. (g) <u>Subject to increase in taxes, duties, levies, change in prices due to change requests, change in prices due to change in minimum wages, change in prices due to delay in DIT in performing its obligations on time.</u> The prices/rates quoted shall be firm and final throughout the period of the validity of the offer and subsequently during the currency of the contract and shall not be subject to any variation/revision/upward modifications, on any account, whatsoever.	As per RFP
42	3.2.3.1 Pre-qualification Criteria, p32-34	The Bidder should not have any pending proceedings, investigations, or cases against it under the Income Tax Act, 1961, the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (PMLA), or any other applicable financial crime laws in India, including but not limited to the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, as of the Bid submission deadline. Consortium or subletting in any form is not permitted	The Bidder should not have any pending proceedings, investigations, or cases against it <u>under the Income Tax Act, 1961</u> ; the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (PMLA), or any other applicable financial crime laws in India, including but not limited to the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, as of the Bid submission deadline <u>which would effect the provisions of the services by the Bidder under this RFP</u> .	As per RFP
43	4.3 Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG), p37-38	4.3.1 The Successful Bidder shall at his own expense submit to Tender Inviting Authority unconditional, irrevocable and continuing Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) from banks, in the format prescribed in Annexure 16, payable on demand, for the due performance and fulfillment of the contract by the Bidder. The proceeds of the PBG shall be payable to the Tender Inviting Authority as compensation for any loss (including loss of opportunity, time or cost, etc.) resulting from the Supplier's/ Bidder's failure to comply with its obligations under the Contract. 4.3.2 Consequent to the issuance of this Order, the Successful Bidder is required to furnish a Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) amounting to 5% of the total contract value in the name of Directorate of ICT & e-Governance. 4.3.3 PBG shall be invoked by Tender Inviting Authority in the event the Bidder: (a) Fails to perform the responsibilities and obligations as set out in this RFP to the complete satisfaction of Tender Inviting Authority including failure to comply with exit management responsibilities. (b) Misrepresentation of facts/information submitted to Tender Inviting Authority. 4.3.6 The PBG may be discharged/returned by Tender Inviting Authority upon being satisfied that there has been due performance of the obligations of the Bidder under the contract. However, no interest shall be payable on the performance bank guarantee. 4.3.7 In the event of the Bidder being unable to service the contract for whatever reason, Tender Inviting Authority would invoke the PBG. 4.3.9 In case the project is delayed beyond the project schedule as mentioned in RFP, the performance bank guarantee shall be accordingly extended by the Bidder till completion of scope of work. 4.3.10 On satisfactory performance and completion of the order in all respects and duly certified to this effect by the Project Coordinator, Contract Completion Certificate will be issued and the PBG will be returned to the Bidder.	4.3.1 The Successful Bidder shall at his own expense submit to Tender Inviting Authority unconditional, irrevocable and continuing Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) from banks, in the format prescribed in Annexure 16, payable on demand, for the due performance and fulfillment of the contract by the Bidder. The proceeds of the PBG shall be payable to the Tender Inviting Authority as compensation for any loss (including loss of opportunity, time or cost, etc.) resulting from the Supplier's/ Bidder's failure to comply with its obligations under the Contract provided the failure is directly and solely attributable to the Bidder. 4.3.3 Consequent to the issuance of this Order, the Successful Bidder is required to furnish a Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) amounting to 5% of the total contract value in the name of Directorate of ICT & e-Governance. 4.3.4 PBG shall be invoked by Tender Inviting Authority in the event the Bidder: (a) Fails to perform the responsibilities and obligations as set out in this RFP to the complete satisfaction of Tender Inviting Authority on agreed scope of work including failure to comply with exit management responsibilities provided the failure is directly and solely attributable to the bidder. (b) Misrepresentation of facts/information submitted to Tender Inviting Authority. 4.3.6 The PBG may be discharged/returned by Tender Inviting Authority upon being satisfied that there has been due performance of the obligations of the Bidder under the contract. However, no interest shall be payable on the performance bank guarantee. 4.3.7 In the event of the Bidder being unable to service the contract for whatever reason the reasons directly and solely attributable to the bidder, Tender Inviting Authority would invoke the PBG. 4.3.9 In case the project is delayed beyond the project schedule as mentioned in RFP for the reasons directly and solely attributable to the bidder, the performance bank guarantee shall be accordingly extended by the Bidder till completion of scope of work. 4.3.10 On satisfactory performance and completion of the order in all respects and duly certified to this effect by the Project Coordinator, Contract Completion Certificate will be issued and the PBG will be returned to the Bidder.	As per RFP
44	4.5 Failure to agree with the Terms and Conditions of the RFP, p38	Failure of the successful Bidder to agree with the Terms & Conditions of the RFP shall constitute sufficient grounds for the annulment of the award, in which event Tender Inviting Authority may award the contract to the next best value Bidder or call for new proposals. In such a case, Tender Inviting Authority shall invoke the PBG and/or forfeit the EMD.	Failure of the successful Bidder to agree with the <u>mutually consented</u> Terms & Conditions of the RFP shall constitute sufficient grounds for the annulment of the award, in which event Tender Inviting Authority may award the contract to the next best value Bidder or call for new proposals. In such a case, Tender Inviting Authority shall invoke the PBG and/or forfeit the EMD.	As per RFP
45	4.6 Termination, p38-39	4.6.1 Termination for Default: The Tender Inviting Authority may, without prejudice to any other rights or remedies available under the Contract or applicable law, terminate the Contract, in whole or in part, by giving thirty (30) days' written notice to the Selected Bidder, if the Selected Bidder: • Fails to deliver the services within the time period specified in the Contract or within any extension thereof granted by the Tender Inviting Authority. • Fails to perform any other obligations under the Contract or • Fails to comply with any material term or condition of the Contract and does not remedy such failure within the period specified in the notice issued by the Tender Inviting Authority. Upon termination for default, the Tender Inviting Authority may procure the required Services from any other source, upon such terms and in such manner as it deems appropriate. The Selected Bidder shall be liable to the Tender Inviting Authority for any additional or excess expenditure incurred in procuring such Services, without prejudice to the Tender Inviting Authority's right to recover damages, invoke the Performance Security/PBG, impose contractual penalties, or exercise any other remedy available under the Contract or under applicable laws, rules, and Government resolutions. In addition to the foregoing remedies, where the default or breach is found to be serious or of such nature as to warrant such action, the Tender Inviting Authority shall have the right to blacklist the Selected Bidder from participating in future tenders, bids, or procurement processes of the Tender Inviting Authority. 4.6.2 Termination for Convenience: Tender Inviting Authority may terminate the contract, in whole or part, at any time with thirty (30) days' written notice for its convenience. Tender Inviting Authority will pay undisputed invoices for tasks completed by the Bidder up to the termination date.	4.6.1 Termination for Default: The Tender Inviting Authority may, without prejudice to any other rights or remedies available under the Contract or applicable law, terminate the Contract, in whole or in part, by giving thirty (30) days' written notice to the Selected Bidder, if the Selected Bidder: • Fails to deliver the services within the time period specified in the Contract or within any extension thereof granted by the Tender Inviting Authority provided the failure is for reasons solely and directly attributable to the Bidder. • Fails to perform any other material obligations under the Contract provided the failure is for reasons solely and directly attributable to the Bidder or • Fails to comply with any material term or condition of the Contract and does not remedy such failure within the period specified in the notice issued by the Tender Inviting Authority. Upon termination for convenience, the Selected Bidder shall be liable to the Tender Inviting Authority for any additional or excess expenditure incurred in procuring such Services, without prejudice to the Tender Inviting Authority's right to recover damages, invoke the Performance Security/PBG, impose contractual penalties, or exercise any other remedy available under the Contract or under applicable laws, rules, and Government resolutions. In addition to the foregoing remedies, where the default or breach is found to be serious or of such nature as to warrant such action, the Tender Inviting Authority shall have the right to blacklist the Selected Bidder from participating in future tenders, bids, or procurement processes of the Tender Inviting Authority. Prior to providing a written notice of termination to Bidder under this clause, the Tender Inviting Authority shall provide Bidder with a written notice of 30 (thirty) days to cure such breach of the Agreement. If the breach continues or remains uncorrected after expiry of cure period, the Tender Inviting Authority shall have right to initiate action in accordance with above clause. In the event of this agreement being terminated, the Tender Inviting Authority shall be liable to make payments of all the amount due under this agreement for which services have been rendered by the Bidder to the Tender Inviting Authority till the date of termination. Bidder shall also have the right to terminate the agreement if the Tender Inviting Authority commits a breach of the terms and conditions of the agreement and, where such breach is curable, fails to cure the same within 15 days provided for curing such breach. 4.6.2 Termination for Convenience: Tender Inviting Authority may terminate the contract, in whole or part, at any time with thirty (30) days' written notice for its convenience. Tender Inviting Authority will pay undisputed invoices for tasks completed by the Bidder up to the termination date. The Tender Inviting Authority will also pay: a) The cost of satisfying all other obligations, commitments and claims that the Bidder may in good faith have undertaken with third parties in connection with the contract. b) The cost of all the material, hardware, equipment, and manpower etc. purchased and/or employed by the Bidder for performing its obligations under the Contract.	As per RFP

			Confidentiality Both parties agree as they may, in the course of their business relationship with the other, acquire or be exposed to information that is proprietary or confidential to the other party, its affiliates or to or their respective clients. Both parties understand, in light of such information and/or confidential nature and not to disclose such information to third parties nor to use such information for any purpose whatsoever, save as may be strictly necessary for the performance of the assignment as mentioned in this proposal. The term "Confidential Information" is used herein to mean any information or documents disclosed by one party to the other party orally, and which is related to writing within a period of 2 days of its disclosure or is written or recorded but not limited to any written or printed documents, samples, models, technical data, know-how, drawings, drawings, drawings, specifications, sketches, manuals, reports, formulas, algorithms, processes, information, lists, trade secrets, computer programs, computer software, computer data bases, computer software documentation, inventions and other know-how, research projects, inventions, developments, processes, engineering techniques, drawings, customers, internal procedures, employees and business opportunities and clearly identified and marked as "Confidential Information". The data contained herein shall not be disclosed, duplicated, used in whole or in part for any purpose other than to evaluate the proposal provided that, a contract is awarded on this proposal as a result of, or in connection with the submission of this data. Both the parties shall have the right to duplicate, use or disclose the data to the extent provided in the contract. This confidentiality restriction shall be in full force and effect until the termination of the contract and for a period of two years thereafter. This restriction does not limit the right to use information contained in the data if it: - is in the public domain or is or was known to the receiving party prior to its receipt, without an obligation to maintain confidentiality; - is lawfully derived from a third party; - is lawfully derived from the public without violation of this Proposal; - is independently developed or obtained by the receiving party without the participation of individuals who have had access to confidential information; - is required to be provided under any law, or process of law duly enacted. Non-employment The DIT will neither offer to employ nor employ, directly or otherwise, any Bidder employee, associated for the purpose of, or with the assignment, during the period between the date of this proposal and two years from the completion of the assignment unless awarded. Liability Bidder shall be bound and not be liable or responsible for any delay or failure to perform the services or failure of the services or a deliverable under this Agreement, to the extent that such delay or failure has arisen as a result of any delay or failure by the DIT or its employees or agents or third party service providers to perform any of its duties and obligations as set out in this Agreement. In the event that Bidder is delayed or prevented from performing its obligations due to such failure to delay on the part of or on behalf of the DIT, then Bidder shall be deemed an additional period of time to perform its obligations and shall be deemed to have agreed the additional period shall be equal to the amount of time for which Bidder is delayed or prevented from performing its obligations due to such failure or delay on the part of or on behalf of the DIT. Such failure or delay shall be brought to the notice of the DIT and subject to mutual agreement with the DIT, then Bidder shall take such action as may be necessary to correct or remedy the failure or delay. Bidder shall be deemed to accept the DIT for the additional costs incurred in connection with correction or remedy as above at time & material rate card as agreed upon between the parties. Neither party shall be liable to the other for any special, indirect, consequential including loss of profit or revenue, damages or other damages whether in contract, tort or other theories of law, even if such party has been advised of the possibility of such damages. The total cumulative liability of either party arising from or relating to this Agreement, in the aggregate, shall not exceed the total amount paid to Bidder by the DIT in the preceding twelve months under that applicable work that gives rise to such liability (in the date the liability arose). General indemnity The DIT will, during the period of the coverage of this assignment, indemnify and hold Bidder harmless from any loss, injury, claim or damage resulting from any death or injury to any person or property of Bidder arising out of the use or possession of the equipment or location of the DIT by Bidder or its personnel, unless caused by the negligence of Bidder personnel and the limitation or liability provided herein shall not apply to such loss, injury, claim or damage. The DIT warrants that all software, information, data, materials and other assistance provided by it under this proposal shall not infringe any intellectual property rights of third parties, and agrees that it shall at all times indemnify and hold Bidder harmless from any loss, claim, damage, costs, expenses, including attorney's fees, which may be incurred as a result of any action or claim that may be made or initiated against it by any third parties alleging infringement of their rights. Governing law This proposal shall be governed by and construed in accordance with laws of India and the parties submit to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts in Delhi. Notice All notices, requests, demands and other communications under this proposal or in connection herewith shall be given to or made upon the respective parties as follows :- Bidder-Tata Consultancy Services Limited, 113 House, Rawlinson Street, Fort, Mumbai 400 001. With a copy to General Counsel Tata Consultancy Services Limited, 113 House, Rawlinson Street, Fort, Mumbai 400 001. DIT (to fill up the Address) or to such other person or address as any of the Parties shall have notified to the others. All notices, requests, demands and other communications given or made in accordance with the provisions of this proposal shall be in writing by letter, fax, email or telegram. Waiver No performance, indulgence or retention by any party at any time to require performance of any provision of this Proposal shall in any way effect, diminish or prejudice the right of such party to require performance of that provision and any waiver by any party or any breach of any provision of this Proposal shall not be construed as a waiver or an amendment of the provisions thereof, or a waiver of any right under or arising out of this Proposal. Assignment Neither Party shall be entitled to assign or transfer all or any of its rights, benefits and obligations under this proposal without the prior written consent of the other Party. Independently Bidder shall be free to do similar business either for itself or for any other party or offer similar services to any third parties but without in any way affecting the services agreed to be offered by Bidder under this Proposal. Independent Relationship This Proposal is not intended to create a relationship such as a partnership, joint venture, agency, or employment relationship. Neither party may act in a manner, which expresses or implies a relationship other than that of independent party nor bind the other party. Modification This proposal may be modified only by an amendment executed in writing by a duly authorized representative for each party.	
58	3.10.3 Commercial Proposal Format Pg 18	(e) The Tender Inviting Authority reserves the right to review and negotiate the price payable, with the selected Bidder, to incorporate downward revisions as applicable and necessary, at any time during the period of Contract.	Bidder requests that this clause be deleted	As per RFP
59	4.2 Letter of Acceptance and Signing of Contract Pg 31	The Successful Bidder shall, within 15 (fifteen) days of the receipt of the notification of the award, give acceptance on its letterhead by authorized signatory, and submit Performance Bank Guarantee. In the event of the acceptance letter duly signed by the Selected Bidder is not received by the stipulated date or PBG is not submitted, the Tender Inviting Authority, unless it consents to extension of time for submission thereof, shall have the right to forfeit the EMD of successful Bidder and award the work to the next successful Bidder.	Bidder requests the following modification: The Successful Bidder shall, within 30 (thirty) 15 (fifteen) days of the receipt of the notification of the award, give acceptance on its letterhead by authorized signatory, and submit Performance Bank Guarantee. In the event of the acceptance letter duly signed by the Selected Bidder is not received by the stipulated date or PBG is not submitted, the Tender Inviting Authority, unless it consents to extension of time for submission thereof, shall have the right to forfeit the EMD of successful Bidder and award the work to the next successful Bidder.	As per RFP
60	4.3 Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) Pg 31	4.3.2 The PBGs shall be submitted within fifteen (15) working days from the date of notice of award of the contract/work order, or at the time of signing/issuing of the contract/work order whichever is earlier.	Bidder requests the following modification: 4.3.2 The PBGs shall be submitted within thirty (30) fifteen working days from the date of notice of award of the contract/work order, or at the time of signing/issuing of the contract/work order whichever is earlier.	As per RFP
61	4.3 Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) Pg 31	4.3.3 Consequent to the issuance of this Order, the Successful Bidder is required to furnish a Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) amounting to 5% of the total contract value in the name of Directorate of ICT & e-Governance.	Bidder requests the following modification: 4.3.3 Consequent to the issuance of this Order, the Successful Bidder is required to furnish a Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) amounting to 2% 5% of the total contract value in the name of Directorate of ICT & e-Governance.	As per RFP
62	4.3 Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) Pg 31	4.3.5 The PBG shall be valid till satisfactory completion of Operations & Maintenance Phase and for a period of 120 days beyond the date of completion of all contractual obligations.	Bidder requests the following modification: 4.3.5 The PBG shall be valid till satisfactory completion of Operations & Maintenance Phase and for a period of 30 120 days beyond the date of completion of all contractual obligations.	As per RFP
63	4.3 Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) Pg 32	4.3.8 Tender Inviting Authority shall also be entitled to make recoveries from the Bidder's bills, performance bank guarantee, or from any other amount due to him, an equivalent value of any payment made to him due to inadvertence, error, collusion, misconstruction, or mistatement.	Bidder requests the following modification: 4.3.8 Tender Inviting Authority shall also be entitled to make recoveries from the Bidder's bills, performance bank guarantee , or from any other amount due to him, an equivalent value of any payment made to him due to inadvertence, error, collusion, misconstruction, or mistatement.	As per RFP
64	4.6.1 Termination for Default: Pg 32	Upon termination for default, the Tender Inviting Authority may procure the required Services from any other source, upon such terms and in such manner as it deems appropriate. The Selected Bidder shall be liable to the Tender Inviting Authority for any additional or excess expenditure incurred in procuring such Services, without prejudice to the Tender Inviting Authority's right to recover damages, invoke the Performance Security/PBG, impose contractual penalties, or exercise any other remedy available under the Contract or under applicable laws, rules, and Government resolutions. In addition to the foregoing remedies, where the default or breach is found to be serious or of such nature as to warrant such action, the Tender Inviting Authority shall have the right to blacklist the Selected Bidder from participating in future tenders, bids, or procurement processes of the Tender Inviting Authority.	Bidder requests the following modification: Upon termination for default, the Tender Inviting Authority may procure the required Services from any other source, upon such terms and in such manner as it deems appropriate. The Selected Bidder shall be liable to the Tender Inviting Authority for any additional or excess expenditure incurred in procuring such Services, without prejudice to the Tender Inviting Authority's right to recover damages, invoke the Performance Security/PBG, impose contractual penalties, or exercise any other remedy available under the Contract or under applicable laws, rules, and Government resolutions. The cost of procurement from alternate source shall be capped to value of goods/services not delivered as established in the contract. In addition to the foregoing remedies, where the default or breach is found to be serious or of such nature as to warrant such action, the Tender Inviting Authority shall have the right to blacklist the Selected Bidder from participating in future tenders, bids, or procurement processes of the Tender Inviting Authority.	As per RFP
65	4.6.3 Termination for Convenience: Pg 33	Tender Inviting Authority may terminate the contract, in whole or part, at any time with thirty (30) days' written notice for its convenience. Tender Inviting Authority will pay undisputed invoices for tasks completed by the Bidder up to the termination date.	Bidder proposes the following new clause: Either party may by written notice with a notice period of 90 days sent to the other, may terminate the Contract, in whole or in part, at any time for its convenience. The notice of termination shall specify the extent to which performance of work under the Contract is terminated, and the date upon which termination becomes effective. On termination, the bidder is entitled to compensation against all the services rendered, material delivered, advances paid and all such costs that have been incurred by the bidder to provide services as per the agreement.	As per RFP
66	4.7 Exit Management Plan Pg 33	4.7 Exit Management Plan	Bidder requests the following clarification: Please clarify on the start date of the exit management period and duration of the same	As per RFP
67	5.8.2 Data Protection, Privacy & Security Requirements Pg 50	7. Security Audit: The Government reserves the right to: Conduct security audits Conduct vulnerability assessments Conduct penetration testing Review source code where applicable Verify compliance with contractual obligations The Bidder shall fully cooperate with such audits.	Bidder requests the following clarification: Who will bear the cost for Audits ?	As per RFP
68	7.6 Project Implementation Timeline Pg 65	Capping of Penalties i. Penalties shall be capped at 15% of the total contract value/implementation-phase milestone-based payments/ quarterly O&M payable amount.	Bidder requests the following modification: Capping of Penalties: i. Penalties shall be capped at 5% 15% of the total contract value/implementation-phase milestone-based payments/ quarterly O&M payable amount.	As per RFP
69	7.6 Project Implementation Timeline Pg 65	Capping of Penalties ii. Repeated breaches (3 consecutive occurrences) may lead to invocation of Performance Bank Guarantee and contract review.	Bidder requests the following modification: Capping of Penalties: ii. Repeated breaches (3 consecutive occurrences) may lead to invocation of Performance Bank Guarantee and contract review.	As per RFP

70	8.1 Payment Terms Pg 68	8.1 Payment Terms	Bidder requests the following addition: b. The Purchaser agrees to pay bidder invoices within thirty days of receipt.	As per RFP
71	8.1 Payment Terms Pg 68	The Bidder must accept the payment terms proposed in the tender. The financial offer submitted by the Bidder must be in conformity with the payment terms proposed in the tender. Any deviation from the proposed payment terms would not be accepted. The Purchaser shall have the right to withhold any payment due to the Bidder, in case of delays or defaults on the part of the Bidder. Such withholding of payment shall not amount to a default on the part of the purchaser.	Bidder requests the following modification: The Bidder must accept the payment terms proposed in the tender. The financial offer submitted by the Bidder must be in conformity with the payment terms proposed in the tender. Any deviation from the proposed payment terms would not be accepted. The Purchaser shall have the right to withhold any payment due to the Bidder for the disputed amount only, in case of delays or defaults on the part of the Bidder. Such withholding of payment shall not amount to a default on the part of the purchaser.	As per RFP
72	Annexure 3: Format for Financial Bid Pg 72	Annexure 3: Format for Financial Bid	Bidder requests the following: Financial Bid Format in which the prices have to be quoted by the bidder is not provided in the RFP. Please provide.	As per RFP
73	9.15 Annexure 15: Bank Guarantee format for Earnest Money Deposit Pg 93	9.15 Annexure 15: Bank Guarantee format for Earnest Money Deposit	Bidder requests clarification between conflicting clauses: Clause 3.5 (Page 12) states - EMD must remain valid for 180 (One Hundred and Eighty) days from the from the last date of submission of the Bid and the validity of the EMD should be extended in the event the last date of submission of the Bid is extended, while Annexure 15 states - This guarantee will remain valid up to 9 months from the last date of bid submission.	As per RFP
74	9.16 Annexure 16: Performance Bank Guarantee Pg 95	9.16 Annexure 16: Performance Bank Guarantee	Bidder requests the following addition: Bank's liability shall stand automatically discharged unless a claim in writing is lodged with the Bank within the period stated in the BG including the extended period. The BG will automatically be deemed to expire on the date of expiry of the BG as mentioned in the agreement even if the physical copy has not been returned to us.	As per RFP
75	9.20 Annexure 20: No Deviation Citations Pg 103	9.20 Annexure 20: No Deviation Citations	Bidder requests the following: Technical deviations may allowed to be submitted by the bidder	As per RFP
76	3.23.1 Pre-qualification Criteria	The Bidder should have provided design, development, implementation, and operations & maintenance of software development or AI Dataset Platform / AI Data Exchange / Enterprise AI Data Platform Project with any State Government or Central Government or any PSU or any government organisation during last 05 years in India: At least One (1) such project of value not less than INR 5.5 Crore, OR At least Two (2) such projects each of value not less than INR 3.5 Crore, OR At least Three (3) such projects each of value not less than INR 2.8 Crore	AI being niche and new technology, there are limited use cases within India since Adoption is picking up now. Also from experience standpoint, implementing something globally does not dilute the learning. In fact, more advanced use cases are implemented abroad. Hence, request to allow global as well as private entry implementation experience.	As per RFP
77	3.23.1 Pre-qualification Criteria	The Bidder should submit below document for each Project: a) Copy of the Work order/Purchase Order. b) Completion Certificate/Go-Live Certificate issued by the client. c) Project Citation with Client details (Name, Designation, Contact Number, Email Id, etc.)	Company Secretary attested document should be allowed as supporting document. Relaxation for the clients where name of client can not be shared due to NDA.	As per RFP
78	5.5.1 Data Storage Architecture & Data Ingestion	Large volumes of structured, semi-structured and unstructured datasets and AI artefacts	Request you to provide volumetric data and the growth of data per year.	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
79	5.5.1 Data Storage Architecture & Data Ingestion	Concurrent multi-user access and high-throughput operations	Plz share how many concurrent multi user will be there ?	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
80	5.6.1 Dataset Repository Module	AI Readiness score implementation and review functionalities.	Plz Share the formula for the score	As per RFP
81	5.6.5 Spotlight Module	This section showcases the latest advancements, initiatives, and success stories in AI landscape.	What are the sources for this? Is the web scraping part of the scope?	1. Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder. 2. As per RFP
82	5.6.11 Analytics and Dashboard Module	Bidders may leverage opensource tools for such data visualization.	Is enterprise support is needed for all the open source tools.	Enterprise support is required for all such licenses.
83	Section 5.6.1 - Dataset Repository Module Page No-47	Catalog (metadata and other parameters) and publish Datasets uploaded by contributors a er due approval	Please provide the detailed metadata schema, dataset structure, and mandatory versus optional fields.	As per RFP
84	Section 5.6.1 - Dataset Repository Module Page No-47	AI Readiness score implementa on and review functionalities	Please clarify whether the AI readiness scoring methodology is predefined or whether the bidder is expected to propose the scoring mechanism.	As per RFP
85	Section 5.6.1 - Dataset Repository Module Page No-47	Browse datasets suited to various industries to support AI projects	Please provide the expected data volume, including data size per dataset, total expected storage at Go-Live, and expected storage after 5 years.	Accordingly, bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
86	Section 5.6.1 - Dataset Repository Module Page No-47	Dataset management	The detailed workflow for dataset lifecycle — create, review, approve, publish and archive — is not provided. Kindly clarify the approval hierarchy.	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
87	Section 5.6.2 - AI Models Module Page No-48	Catalog and publish AI Models uploaded by contributors a er due approval.	Please clarify whether the platform is expected to (a) only store / catalogue models, (b) perform model training / inference, or (c) host inference APIs.	As per RFP
88	Section 5.6.7 - Ranking Engine Page No-49	Rank the top Contributors, leading organiza ons, and high-impact Sectors based on Published datasets/Models/Use-cases, number of downloads, votes etc.	Please confirm whether an AI / ML-based recommendation engine is mandatory and whether ranking logic is predefined or bidder-defined.	As per RFP
89	Section 5.6.8 - User, Role, Privilege Management Module Page No-50	RBAC & ABAC abilities for user registra on and management for departments, startups, academia, and industry users. Role-based access control (like Explorer, Contributor, Organization Admin, etc.)	Please provide the detailed role hierarchy and privilege matrix.	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder during later phases of requirement discovery.
90	Section 5.6.8 - User, Role, Privilege Management Module Page No-50	Integra on with DigLocker, Citizen SSO, Office SSO, MeriPehchaan and Parichay for individual and government user authentication.	Please confirm whether APIs for DigLocker, Parichay and SSO will be provided or need to be developed by the bidder.	Tenderer will share the required details to successful bidder.
91	Section 5.6.2 - AI Models Module Page No-48	Version control, Licensing (e.g., CC, Apache), tagging, and access se ngs (Open, Restricted, Private).	Please provide the data classification framework to be implemented, such as public, restricted and confidential.	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
92	Section 5.6.4 - Consent Page No-52	Consent applica on while data sharing for classified data	Please provide the workflow for consent-based data sharing and validation.	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
93	Section 5.8.1 - Privacy, Compliance and Audit Mechanisms Page No-55	STQC Certification: Obtaining formal Quality and Security certification from the STQC where applicable.	Please confirm whether STQC certification is mandatory before Go-Live.	As per RFP
94	Section 5.8.1 - Privacy, Compliance and Audit Mechanisms Page No-55	STQC Certification: Obtaining formal Quality and Security certification from the STQC where applicable.	Please confirm whether CERT-in empanelled auditors will be provided or whether the bidder has to arrange them.	As per RFP
95	SOW Section 5.5.1 – Data Storage Architecture	The SOW requires a unified, scalable, distributed, S3-compatible / object-storage-based architecture capable of massive-scale dataset storage	Kindly provide the expected Day-1 data volume, expected annual data growth, maximum expected dataset/file size, total production storage sizing, backup storage sizing, DR storage sizing, and clarify whether the bidder must provision any fixed initial storage capacity at Go-Live or whether only a scalable architecture is required.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
96	SOW Section 5.5.1 – Data Ingestion Architecture	The SOW requires support for concurrent upload/download, chunking, resumable upload, checksum validation, API-based ingestion, streaming/batch ingestion and high-throughput operations.	Kindly provide the expected number of concurrent uploads and downloads, peak throughput requirements, average and maximum file sizes, expected API ingestion volumes, batch ingestion volumes, and expected data growth over the O&M period.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
97	SOW Sections 5.7.1, 7.6 and 7.5.4	GSOC production hardware and infrastructure are stated to be provided based on finalized hardware sizing and availability.	Kindly specify the process, ownership and expected timeline for hardware sizing, approval, provisioning and readiness. Kindly confirm that delays attributable to GSOC hardware readiness, infrastructure provisioning, Department approvals, third-party dependencies or integration availability will be excluded from implementation milestone penalties and SLA calculations.	As per RFP, RCA is required to provide justification of breach in SLA which may be accepted by Tenderer.
98	SOW Sections 5.6.2, 5.5.1 and 5.7.1	The SOW does not expressly mention GPU infrastructure.	Kindly confirm whether GPU resources are required for any platform functionality, including AI model training, fine-tuning, inference, embeddings, vector search, model evaluation or analytics. If GPU resources are required, kindly specify expected capacity, usage, and whether GPU infrastructure will be provided by GSOC / Department or must be procured by the bidder.	This is out of scope for this RFP.
99	SOW Section 5.6.2 – AI Models Module	The AI Models Module refers to cataloguing, publishing, exploration, metadata management, version control, licensing, model mapping and integration with code repositories / CI-CD pipelines.	Kindly confirm whether the scope is limited to AI model repository, cataloguing, governance, metadata management, lifecycle management and discovery, and does not include AI model development, training, fine-tuning, optimization, inference hosting or model serving, unless separately ordered through change request / rate card.	As per RFP

100	SOW Sections 5.7, 5.6.8 and 5.6.12	The SOW states that integration details with Government systems will be finalized during requirement gathering and solution design.	Kindly provide an indicative list of Government applications / APIs to be integrated, expected number of integrations, availability of sandbox / test credentials, expected API readiness timelines, dependency owners, and confirm whether delays due to third-party / Government API availability will be excluded from milestone and SLA penalties.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSIT/DIT.
101	SOW Sections 2.2, 5.11.1.3, 5.11.1.4 and 5.11.1.7	Dataset onboarding and facilitation are part of the scope.	Kindly provide the approximate number of datasets, expected data volume, number of metadata records, number of participating departments, and expected onboarding schedule during implementation and initial O&M period.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSIT/DIT.
102	SOW Sections 5.6.1, 5.11.1.3 and Annexure 4 – Hand Holding Support Staff	The SOW refers to dataset classification, anonymization, metadata standardization, cataloguing and handholding support.	Kindly clarify whether data cleansing, metadata standardization, data quality improvement, classification and anonymization activities will be performed by the respective departments, with the bidder providing tools, templates, guidance and facilitation, or whether the bidder is expected to perform these activities for all datasets.	As per RFP
103	SOW Section 5.11.1.7; Annexure 4; Table C	Hand Holding Support Staff is mentioned as optional and on need basis.	Kindly clarify the expected number of such resources, deployment period, ordering mechanism, and whether their cost is included in the base O&M price or will be ordered separately under Table C rate card.	As per RFP
104	SOW Section 5.7.1 – Database Server	GSOC will provide the VM for hosting the database server, while database license, installation, configuration, deployment, performance tuning and management are bidder responsibility.	Kindly clarify whether an open-source database is expected / preferred, or whether the bidder must price commercial database licenses as part of the proposal.	As per RFP
105	SOW Section 5.7.1 – Firewall / WAF	GSOC will provide and manage physical / network-level WAF infrastructure subject to standard security policies, while application-specific WAF rules, tuning, monitoring and any additional commercial WAF licenses are bidder responsibility.	Kindly clarify whether any specific commercial WAF license, subscription, signature update service or specialized security service is mandatory, and whether such costs are to be included in the bidder's price.	As per RFP
106	SOW Sections 5.5.1, 5.7.1 and 5.8.1	Requirements under SOW Sections 5.5.1, 5.7.1 and 5.8.1 require clarification regarding the scope, responsibilities and/or applicable conditions.	Kindly provide the expected backup policy, backup frequency, backup retention, disaster recovery RPO / RTO, centralized log retention period, archival requirements, and compliance expectations. Kindly also clarify whether application-level backups, database backups and log archival are bidder scope, or whether GSOC infrastructure-level backup is sufficient.	As per GSOC policy. The details shall be provided to successful bidder.
107	SOW Sections 5.8, 5.13.6 and 8.2	Requirements under SOW Sections 5.8, 5.13.6 and 8.2 require clarification regarding the scope, responsibilities and/or applicable conditions.	Kindly confirm whether the Department will provide test datasets, business users, UAT sign-off authority, timely approvals and coordination support during UAT. Kindly also clarify whether the UAT environment is bidder scope, whether UAT delays attributable to Department will be excluded from milestone penalties, and whether test data creation / anonymization is bidder scope.	As per RFP
108	SOW Sections 7.4 and 7.7	Security breach penalties are prescribed for data breach, theft or exposure due to vendor negligence or system misconfiguration.	Kindly confirm that such penalties will apply only after root cause analysis establishes that the breach is attributable to the bidder, and that breaches arising from GSOC infrastructure, network, third-party systems, Department actions, approved exclusions or force majeure will be excluded.	As per RFP
109	SOW Sections 5.11, 7.3 and 7.7	The SOW defines business hours as 10:00 to 18:30, but incident resolution penalties and uptime SLAs are also prescribed.	Kindly clarify whether the 99.95% availability SLA applies 24x7 or only during business hours. Kindly specify the required O&M support coverage model: 8x5, 12x6 or 24x7; helpdesk channels; ticketing tool; escalation matrix; incident response process; and whether incident resolution times run during business hours or calendar hours. Kindly also clarify how gateway latency and peak hour requests will be measured.	As per RFP
110	Section 3.23.1 – Pre-Qualification Criteria, Sr. No. 1.3	The Bidder should have provided design, development, implementation, and operations & maintenance of software development or AI Dataset Platform / AI Data Exchange / Enterprise AI Data Platform Project with any State Government or Central Government or any PSU or any government organisation during last 07 years in India: At least One (1) such project of value not less than INR 5.5 Crore, OR At least Two (2) such projects each of value not less than INR 3.5 Crore, OR At least Three (3) such projects each of value not less than INR 2.8 Crore	Request to please modify the clause as : "The bidder should have successfully executed at least two projects, each having a value of ₹NR 1.8 Crore or above."	As per RFP
111	Section 3.3 Instructions to bidders-Eligible Bidders	All the pre-qualification criteria must be met by the Bidder. The Bidder must have the proven capabilities to deliver the entire scope as mentioned in this RFP. The pre-qualification criteria may be referred to for details. In case any Bidder has undergone corporate restructuring (including merger, demerger, hive off, slump sale etc.), it may showcase credentials of its erstwhile current entity provided sufficient documentary proof is submitted with the proposal to evince that such credentials have accrued to/ transferred to/ are in the name of the Bidding entity and the Bidding entity is authorized to use such credentials. Notwithstanding the foregoing, credentials of the parent entity, holding entity, subsidiaries or affiliates etc. cannot be used (and shall not be considered).	Request please modify the clause as "Bidder can submit the documentary evidence of their group company/subsidiary"	As per RFP
112	Section 3.23.1 – Pre-Qualification Criteria, Sr. No. 1.4	§ 23.1 Pre-qualification Criteria – 1.4: Bidder should have the following certifications, as on the date of bid submission: (i) ISO 9001 (Quality Management System) And (ii) ISO 27001 (Information Security Management System) And (iii) CMMI Level 3 or Higher.	We request you to please modify this clause as : Bidder should have the following certifications, as on the date of bid submission: (i) ISO 9001 (Quality Management System) And (ii) ISO 27001 (Information Security Management System)	As per RFP
113	Clause 1.7 – Page 28	The Bidder should have at least 100 full-time professionals on its payroll as on the bid submission date, with relevant experience in IT services and software development roles including, but not limited to, Project Manager, Business Analyst, Database Administrator (DBA), Developer, Solution Architect/System Administrator, Tester and UI/UX Designer. In addition, the Bidder should have at least 5 full-time AI professionals on payroll, such as AI/ML Engineers, AI Solution Specialists. Supporting documents needed 1. PF/ESIC details of all such employees on payroll, and 2. A self-declaration on its letterhead listing the professionals engaged in relevant roles, including their skills and designations; A certificate to the effect signed and stamped by company's HR	We request the Authority to kindly accept the employee list containing the name, designation, role and relevant skills, along with a certificate duly signed and stamped by the authorized HR representative, as sufficient documentary evidence for establishing the required manpower strength. The Bidder has more than 100 full-time technical professionals on its payroll with relevant experience in IT services and software development. However, PF/EPF records may not be available for every employee, particularly where the employee's basic wages exceed ₹15,000 per month and EPF coverage is not mandatory and may be opted for voluntarily. Therefore, making PF/ESIC details mandatory for each and every employee may not accurately represent the actual manpower strength of the Bidder. We therefore request the Authority to kindly accept the HR-certified employee list and HR certificate as the primary evidence of manpower strength, and consider PF/ESIC details only where applicable/available. This will ensure that the eligibility is assessed based on the actual number of full-time professionals employed by the Bidder rather than solely on their PF/ESIC registration status.	As per RFP
114	Section 3.23.2 – Technical Evaluation Criteria – Annual Turnover – Page 29	The Bidder should have an average annual turnover of minimum ₹14 Crores during the last three completed financial years. The scoring methodology provides 10 marks for ₹14–30 Crores, 15 marks for ₹30–45 Crores and 20 marks for ₹45 Crores.	We request the Authority to kindly consider awarding 20 marks to bidders having an average annual turnover of more than ₹30 Crores. A turnover exceeding ₹30 Crores demonstrates adequate financial strength and capacity to undertake the proposed project. Further, since the minimum eligibility threshold is already ₹14 Crores, restricting the maximum 20 marks to bidders having turnover above ₹45 Crores may disproportionately favour very large organizations. We therefore request that the scoring methodology may kindly be revised as ₹14–30 Crores: 10 marks; ₹30 Crores: 20 marks; thereby providing a fair and competitive opportunity to technically capable bidders.	Please refer corrigendum
115	Section 3.23.2 – Technical Evaluation Criteria – Manpower Strength – Page 30	The RFP provides 5 marks for 100–200 IT Technical Manpower and 10 marks for more than 200 IT Technical Manpower.	We request the Authority to kindly consider awarding 10 marks to bidders having more than 100 IT Technical Manpower. The minimum PQ requirement itself mandates 100 technical professionals, and a bidder meeting this requirement demonstrates adequate organizational capacity to execute the project. Further, manpower strength beyond 100 indicates additional organizational capability and resource availability. We therefore request that the scoring criteria may be revised to provide 5 marks for 100–150 IT Technical Manpower and 10 marks for more than 100 IT Technical Manpower, to ensure wider participation of capable and experienced bidders.	As per RFP
116	Clause 5.4 – Discovery – Page 37	The selected bidder shall conduct discovery workshops and requirement-gathering sessions and prepare the SRS, FR, TR and NFR.	Kindly clarify the number of departments/stakeholders, workshops and business processes expected to be covered during the Discovery phase. Also, kindly confirm that requirements identified beyond the defined RFP scope after approval of SRS/FR/TR/NFR shall be treated as Change Requests.	Tenderer will share the required details to successful bidder.
117	Clause 5.6.1 – Dataset Repository Module – Page 47	The platform shall support upload, discovery, filtering, download, cataloguing, publishing, version control, licensing, tagging and API access for datasets.	Kindly provide the indicative number of datasets to be onboarded, expected dataset size range, maximum individual file/dataset size, supported file formats and expected annual growth for appropriate architecture and capacity planning.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSIT/DIT.
118	Clause 5.6 – Dataset Upload/Processing – Page 41	The platform shall support high-volume structured and unstructured datasets, concurrent uploads/downloads, API-based ingestion, streaming uploads/downloads and batch ingestion.	The term "high-volume" is not quantitatively defined. Kindly specify the expected maximum file size, aggregate storage requirement, concurrent uploads/downloads, peak throughput and API transaction volume to be supported.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSIT/DIT.

119	Clause 5.6.1 – AI Readiness Score – Page 47	The bidder is required to implement AI Readiness Score functionality, with the methodology to be proposed by the bidder and approved by DIT.	Kindly clarify the expected parameters, scoring methodology, number of datasets to be assessed and frequency of recalculation. Alternatively, kindly confirm that the methodology shall be finalized during the Discovery/Solution Design phase and approved by DIT.	As per RFP
120	Clause 5.6.2 – AI Models Module – Page 48	The platform shall support cataloging, publishing, versioning, licensing, tagging, access control and integration with code repositories/CI/CD pipelines for AI models.	Kindly clarify the expected number and types of AI models, maximum model size, number of model repositories to be integrated and whether the SI is required to develop/host AI models or only provide the repository/cataloging and lifecycle-management platform.	As per RFP
121	Clause 5.6.1 – Federated and Real-Time Dataset Access – Page 48	The platform shall support secure federated and real-time dataset access through APIs/data connectors and live synchronization with departmental databases.	Kindly provide the indicative number of departmental systems/databases to be integrated, database technologies, API availability and expected frequency of synchronization. Also clarify whether development of APIs/connectors for legacy departmental systems is within the SI's scope.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
122	Clause 5.6.1 – Data Classification & Anonymization – Page 48	The platform shall provide tools for dataset classification and anonymization based on DPDP Act and applicable frameworks.	Kindly clarify whether the SI is expected to provide automated data discovery, PII detection, masking, anonymization and pseudonymization capabilities for all supported data formats, or whether the scope is limited to providing configurable tools/workflows.	As per RFP
123	Clause 5.6.1 – AI Artefacts – Page 47 onwards	AI Sangrah is required to support datasets, AI/ML models, code, applications/tools, notebooks, benchmarks and other artefacts.	Kindly clarify whether the SI is required to develop/provide sample AI artefacts, models, datasets, notebooks or use cases, or whether the SI's responsibility is limited to developing the platform for hosting and managing artefacts contributed by authorized users.	As per RFP
124	Clause 5.5 – System Architecture & Infrastructure – Pages 37–38	The solution is required to be scalable, modular, microservices-based, API-first and cloud agnostic, while production deployment is required at GSDC.	Kindly provide the existing GSDC infrastructure details and available capacity, including compute, RAM, storage, GPU, network bandwidth, backup and DR infrastructure. This information is required for appropriate solution sizing and commercial estimation.	As per RFP
125	Clause 5.8.1 – Privacy, Compliance & Audit – Page 55	The agency shall implement privacy safeguards including data masking, encryption and anonymization and ensure compliance with applicable Government security standards.	Kindly provide the specific security audits, certifications, compliance assessments and applicable standards required during implementation and O&M, along with their frequency and acceptance criteria.	As per RFP
126	Clause 5.11.1 – O&M Scope – Page 54 onwards	O&M includes platform maintenance, monitoring, backups, fallover checks, security patches and management of data/model ingestion pipelines.	Kindly specify the expected number of users, departments, datasets, AI models, APIs and integrations to be supported during the five-year O&M period, along with the expected annual growth, to enable bidders to appropriately estimate O&M resources and effort.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
127	Clause 5.11 / 5.12 – O&M & Change Requests	O&M is on a Time & Material basis, while the RFP also requires ongoing enhancements, optimization and functional improvements.	Kindly provide a clear definition of routine O&M, bug fixing, minor enhancement, optimization and functional improvement versus activities that shall qualify as separately chargeable Change Requests, particularly for new modules, major enhancements and new integrations.	As per RFP
128	Clause 5.11.1.7 – Additional Manpower – Page 62	Additional qualified manpower may be required based on evolving requirements, including facilitation for dataset onboarding.	Kindly clarify the expected nature/quantity of additional manpower, process for requisition, approval mechanism, minimum deployment period, applicable rate card and billing methodology.	Please refer corrigendum
129	Clauses 5.4 / 6 – Project Deliverables & Acceptance	The SI is required to prepare various project documents, deliverables and reports which are subject to review/approval by the Department.	Kindly provide a detailed Deliverables and Acceptance Matrix, specifying the deliverable, submission timeline, reviewing/accepting authority and measurable acceptance criteria. Kindly also clarify the maximum review/approval period for each deliverable, as acceptance timelines directly impact project milestones and payment milestones.	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
130	Clause 5.3 / 5.5 – Broad Scope of Work & System Architecture – Pages 37–38	The SI is responsible for design, development, integration, deployment and testing of the solution, while production deployment is to be hosted at GSDC.	Kindly clarify who will provide the infrastructure/cloud environment for Development, Staging, Testing and UAT environments. Specifically, please confirm whether the required compute, storage, database, GPU, networking, security, backup and other infrastructure/cloud resources for Development, Staging, Testing and UAT will be provided by DIT/GSDC, or whether the same are required to be provisioned by the SI, in case these environments are to be provisioned by the SI, kindly provide the required sizing/specifications and duration of usage so that the same can be appropriately considered in the commercial proposal.	As per RFP
131	Clause 5.7 – Integration & Deployment – Page 47 onwards	The SI is responsible for integration and deployment of the AI Sangrah platform.	Kindly clarify whether all required third-party/departmental API access, credentials, connectivity, technical documentation, sandbox/test environments and support from respective departments will be provided by DIT/GSDC. Any delay due to non-availability of such dependencies may kindly be excluded from the SI's project timelines and associated penalties.	As per RFP
132	Section 3.23.2 – Technical Evaluation Criteria, Certification – Page 31	Bidder should have the following certification: 1. CMMI Level 3 – 05 Marks 2. Above CMMI Level 3 – 10 Marks	We request the Authority to kindly consider awarding 10 marks to bidders having CMMI Level 3 certification. CMMI Level 3 demonstrates that the organization has established, defined and standardized processes for software development and service delivery. Awarding only 5 marks to CMMI Level 3 may disadvantage bidders who already meet a recognized maturity standard. We therefore request that CMMI Level 3 and above may kindly be considered for 10 marks, thereby providing a fair opportunity to bidders with established process maturity.	As per RFP
133	Sec 5.7.1, p.53	GSDC provides hardware and infrastructure for the Production environment only, based on finalized hardware sizing	Will GSDC provision GPU/accelerated compute for AI/ML model training, inference, and the Sandbox-related workloads?	As per RFP
134	Sec 3.23.1, p.32	The RFP consistently requires Work Order AND Completion/Go-Live Certificate together as mandatory supporting documents for every cited project.	Considering the nature of AI/technology projects, where projects are often implemented in phases and may be ongoing, it is requested that the supporting document requirement be considered as Work Order OR Completion/Go-Live Certificate OR an equivalent ce	As per RFP
135	Sec 7.5.3	Contract termination trigger if cumulative penalties exceed 20% of work order / 30% in a month	Please confirm if these penalty caps are also the ceiling on total liability, or if damages beyond termination can still be claimed separately.	As per RFP
136	Section 3.23.1 – Pre-Qualification Criteria	The Bidder should have provided design, development, implementation, and operations & maintenance of software development or AI Dataset Platform / AI Data Exchange / Enterprise AI Data Platform Project Project with any State Government or Central Government or any PSU or any government organisation during last 05 years in India: At least One (1) such project of value not less than INR 5.5 Crore, OR At least Two (2) such projects each of value not less than INR 3.5 Crore, OR At least Three (3) such projects each of value not less than INR 2.8 Crore The Bidder should submit below document for each Project: a) Copy of the Work order/Purchase Order. b) Completion Certificate/Go-Live Certificate issued by the client. c) Project Citation with Client details (Name, Designation, Contact Number, Email Id, etc.)	With reference to the this clause, we kindly request the Authority to consider the SDAC copy for the GeM Contract as an acceptable document towards compliance with the RFP requirement. Since the project follows a milestone-based implementation approach, the completed milestones have achieved Go-Live and have been duly certified through the corresponding SDAC. Therefore, we request that the SDAC copy, reflecting the Go-Live status of the completed milestones, be accepted for evaluation under this criterion.	As per RFP
137	Section 3.23.2 – Technical Evaluation Criteria	Manpower Strength Bidder should have below technical manpower as required in PQ. 1. 100 – 200 IT Technical Manpower – 05 marks 2. More than 200 IT Technical Manpower – 10 Marks	With reference to the this clause, we kindly request the Authority to revise the technical manpower criteria in the PQ to encourage wider participation and maintain a competitive bidding process. We propose the following revised marking criteria: 1. 50–100 IT Technical Manpower – 05 Marks 2. More than 100 IT Technical Manpower – 10 Marks This revision will enable broader participation from qualified bidders while maintaining the intent of the evaluation criteria.	As per RFP
138	Section 3.23.2 – Technical Evaluation Criteria	Certification Bidder should have below certification. 1. CMMI Level 3 – 05 Marks 2. CMMI Level 4 and above – 10 marks	With reference to the above clause, we kindly request the Authority to revise the certification criteria to promote wider participation and maintain a competitive bidding process. We propose the following revised marking criteria: 1. ISO 9001 and ISO 27001 Certifications – 05 Marks 2. ISO 9001, ISO 27001, and a minimum CMMI Level 3 Certification – 10 Marks The proposed revision recognizes widely accepted quality and information security certifications while continuing to encourage process maturity through CMMI certification.	As per RFP
139	Clause 5.4 – Discovery / Page 37; Clause 5.5 – System Architecture & Solution Design / Page 41	Detailed functional, technical and non-functional requirements are to be finalized during discovery and the architecture/technology stack is subject to approval.	Kindly confirm that requirements or architecture changes introduced after approval of the SRS/solution design, which materially affect effort, licensing, infrastructure or timelines, shall be handled through an approved Change Request with corresponding cost/time adjustment.	As per RFP
140	Clause 5.5 – System Architecture & Solution Design / Page 41; Clause 5.7 – Integration and Deployment / Page 47	The solution is required to support scalable architecture, high-volume data, distributed storage, API-based ingestion, streaming/batch ingestion and other workloads, while detailed sizing information is not specified.	Kindly provide the expected initial and projected workload assumptions, including compute requirements, storage requirement, annual growth, network bandwidth, ingestion throughput and other relevant sizing parameters to enable bidders to prepare technically and commercially comparable proposals.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
141	Clause 5.6.1 – Dataset Repository Module / Page 42; Clause 5.6.12 – Integrations / Page 45	The platform is required to support high-volume structured/unstructured datasets, programmatic API access, federated access and live data connectors.	Kindly provide the indicative initial dataset volume, number of datasets/artefacts, maximum individual dataset/file size, expected annual growth, upload/download throughput, retention period and expected onboarding frequency for appropriate sizing of storage, compute, network and backup infrastructure.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.

142	Clause 5.3 – Broad Scope of Work / Pages 36-37	The SI is responsible for end-to-end execution and the scope uses the expression "including but not limited to".	Kindly confirm that the bidder's fixed-price obligation shall be limited to the functional, technical and non-functional requirements expressly specified in the RFP/Approved SRS, and that any material additional requirement shall be addressed through an approved Change Request with corresponding commercial and timeline implications.	As per RFP
143	Clause 5.6.12 – Integrations / Page 45; Clause 5.7 – Integration and Deployment / Page 47	The SI is required to facilitate integration with Government platforms, systems, APIs and services, while the detailed integrations are to be finalized during requirement gathering/design.	Kindly provide the indicative list and number of systems, portals, APIs and external interfaces proposed for integration, along with available API specifications, documentation, authentication mechanism, sandbox/test environment and interface details, to enable accurate estimation of integration effort.	As per RFP
144	Clause 5.6.12 – Integrations / Page 45; Clause 5.7 – Integration and Deployment / Page 47	API-first architecture, APIs based/federated access and integration/publication of APIs with the State API Gateway/Hub are required.	Kindly clarify whether the respective Government departments/system owners will provide ready-to-consume and documented APIs. Where APIs are unavailable or require modification, kindly clarify whether API development, modification, exposure or source-system changes are within the SI's scope.	As per RFP
145	Clause 5.7 – Integration and Deployment / Page 47	The SI has overall integration responsibility, while source-system details are to be finalized subsequently.	Kindly confirm that development, modification, remediation or enablement of APIs in third-party/Government source systems, including making existing departmental applications/API endpoints consumable by AI Sangrah, shall not form part of the fixed-price scope unless specifically identified and quantified in the RFP. Such activities, if required, may kindly be handled through an approved T&M Change Request.	For APIs exposed by external source systems, ownership, development, modification and maintenance shall remain the responsibility of the respective source system owner.
146	Clause 5.6.12 – Integrations / Page 45; Clause 5.7.1 – GSDC Support / Pages 47-49	Integration/publication with the State API Gateway/Hub and API management/monitoring are required.	Kindly clarify the availability and responsibility for State API Gateway/Hub onboarding, gateway configuration, certificates, API subscriptions, transaction charges, gateway licenses and other associated costs. Kindly confirm which of these facilities/charges shall be provided by GSDC/State Government and which, if any, are to be borne by the SI.	As per RFP
147	Clause 5.7 / 5.7.1 – Integration and Deployment / Pages 47-49	Federated access, periodic synchronization and live data connectors from departmental databases are required.	Kindly provide the indicative number of source databases/systems, connectivity method, data formats, synchronization frequency, approximate data volume and expected connectivity/security arrangements. Kindly clarify whether VPN/private connectivity, firewall changes and source-side infrastructure shall be provided by the respective departments/GSDC.	Source system details, synchronization frequency, integration methodology and related requirements shall be finalized during Discovery and Solution Design.
148	Clause 5.7.1 – Support Provided by GSDC / Pages 47-49	GSDC will provide Production infrastructure based on finalized sizing, while the bidder is responsible for other environments/facilities.	Kindly provide the existing/proposed GSDC infrastructure baseline and available capacity, including CPU, RAM, storage, network bandwidth, virtualization/container platform, load balancer, WAF, backup, monitoring/logging and other relevant infrastructure, to enable accurate solution sizing and commercial estimation.	As per RFP
149	Clause 5.7.1 – Support Provided by GSDC / Pages 47-49	The DevOps/environment requirement includes Development, Staging, UAT, Production and DR, while the GSDC responsibility matrix primarily identifies Production infrastructure.	Kindly clarify the infrastructure and hosting responsibility for the DR environment, including compute, storage, network connectivity, security components, backup and associated facilities.	GSDC will provide
150	Clause 5.7.1 – DR; Clause 7 – SLA	DR is included but specific RPO/RTO, DR capacity, replication mechanism and DR testing requirements are not defined.	Kindly provide the required RPO, RTO, DR capacity/sizing, replication mechanism, DR site responsibility and frequency/scope of DR drills/testing for appropriate technical and commercial sizing.	As per GSDC policy. The details shall be provided to successful bidder.
151	Clause 5.7.1 – GSDC Support / Pages 47-49; Clause 5.11 – O&M / Pages 54-57	GSDC is responsible for infrastructure-level backup while SI O&M also includes regular backups, failover checks and configuration validation.	Kindly clarify the responsibility boundary for application, database, configuration, dataset and log backups, including backup retention, restore testing, restoration responsibility and associated infrastructure.	As per RFP
152	Clause 5.6.11 – Analytics & Dashboard / Page 45; Clause 5.6.12 – Integrations / Page 45	Analytics, usage statistics, API monitoring and reporting are required, while user/API workload assumptions are not specified.	Kindly provide indicative registered users, active users, peak concurrent users, peak hour usage and expected API transaction volume/TPS to enable appropriate sizing of application, database, API gateway, monitoring and logging infrastructure.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSIT/DT.
153	Clause 5.6.4 / 5.6.11 – Platform Usage / Analytics; Clause 5.8 – Testing	The platform is required to support a minimum of 1,000 concurrent users and "zero-latency degradation".	Kindly define measurable performance benchmarks for 1,000 concurrent users, including transaction-wise response time, throughput, workload/data-size assumptions and acceptable latency thresholds. Kindly also clarify the intended meaning of "zero-latency degradation".	As per RFP
154	Clause 5.8 – Testing, Compliance, Data Protection and Audit / Pages 49-50	Security, penetration, performance, stress and load testing is required prior to Go-Live and "whenever required" during the contract period.	Kindly specify the expected frequency/number of security, performance, stress and load testing activities during the five-year O&M period. Kindly also clarify whether testing beyond the defined baseline/frequency shall be treated as a Charge Request.	As per RFP
155	Clause 5.8 – Performance Testing / Page 49; Clause 7.7 – SLA / Page 66 onwards	Performance testing requires 1,000 concurrent users and zero-latency degradation, while SLA provisions prescribe a separate response-time threshold of 500 ms for more than 0% peak-hour requests.	Kindly clarify the relationship between these requirements and confirm the measurable performance/response-time criteria that shall govern FAT, UAT, Go-Live and subsequent SLA measurement.	As per RFP
156	Clause 5.9 – Technical Resources / Pages 52-53; Clause 8.2 – Payment Milestones / Pages 69-70	Implementation and O&M require manpower deployment, with Annexure-3 providing B2 as Man-Month Cost for Resources per Quarter for 20 quarters.	Kindly clarify whether B2 represents a committed minimum O&M manpower cost payable for each quarter or whether payment shall be strictly based on actual resources deployed/involved during the respective quarter.	As per RFP
157	Clause 5.11 – O&M / Pages 54-57; Clause 5.11.2 – Team Composition / Pages 55-56	O&M is stated to be on a Time & Material basis, while a minimum O&M team is prescribed and the team may be up-sized/down-sized.	Kindly clarify the minimum O&M manpower commitment, applicable billing basis, treatment of partial deployment/partial quarter and whether the Purchaser may reduce the team below the prescribed minimum.	As per RFP
158	Clause 5.11.1 – O&M / Page 56; Clause 5.11.2 – O&M Resources	Additional qualified manpower may be required based on evolving requirements, including dataset onboarding.	Kindly confirm that additional manpower shall be deployed only against a separate written order/approved requirement specifying profile, quantity, duration and scope, and clarify whether an annual/contractual ceiling shall apply to such additional manpower.	As per RFP
159	Clause 5.11.2 – O&M Resources / Pages 55-56	At least 70% of O&M team members shall be retained from the implementation team "as per required number of resources".	Kindly clarify whether the 70% requirement is calculated against the total O&M team strength or implementation team strength, particularly since the implementation and minimum O&M team sizes are different.	As per RFP
160	Clause 5.11.3 – O&M / Page 57	Clause 5.11.3 refers to activities listed under Clause 5.8.1, whereas O&M activities are detailed under Clause 5.11.1.	Kindly confirm whether the reference to Clause 5.8.1 in Clause 5.11.3 is a typographical error and should instead refer to Clause 5.11.1.	Please see Corrigendum
161	Clause 5.11.1 – O&M / Pages 54-57	O&M includes L1/L2/L3 support, incident management, onboarding, documentation, compliance, monitoring and other operational activities, while only four minimum O&M resources are prescribed.	Kindly provide indicative service volumes, including expected users, support tickets, onboarding requests, datasets and other operational workloads, to validate whether the prescribed minimum team represents the baseline workload. Kindly confirm that additional manpower required beyond the defined baseline shall be handled through the additional manpower mechanism.	As per RFP
162	Clause 5.11 – O&M / Pages 54-57	O&M team is required to be deployed onsite, while certain specialist/OEM activities may require remote support.	Kindly confirm that specialist/OEM personnel may provide remote support as required, provided the prescribed core O&M team remains deployed onsite.	As per RFP
163	Clause 5.12 – Time and Material – Change Requests / Page 57	The clause is titled "Time and Material – Change Requests", while it also states that continuous enhancement, optimization, bug fixing, configuration changes and functional improvements shall be performed without additional cost.	Kindly clarify which activities are included within the quoted O&M price and which shall qualify as chargeable T&M Change Requests. Kindly define the boundaries of "Functional Improvements", "Optimization", enhancement and bug-fixing activities.	As per RFP
164	Clause 5.12 – Change Requests / Page 57; Clause 5.3-5.4 – Scope/Discovery	New functionality, integrations, evolving requirements and source-system/API changes may arise after detailed requirements are finalized.	Kindly confirm that new functionality, new integration, source-system/API development or modification, material business-process changes and requirements beyond the approved SRS/baseline scope shall be treated as chargeable Change Requests/T&M activities with corresponding commercial and schedule adjustment.	As per RFP
165	Clause 5.13 – Deliverables / Page 58; Clause 8 – Payment / Pages 68-70	Payments are linked to submission/review/acceptance of deliverables by DT/third-party reviewers, where applicable.	Kindly specify a maximum period for review and acceptance of each deliverable and provide for deemed acceptance where no written acceptance is communicated within the prescribed period.	As per RFP
166	Clause 5.13 – SLA / Page 58; Clause 7.6 – SLA / Page 66 onwards	Go-Live depends upon UAT, security audit, GIGW compliance and other approvals, while implementation milestones have defined timelines.	Kindly confirm that delays in approvals, infrastructure provisioning, data/API availability, security audits, GIGW compliance or other dependencies attributable to DT/GSDC/Departments/third parties shall result in corresponding extension of the affected milestone without penalty to the SI.	As per RFP
167	Clause 6 – Project Governance / Pages 59-61; Clause 5.7 / Page 47	Project execution involves DIT, GIL, GSDC, Department Nodal Officers, Government SOC, third-party auditors and other stakeholders.	Kindly provide a clear responsibility/RACI matrix covering infrastructure provisioning, data/API availability, requirement approval, UAT, security approvals, dataset onboarding, integration, SLA attribution and final acceptance.	As per RFP
168	Clause 7.3 – SLA Definitions / Page 62; Clause 7.7 – SLA / Page 66 onwards	SLA availability is calculated based on Scheduled Operation Time, while Business Hours are separately defined as 10:00-18:30.	Kindly define the exact Scheduled Operation Time for calculation of the 99.95% availability SLA and confirm whether availability shall be measured on a 24x7 basis or only during defined operating hours.	As per RFP
169	Clause 7.3 / 7.7 – SLA / Pages 62 and 66 onwards	Production service depends upon GSDC infrastructure, network, WAF, load balancer, backup and third-party/departmental systems.	Kindly provide a responsibility/attribution matrix and confirm that downtime caused by GSDC infrastructure, network, security components, third-party systems, Government dependencies or other events beyond the SI's reasonable control shall be excluded from SLA calculations, subject to documented RCA.	As per RFP
170	Clause 7.6 – Project Implementation Timeline / Page 65	Implementation penalties are capped at 15% of the applicable contract value/milestone/O&M amount.	Considering that the RFP already provides milestone-wise penalties and other contractual remedies, kindly consider reducing the maximum aggregate penalty cap from 15% to 10% of the applicable contract/milestone/O&M value, to ensure a more reasonable and proportionate allocation of contractual risk.	As per RFP
171	Clause 7.5.3 – SLA / Pages 63-64; Clause 7.6 – Implementation Timeline / Page 65	The RFP contains multiple penalty and termination mechanisms, including cumulative penalties exceeding 20% of Work Order value and monthly O&M penalty thresholds, in addition to the 15% cap.	Kindly consider rationalizing the penalty provisions by applying a single aggregate penalty cap of 10% of the applicable contract phase/value, with termination/PBG invocation reserved for material and repeated breaches after due notice and reasonable opportunity to cure.	As per RFP
172	Clause 7.4 – Security Breach/Data Theft / Page 63; Clause 7.7 – SLA / Pages 66 onwards	The RFP provides for consequences arising from security/data breaches and recovery of applicable regulatory penalties attributable to the bidder.	Kindly clarify whether an overall aggregate liability cap shall apply to the SI, including SLA penalties, implementation penalties, security breach, regulatory penalties, indemnity and other contractual claims.	As per RFP
173	Clause 5.10.2 – 5.10.3 – Software Licensing / Pages 53-54	Bidder is required to procure required licenses and ensure continued OEM support, including an irrevocable OEM undertaking where five-year licensing is not available upfront.	Kindly clarify the treatment of OEM-mandated price increases, changes in licensing models, product discontinuation or other OEM-driven commercial changes during Years 2-5, and whether corresponding price variation shall be permitted.	As per RFP
174	Clause 5.10 – Software Licensing / Pages 53-54; Annexure-19 / Page 102	The bidder may propose proprietary, COTS and open-source technologies, with licensing/support obligations during the contract period.	Kindly clarify that Government ownership shall apply to project-specific deliverables developed under this RFP, while the bidder's pre-existing/background IP, reusable frameworks, accelerators, generic libraries and third-party/open-source components shall remain subject to their respective ownership/licensing terms.	As per RFP
175	Clause 5.5 – Cloud-Agnostic Design / Page 38	Bidder may provision Development, Testing, Staging, UAT and Training environments on bidder-hosted cloud and all associated costs shall be borne by bidder.	Kindly clarify the exact sizing, duration and availability requirements for each non-production environment, including whether these environments are required continuously throughout the project/O&M period or only during the applicable implementation phases.	As per RFP
176	Clause 5.9 – Technical Resources / Page 53; GSDC/Tenderer Support provisions	Tenderer provides seating and internet connectivity, while other infrastructure/facilities required for execution and maintenance are bidder responsibility.	Kindly clarify the facilities to be provided by the Tenderer/GSDC and whether bidder-provided facilities include laptops/desktops, development/testing devices, VPN/connectivity, productivity tools, communication facilities and other employee infrastructure.	As per RFP
177	Clause 5.11.1.3 – Artefact Onboarding and Validation Support / Page 56; Clause 5.11.1.7 – Additional Manpower / Page 56	O&M includes onboarding and validation support for datasets, models, tools and use cases, with additional manpower potentially required for dataset onboarding.	Kindly provide the expected number of datasets/models/tools/use cases to be onboarded during implementation and annually during O&M, together with the expected level of validation, metadata preparation, data classification, anonymization and transformation, for accurate manpower and commercial estimation.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSIT/DT.
178	Clause 7.6 – Project Implementation Timeline / Page 65; Clause 5.13 – Deliverables / Page 58	Training of designated users is included in implementation, covering administration, dashboards/reports, exploration/usage and onboarding.	Kindly provide the indicative number of users/participants, number of training batches/versions, expected duration, location/mode and training deliverables required, to enable accurate estimation of training and associated manpower/travel costs.	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
179	Clause 5.13 / Page 58; Exit/Data Protection provisions / Pages 51-52	Bidder is required to return Government data, metadata and derived artefacts and provide source code/documentation at project completion/termination.	Kindly define the exit-management period, expected data volume/format, transfer mechanism, migration/handholding requirements and maximum duration of bidder support during exit. Any migration or support beyond the defined baseline may kindly be treated as a Charge Request.	As per RFP
180	Clause 8.1 – Payment Terms / Pages 69; Clause 8.2 – Payment Milestones / Pages 69-70	Payment is linked to services actually availed, while certain resources/services may be specifically ordered or committed for a defined period.	Kindly clarify that where a service/resource has been specifically ordered/approved for a defined period, the corresponding committed amount shall be payable irrespective of utilization caused by Purchaser-side scheduling/non-utilization, and that disputed amounts shall be limited to the genuinely disputed portion of the invoice.	As per RFP
181	Clause 5.3-5.12 – Scope of Work / Pages 36-57; Clause 8 – Payment / Pages 69-70	The bidder is required to provide an end-to-end solution while several requirements, integrations, infrastructure sizing, data onboarding and evolving O&M requirements are to be finalized during/post implementation.	Kindly confirm that the financial bid shall be evaluated against the defined baseline scope and assumptions available at the bidding stage, and that material changes in workload/data volume, integrations, source systems/API development, infrastructure, manpower or regulatory/technical requirements introduced subsequently shall be addressed through an approved Change Request with corresponding commercial and timeline adjustment.	As per RFP
182	Clause 5.3-4.7 – Scope, Discovery, Architecture & Integration / Pages 36-49	Integration requirements and detailed technical requirements will be finalized during discovery/design, while the bidder is expected to provide firm commercial pricing.	Kindly confirm that the number and complexity of integrations shall be frozen during the approved SRS/solution design stage and that integrations exceeding the agreed baseline, including new systems/APIs introduced subsequently, shall be treated as Change Requests.	As per RFP

183	Clause 5.6.12 – Integrations / Page 45; Clause 5.7 / Page 47	API-based access, federated access, connectors and API Gateway integration are required, but no API throughput, rate limits or payload assumptions are provided.	Kindly provide indicative API request volume/TPS, peak load, payload size, API rate limits, expected concurrent API consumers and applicable data-transfer requirements for API Gateway and application sizing.	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
184	Clause 5.6.1 / 5.6.13 – Dataset Repository & Integrations / Pages 42–45	Dataset repository and integration requirements include structured/unstructured data and departmental data sources, but source-data quality/readiness is not defined.	Kindly clarify the expected condition of source data, including whether data cleansing, transformation, deduplication, metadata creation, classification, anonymization or quality remediation is expected from the SI. Please provide indicative assumptions for such activities for commercial estimation.	As per RFP
185	Clause 5.11 – O&M / Pages 54–57; Clause 5.12 – Change Requests / Page 57	O&M includes bug fixing, optimization, functional improvements and continuous enhancement, while T&M Change Requests are also provided.	Kindly clarify that corrective maintenance for defects attributable to the SI shall be included within O&M, whereas enhancement/new functionality, new integration, major configuration changes, source-system changes and business-process changes beyond the approved baseline shall be chargeable Change Requests.	As per RFP
186	Clause 4.8 – Intellectual Property Rights / Page 34; Annexure-19 / Page 102	The RFP provides broad Government ownership over materials developed during the project and separately requires disclosure of proprietary/COTS/open-source tools and licenses.	Kindly clarify the ownership/licensing treatment of bidder's pre-existing IP, reusable components, generic frameworks, development tools, libraries and accelerators embedded in the solution, so that only project-specific deliverables are transferred to the Purchaser while underlying reusable/background IP remains with the respective owner.	As per RFP
187	Clause 5.7.1 – GSDC Support / Pages 47–49; Clause 5.9 – Technical Resources / Page 53	GSDC/Tenderer provides certain infrastructure and facilities, while bidder bears other infrastructure/facility costs.	Kindly provide a comprehensive responsibility matrix for all infrastructure, software, tools, connectivity, security components, certificates, monitoring, backup, DR, endpoint devices and other facilities to eliminate overlap or unpriced responsibilities between GSDC and SI.	As per RFP
188	1.3 Fact Sheet Page #12-13	8. Last date for Submission of Pre-Bid Queries	1. We request that a minimum of 12-14 working days be provided between publication of the consolidated responses to pre-bid queries/corrigendum and the final bid submission deadline, to allow bidders adequate time to incorporate any clarifications/changes into their technical and commercial proposals.	Kindly refer website for due date & corrigendum if any
189	2. Background of Gujarat AI Initiatives Page #15	11. Last date and time for proposal submission (in or before) 2.1 Introduction: AISangrah The repository will support the development of data-driven governance, enable secure access to high-value datasets, and align with national data initiatives such as AIKosh and Open Government Data.	1. Please clarify the nature of integration expected with AIKosh/OGD – i.e., whether AISangrah needs to programmatically sync/mirror datasets with these national platforms, or only maintain conceptual/branding alignment. 2. If AISangrah needs to programmatically sync/mirror datasets with these national platforms then please share below details 2.1. Total Number of APIs 2.2. Availability of APIs and its respective documents 2.3. We assume that all cost related to these APIs will be borne by the department. Please confirm.	As per RFP, Tenderer will share the required details to successful bidder.
190	1.2.3.1 Pre-qualification Criteria Page #33	1.2 The bidder should have a minimum average annual turnover of INR 14 Crore during the last three financial years (from IT/ITES/software development) with positive net worth as on 31st March 2025.	1. Considering the overall size, scope, and complexity of the project—and with an objective to attract technically strong and experienced bidders, we recommend revising the turnover requirement as suggested below. We also request that the same revised criteria be reflected in the Technical Evaluation parameters. 1.2 The bidder should have a minimum average annual turnover of INR 50 Crore during the last three financial years (from IT/ITES/software development) with positive net worth as on 31st March 2025.	Please refer corrigendum
191	1.2.3.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria Page #36	4 Presentation 5. Capability Demonstration – 5 Marks	1. Please clarify that what is expected as a submission for Capability Demonstration during presentation?	Demonstration on the capability of the bidder in terms of past projects, right resources, etc.
192	5.3 Broad scope of work Page #42	a. Requirement Gathering: The Selected Bidder shall conduct detailed discovery workshops and requirement-gathering sessions with the department and relevant stakeholders to draft the Software Requirement Specification (SRS).	1. Kindly clarify the expected number of requirement-gathering/discovery workshops, the participating departments/stakeholders, and whether these workshops are to be conducted at a single location or across multiple locations. 2 Kindly enlist workshop locations if its for multiple location.	As per RFP
193	General – Existing Datasets/Use Cases for Onboarding Page #35, #54	Relates to Clause 5.4 (Discovery, Page #43) and Clause 5.11.3 (Artifact Onboarding and Validation Support, Page #63).	1. Kindly confirm whether DIT/GIL already has an identified, ready inventory of datasets, AI models, and use cases to be onboarded onto AISangrah at/around Go-Live, or whether the System Integrator is expected to identify and facilitate onboarding of such artifacts entirely afresh during/after the Discovery phase. 2. In case of ready inventory, can bidders be allowed to review the same? 3. Please share the indicative number/volume of datasets expected to be onboarded in Year 1 of O&M, for capacity and resource planning.	SI has to facilitate the onboarding of Artifacts. There is no ready inventory of datasets, AI Models, and use cases. Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSI/DIT. Selected Bidder has to facilitate the onboarding of Artifacts.
194	4.3 Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) 4.3.3 – Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) Page #37	4.3.3 Consequent to the issuance of this Order, the Successful Bidder is required to furnish a Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) amounting to 5% of the total contract value in the name of Directorate of ICT & e-Governance.	1. Considering that the OPEX component is payable on an annual basis, we request DIT/GIL to permit submission of the Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) as 5% of the respective annual OPEX value (to be renewed annually) and 5% of the CAPEX value, instead of 5% of the cumulative contract value. Kindly consider.	As per RFP
195	5.6.1 Core Feature Development 5.6.1. Dataset Repository Module Page #48	9 Centralized Metadata repository for data sets (Appropriate standards like DCAI must be maintained).	1. Kindly provide details of the types/categories of datasets that are proposed to be maintained in the centralized metadata repository. Additionally, please share 8 - 10 real life sample datasets to facilitate accurate understanding of the scope, project objective and metadata requirements.	Types of datasets are mentioned in RFP section 5.5.1.
196	Data Centre (GSDC) on-premises infrastructure. The Bidder may provision Development, Testing Page #43	d. Cloud-Agnostic Design: However, the Production environment shall be hosted exclusively at the Gujarat State Data Centre (GSDC) on-premises infrastructure. The Bidder may provision Development, Testing, Staging, UAT, and Training environments on bidder-hosted Cloud, subject to compliance with the DPDP Act, MeitY guidelines, and prior approval of the Tenderer.	1. In order to provision the Development, Testing, Staging, UAT, and Training environments, bidders require the complete technical specifications of the Production/LIVE environment where the final solution will be hosted. This will enable bidders to provision comparable environments and ensure compatibility, thereby avoiding any deployment, configuration, or performance-related issues during migration to the Production environment. Kindly share the complete Bill of Materials (BOM)/technical specifications of the Production server environment, including compute, storage, supporting operating system, supporting database, network, security, and other relevant infrastructure details. 2. We also request you to please share the expected volumes for UAT and Training environments in terms of number of records, number of documents, number of pages etc. so that bidders can estimate the infrastructure sizing accordingly.	1. Bidders are expected to design a distributed, cloud-native, horizontally scalable, and modular storage architecture capable of supporting datasets of varying sizes and formats, with seamless scalability to accommodate future growth without requiring major architectural changes. 2. Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSI/DIT.
197	5.5 System Architecture and Solution Design Page #43	a. Architecture & UX: Design the over-arching Solution Architecture, Application Architecture, and User Experience (UX/UI) blueprints, ensuring alignment with DIT standards, interactive user interface and user experience designs developed using tools such as Figma or equivalent prototyping platforms, covering key workflows, dashboards and interfaces, for review and approval by the DIT prior to development.	1. Please specify the number of review-approval cycles included within the project timeline for architecture and UI/UX sign-off, and the maximum turnaround time DIT will commit to for each review cycle.	As per RFP
198	5.4 Discovery Page #43	b. Formal Approval: Finalisation of Functional Requirements (FR), Technical Requirements (TR), and Non-Functional Requirements (NFR) subject to formal approval by the Directorate of ICT and e-Governance (DIT).	1. In the event of any delay in the approval of the SRS, FRs, NFR and other documents, we kindly request you to re-baseline the project timeline accordingly and revise the penalty calculation to reflect the revised timelines. We request your kind consideration of the same.	As per RFP
199	5.5 System Architecture and Solution Design vs. Annexure 19(e) On-Premises Hosting Page #43 & #108	5.5 d. Cloud-Agnostic Design: The solution architecture shall support deployment across GSDC, NIC Cloud (MeghRaj), and MeitY-empowered cloud providers to ensure deployment flexibility and avoid vendor lock-in. Annexure 19, Instruction (e): Bidders must ensure that all tools are compatible with the on-premises hosting model and can be deployed at the Gujarat State Data Center.	1. Clause 5.5(d) requires deployment flexibility across GSDC, NIC Cloud (MeghRaj), or MeitY-empowered cloud providers, whereas Annexure-19 mandates that all tools be compatible with and deployable on the Gujarat State Data Centre (GSDC). For an AI/ML-based platform, certain proprietary AI/ML/NLP engines, LLMs, or specialized analytics components may not be technically deployable in an on-premises environment due to licensing, infrastructure, dependency, or architectural constraints. We request the Authority to kindly clarify whether a hybrid deployment architecture will be acceptable, wherein all application components, databases, business data, and confidential government information remain hosted within GSDC, while specific AI/ML inference engines, model services, or managed AI components may be deployed on NIC Cloud or a MeitY-empowered cloud, subject to compliance with applicable data residency, security, and Government of India guidelines. This clarification will enable bidders to propose the most technically robust and future-ready AI solution without compromising data security, regulatory compliance, or project objectives. It is also requested that bidders may be permitted to propose equivalent AI/ML technologies, including proprietary, open-source, or managed AI services, wherever on-premises deployment is technically infeasible, provided that (i) all government data continues to reside within India, (ii) no confidential data is retained or used for model training by the service provider, and (iii) all applicable security, privacy, and contractual requirements of the Authority are fully complied with.	As per RFP
200	5.5.1 Data Storage Architecture & Data Ingestion Page #45	Unified and Scalable Storage Architecture: The platform shall adopt a distributed, cloudnative and horizontally scalable storage architecture capable of supporting: 1. Massive-scale dataset storage and processing workloads;	1. To enable accurate sizing of the storage solution and commercial bid, kindly share the expected initial data volume (in TB) at Go-Live and the anticipated year-on-year growth rate over the 5-year O&M period. 2. Kindly clarify the expected number of concurrent dataset upload/download transactions and the average/maximum individual file size to be supported. 3. We request authority to share approximate 10-15 real life sample data sets with use cases related to Health, Education, Transportation etc. 4. Please share approximate size / volume of data set at the time of go live and year on year increment during 5 years of O & M period.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSI/DIT.
201	5.5.1 Data Storage Architecture & Data Ingestion Page #46	The system shall support intelligent chunking/partitioning of files during upload, wherein large files are automatically divided into smaller encrypted segments for efficient transmission, parallel processing, resumable upload, and network-failure recovery. Upon successful completion of upload, the platform shall automatically reconstruct and validate the file integrity using checksum/hash verification mechanisms to ensure that the uploaded dataset is restored as a single unified file without any data break or intermediate corruption.	Please specify the maximum individual file size and maximum concurrent upload sessions the platform must support, to guide the ingestion architecture and storage throughput design.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSI/DIT.

202	5.7 Integration and Deployment Page #53 2. Background of Gujarat AI Initiatives Page #15	Ecosystem Integration: Facilitate seamless integration with existing government platforms, systems, APIs, and services wherever applicable. Key Pillars of the Gujarat AI Action Plan (a) Data Governance: Establishing a secure, interoperable AI data ecosystem in compliance with national standards to drive decision intelligence. • Should display AI readiness scores across different domains for model development. The AI Readiness Score methodology and evaluation framework shall be proposed by the Selected Bidder based on industry standards and best practices. The proposed framework shall be submitted to the tenderer for review and approval during the Solution Design phase.	1. Kindly share a definitive list of existing government/national platforms (e.g., Aikosh, API Setu, GSWAN-hosted systems, departmental systems) with which integration is mandatorily required at Go-Live, versus those that may be taken up as future/phased enhancements. 2. Please confirm that API access, documentation, and any associated costs for such third-party/government platform integrations will be provided/facilitated by DIT/GIL.	As per RFP
203	5.6.1 Core Feature Development 5.6.1 – Dataset Repository Module: AI Readiness Score Page #87	AI Readiness score implementation and preview functionalities... • Should display AI readiness scores across different domains for model development. The AI Readiness Score methodology and evaluation framework shall be proposed by the Selected Bidder based on industry standards and best practices. The proposed framework shall be submitted to the tenderer for review and approval during the Solution Design phase.	1. Kindly clarify whether the methodology/scoring framework for the 'AI Readiness Score' is to be defined and proposed by the bidder, or whether DIT will provide a pre-defined framework/parameters for this scoring mechanism. 2. If the proposed framework is not approved during the Solution Design phase, what will be your contingency plan to ensure smooth project progress and avoid delays?	As per RFP
204	5.6.1 Core Feature Development 5.6.1 – Dataset Repository Module: Page #48	Tools to Support Datasets for classification and Anonymization based on DPDP Act and any other prevailing acts, rules, frameworks or guidelines etc.	1. Please share the expected scale (number of datasets/records per month) for which automated classification and anonymization needs to be supported, for accurate solution sizing.	The exact number of datasets and records to be processed cannot be determined at this stage and may vary based on participation by departments and contributors. Bidders are expected to propose a scalable solution capable of supporting automated classification and anonymization for datasets of varying sizes and volumes. The proposed solution shall be designed to scale seamlessly to meet future requirements without any architectural changes.
205	5.6.1 Core Feature Development Page #48	Dataset Repository Module: Tools to Support Datasets for classification and Anonymization based on DPDP Act and any other prevailing acts, rules, frameworks or guidelines etc.	Please specify whether the platform must provide automated PII detection/anonymization tooling (e.g., auto-masking), or whether classification/anonymization is a manual workflow performed by data contributors before upload.	As per RFP
206	5.6.1 Core Feature Development Page #48	5.6.2. AI Models Module: Build ability in the solution to integrate with code repositories/CICD pipeline for deployment.	Kindly clarify the expected depth of CI/CD integration – is the platform required to trigger model deployment to external environments, or only to link/reference external repository commits and pipeline status within the catalog?	As per RFP
207	5.6.1 Core Feature Development Page #50	5.6.8 – User, Role, Privilege Management Module: Integration with DigLocker, Citizen SSO, Office SSO, MeriPehchaan and Parichay for individual and government user authentication.	1. Please confirm that API access, credentials, and any associated subscription/transaction costs for these third-party integrations shall be borne directly by DIT, and not the bidder.	As per RFP.
208	5.6.1 Core Feature Development Page #50	5.6.11. Analytics and Dashboard Module: Interactive charts, graphs, and maps may be used to visualize complex datasets, including geospatial data. Bidders may leverage open-source tools for such data visualization. GIS/mapping capability is not intended as a mandatory core platform requirement requiring specialized GIS licensing unless specifically proposed by the bidder.	Please clarify whether GIS/mapping capability is a core platform requirement applicable to all geospatial datasets, or a specific use-case requiring specialized GIS licensing/tools to be quoted separately.	Bidder may use opensource tools for the data visualization.
209	5.6.1 Core Feature Development Page #51	5.6.12. Integrations: Integrate/Publish APIs with State API Gateway/Hub	Please confirm the current status and readiness of the Gujarat State API Hub (separately being procured under a parallel RFP) and the expected integration touchpoints/APIs to be exposed by AISangrah to that Hub.	Tenderer will share the required details to successful bidder.
210	5.6.2 Application Security and Vulnerability Management Page #52	Regular VAPT: The Selected Bidder shall, at its own cost and responsibility, conduct Vulnerability Assessment and Penetration Testing (VAPT), remediation of identified vulnerabilities, and obtain VAPT clearance for the AI Sangrah platform prior to Go-Live. Post Go-Live, VAPT shall be conducted by the CERT-in empanelled agency engaged by the Security Operations Centre (SOC), Government of Gujarat, while the Selected Bidder shall be responsible for remediation of all identified vulnerabilities during the contract period.	1. We assume that only ONE Security Audit / VAPT Audit (i.e. Before Go Live) will be in the scope of the selected bidder. Any further requirement of Security Audit / VAPT event if it is required before Go-Live will be directly paid by the department. Please confirm.	As per RFP
211	5.6.2 Application Security and Vulnerability Management Page #52	Patch Management: A mandatory 24-to-48-hour remediation window for 'Critical' and 'High' vulnerabilities identified via NVD/CERT-in advisories.	1. We assume that 24 to 48 hours mentioned in this clause refers to business hours. Please confirm. 2. Please clarify the treatment in cases where the fix/patch is dependent on a third-party OEM's release timeline, which is beyond the bidder's control.	1. As per RFP, 24-48 hours are normal hours and not the business hours. 2. As per RFP.
212	5.7 Integration and Deployment Page #53 5.5 System Architecture and Solution Design Page #43	The solution shall comply with all applicable Gujarat State Data Center (GSDC) policies, guidelines, and procedures, including ISO 20000 and ISO 27001 standards, as prescribed by the Government of Gujarat. d. Cloud-Agnostic Design: The architecture must be designed for deployment flexibility across the Gujarat State Data Centre (SDC), Multi-empanelled cloud providers, or NIC Cloud (Meghra) without vendor lock-in.	Please confirm the final hosting environment (GSDC vs. Mety cloud vs. NIC Meghra), as this materially affects infrastructure costing and architecture design.	As per RFP
213	5.7.1 Support Provided by GSDC Page #53	GSDC shall provide the required hardware and infrastructure for the Production environment only, based on finalized hardware sizing and availability. The SDA shall provide the complete list of required open-source software/tools. If any commercial/paid software is proposed by the SDA, the procurement of licenses, subscriptions, and enterprise support shall be entirely the responsibility of the SDA. Staging and other non-production environments shall be managed by the SDA.	1. Please clarify the process and timeline for GSDC to approve and provision the finalized hardware sizing, and whether the SI is expected to provision Staging/UAT environments on GSDC infrastructure or on the SI's own cloud/on-prem setup.	As per RFP
214	5.7.1 Support Provided by GSDC Page #53	1. Staging / Production Environment: GSDC shall provide the required hardware and infrastructure for the Production environment only... Staging and other non-production environments shall be managed by the SDA.	1. Kindly share the expected timeline for GSDC to provision Production hardware/infrastructure after finalization of hardware sizing, and confirm that any delay attributable to GSDC infrastructure provisioning shall be excluded from the Bidder's implementation timeline penalty calculation (Clause 7.6). 2. Please confirm whether a cloud-hosted Staging environment is acceptable as an alternative to a self-managed on-premises staging setup.	As per RFP
215	5.7.2 Responsibility for Non-GSDC Components Page #54	Except for the infrastructure, platforms, licenses, tools, and support services expressly stated in the above table as being provided by GSDC, all other hardware, software, licenses, subscriptions, tools, utilities, middleware, security solutions, monitoring systems, application components, third-party services, and associated support requirements necessary for successful implementation, operation, and maintenance of the Project shall be solely the responsibility of the Selected Bidder (SDA). The Selected Bidder shall be responsible for the identification, procurement, deployment, configuration, integration, licensing, renewal, upgrade, maintenance, and support of all such components at its own cost, without any additional financial implication to DIT or GSDC.	Please confirm whether DIT will provide a consolidated, indicative Bill of Materials (BoM) of expected third-party/commercial software components, or whether bidders are expected to independently determine and price the full technology stack.	As per RFP
216	5.8 – Performance and Load Testing Page #55	c. Performance and Load Testing: Validation of system stability under a minimum load of 1,000 concurrent users to ensure zero-latency degradation during peak usage.	1. Kindly define the acceptable response-time/latency threshold to be used as the benchmark for 'zero-latency degradation', since this term is not quantified in the RFP. 2. Please share the expected total registered user base and dataset/transaction volume over the 5-year period, to enable appropriate load-test scenario design.	1. As per RFP (clause 7.7) 2. Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
217	5.8 Testing, Compliance, Data Protection and Audit Mechanisms Page #55	a. Functional & User Acceptance Testing (UAT): Coordinated validation of all business workflows and stakeholder requirements. b. Security Testing (VAPT): Comprehensive Vulnerability Assessment and Penetration Testing through CERT-in empanelled auditors to ensure a "Safe-to-Host" status. c. Performance and Load Testing: Validation of system stability under a minimum load of 1,000 concurrent users to ensure zero-latency degradation during peak usage. d. Reliable and Scalable Testing (RAS): Implementation of a RAS framework to verify the platform's high availability, fault tolerance, and its ability to scale horizontally as data ingestion volumes increase.	1. We request the department to specify the frequency, number of iterations for each type of testing to be carried out by the successful bidder during the implementation and O&M phases.	As per RFP
218	5.8 Testing, Compliance, Data Protection and Audit Mechanisms Page #55	c. Performance and Load Testing: Validation of system stability under a minimum load of 1,000 concurrent users to ensure zero-latency degradation during peak usage.	Please clarify the definition of 'zero-latency degradation' with quantifiable NFR targets (e.g., maximum acceptable response time in ms/seconds under peak load) to allow objective testing and sign-off.	As per RFP (clause 7.7)
219	5.8.2 Point 4 – Data Localization: Page #57	All Government data shall be stored and processed within India and in Government-approved hosting environments. Cross-border transfer of Government data shall not be permitted without prior written approval from the Government.	1. Kindly clarify whether cloud-based AI/ML services hosted in India (with data residency within India) are permitted for implementation, or whether all AI/ML workloads, models, and datasets are required to be deployed entirely on-premises within the GSDC.	As per RFP
220	5.8.2 Point 8 – Data Breach Notification Page #56, #57	The Bidder shall notify the Department and State Data Authority of any actual or suspected data breach within 6 hours of becoming aware of such incident in the provided Data Breach Notification Format.	1. Please clarify whether the 6-hour timeline is counted from the time the bidder's team first detects/suspects the incident, or from the time of formal confirmation of the breach.	As per RFP
221	5.8.2 Point 16 – Data Processing Addendum (DPA) Page #57	Mandatory Data Processing Addendum (DPA): The Successful Bidder shall execute the Government-prescribed Data Processing Addendum (DPA) as part of the Agreement.	1. Kindly share the draft/format of the Government-prescribed Data Processing Addendum (DPA) along with this RFP or through a corrigendum, to enable bidders to assess its commercial and legal implications prior to bid submission.	As per RFP, The DPA shall be shared to the successful bidder.
222	5.9 Technical Resource Page #58	The Bidder shall deploy minimum below qualified resources for full time at site during Implementation. All resource deployment and replacements have to be prior approved by the Authority. The development team will be stationed onsite.	1. Kindly confirm the exact onsite location (Gandhinagar/DIT office) where the Implementation-phase team is required to be stationed. 2. We assume that DIT/GIL will provide dedicated PC/Laptop and workstation/seating space for onsite resources. Please confirm.	1. Onsite location will be in Gandhinagar. 2. As per RFP, Tenderer will provide seating space and internet connectivity.
223	5.10 – Software Licensing Model Page #58	5.10.1 The AISangrah solution software components should primarily be based on Open-Source license with enterprise support.	Please clarify whether any specific Open-Source technology stack is mandated/preferred by DIT (e.g., for IAM, object storage, search engine), or if the SI has full discretion to propose the stack subject to approval.	As per RFP
224	5.11.1.1 Point 7 – Reassignment of O&M Resources Page #61	The Tendering authority reserves the right to utilize the resources under the RFP for any other platform maintenance and development purposes in case bandwidth of the resources are available.	1. Kindly clarify the scope/extent of this provision – specifically, whether deployed AISangrah O&M resources can be assigned to entirely unrelated DIT/GIL projects, and if so, how the AISangrah platform's own SLA commitments (uptime, incident resolution, etc.) would be safeguarded during such reassignment.	As per RFP

225	5.12 – Time and Material – Change Requests Page #63	„a dedicated charge request will be issued to the selected vendor for design, development and implementation... without any additional cost to the Purchaser. The deployed O&M resources shall support ongoing development...“	1. Since this section is titled "Time and Material – Change Requests" but the clause states all CRs are to be absorbed by existing O&M resources without any additional cost, kindly clarify whether a separate Time & Material billing mechanism (e.g., using the Additional Manpower Rate Card at Annexure 3, Table C) is available for major/large-scope Change Requests exceeding the existing O&M team's bandwidth, or whether all CRs of any size/scale are to be absorbed at no additional cost throughout the 5-year O&M period.	As per RFP
226	7.5.3 Penalty Cap vs. 7.6 Capping of Penalties (15%) Page #69	7.5.3: "(a) Penalties calculations exceed 30% of the work order amount (b) Penalties calculations in any month exceed 30% of work order amount." 7.6: "Penalties shall be capped at 15% of the total contract value/implementation-phase milestone-based payments/quarterly O&M payable amount."	1. There appear to be differing penalty-cap thresholds in different sections of the RFP – 15% (Clause 7.6) versus 30%/30% (Clause 7.5.3). Kindly clarify which cap is authoritative, and the relationship between these caps (e.g., whether 7.5.3 governs overall termination-trigger thresholds during O&M while 7.6 caps the quantum of penalty actually deducted). 2. We also request you to keep the individual as well as cumulative penalty-cap thresholds as 5% instead of 15% or 20% or 30%. Kindly consider.	As per RFP
227	7.6 – Implementation Timeline: Penalty on Delay (Sl. No. 3 & 4) Page #71	Delay beyond 4 weeks (without valid reason) → Department may terminate contract & forfeit PBG. (Applicable to both the Development phase and the On-Premise Deployment/Go-Live phase milestones).	1. Kindly confirm whether contract termination and PBG forfeiture is an additional remedy on top of the per-day delay penalty (0.05% of implementation cost/day) already levied beyond 4 weeks, or an alternative remedy exercised instead of continuing per-day penalties. We request that termination be considered only after a reasonable cure period/show-cause opportunity is given to the bidder.	As per RFP
228	7.6 Project Implementation Timeline Page #70	Timelines	1. Considering the size, scope, and complexity of the project, the proposed implementation timeline of 25 weeks appears to be inadequate for delivering a robust, secure, and high-quality solution. We therefore request the Authority to extend the project implementation timeline to at least 52 weeks instead of 25 weeks. This additional time will enable the Selected Development Agency (SDA) to adequately complete requirements analysis, solution design, development, integration, comprehensive testing, security and performance validation, user acceptance testing, and deployment, thereby ensuring successful project execution and delivery in accordance with the RFP requirements.	As per RFP
229	7.6 Project Implementation Timeline Page #71	Capping of Penalties Penalties shall be capped at 15% of the total contract value/implementation-phase milestone-based payments/ quarterly O&M payable amount.	1. 15% of upper cap for penalty is very high and may impact cashflow of the bidder. Keeping latest industry standard, upper cap for penalty should be up to 5%. We therefore request you to revise it and make it "up to 5%". Kindly consider.	As per RFP
230	7.7 Service and Performance Penalty during O&M: Unplanned Downtime Page #72	Bidder must guarantee minimum uptime of 99.95%.	1. Kindly reconfirm that downtime caused specifically by GSDC-provided infrastructure, network, load balancer, WAF, or database server hardware (as listed under GSDC's support scope at Clause 5.7.1) shall be explicitly excluded from the uptime calculation used for SLA penalty purposes under Clause 7.7.	As per RFP
231	7.7 Service and Performance Penalty during O&M Page #72	Security Breach/Data Theft Penalty: Any penalty enforced during the contract period on to DIT for this particular clause based on any rules, regulations, Acts etc will be transferred to successful bidder over and above below penalties, [High Severity: INR 5 Lakh; Medium: INR 3 Lakh; Low: INR 1 Lakh per incident].	1. The pass-through of "any penalty enforced... onto DIT..." based on any rules, regulations, Acts etc.: appears open-ended and could, in principle, extend to substantial regulatory penalties (e.g., under the DPDP Act, 2023). Kindly clarify whether this pass-through liability is capped, and if so, request that an overall liability cap (e.g., linked to contract value) be specified for this clause.	As per RFP
232	7.7 Service and Performance Penalty during O&M Page #72	Bidder must guarantee minimum uptime of 99.95%. Non-adherence to the minimum uptime will attract penalty charges as per below details:	1. We assume that this penalty will apply only to the downtime of the AISangrah Portal working. Any downtime arising from hosting infrastructure or server-related issues or infrastructure provided by GSTD will not be considered while calculating uptime penalties. Kindly confirm.	As per RFP
233	7.7 Service and Performance Penalty during O&M Page #72	Incident Resolution Time Time taken to resolve a reported incident after official logging in the ticketing system. 0.25% of Quarterly Payment for every 2 hours of delay (Severity L1) 0.25% of Quarterly Payment for every 6 hours of delay (Severity L2) 0.25% of Quarterly Payment for every 12 hours of delay (Severity L3)	1. The SLA specified appears to be impractical, as actual resolution timelines may vary depending on the complexity of the issue. We therefore recommend the following revisions to ensure the SLA is both practical and achievable. 0.10% of Quarterly Payment for every 8 hours of delay (Severity L1) 0.10% of Quarterly Payment for every 16 hours of delay (Severity L2) 0.10% of Quarterly Payment for every 24 hours of delay (Severity L3) 2. We assume that above mentioned hours are business hours only. Please confirm.	As per RFP
234	7.8.2 – Resource Replacement Notice Period Page #73	Before replacing a resource, minimum two months' time to TENDERER along with panel has to be given to choose the substitution from the panel else penalties and pro-rata deduction in the quarterly fees will be made.	1. A two-month advance notice for resource replacement is significantly longer than standard IT industry notice periods (typically 30-60 days) and may not always be feasible in cases of medical & other contingencies that are un-avoidable. We request this be revised to a minimum of 30-45 days for normal attrition and mutually agreeable time duration in case of contingencies. Kindly clarify/reconsider.	As per RFP
235	7.8.3 – Resource Replacement Frequency Page #73	Replacement of a profile by the agency (only one replacement per technical profile with equal or higher qualification and experience – would be permitted per year).	1. Kindly clarify the process to be followed in case more than one replacement of the same technical profile becomes necessary within a year due to genuine attrition / resignation (outside the bidder's control), since the clause appears to cap replacements at one per profile per year.	As per RFP
236	8.2 Payment Milestone Page #76	M3: 1. Development of AI Sangrah Portal features as per scope, Testing, Infrastructure setup, Deployment of Data Classification, anonymization tools security, and audit on Development environment. - 30% of CAPEX M5: FAT and Successful Go-Live as per Scope of Work - 30% of CAPEX	1. For better cashflow, we suggest below changes in the said payment terms. Kindly consider. M3: 1. Development of AI Sangrah Portal features as per scope, Testing, Infrastructure setup, Deployment of Data Classification, anonymization tools security, and audit on Development environment. - 40% of CAPEX M5: FAT and Successful Go-Live as per Scope of Work - 20% of CAPEX	As per RFP
237	8.2 / Annexure 3 Table B Page #80	Annexure 3, Table B: "B2 Man-Month Cost for Resources per quarter (As per clause No. 5.11.2)"	1. We could not find any line item for Operations & Maintenance in the commercial bid format. Other than on-site man-power office team will also work during O & M period. We therefore request you to add "O & M Support Cost for Entire Solution - Quarters - 20". Kindly consider.	As per RFP
238	Annexure 3, Table C – Additional Manpower Rate Card Page #81	Table C – Additional Manpower Rate Card... Quantity column shows '1' (or 'Min 1') against each resource category; rate card to be used for ramp-up/ramp-down and procurement of manpower 'on requirement basis' during O&M.	1. Kindly confirm that the 'Quantity' column in Table C is only indicative/nominal (for rate discovery purposes) and the bidder is only required to quote a per-resource-month rate, not a committed deployment quantity. 2. Please confirm whether the rates quoted in Table C are inclusive or exclusive of applicable GST, for consistent evaluation across bidders.	1. As per RFP. 2. As per RFP Annexure 3, Table C, Note A. Please refer corrigendum.
239	9.19 Annexure 19: Details of Tools/Software/Licenses Proposed by the Bidder Page #105	g) If proposing open-source tools, bidder must commit to providing enterprise-grade support.	1. We assume that the support from the bidder would be acceptable and OEM's Enterprise level support is not mandatory. Kindly confirm this understanding. 2. Also let us know your expectation from enterprise-grade support.	As per RFP
240	General	Infrastructure BOM	1. As all licenses (i.e. OS, DB, Middleware etc.) are to be provisioned and provided by the successful bidder, please share below details so that appropriate license can be procured and cost can be estimated. 1.1. Total Number of Registered Users 1.2. Total Number of Concurrent Users 1.3. Infrastructure Bill of Material of each Server (including CPU, GPU etc.) including DC & DR	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSIT/DIT.
241	General	Training	1. Total how many users need to be trained? 2. What will be the average batch size? 3. We assume that training will need to be provided ONLINE only. Please confirm. 4. If above is not the case then please share location(s) where training will be imparted. 5. We assume that only ONE time training is need to be provided. Please confirm or correct us.	Tenderer will share the required details to successful bidder.
242	General	Users	1. Please share below user details for better understanding of application load and usage. 1.1. Types of Users 1.2. Total Number of Users under Each Type 1.3. Concurrent Users at Peak Load	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSIT/DIT.
243	General	Sandbox	1. With reference to the earlier tender, we note that the references to the Sandbox environment have been removed from the new RFP document. We would therefore like to seek clarification on whether the Sandbox environment will be procured and provisioned by GIL / the Department, or whether the same is expected to be procured, configured, and provisioned by the Bidder. In case the Sandbox environment is to be procured and provisioned by the Bidder, kindly share envisaged volumetrics along with the detailed technical and infrastructure requirements/specifications for the Sandbox to enable us to appropriately assess the scope, effort, and associated costs.	As per RFP
244	GeM Bid Page 2 / RFP Page 12 EMD – GeM Bid / Clause 3.5	GeM Bid states: "Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) shall also be accepted by the buyer in the form of a surety bond." However, Clause 3.5 of the RFP refers to EMD through Demand Draft / Bank Guarantee.	Kindly confirm that, in line with the prevailing GeM provisions and the specific provision stated in the GeM Bid, EMD submitted in the form of an Insurance Surety Bond issued by an IRDAI-regulated insurer shall be accepted as a valid form of EMD/Bid Security. Accordingly, the relevant RFP provisions may also be read in conformity with the GeM Bid.	EMD shall be submitted in accordance with the provisions specified in the GeM bid and Clause 3.5 - Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) of the RFP.
245	RFP Page 31 Clause 4.3 – Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG)	The successful bidder is required to furnish an unconditional, irrevocable and continuing Performance Bank Guarantee equivalent to 5% of the total contract value.	Considering that Insurance Surety Bonds are an established alternative security instrument for Government procurement and provide equivalent contractual security without blocking the Bidder's banking limits, we request the Authority to kindly permit submission of the Performance Security/PBG in the form of an Insurance Surety Bond issued by an IRDAI-regulated insurer, in addition to Bank Guarantee. The prescribed PBG format may accordingly be suitably amended / an equivalent Insurance Surety Bond format may be permitted. Justification: A 5% performance security for the full 70-month engagement can materially block banking limits over a long contract period. Allowing an IRDAI-regulated Insurance Surety Bond provides equivalent contractual security while improving bidder liquidity and competition without diluting the Authority's protection.	As per RFP

246	RFP Clause 1.3 - Fact Sheet, Sr. No. 4, Page 5; Clause 3.22.3.1, Page 26	Method of Selection: Least Cost Selection (LCS) method will be used among technically qualified bidder. Bidder with the total average score of 70 or more in technical evaluation stage will be qualified for financial bid opening, and the bidder with lowest quote (L1 bidder) will be selected from the technically qualified bidders.	Considering the complexity of the engagement involving design, development, integration, cybersecurity, data governance, AI/data platform architecture and five years of O&M, it is requested to adopt Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS), preferably with 70:30 technical-commercial weightage, instead of LCS. This will ensure that solution quality, architecture, security, delivery methodology and capability of the implementation partner are appropriately considered along with price. Justification: The assignment is technically intensive and includes AI/data platform architecture, cybersecurity, integrations, data governance and five years of O&M. QCBS would ensure that solution quality and implementation capability are weighted alongside price, reducing lifecycle and delivery risk in a mission-critical platform.	As per RFP
247	GeM Bid Document - Technical Specifications, Page 4; RFP Clause 5.9, Pages 52-53; Clause 5.11.2, Pages 56-57	GeM Bid specifies: 'Deployment of core team - hybrid (Buyer to specify model in scope of work)'. RFP Clause 5.9 states that the technical resources during implementation shall be deployed full time at site and the development team will be stationed onsite. Clause 5.11.2 further states that the O&M team shall be deployed only at the onsite location.	Kindly clarify and harmonize the deployment model. Please confirm whether the implementation and O&M resources are required to be fully onsite as stated in the RFP, or whether a hybrid model is permissible as indicated in the GeM Bid. A uniform deployment model is required for manpower planning and commercial estimation. Justification: The GeM specification and the RFP prescribe different deployment models. Since onsite versus hybrid deployment directly affects manpower availability, travel, infrastructure and commercial pricing, a single unambiguous deployment model is necessary for comparable bids and realistic resource planning.	As per RFP
248	RFP Clause 5.5.1 - Data Storage Architecture & Data Ingestion, Pages 38-40; Clause 5.8, Page 49	The platform is required to support massive-scale storage, high-volume structured/semi-structured/unstructured datasets, concurrent uploads/downloads, API-based ingestion, streaming/batch ingestion and a minimum load of 1,000 concurrent users; however, indicative dataset/data volume and transaction sizing are not specified.	Kindly provide indicative sizing parameters such as initial and projected dataset count, approximate storage/data volume, average and maximum file size, expected daily/monthly ingestion volume, number of APIs/integrations, expected transactions, peak concurrent upload/download users and annual growth assumptions. These parameters are required for accurate architecture, storage, performance and license sizing. Justification: Storage, ingestion, API and concurrency requirements are scale-dependent, but the RFP does not provide indicative data volumes or growth assumptions. Baseline sizing inputs are required to design the architecture, estimate infrastructure/licensing needs and avoid either under-sizing or unnecessary over-provisioning.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSIT/DIT.
249	RFP Clause 5.6.2 - Application Security and Vulnerability Management, Pages 46-47; Clause 5.8 and 5.8.1, Pages 49-50	The Selected Bidder is required to conduct VAPT, performance, stress, load and other security testing prior to Go-Live and whenever required during the contract period. Post Go-Live VAPT is stated to be conducted by the CERT-In empanelled agency engaged by the Government SOG, while STQC certification is stated as applicable 'where applicable'.	Kindly clarify (i) the mandatory frequency/number of VAPT, performance, load and security audits during the contract period, (ii) whether post-Go-Live audit agency cost is borne by the Department/SOG or the Bidder, and (iii) whether STQC certification is mandatory for this project and, if yes, its scope and cost responsibility. Any delay attributable to external audit/certification agencies may also kindly be excluded from bidder-attributable timelines. Justification: Audit frequency, cost ownership and STQC applicability directly affect effort, third-party cost and project timelines. Clear allocation is also necessary because audit/certification agencies are external dependencies and delays outside the bidder's control should not result in SLA or milestone penalties.	As per RFP
250	RFP Clause 5.7.1 - Support Provided by GSOC, Pages 47-48; Clause 7.6, Pages 64-66	GSOC will provide specified production infrastructure/support including production hardware, physical load balancer, SSL/server-level antivirus, database VM, infrastructure-level backup, centralized log storage and physical/network-level WAN. Clause 7.6 provides that delays attributable to the Client, duly justified and documented, shall not be counted against bidder timelines or penalized.	Kindly provide the expected provisioning/approval timeline for GSOC production infrastructure, hosting clearance and related dependencies. It is also requested to confirm that project milestones shall be correspondingly extended, without penalty, for delays arising from GSOC provisioning, hosting approvals or other Department-controlled dependencies. Justification: Production readiness depends on timely availability of GSOC infrastructure and approvals that are outside the bidder's direct control. Defining provisioning timelines and corresponding schedule relief will align responsibilities with the RFP's existing principle that Client-attributable delays should not be penalized.	As per RFP
251	RFP Clause 5.12 - Time and Material - Change Requests, Page 57	The clause states that a dedicated change request will be issued for design, development and implementation of enhancements; however, it also requires continuous enhancement, optimization, bug fixing, configuration changes and functional improvements throughout O&M without additional cost.	Kindly define the boundary between included O&M activities and payable Change Requests. Routine bug fixes, stabilization and minor configuration changes within the approved SRS/Go-Live scope may remain part of O&M; however, new features, additional modules/integrations, architecture changes, regulatory changes, additional licenses/resources or material functional enhancements may kindly be processed through a written Change Request with corresponding timeline and commercial adjustment. Justification: The current wording overlaps continuous O&M enhancement obligations with separately payable Change Requests. A clear boundary is required to prevent material new functionality, integrations, architecture changes or regulatory requirements from being treated as included O&M without corresponding time and commercial adjustment.	As per RFP
252	GeM Bid Document - ePBG Detail, Page 2; RFP Clause 4.3, Pages 31-32; Annexure 16, Pages 95-97	GeM Bid specifies ePBG at 5% for 70 months, whereas RFP Clause 4.3 and Annexure 16 prescribe Performance Bank Guarantee from banks in the prescribed format.	Kindly confirm that Performance Security may be submitted through GeM ePBG and/or Insurance Surety Bond/Insurance Guarantee, in addition to Bank Guarantee, in accordance with applicable GeM/Government procurement provisions. Kindly also confirm the beneficiary/SFMS details and acceptable mode for submission. Justification: The GeM Bid provides an ePBG mechanism, while the RFP prescribes a bank PBG format. Confirmation of acceptable modes, including Insurance Surety Bond where permitted, will remove instrument-level ambiguity and enable bidders to arrange compliant performance security before award.	As per RFP
253	RFP Clause 5.6.8, Page 44; Clause 5.6.12, Page 45; Clause 5.7, Page 47	The solution requires integrations with DigLocker, Citizen SSO, Office SSO, MeriPehchaan, Panichay, EntityLocker, State API Gateway/HuA and other Government systems/APIs, with final integration details to be shared during Requirement Gathering and Solution Design.	Kindly confirm availability of API specifications, sandbox/test environments, test credentials, nodal contacts and approval timelines for the identified Government integrations. It is requested that delays in access, credentials, API readiness or approvals from Departments/bid-party Government platforms result in corresponding timeline extension without bidder penalty. Justification: Multiple integrations depend on external Government platforms, credentials and approvals. Availability of sandbox environments, API documentation and defined approval timelines is essential for realistic integration planning, testing and protection from delays attributable to third-party Government systems.	As per RFP
254	RFP Clause 5.13, Pages 58-59; Clause 6.2, Pages 60-61; Clause 8.2 - Additional Notes, Page 71	The Bidder is required to submit BRD, SRS, architecture documents, project plan, test plans, UAT scripts, manuals and PMRs. Payment is subject to review and acceptance of deliverables by DIT and third-party reviewers, if any; however, a defined review/acceptance timeline is not specified.	Kindly prescribe a definite review and approval period, preferably 15 working days from submission of each deliverable. If no observations are communicated within the stipulated period, the deliverable may kindly be treated as deemed accepted for milestone/payment purposes, without prejudice to rectification of subsequently identified defects within the agreed scope. Justification: The project has several approval-dependent deliverables and milestone payments, but no fixed review period is stated. A defined review/approval timeline will prevent open-ended acceptance cycles, support predictable project progress and avoid payment delays caused solely by pending departmental review.	As per RFP
255	RFP Clause 3.10.2, Page 17; Annexure 4 - Resource Qualification, Pages 77-80; Annexure 18 - CV Format, Pages 99-101	The Technical Proposal requires CVs of Key Personnel as per Annexure 18. Annexure 4 further states that the bidder shall submit the CV of each proposed resource and only CVs submitted in the specified format shall be considered for evaluation.	Considering the long bid-to-deployment cycle and possible resource movement, it is requested that bidders be permitted to submit an undertaking at bid stage confirming availability/deployment of resources meeting the prescribed qualifications, and detailed CVs of the proposed personnel be submitted by the successful bidder prior to deployment for Department approval. Alternatively, kindly permit replacement of named resources before deployment with equivalent or higher-qualified resources. Justification: Named resources may change between bid submission and actual deployment during a long procurement cycle. Permitting equivalent or higher-qualified replacements, subject to approval, preserves the prescribed competency standard while avoiding disqualification or deployment risk for genuine personnel movement.	As per RFP
256	RFP Clause 4.3.1 and 4.3.4, Page 31	The proceeds of the PBG are payable as compensation for any loss, including loss of opportunity, time or cost, resulting from failure to comply with contractual obligations. The PBG may be invoked for failure to perform responsibilities/obligations to the complete satisfaction of the Tender Inviting Authority or for misrepresentation.	It is requested that PBG invocation be restricted to material breach attributable to the Bidder, remaining uncured after written notice and a reasonable cure period, or proven material misrepresentation. Invocation may kindly be limited to direct and demonstrable loss and should not duplicate amounts already recovered through LDs, penalties or payment deductions. Justification: PBG invocation is a significant remedy and should be linked to a material bidder-attributable default after notice and cure opportunity. Limiting recovery to demonstrable loss and preventing duplicate recovery through PBG, LDs and deductions ensures proportionality and avoids multiple recoveries for the same event.	As per RFP
257	RFP Clause 4.3.7 and 4.3.8, Pages 31-32	Clause 4.3.7 states that if the Bidder is unable to service the contract 'for whatever reason', the Tender Inviting Authority would invoke the PBG. Clause 4.3.8 permits recoveries from bills, PBG or any other amount due.	The phrase 'for whatever reason' may cover events outside the Bidder's control. Kindly clarify that PBG invocation/recovery shall not apply to non-performance caused by Department/GSOC dependencies, delayed approvals, infrastructure non-availability, third-party Government systems, force majeure, change in law/scope or other reasons beyond the Bidder's reasonable control, subject to timely written intimation. Justification: The phrase 'for whatever reason' can capture failures caused by GSOC, Department dependencies, third-party systems or force majeure. Excluding events beyond the bidder's reasonable control is consistent with risk allocation elsewhere in the RFP and prevents unjustified invocation of performance security.	As per RFP
258	RFP Clause 4.6.1 - Termination for Default, Pages 32-33	The Tender Inviting Authority may terminate the Contract for default by giving thirty days' written notice and may procure required services from another source, with the Selected Bidder liable for additional/excess expenditure.	Kindly clarify that termination for default and excess-cost recovery shall apply only to a material breach attributable to the Bidder that remains uncured after written notice and reasonable cure opportunity. Delays caused by Department/GSOC dependencies, third-party systems, scope/law changes or force majeure may kindly be excluded. Any excess-cost recovery may be limited to reasonable, direct and documented cost, subject to the overall contractual liability/penalty cap. Justification: Termination and excess-cost recovery are severe contractual remedies. Restricting them to material uncured bidder-attributable default, with reasonable notice and documented direct costs, creates balanced risk allocation and avoids penalising the bidder for dependencies controlled by the Authority or third parties.	As per RFP
259	RFP Clause 4.6.3 - Termination for Convenience, Page 33	The Tender Inviting Authority may terminate the Contract, in whole or in part, at any time with thirty days' written notice for convenience and will pay undisputed invoices for tasks completed up to the termination date.	It is requested that, upon termination for convenience or any termination not attributable to Bidder default, the Bidder be paid for completed services, accepted/submitted deliverables, reasonable work-in-progress, approved/non-cancellable O&M-license-subscription commitments and reasonable demobilization/transition costs incurred up to the effective termination date, against supporting documents. Justification: Termination for convenience is not caused by bidder default and may leave unavoidable work-in-progress, committed OEM subscriptions and demobilization costs. Reimbursement of reasonable documented commitments protects the bidder from stranded costs while allowing the Authority to retain its termination right.	As per RFP

260	RFP Clause 4.7 - Exit Management Plan, Pages 33-34	Exit Management obligations and related costs are included in the Terms of Payment Schedule, and the SI is required to continue best efforts to deliver services during the Exit Management period.	Kindly clarify that exit assistance is limited to reasonable transition of project-specific data, documentation and deliverables within the agreed scope. Any additional/post-termination support beyond the agreed exit scope may kindly be payable at mutually agreed rates. The Bidder should not be required to transfer its pre-existing/proprietary tools, reusable components, internal methodologies, shared infrastructure, credentials or third-party materials except as permitted by applicable licenses. Justification: Exit support should facilitate orderly handover of project-specific assets without transferring the bidder's background IP, reusable tools or third-party materials. Defining the scope and commercial treatment of post-termination assistance will ensure continuity while protecting legitimate proprietary rights.	As per RFP
261	RFP Clause 4.8.1 to 4.8.3 - Intellectual Property Rights, Page 34	The RFP provides that the Tenderer shall be entitled to intellectual property and proprietary rights in products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how, documents and materials developed in relation to the Project, and that all IP in project documents, assets, resources, designs, source code and application shall vest with the Tenderer.	It is requested to clarify that Government ownership applies to project-specific custom deliverables developed exclusively under the Contract and does not transfer the Bidder's pre-existing IP, reusable tools/frameworks/libraries, accelerators, generic know-how, proprietary platforms, model internals or third-party/OS/open-source/OEM components. The Authority may receive the necessary perpetual/project-use rights for embedded components subject to applicable licenses. Justification: The RFP's IP wording is broad enough to potentially capture pre-existing and reusable bidder/OEM intellectual property. A background-IP carve-out is necessary so that the Government receives full ownership/use rights in project-specific deliverables without unintentionally acquiring unrelated proprietary assets.	As per RFP
262	RFP Clause 5.7.2 - Responsibility for Non-GSOD Components, Pages 48-49	Except for components expressly provided by GSOD, all other hardware, software, licenses, subscriptions, tools, utilities, middleware, security solutions, monitoring systems, application components, third-party services and associated support required for the Project are the responsibility of the Selected Bidder at its own cost.	Kindly clarify that the Bidder's responsibility is limited to components forming part of the approved solution/BOM and scope. Any additional requirement arising from change in scope, regulatory change, GSOD infrastructure constraints, integration changes or Authority-directed architecture changes may kindly be handled through formal change control with corresponding cost and timeline adjustment. Justification: The bidder can reasonably price only those non-GSOD components forming part of the approved architecture and scope. Additional requirements arising from Authority-directed changes, GSOD constraints or regulatory changes should follow change control to maintain commercial and schedule fairness.	As per RFP
263	RFP Clause 5.8.2(i) - Data Ownership, Page 51	All data, metadata, derived data, reports, models, dashboards, analytics outputs and AI-generated artefacts created, collected, processed or stored as part of the Project shall remain the exclusive property of the Government of Gujarat.	Kindly clarify that Government ownership covers Government-provided data and project-specific outputs/deliverables created for the Authority, but does not transfer ownership of the Bidder's pre-existing IP, reusable analytics methods, generic algorithms/models, model internals, prompts/templates, tools/frameworks, know-how or third-party/OEM materials used to deliver the solution. Justification: Government ownership of project data and project-specific outputs is appropriate, but should not extend to the bidder's pre-existing algorithms, reusable methods, tools, models or third-party IP. The clarification preserves Government data ownership while maintaining established background-IP rights.	As per RFP
264	RFP Clause 5.8.2(i) - Security Audit, Page 51	The Government reserves the right to conduct security audits, vulnerability assessments, penetration testing, review source code where applicable and verify compliance with contractual obligations, and the Bidder shall fully cooperate.	Kindly clarify that source code review, where applicable, shall be limited to project-specific custom source code developed under the Contract, under appropriate confidentiality and security safeguards, and shall not require disclosure of the Bidder's pre-existing/proprietary code, reusable components, third-party/OEM software, model internals, credentials, shared infrastructure details or other security-sensitive information not necessary for the audit. Justification: Security review of project-specific custom code supports auditability, but unrestricted review could expose reusable proprietary code, third-party components or security-sensitive information unrelated to the project. A defined review boundary protects both audit objectives and legitimate confidentiality/security interests.	As per RFP
265	RFP Clause 5.8.2(i)(i), Page 52; Pre-Qualification Clause 1.9, Page 28	Clause 5.8.2(i)(i) states that the Bidder shall not engage any subcontractor or third-party processor for handling Government data. Pre-Qualification Clause 1.9 further states that consortium or subletting in any form is not permitted.	Kindly confirm that use of OEMs, licensed software providers, CERT-in empanelled auditors, security testing agencies, approved hosting/cloud support and specialist technology service providers required for implementation/O&M shall not be treated as prohibited consortium/subletting, provided Government data access is appropriately controlled and such parties are bound by applicable confidentiality, security and data protection obligations and prior approval requirements. Justification: The solution inherently relies on OEM products, CERT-in auditors and specialist technology providers even though consortium/subletting is prohibited. Confirming that such controlled specialist/OEM engagements are not treated as prohibited subletting is necessary for practical delivery, licensing and statutory security testing.	As per RFP
266	RFP Clause 5.8.2(i)(iv) - Indemnity, Page 52	The Bidder shall indemnify the Government against data breaches, privacy violations, regulatory penalties, unauthorized disclosures and security incidents arising from bidder negligence.	It is requested that indemnity be limited to direct third-party claims/final regulatory penalties arising to the extent of proven negligence or willful misconduct of the Bidder. Incidents caused by Department/GSOD systems, Authority instructions, third-party platforms, force majeure, modifications by others or matters outside the Bidder's reasonable control may kindly be excluded, and indemnity exposure may be made subject to the overall contractual liability cap. Justification: Indemnity should apply where loss or regulatory exposure is actually attributable to the bidder's proven negligence or willful misconduct. Excluding Authority/GSOD/third-party causes and applying an overall liability framework avoids open-ended exposure for circumstances outside the bidder's control.	As per RFP
267	RFP Clause 5.8.2(i)(v) - Right to Suspend Access, Page 52	The Government reserves the right to immediately suspend access to Government data and systems in case of security incidents, contractual violations, regulatory non-compliance or threats to public interest.	Kindly clarify that any suspension shall, to the extent practicable, be limited to the affected systems/data and be accompanied by written reasons. Where such suspension prevents or delays performance by the Bidder, the affected timelines and SLAs may kindly be correspondingly adjusted and no bidder penalty should apply for the period of such access restriction. Justification: Immediate suspension may be necessary for security, but such action can itself prevent the bidder from meeting timelines or SLAs. Corresponding schedule/SLA relief for the period of Authority-imposed access restriction ensures that the bidder is not penalized for inability to perform caused by the suspension.	As per RFP
268	RFP Clause 5.10.2 and 5.10.3, Pages 53-54	The Bidder is responsible for supplying necessary licenses in the name of DIT. Where an OEM does not offer a five-year license upfront, the Bidder must submit an irrevocable OEM undertaking committing to uninterrupted renewals for a minimum of five years; failure is treated as a material breach.	Kindly permit commercially equivalent subscription/renewal coverage where an OEM's standard policy does not provide a five-year upfront license or irrevocable undertaking. Non-availability of an OEM-issued irrevocable undertaking may kindly not be treated as Bidder breach where the Bidder maintains uninterrupted valid license/support coverage throughout the required contract period. Justification: Many OEMs sell only standard-term subscriptions and may not issue irrevocable five-year renewal undertakings. Allowing continuous equivalent subscription coverage achieves the Authority's objective of uninterrupted licensing without making bidder compliance dependent on a non-standard OEM document.	As per RFP
269	RFP Clause 7.5.3, Page 63; Clause 7.6 - Capping of Penalties, Page 65; Clauses 7.7 and 7.8, Pages 66-68	The RFP provides multiple implementation, O&M, manpower, RCA, latency and security-related penalties. Clause 7.6 caps penalties at 15% of the total contract value/implementation milestone payments/quarterly O&M payable amount, while Clause 7.5.3 permits contract action where cumulative penalties exceed 20% of total Work Order value or monthly O&M penalties exceed 30% of applicable quarterly O&M fees on a pro-rata basis.	It is respectfully requested that all LDs, SLA penalties, manpower penalties, deductions, delay penalties and similar penal recoveries be capped in aggregate at 10% of the total contract value, and that there be no duplicate penalty, deduction or PBG invocation for the same underlying event. Termination may kindly apply only for repeated material uncured breach attributable to the Bidder after notice and cure opportunity. Justification: The RFP contains multiple penalty regimes with different caps, creating potential cumulative and overlapping exposure. A single aggregate cap and prohibition on duplicate recovery improves contractual certainty, supports proportionate risk allocation and avoids multiple penalties for the same underlying event.	As per RFP
270	RFP Clause 7.7 - Security Breach/Data Theft, Pages 66-67	Any statutory/regulatory penalty imposed on DIT for a data breach/security incident attributable to vendor negligence or system misconfiguration is to be transferred to the successful bidder over and above the specified High/Medium/Low severity breach penalties.	Kindly clarify that pass-through of statutory/regulatory penalties shall be limited to final penalties imposed to the extent caused by the Bidder's proven negligence or willful misconduct, after reasonable opportunity for the Bidder to participate in defence/mitigation. Such pass-through amounts and security-breach penalties may kindly form part of the overall aggregate penalty/liability cap and should not duplicate other recoveries for the same event. Justification: Regulatory penalties can be substantial and may arise from multiple contributing causes. Pass-through should therefore be limited to final, proven bidder-attributable liability with an opportunity to participate in mitigation/defence, and should not duplicate separate security-breach or SLA recoveries.	As per RFP
271	RFP Clause 7.8.2 and 7.8.3, Pages 67-68	Resources whose profiles are submitted at Technical Presentation are not allowed to be replaced except with prior approval. The RFP requires advance notice/panel for replacement and permits only one replacement per technical profile per year with equal or higher qualification and experience.	Kindly permit replacement of personnel for bona fide HR/operational events such as resignation, illness, separation, statutory leave, non-performance or other unavoidable reasons, with equivalent or higher-qualified personnel subject to reasonable Department approval. The two-month advance requirement may kindly be relaxed where the event is not foreseeable, while ensuring appropriate handover/overlap wherever practicable. Justification: Personnel movement can occur for genuine and unforeseeable reasons during a five-year O&M period. Allowing equivalent or higher-qualified replacement with reasonable approval and handover maintains service quality without imposing impractical advance notice requirements where resignation or absence is sudden.	As per RFP
272	RFP Clause 8.1 - Payment Terms, Pages 68-70	The Purchaser has the right to withhold payment due to the Bidder in case of delays/defaults, and such withholding shall not amount to a default on the part of the Purchaser.	Kindly clarify that withholding shall be limited to the disputed portion of the relevant invoice/deliverable and only to the extent of delay/default attributable to the Bidder. Undisputed amounts may kindly be released within the prescribed payment period, and withholding should not apply for delays caused by Department/GSOD dependencies, third-party Government systems or force majeure. Justification: Withholding the entire invoice for a limited dispute can materially affect project cash flow even where most services are undisputed. Restricting withholding to the affected amount preserves the Authority's remedy while ensuring continued payment for accepted services and non-bidder-attributable delays.	As per RFP
273	RFP Clause 8.1(e), (i) and (j), Pages 69-70	Penalties/LDs for delay and non-performance may be deducted from payments; disputed amounts may be withheld until settlement; and payment is made after deduction of applicable penalty and receipt of undisputed invoices/clarifications.	Kindly clarify that any LD/penalty deduction will be made after written notice to the Bidder, reasonable opportunity to submit RCA/response and determination that the delay/non-performance is attributable to the Bidder. Only the disputed amount may kindly be withheld while all undisputed invoice amounts continue to be released as per the payment timeline. Justification: Penalty deductions should follow a transparent attribution process because delays may arise from Department, GSOD or third-party dependencies. Written notice, RCA/response opportunity and release of undisputed amounts will reduce disputes and align deductions with actual bidder responsibility.	As per RFP

274	RFP Clause 3.23.2 - Technical Evaluation Criteria, Sr No. 3, Page 30	Relevant IT Project Experience: At least One (1) eligible project with minimum value of Rs. 1 Crore involving implementation of a Data Exchange Platform, Data Ingestion Platform, or AI-based Solution/Service Integration within an Enterprise Platform environment in last 05 years.	It is requested to amend the criterion to accept implementation within an 'Enterprise Platform / Open Platform environment'. This will allow technically relevant experience in open, interoperable and government-scale platforms to be considered while preserving the intended requirement for Data Exchange, Data Ingestion or AI-based Solution/Service Integration experience. Justification: The intended competency is experience in Data Exchange, Data Ingestion or AI-based integration, which can be demonstrated equally in an open/interoperable platform environment. Adding 'Open Platform' broadens relevant competition without diluting the functional or technical experience requirement.	As per RFP
275	GeM Bid Document – Buyer Added Bid Specific Terms & Conditions, Option Clause 25%, Page 4	The Buyer may increase or decrease the contract quantity or contract duration by up to 25% at the time of issue of contract, and for lump-sum service contracts may increase the scope of work and contract value up to 25% with the consent of the Service Provider.	Kindly confirm that any increase in scope, quantity and/or contract duration under the Option Clause shall be accompanied by a corresponding proportionate adjustment in contract value, manpower/resources, licences/infrastructure requirements and implementation/O&M timelines, as applicable. Any additional scope beyond the originally approved requirements may kindly be implemented only through mutually agreed change control without adversely affecting the existing project milestones or SLAs. Justification: The GeM Option Clause may materially alter scope, duration and resource requirements. Proportionate adjustment of contract value, manpower, licences and timelines is necessary so that an Authority-directed increase does not create unfunded obligations or cause avoidable milestones/SLA breaches.	As per RFP
276	RFP Clause 4.3.3 to 4.3.6 – Performance Bank Guarantee, Page 31; GeM Bid – ePBG Detail, Page 2	The successful Bidder is required to furnish PBG equivalent to 5% of the total contract value, which remains valid until satisfactory completion of the O&M phase and 120 days beyond completion of contractual obligations.	Considering that the project comprises a six-month implementation phase followed by five years of O&M, kindly permit proportionate reduction/release of the Performance Security after successful Go-Live and acceptance of the implementation phase. Thereafter, the PBG may kindly be maintained against the outstanding O&M contract value for the balance contractual period. This will avoid disproportionate blocking of financial limits after completion and acceptance of the CAPEX/Implementation obligations while continuing to provide adequate performance security for the remaining O&M obligations. Justification: After successful Go-Live, the implementation risk materially reduces and only the remaining O&M obligations continue. Proportionate PBG reduction against outstanding contractual value would maintain adequate security while avoiding unnecessary long-term blocking of financial limits for obligations already completed and accepted.	As per RFP
277	Clause 5.8.2(14), Page 51	Indemnity: The Bidder shall indemnify the Government against Data breaches, Privacy violations, Regulatory penalties, Unauthorized disclosures, Security incidents arising from bidder negligence.	It is requested to clarify that indemnity shall apply only to direct third-party claims, final regulatory penalties and direct losses arising from proven negligence or willful misconduct of the Bidder, and shall exclude incidents caused by Authority/GSDC systems, instructions, data quality, third-party platforms, force majeure, modifications by others, or factors outside Bidder's reasonable control. The indemnity should also be subject to the aggregate liability/penalty cap. Suggested Clause: "The Bidder shall indemnify the Government for direct third-party claims and final regulatory penalties arising from data breaches, privacy violations, unauthorized disclosures or security incidents to the extent caused by the Bidder's proven negligence or willful misconduct. The indemnity shall exclude causes attributable to Authority/GSDC systems, instructions, third-party platforms, modifications by others, force majeure or matters outside the Bidder's reasonable control, and shall be subject to the aggregate liability cap under the Agreement."	As per RFP
278	Clause 5.8.2(15), Page 51	Right to Suspend Access: The Government reserves the right to immediately suspend access to Government data and systems in case of: • Security incidents • Contractual violations • Regulatory non-compliance • Threats to public interest	It is requested to clarify that suspension of access shall be proportionate to the affected systems/data, with prompt written reasons and restoration after remediation, and that timelines, SLAs, penalties and payment obligations shall be suitably adjusted where suspension prevents the Bidder from performing its obligations. Suggested Clause: "Any suspension of Bidder access shall be limited to the affected systems/data and accompanied by written reasons, except in emergency security situations. To the extent such suspension impacts performance, related timelines, SLAs and penalties shall be adjusted, and payment for unaffected/completed services shall continue as per the Agreement."	As per RFP
279	Clause 5.10.2 and 5.10.3, Page 53	The Bidder shall be solely responsible for procuring and supplying all necessary licenses in the name of DIT for software, tools, databases, and any other middleware required for the complete and uninterrupted delivery of the defined services and ensure that these products are having continuous support from the OEM. In the event that an OEM does not offer a 5-year (including development, O&M phase and buffer time) license upfront, the Bidder shall mandatorily submit an irrevocable undertaking from the respective OEM, clearly committing to provide uninterrupted license renewals to cover a minimum of 5 years from the date of initial license activation ensuring coverage for entire Operations & Maintenance (O&M) period. Failure to supply such licenses or valid OEM undertakings shall be treated as a material breach of contract, attracting appropriate penalties and/or legal action as per the terms of the agreement.	It is requested to clarify that OEM/license obligations shall be subject to the standard terms, support policies, licensing models and availability of the respective OEMs, and that non-availability of an upfront 5-year license or irrevocable OEM undertaking should not be treated as Bidder breach where equivalent subscription/renewal coverage is commercially available and maintained by the Bidder during the contract period. Suggested Clause: "Where an OEM does not issue a five-year upfront license or irrevocable renewal undertaking, the Bidder may provide commercially equivalent subscription/renewal coverage for the contract period in accordance with the OEM's standard licensing and support terms. Non-availability of an OEM-issued undertaking shall not constitute Bidder breach if uninterrupted license coverage is maintained."	As per RFP
280	Clause 5.12, Page 56	To support the continuous evolution of the AISangrah (Post Go-Live) platform and ensure timely responses to enhancements emerging from user feedback, programmatic requests, on due approval a dedicated change request will be issued to the selected vendor for design development and implementation. The bidder shall ensure continuous enhancement, optimization, bug fixing, configuration changes and functional improvements to the platform throughout the contract period as part of the Operations & Maintenance (O&M) services, without any additional cost to the Purchaser.	It is requested to clarify that O&M shall include routine bug fixes, stabilization and minor configuration changes within the approved scope, while new features, additional modules, integrations, architecture changes, regulatory changes, additional licenses/resources or material enhancements shall be treated as change requests payable as per approved rate card/mutually agreed commercials. Suggested Clause: "Routine bug fixes, stabilization and minor configuration changes within the approved scope shall be included in O&M. New features, additional modules, integrations, architecture changes, regulatory changes, additional licenses/resources or material enhancements shall be handled through a written change request with corresponding timeline and cost adjustment."	As per RFP
281	Clause 7.5.1 and 7.5.3, Page 62	SLA parameters shall be monitored on a quarterly basis as per the individual SLA parameter requirements. In case the service levels cannot be achieved at service levels defined in the tables below, it shall result in a breach of contract and shall invoke penalties. Purchaser can take appropriate action including termination of the contract if – (i) Penalties calculations exceed 20% of the work order amount (b) Penalties calculations in any month exceed 30% of work order amount	It is requested to clarify that SLA shortfall shall not automatically constitute breach of contract unless attributable to the Bidder after RCA, and that termination shall apply only for repeated material uncurbed breach, after notice and cure. The thresholds in Clause 7.5.3 should also be aligned with the requested aggregate LD/penalty cap of 10% of contract value. Suggested Clause: "SLA penalties shall apply only to SLA failures attributable to the Bidder as established through RCA. Termination for SLA failures may be exercised only for repeated material breach remaining uncurbed after notice. Aggregate LDs, SLA penalties, deductions and similar remedies shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the total contract value and shall not be duplicated for the same event."	As per RFP
282	Clause 7.6, Page 64	Capping of Penalties i. Penalties shall be capped at 15% of the total contract value/implementation-phase milestone-based payments/ quarterly O&M payable amount. ii. Repeated breaches (3 consecutive occurrences) may lead to invocation of Performance Bank Guarantee and contract review. iii. Any delay arising due to unforeseen circumstances or reasons attributable to the Client, duly justified and documented, shall not be counted against the timelines or penalized at the Bidder's end.	As requested for bidder protection, it is respectfully requested that the aggregate cap for all LDs, SLA penalties, deductions, delay penalties and other penal recoveries be reduced from 15% to 10% of the total contract value, with no duplicate recovery or PBG invocation for the same underlying event. Suggested Clause: "All LDs, SLA penalties, deductions, delay penalties and other penal recoveries under the RFP/Agreement shall be capped in aggregate at ten percent (10%) of the total contract value. No duplicate penalty, deduction, PBG invocation or other recovery shall be made for the same underlying breach/event."	As per RFP
283	Clause 7.7, Pages 65-66	Any data breach, theft, or exposure of sensitive government data due to vendor negligence or system misconfiguration. Any penalty enforced during the contract period on to DIT for this particular clause based on any rules, regulations, Acts etc will be transferred to successful bidder over and above below penalties. High Severity Breach: INR 5 Lakh per incident Medium Severity Breach: INR 3 Lakh per incident Low Severity Breach: INR 1 Lakh per incident	It is requested to clarify that pass-through of statutory/regulatory penalties shall apply only to final, non-appealable penalties imposed due to the Bidder's proven negligence or willful misconduct, and shall not apply to incidents caused by Authority/GSDC systems, third-party platforms, force majeure, Authority instructions, or factors outside the Bidder's reasonable control. Such amounts should be included within the overall 10% aggregate cap. Suggested Clause: "Any pass-through of statutory/regulatory penalty shall be limited to final, non-appealable penalties imposed due to the Bidder's proven negligence or willful misconduct, after giving the Bidder reasonable opportunity to participate in defence/mitigation. Such pass-through and security-breach penalties shall form part of the aggregate 10% cap and shall not duplicate other recoveries."	As per RFP
284	Clause 7.8.2 and 7.8.5, Pages 66-67	The agency is not allowed to replace those resources whose profile has been submitted at the time of Technical Presentation. Further in the event where the bidder is not able to retain the resources quoted in the bid, then the replacement must be pre-approved. Before replacing a resource, minimum two months' time to TENDERER along with panel has to be given to choose the substitution from the panel else penalties and pro-rata deduction in the quarterly fees will be made. The deployed resources shall not be engaged in any activity other than that assigned by the TENDERER. Penalty of Rs. 50,000 per resource may be imposed on breach of SLA. On consecutive breach of 03 times may lead to termination of the contract.	It is requested to clarify that replacement of personnel due to resignation, illness, separation, statutory leave, non-performance, disciplinary reasons or other bona fide HR events shall be permitted with equivalent or better qualified resources, and that termination for manpower SLA shall apply only for material repeated uncurbed breach attributable to the Bidder. Suggested Clause: "Resource replacement for bona fide HR or operational reasons shall be permitted with equivalent or higher qualified personnel, subject to reasonable approval by the Authority. Manpower penalties shall apply only for proven non-compliance attributable to the Bidder, and termination shall be considered only for repeated material uncurbed breach after written notice."	As per RFP
285	Clause 8.1, Page 67	The Purchaser shall have the right to withhold any payment due to the Bidder, in case of delays or defaults on the part of the Bidder. Such withholding of payment shall not amount to a default on the part of the purchaser.	It is requested to clarify that withholding shall be limited only to the disputed portion of the relevant invoice/deliverable and only to the extent of delay/default attributable to the Bidder. Undisputed amounts should be released within a defined payment period and withholding should not apply where the delay/default is caused by Authority/GSDC dependencies or force majeure. Suggested Clause: "The Purchaser may withhold only the disputed portion of an invoice directly linked to a delay/default attributable to the Bidder. Undisputed amounts shall be released within thirty (30) days of invoice submission/acceptance, and no withholding shall apply for delays caused by Authority/GSDC dependencies, third-party systems, force majeure or reasons beyond the Bidder's reasonable control."	As per RFP
286	Clause 8.1(e), 8.1(h) and 8.1(i), Pages 67-68	Any penalties and/or liquidated damages, as applicable, for delay and non-performance, as mentioned in this bidding document, will be deducted from the payments for the respective deliverables. In case of disputed items, the disputed amount shall be withheld and will be paid only after settlement of the dispute. The payment will be done after deducting penalty if any as per this RFP after submission of the undisputed invoices raised to client (with all required supporting documents) or receipt of written clarifications on the invoice sought by the purchaser whichever is later, after duly complying all the guidelines of this RFP and subsequent agreement.	It is requested to clarify that LDs/penalties shall be deducted only after written notice, RCA/reasoned determination of Bidder-attributable default, and opportunity to respond/cure, and that only the disputed amount may be withheld while undisputed payments continue to be released. Suggested Clause: "Any LD/penalty deduction shall be made only after written notice to the Bidder, reasonable opportunity to respond/cure, and determination that the delay/non-performance is attributable to the Bidder. Only the disputed amount may be withheld; all undisputed invoice amounts shall be paid as per the payment timeline."	As per RFP

287	Clause 8.2, Additional Note, Page 71	All deliverables shall be reviewed and accepted by DIT and third-party reviewers (if any) before payment is processed.	It is requested to clarify a definite review/acceptance timeline and deemed acceptance mechanism so that payment is not delayed indefinitely due to pending review by DIT or third-party reviewers. Suggested Clause: "DIT/third-party reviewers shall provide written observations within fifteen (15) working days of deliverable submission. If no written observations are provided within such period, the deliverable shall be deemed accepted for payment purposes, without prejudice to the Bidder's obligation to rectify defects subsequently identified within the agreed warranty/support scope."	As per RFP
288	Clause 3, Technical Evaluation Criteria, Page No- 29/PDF - 39	Relevant IT Project Experience At least One (1) eligible project involving implementation of a Data Exchange Platform, Data Ingestion Platform, or AI-based Solution/Service integration within an Enterprise Platform environment in last 05 years Supporting Documents: Work Order/Agreement + Go Live/Completion Certificate	At least One (1) eligible project involving implementation of a Data Exchange Platform, Data Ingestion Platform, or AI-based Solution/Service integration within an Enterprise/Open Platform environment in the last 05 years Justification: This amendment will allow experience in Enterprise/Open Platform environments to be considered, thereby encouraging broader participation from technically qualified bidders while maintaining the intent of the Technical Evaluation criteria	As per RFP
289	CI 5.7.1 Sr.1 & Sr.4 (p.47-48)	GSDC provides "hardware and infrastructure for the Production environment" (Item 1) but separately states GSDC provides only the VM for the Database Server (Item 4). Compute for application/web tier, container orchestration, and any GPU/AI compute is not explicitly listed.	Please provide an itemised list (with indicative specifications -vCPU/RAM/storage) of exactly what compute/infrastructure GSDC will provide free of cost for Production (app servers, container platform, GPU/AI compute, etc.) versus what the Bidder must provision and cost, so the solution architecture can be sized accurately.	As per RFP
290	CI 5.5(d) (p.37)	Production must be hosted exclusively at GSDC on-premises; Bidder may host Dev/Test/Staging/UAT/Training on bidder's own cloud, entirely at Bidder's cost, for the full project duration.	Please confirm the expected sizing (vCPU/RAM/storage/bandwidth) for each non-production environment, and whether these must be maintained for the full 5-year O&M period or only through Go-Live, to allow the non-production architecture to be designed and sized correctly.	As per RFP
291	CI 5.7 (p.47) referencing "Disaster Recovery (DR)"	DevOps section lists dedicated environments including Disaster Recovery (DR), but Section 5.7.1 (GSDC provided items) does not mention DR infrastructure.	Please confirm whether a DR site is mandatory in scope, and if so, whether DR infrastructure will be provided by GSDC or must be procured/hosted by the Bidder (and where), so the DR architecture can be designed accordingly.	GSDC will provide.
292	CI 5.5.1 - Data Storage Architecture (p.38-40)	The scope requires a scalable, high-throughput, AI-ready object storage architecture with no stated target data volume, growth rate, or number of datasets/artifacts to be onboarded.	Please share the expected initial data volume (TB) at Go-Live and projected annual growth over the 5-year O&M period, to allow the storage architecture and backup/retention design to be sized correctly.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
293	CI 5.6.1, 5.6.8 - Integrations (p.41-44)	Scope requires "live data connectors to source departmental databases", plus integration with DigLocker, Citizen SSO, Office SSO, MerPehchan, Parichay, EntityLocker and the State API Gateway, but no count or list of source systems is given.	Please share the indicative number and list of departmental source systems/APIs to be integrated in Phase 1 (with database technology/protocol where known), so the integration architecture and effort can be scoped.	As per RFP
294	CI 5.8 (-) - Performance Testing (p.49)	Load testing must validate "a minimum of 1,000 concurrent users" with zero-latency degradation.	Please confirm whether 1,000 concurrent users is also the sizing basis to be used for the proposed infrastructure and software architecture, or whether a different (higher) steady-state user/registration number should be designed for by Year 3-5 of O&M.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
295	CI 5.6.1 / 5.6.2 - AI Readiness & Model Relevance Score (p.41-42)	Platform must display an "AI Readiness Score" and "Model Relevance Score", methodology to be proposed by Bidder.	Please confirm whether these scoring functions require GPU-based compute/inference, or can be delivered as rule-based/CPU-only scoring, since this determines the compute architecture to be proposed.	As per Clause 5.6.1.1, the AI Readiness Score and Model Relevance Score methodology shall be proposed by the selected bidder and submitted for approval. The underlying technology approach may be proposed by the bidder in accordance with the solution architecture.
296	CI 5.10.1-5.10.3 - Software Licensing (p.53-54)	Solution should "if primarily" use Open-Source with enterprise support; proprietary components discouraged unless justified; 5-year license/OEM undertaking mandatory.	Please confirm if there is a pre-approved/restricted list of permitted COTS tools (e.g. for API gateway, IAM, monitoring, CI/CD) or if Bidder has full discretion in the technology stack proposed.	As per RFP
297	CI 5.6.2 - STQC Certification (p.50)	STQC certification is required "where applicable", without specifying scope or trigger conditions.	Please confirm if STQC certification is mandatory for this specific project (not merely "where applicable") and specify its scope, so the certification activities can be planned into the technical approach and delivery timeline.	As per RFP
298	CI 5.6.1-5.6.14 vs CI 7.6 Timeline T3 (p.41-45, 64-65)	13+ functional modules (Dataset, AI Models, User Cases, Toolkits, Spotlight, Grievance, Ranking, IAM/RBAC-ABAC, Search/Discovery, Access-Control Workflow, Analytics Dashboard, Integrations, Audit/Logging, Consent) plus full security hardening are to be built within the 16-week Development milestone (T3).	Please confirm whether all listed modules are mandatory for the single Go-Live (T4/T5), or whether a phased/prioritised Go-Live (e.g. core modules first, Spotlight/Ranking Engine in a later O&M release) is acceptable, so the proposed solution and delivery plan can be realistically scoped.	As per RFP
299	CI 7.6 Milestones 3 & 4 (p.65)	On-premise deployment, hosting, FAT and Go-Live (T4) is only 3 weeks after the 16-week development/testing milestone (T3), which itself already includes "security audit on Development environment".	Please clarify the expected scope and duration of FAT, and confirm whether CERT-In VAPT clearance ("Safe-to-Hoist") for the Production environment is expected to complete within this 3-week window, or whether Go-Live may be conditional/phased pending VAPT sign-off.	As per RFP
300	CI 5.9 - Technical Resource Table (p.52-53)	Minimum implementation-phase team is 9 resources (PM, SA, 2 Backend Dev, 2 Front-end Dev, 1 DB Dev, 1 BA, 1 Tester) for the full scope in Q2.	Given the breadth of scope (13+ modules, 5+ external-identity integrations, security hardening, multi-lingual UI), please confirm the stated table is only the contractual minimum and Bidders are free to propose a larger team in their technical/delivery approach without being penalised in evaluation.	As per RFP
301	CI 5.5 (f) - Multilingual Support (p.38)	Platform UI must support Gujarati, Hindi and English.	Please confirm whether translated content/strings for Gujarati and Hindi will be supplied by DIT, or whether translation/localisation is entirely the Bidder's responsibility.	As per RFP
302	CI 3.23.2 Sr.4 - Technical Presentation, sub-item 4 (p.29-30) vs CI 5.5.1 (p.38-40)	Presentation criterion "Data Storage & Ingestion" (5 marks) requires the Bidder to present ingestion pipelines, lineage, cataloguing and AI-ready architecture, but no reference architecture, existing system landscape, or current data volumes are shared in the RFP.	Please share any existing departmental data inventory / reference architecture documents (if available) that DIT can provide ahead of the technical presentation, so the proposed solution design is grounded in DIT's actual environment rather than generic assumptions.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
303	CI 5.11.2 / Annexeure 3 Table B, B2 (p.55,74)	O&M team composition table lists 4 roles (BA/PC, Backend Dev, Front-end Dev, Data Engineer). Financial Bid Table B2 asks for "Man-Month Cost for Resources per quarter", Qty = 20.	Please confirm B2's unit price/total is meant to represent the combined quarterly cost of all 4 O&M roles together (i.e. Qty 20 = 20 quarters = 5 years), and not a per-resource rate. Kindly clarify the exact calculation basis expected in the price bid.	As per RFP
304	Annexeure 3 Table C vs CI 5.11.2 (p.56,75)	Table C "Additional Manpower Rate Card" lists 11 roles (PM, SA, Backend/Front-end Engineer, DBA, System Admin, Tester, BA, Data Engineer, Project Coordinator, Hand-Holding Staff), while the core O&M team (CI 5.11.2) has only 4 roles.	Please confirm Table C rates are only for on-demand ramp-up/backfill requests during O&M (billed separately and as when ordered) and are NOT part of the base CAPEX/OPEX quoted in Table B, so bidders price them consistently.	As per Clause 5.11.1.7 - Additional Manpower and Annexeure-3 Table C, the rate card shall be applicable for additional manpower requirements, if any, during the contract period as approved by the Tenderer. Additionally, please see Corrigendum
305	CI 5.10.2 (p.54)	All software/tool/database licenses must be procured "in the name of DIT"; paper licenses to be submitted to DIT office.	Please confirm this licensing cost is to be fully included within the Bidder's consolidated CAPEX/OPEX quote (Annexeure 3, A2/B1), and DIT will not separately fund or reimburse license procurement.	As per RFP
306	CI 5.8 - Post-Go-Live VAPT (p.46)	Post-Go-Live VAPT is conducted via a CERT-in empanelled agency engaged by SOC/GoG, while the Bidder is responsible for remediation of identified vulnerabilities during the contract period.	Please confirm whether the Bidder bears any contracting fee for post-Go-Live VAPT cycles, or only the remediation effort, so VAPT-related OPEX is estimated correctly.	As per RFP
307	CI 5.9 & CI 8.1(h) (p.52,69)	Development/O&M team must be stationed onsite for the full project duration; Tenderer provides only seating + internet; Bidder shall not charge for travel/boarding/lodging/out-of-pocket expenses.	Please confirm what facilities beyond seating and internet (workstations/laptops, dev-tool licenses, VPN, printing, etc.) the Bidder must independently arrange at its own cost for "9-13 onsite resources over 5.5 years, to allow accurate HR/overhead cost estimation.	As per RFP
308	CI 5.12 - Time and Material - Change Requests (p.57)	Titled "Time and Material", but the clause simultaneously states the Bidder shall provide "continuous enhancement, bug fixing, configuration changes and functional improvements... without any additional cost to the Purchaser" throughout O&M.	Please clarify the demarcation between (a) Change Requests billed via the Table C rate card as ad-hoc T&M, and (b) improvements to be absorbed free within the existing O&M team's bandwidth, so OPEX/change-request budget is estimated correctly.	As per RFP
309	Annexeure 3 Table B, A2 vs B1 (p.74)	A2 = "License costs Year 1" (Qty = 1 Year); B1 = "License costs 2nd Year onwards" (Qty = 16 Quarters, i.e. 4 years).	Please confirm whether A2's "Year 1" is measured from Contract/Work-Order start (T0) or from Go-Live, since the implementation phase itself is "6 months" - this affects whether license cost overlaps with the implementation period and how it should be phased in the price bid.	As per RFP
310	CI 7.5.3 vs CI 7.7 (p.63,66)	CI 7.5.3 caps cumulative penalties at 15% of contract value/milestone value before termination (20% cumulative, or 30% in a single O&M month). CI 7.7 lists separate Security-Breach/Data-Theft penalties (INR 1L/3L/5L per incident) described as "over and above" other SLA penalties.	Please clarify whether Security-Breach/Data-Theft penalties under CI 7.7 are included within, or excluded from, the 15% overall penalty cap in CI 7.5.3, since this affects the Bidder's risk/liability pricing and insurance provisioning.	As per RFP
311	CI 4.3.3 - PBG (p.31)	PBG = 5% of "total contract value", valid till O&M completion + 120 days.	Please confirm whether "total contract value" for PBG purposes means CAPEX only, or CAPEX + full 5-year OPEX (which is billed quarterly on a time-and-material basis and not a fixed upfront sum), so the PBG amount can be computed correctly at award.	As per RFP
312	Annexeure 6, Point 6 (p.81)	Bidder must have an office in the state, or undertake to establish one at Gandhinagar/Ahmedabad within 45 days of contract award.	Please confirm this is a post-award covenant (not a bid-eligibility disqualifier) for Bidders without an existing Gujarat office, and that the cost of establishing/maintaining this office is to be borne entirely by the Bidder (to be built into the cost estimate).	As per RFP
313	CI 5.11.1.1, Item 7 (p.55)	"The Tendering authority reserves the right to utilize the resources under the RFP for any other platform maintenance and development purposes in case bandwidth of the resources are available."	Please clarify if there is any cap/limit on the extent to which the deployed O&M team can be redirected to non-AI Sangrah work, and confirm no additional compensation is intended for such redirected efforts, so staffing/utilisation is planned and priced correctly.	As per RFP
314	CI 7.8.2 (p.67)	Resource replacement (other than by resignation) requires minimum 2 months' prior notice and panel-approved substitution before change is permitted.	Please confirm the process and expected turnaround for DIT/panel approval of proposed replacement resources, so the Bidder can plan bench/backup resourcing costs to avoid SLA penalty exposure under CI 7.8.1.5.	As per RFP
315	3.23.1 Pre-qualification Criteria, 1.2, Page No 27	The bidder should have a minimum average annual turnover of INR 14 Crore during the last three financial years (from IT/ITES/software Development) with positive net worth as on 31st March 2025.	Kindly reduce the value of average annual turnover to INR 10 Crore for better participation.	Please see Corrigendum
316	3.23.1 Pre-qualification Criteria, 1.4, Page No 27	Bidder should have the following certifications, as on the date of bid submission: (i) ISO 9001 (Quality Management System) And (ii) ISO 27001 (Information Security Management System) And (iii) CMMI Level 3 or Higher.	Kindly remove CMMI Level 3/4/5.	As per RFP
317	3.23.1 Pre-qualification Criteria, 1.5, Page No 28	Consortium or subletting in any form is not permitted	Kindly allow the consortium for better participation.	As per RFP
318	3.23.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria 1, Page No 29		Kindly reduce the marking scheme as below: ≥10 Cr and <11 Cr : 10 Marks ≥11 Cr and <12 Cr : 30 Marks	Please see Corrigendum

319	3.23.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria 5, Page No 30	Manpower Strength Bidder should have below technical manpower as required in PQ. 1.100 – 200 IT Technical Manpower – 05 marks 2. More than 200 IT Technical Manpower – 10 Marks	Kindly reduce suggested Revised Criteria: Bidder should have the following IT Technical Manpower as required in PQ. 1.50 – 100 IT Technical Manpower – 05 Marks 2. More than 100 IT Technical Manpower – 10 Marks	As per RFP
320	3.23.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria 6, Page No 31	Certification Bidder should have below certification. 1. CMMI Level 3 – 05 Marks 2. Above CMMI Level 3 – 10 marks	Kindly add ISO 9001 (Quality Management System) And ISO 27001 (Information Security Management System) in marking scheme.	As per RFP
321	RFP Clause No. 1.3 Fact Sheet, S.No.5-Proposal Security/ Earnest Money Deposit (EMD), Page No.12 And RFP Clause No. 3.5 Earnest Money Deposit (EMD), Page No.18	INR 14,00,000/- (INR Fourteen lakhs only) either through DD OR by a Bank Guarantee (as per format attached in Annexure-15 of RFP) and should be valid for 180 days from the due date of the RFP	<u>Request for amendment:</u> We kindly request that EMD exemption be extended to MSME bidders. Bidders claiming the exemption should be required to submit a valid MSME registration document, such as an Udyam Registration Certificate or NSIC Certificate, as proof of eligibility.	As per RFP, and please refer the Corrigendum
322	RFP Clause No. 3.22.3.1 Proposal Evaluation Committee (PEC) Stage 3: Financial Evaluation Point (b)- Least Cost Selection (LCS) method Page No.32	Least Cost Selection (LCS) method will be used among technically qualified bidders. The bidder with lowest quote (L1 bidder) will be selected from the technically qualified bidders	<u>Request for Amendment:</u> The selection of the successful bidder shall be based on the Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) methodology, with a weightage of 70% for the technical score and 30% for the financial score. Only technically qualified bidders shall be considered for financial evaluation. The bidder achieving the highest combined weighted score shall be ranked first (H1) and selected for award of the contract.	As per RFP
323	General	General	Considering the strategic nature and complexity of this empanelment, the extensive pre-qualification requirements, detailed technical evaluation criteria, preparation of supporting documentary evidence, identification and confirmation of proposed resources, and the multiple levels of internal management approvals required, we request to kindly extend the bid submission deadline by at least four (04) weeks from the date of publication of the corrigendum and responses to the pre-bid queries	The bid submission date and other timelines shall be as notified by the Tenderer through the GeM portal and official communications.
324	Page 5; 1.3 Fact Sheet; Sl. No. 4: Method of Selection	Least Cost Selection (LCS) method will be used among technically qualified bidder.	We request GIL to kindly consider adopting a QCBS methodology with a 80:20 (Technical: Financial) weightage in place of the current Least Cost Selection (LCS) approach, this would enable selection of the most technically competent implementation partner while maintaining commercial competitiveness, thereby reducing project risks and ensuring successful delivery of this mission-critical digital initiative	As per RFP
325	Page 26; Clause 3.23: Evaluation Criteria Sub-Clause 3.23.1: Pre-Qualification Criteria; Sl. No. 1.2	The bidder should have a minimum average annual turnover of INR 14 Crore during the last three financial years (from IT/ITES/software development) with positive net worth as on 31st March 2025.	We request to increase the minimum average annual turnover criterion to INR 100 Crore. A higher financial eligibility threshold would help ensure participation of financially sound and experienced System Integrators with the organizational capacity, delivery capability, and long-term sustainability required for successful execution. We request the following modification: "The bidder should have a minimum average annual turnover of INR 100 Crore during the last three financial years (from IT/ITES/software development) with positive net worth as on 31st March 2025."	Please see Corrigendum
326	Page 26; Clause 3.23: Evaluation Criteria Sub-Clause 3.23.1: Pre-Qualification Criteria; Sl. No. 1.3	The Bidder should have provided design, development, implementation, and operations & maintenance of software development or AI Dataset Platform/ AI Data Exchange / Enterprise AI Data Platform Project with any State Government or Central Government or any PSU or any government organisation during last 07 years in India: At least One (1) such project of value not less than INR 3.5 Crore, OR At least Two (2) such projects each of value not less than INR 3.5 Crore, OR At least Three (3) such projects each of value not less than INR 2.8 Crore	We request GIL to kindly allow consideration of Ongoing Projects for evaluation, considering the long implementation timelines of large-scale Government digital transformation projects, many strategically significant projects remain under execution.	As per RFP and, Please refer the Corrigendum
327	Page 26; Clause 3.23: Evaluation Criteria Sub-Clause 3.23.1: Pre-Qualification Criteria; Sl. No. 1.4	Bidder should have the following certifications, as on the date of bid submission: (i) ISO 9001 (Quality Management System) And (ii) ISO 27001 (Information Security Management System) And (iii) CMMI Level 5 or higher.	We request GIL to kindly modify the certification requirement to mandate CMMI Level 5 instead of CMMI Level 3 or Higher. Considering the strategic nature of the project, CMMI Level 5 organizations demonstrate the highest level of process maturity, quantitative project management, continuous process optimization, and quality assurance practices, which are critical for successful delivery of complex, mission-critical Government digital transformation initiatives We request the following modification: "Bidder should have the following certifications, as on the date of bid submission: (i) ISO 9001 (Quality Management System) (ii) ISO 27002 (Information Security Management System) (iii) ISO 20000 (Information Technology Service Management) (iv) CMMI Level 5"	As per RFP
328	Page 29; Clause 3.23: Evaluation Criteria Sub-Clause 3.23.2: Technical Evaluation Criteria; Sl. No. 1	The Bidder should have average annual turnover of minimum Rs. 14 Crores or above during the last three completed financial years. Criteria Marks ≥ 14 Cr and <= 30 Crores - 10 > 30 Crores and <=45 Crores - 15 > 45 Crores - 20	We request GIL to kindly clarify whether the turnover considered for the Technical Evaluation criteria shall be the overall average annual turnover of the bidder or average annual turnover specifically from IT/ITES/Software Development services, as specified under the Pre-Qualification Criteria	Please see Corrigendum
329	Page 29; Clause 3.23: Evaluation Criteria Sub-Clause 3.23.2: Technical Evaluation Criteria; Sl. No. 1	Annual Turn Over Criteria: The Bidder should have average annual turnover of minimum Rs. 14 Crores or above during the last three completed financial years. Criteria Marks ≥ 14 Cr and <= 30 Crores - 10 > 30 Crores and <=45 Crores - 15 > 45 Crores - 20	We request GIL to suitably revise the Technical Evaluation criteria for turnover in line with the proposed enhancement of the minimum turnover eligibility criterion (Query Sl. No. 3) to ensure participation of financially strong and experienced organizations with the capacity to execute We request the following modification: "The Bidder should have average annual turnover of minimum Rs. 10x Crores or above during the last three completed financial years. Criteria Marks ≥ 100 Cr and <= 150 Crores - 10 Marks > 150 Crores and <=200 Crores - 15 Marks > 200 Crores - 20 Marks"	As per RFP, and please refer the Corrigendum
330	Page 29; Clause 3.23: Evaluation Criteria Sub-Clause 3.23.2: Technical Evaluation Criteria; Sl. No. 2	IT Project Experience: Bidder has completed design, development, implementation, and operations & maintenance of software development project or Data Exchange Application Project in India since last 07 years. Criteria Marks 3 Projects 10 4 Projects 15 ≥ 5 Projects 20 Supporting document – Order/Agreement copy and Go-Live Certificate/Completion Certificate clearly mentioning the name of the end client	We request GIL to kindly allow consideration of Ongoing Projects for evaluation, considering the long implementation timelines of large-scale Government digital transformation projects, many strategically significant projects remain under execution.	As per RFP
331	Page 29; Clause 3.23: Evaluation Criteria Sub-Clause 3.23.2: Technical Evaluation Criteria; Sl. No. 6	Certification: Bidder should have below certification. 1. CMMI Level 3 – 05 Marks 2. CMMI Level 4 and above – 10 marks	We request GIL to revise the evaluation criterion to recognize organizations possessing both CMMI Level 5 – Development and CMMI Level 5 – Services certifications. While CMMI Level 5 – Development demonstrates the highest level of maturity in software engineering, development lifecycle, and quality management, CMMI Level 5 – Services reflects organizational excellence in service delivery, operational processes, incident management, continuous service improvement, and long-term support. Since this project includes both implementation and five years of Operations & Maintenance, organizations certified at CMMI Level 5 in both Development and Services are better equipped to deliver high-quality implementation and sustained operational excellence throughout the project lifecycle. Awarding marks for both certifications would therefore enable a more comprehensive assessment of the bidder's organizational capability. We request the following modification: "Bidder should have the following certifications: CMMI Level 5 – Development – 05 Marks CMMI Level 5 – Services – 05 Marks Maximum Marks: 10"	As per RFP

332	Page 33; Clause 5	Scope of Work	We request GIL to kindly provide the indicative list of Government Departments, agencies, source systems, databases, and other data sources proposed to be integrated and onboarded to the AI Sangrah platform. Further, kindly indicate the estimated number of datasets, expected data volume, and the number of integrations envisaged under the project. This information is essential for accurate effort estimation, solution architecture, infrastructure sizing, integration planning, and commercial estimation.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
333	Page 33; Clause 5	Scope of Work	We request GIL to kindly clarify whether the responsibility for identification, collection, collation, and submission of datasets from various Government Departments and participating organizations shall rest with the respective Departments through DIT, or whether the System Integrator shall be responsible for coordinating with individual Departments for collection of datasets, since the platform is expected to onboard datasets from multiple Government Departments and organizations, clarity regarding ownership of data collection and stakeholder coordination is essential for realistic effort estimation, project planning, and timely implementation.	Dataset ownership and source-system coordination shall be facilitated through the Tenderer and concerned departments. The bidder shall facilitate and support artifacts onboarding, validation, integration and related activities as specified in RFP.
334	Page 52; Clause 5.9; Technical Resources	General	We request GIL to kindly include separate marking for the proposed Key Technical Resources under the Technical Evaluation Criteria. While the RFP specifies detailed qualification and experience requirements for key technical resources and requires submission of their CVs, no specific marks have been allocated for evaluating these resources. We therefore request GIL to include a dedicated evaluation criterion for Key Technical Resources to enable an objective assessment of the proposed team	As per RFP
335	3.23.1 Pre-qualification Criteria, Pg No 27, Sr No 1.3	Criteria: The Bidder should have provided design, development, implementation, and operations & maintenance of software development or AI Dataset Platform / AI Data Exchange / Enterprise AI Data Platform Project with any State Government or Central Government or any PSU or any government organisation during last 07 years in India.	Protean has projects which started before 15+ years, however are under continuous operations and maintenance till date. The system of these legacy projects have been upgraded as per technological advancements over the period of time. Please clarify if projects started before 7 years, however under continuous operations and maintenance as of date will be accepted under this criteria?	As per RFP
336	3.23.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria, Pg No 29, Sr No 2	Scoring Methodology The Bidder should have provided design, development, implementation, and operations & maintenance of software development or AI Dataset Platform / AI Data Exchange / Enterprise AI Data Platform Project with any State Government or Central Government or any PSU or any government organisation during last 07 years in India.	Protean has projects which started before 15+ years, however are under continuous operations and maintenance till date. The system of these legacy projects have been upgraded as per technological advancements over the period of time. Please clarify if projects started before 7 years, however under continuous operations and maintenance as of date will be accepted under this criteria?	As per RFP
337	3.23.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria, Pg No 29, Sr No 3	Scoring Methodology At least One (1) eligible project with Min. value of Rs. 1 Crore involving implementation of a Data Exchange Platform, Data Ingestion Platform, or AI-based Solution/Service Integration within an Enterprise Platform environment in last 05 years	Protean has projects which started before 15+ years, however are under continuous operations and maintenance till date. The system of these legacy projects have been upgraded as per technological advancements over the period of time. Please clarify if projects started before 7 years, however under continuous operations and maintenance as of date will be accepted under this criteria?	As per RFP
338	GeM Document: Bid End Date/Time	21-09-2026 15:00	For submitting the best Techno-Commercial Proposal, we request you to kindly provide an extension to Bid Submission deadline by 15 days i.e upto 06-Oct-2026	As per RFP
339	Clause 5.2, Page 36	The Selected Bidder is required to conduct periodic product benchmarking of AI Sangrah against comparable platforms such as Aikosh and OGO, and against prevailing industry standards.	We request clarification as to whether Aikosh is to be treated only as a functional benchmark for periodic comparison, or whether adoption of Aikosh's published reference architecture, metadata schema and AI readiness methodology is expected for AI Sangrah. Furthermore, The Department is also requested to indicate the frequency at which benchmarking reports are to be submitted during the O&M period.	1. As per RFP 2. Tenderer will share the required details to successful bidder.
340	Clause 5.4, Page 37 read with Clause 7.6 (Serial 2), Page 64	The Selected Bidder shall conduct detailed discovery workshops and requirement-gathering sessions with the Department and relevant stakeholders to draft the SRS, within a window of T2 + T1 + 4 weeks.	To enable accurate planning of the discovery phase, the Department is requested to indicate: (a) the number of stakeholder departments, boards and agencies to be covered in the discovery workshops; (b) the location(s) at which the workshops are to be conducted; (c) whether a pre-existing functional requirement baseline, wireframe set or process documentation is available from any prior study, which may be made available to the Selected Bidder at project initiation.	(a) As per RFP Clause 5.1 (Background) (b) The location is as in Gandhinagar with all the departments. (c) This project is inception from scratch so no such documents are available.
341	Clause 5.5(b), Page 37 read with Annexure 19, Page 102	The architecture shall be microservices-based with each component independently deployable and scalable. Annexure 19 requires bidders to ensure that all proposed tools are compatible with the on-premises hosting model and can be deployed at the Gujarat State Data Centre.	We request confirmation that: (a) Containerised deployment using Docker and Kubernetes is permitted within the GSDC environment; (b) Whether GSDC will provide a managed container orchestration platform, or whether the Selected Bidder is required to deploy, harden and operate the Kubernetes distribution on GSDC-provided virtual machines; (c) If the latter, whether an upstream CNCF-conformant open-source Kubernetes distribution with enterprise support is acceptable, or a specific commercial distribution is mandated. This has a direct bearing on the proposed deployment architecture and the Bill of Material.	(a) Yes, As per GSDC. (b) Support provided by GSDC shall be as per RFP (c) Bidder may propose open source tools with enterprise support in the BoQ.
342	Clause 5.5(f), Page 38	The platform shall support multilingual user interfaces including Gujarati, Hindi and English, applicable to the platform interface only and not to the hosted data.	The Department is requested to confirm: (a) Whether translated content for the Gujarati and Hindi interfaces will be supplied and validated by DIT, or whether translation is within the Selected Bidder's scope; (b) Whether machine-assisted translation with departmental validation is acceptable; (c) That user-generated content such as artifact titles, descriptions and metadata entered by contributors is excluded from the multilingual requirement, consistent with the stated carve-out for hosted data; (d) Whether Gujarati and Hindi interfaces are required at Go-Live or may be delivered in a subsequent release.	As per RFP
343	Clause 5.5 (Page 37-38) read with Clause 5.5.1 (Page 40), Clause 5.7 (Page 47) and Clause 5.7.1 (Page 47-48)	Clause 5.7 mandates deployment across dedicated Development, Staging, UAT, Production and Disaster Recovery (DR) environments, and Clause 5.5.1 separately mandates disaster recovery mechanisms. However, Clause 5.7.1 commits GSDC hardware and infrastructure for the Production environment only, and Clause 5.5(d) permits bidder-hosted cloud solely for Development, Testing, Staging, UAT and Training. The Disaster Recovery environment is therefore not attributed to either party, and no RTO or RPO is stated anywhere in the RFP.	The Department is requested to confirm: (a) Whether the Disaster Recovery site infrastructure will be provided by GSDC, NDC or another Government-approved DR facility, or falls within the Selected Bidder's scope of supply; (b) If within the Bidder's scope, the permissible DR location consistent with the data localisation requirement at Clause 5.8.2(4); (c) The required Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO); (d) The DR posture expected, i.e. active-active, active-passive (hot / warm / cold); (e) The inter-site replication bandwidth that will be made available between the primary and DR sites. These inputs are essential for designing the resilience architecture on a comparable basis across bidders.	As per GSDC policy. The details shall be provided to successful bidder.
344	Clause 5.5.1 (Scalable Storage Architecture), Page 38-40	The Selected Bidder shall design and maintain a horizontally scalable, S3-compatible distributed object storage architecture capable of handling massive-scale dataset storage and processing workloads, with elastic scaling without architectural change. No volumetric baseline is provided in the RFP.	For storage architecture, ingestion throughput design and infrastructure sizing, the Department is requested to provide indicative the following volumetrics: (a) Total dataset volume expected at Go-Live and projected growth over the five-year O&M period, in TB; (b) The number of departments and organizations targeted for onboarding at Go-Live and annually thereafter; (c) The estimated number of datasets, AI models and use-cases to be hosted at Go-Live; (d) The average and maximum single-file size to be supported; (e) The expected daily and monthly ingestion and download volume. In the absence of these inputs, storage architectures proposed by different bidders will not be technically comparable.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
345	Clause 5.5.1 (Object Storage-Based Architecture), Page 39-40 read with Clause 5.7.1(1), Page 47-48	The platform shall adopt S3-compatible distributed object storage or an equivalent modern architecture as the primary storage layer, with a stated preference for open-source and cloud-agnostic technologies. GSDC is stated to provide the required hardware and infrastructure for the Production environment based on finalized hardware sizing and availability.	The Department is requested to confirm whether: (a) GSDC will provide an S3-compatible object storage service as a ready platform capability; or (b) GSDC will provide raw storage capacity and compute nodes on which the Selected Bidder must deploy, configure and operate a software-defined object store such as MinIO, Ceph or equivalent. This determines whether the object storage software, its enterprise support subscription and the associated operational effort fall within the Selected Bidder's scope.	GSDC will provide raw storage capacity and compute nodes on which the Selected Bidder must deploy, configure and operate a software-defined object store.
346	Clause 5.5.1 (Data Durability, Backup and Disaster Recovery), Page 40 read with Clause 5.7.1(5), Page 48	The solution shall ensure high data durability through automated replication and failover, backup and archival policies and disaster recovery mechanisms, while GSDC performs only infrastructure-level backup as per its standard backup policy for the servers provided by it.	We request clarification on: (a) the required replication factor and data durability target for the object storage layer; (b) the data retention and archival period mandated under applicable Government policy for datasets, models and audit logs; (c) whether application-level and data-level backup, as distinct from GSDC's infrastructure-level backup, is within the Selected Bidder's scope, and whether the corresponding backup storage capacity will be provisioned by GSDC; (d) whether a copy of the GSDC standard backup policy may be shared, so that the residual backup design responsibility of the Bidder can be precisely defined.	As per GSDC policy. The details shall be provided to successful bidder.
347	Clause 5.5.1 (Data Ingestion Architecture), Page 40	The ingestion architecture must support intelligent chunking of large files into smaller encrypted segments, resumable upload, parallel processing, network-failure recovery, automatic reconstruction with checksum-based integrity verification, and both streaming and batch ingestion.	For sizing of the ingestion tier, the Department is requested to indicate: (a) The maximum single-file size to be supported for chunked, resumable upload; (b) The expected number of concurrent ingestion sessions at peak; (c) The internet and GSIWAN bandwidth that will be available to the AI Sangrah production environment at GSDC, and whether bandwidth augmentation, if required, is within GSDC's scope; (d) Whether a Content Delivery Network or equivalent acceleration capability is envisaged for large-file distribution to external users.	As per RFP

348	Clause 5.6.1 (Dataset Repository Module - AI Readiness Score), Page 41-42 read with Clause 5.6.2 (Model Relevance Score), Page 43	The AI Readiness Score methodology and evaluation framework shall be proposed by the Selected Bidder based on industry standards and best practices, and submitted to the tenderer for review and approval during the Solution Design phase. A Model Relevance Score functionality is similarly required without a stated methodology.	The Department is requested to clarify: (a) whether an existing Government of Gujarat, MeitY or AIKosh framework is to be adopted or referenced, or whether the Selected Bidder is free to propose an independent framework; (b) whether scoring is expected to be computed automatically at ingestion, computed with assisted human review, or curated manually; (c) the dimensions expected to be covered, for example completeness, accuracy, documentation quality, schema conformance, licensing clarity and bias assessment; (d) whether the score is required to be recomputed on each dataset or model version. The same clarifications are sought in respect of the Model Relevance Score.	The AI Readiness Score and Model Relevance Score methodologies shall be proposed by the Selected Bidder based on industry best practices and submitted to the Department for review and approval during the Solution Design phase. The detailed evaluation criteria, scoring dimensions, computation approach, and recalculation requirements shall be finalized during the SRS and solution design stage in consultation with the Department.
349	Clause 5.6.1 (Dataset Repository Module - Classification and Anonymisation), Page 42 read with Clause 5.6.1(A), Page 49-50	The platform shall provide tools to support datasets for classification and anonymisation based on the DPDP Act and other prevailing acts, rules, frameworks and guidelines, and shall enforce data masking, encryption and anonymisation protocols.	The Department is requested to clarify: (a) whether a Commercial Off-The-Shelf classification and anonymisation product is expected, or whether custom-developed components using open-source libraries are acceptable; (b) the anonymisation techniques and assurance level required, for example static masking, tokenisation, generalisation, k-anonymity, l-diversity or differential privacy; (c) whether classification is to be automated through content inspection and pattern detection, or declared by the contributing department through a workflow; (d) the classification taxonomy to be applied under the Gujarat State Data Governance Framework; (e) which authority is responsible for certifying the adequacy of anonymisation before publication.	(a) The Selected Bidder may propose either a Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) solution or a custom-developed solution leveraging open source components, provided the proposed solution meets all functional, security, compliance, and performance requirements of the RFP. (b) The anonymisation techniques and controls shall be proposed by the Selected Bidder in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, industry standards, and best practices, and shall be finalized during the Solution Design phase in consultation with the Department. (c) The platform shall support configurable classification workflows, including automated and user-driven classification mechanisms, as required. The detailed approach shall be finalized during the SRS stage. (d) The classification taxonomy shall be aligned with the Gujarat State Data Governance Framework and other applicable Government policies and guidelines. The detailed taxonomy shall be finalized during the Solution Design phase. (e) The publishing department/data owner shall be responsible for reviewing and approving datasets prior to publication. The platform shall provide necessary controls and auditability to support the review and approval process.
350	Clause 5.6.1 (Federated and Real-time Dataset Access), Page 42	The platform shall support secure federated and real-time dataset access through APIs and data connectors, including live data connectors to source departmental databases for periodic synchronization with versioning and change management, and API-based federated access wherein the dataset remains at the source department.	As this requirement carries dependencies on third-party departmental systems, the Department is requested to: (a) provide an indicative list and count of source departmental systems to be connected or federated at Go-Live, together with their underlying database and application technologies; (b) confirm the connectivity path to be used, whether GSWAN, the State API Gateway or dedicated links, and which party will provision it; (c) confirm whether source departments will expose APIs, or whether the Selected Bidder is required to build extraction connectors directly against departmental databases; (d) confirm that DIT will facilitate the necessary approvals, technical access and coordination with the concerned departments; (e) confirm whether connectors beyond the indicative list will be taken up through the approved Change Request process.	(a) The list and number of source systems to be onboarded shall be finalized during the discovery and SRS phase in consultation with the Department and participating stakeholders. (b) Connectivity arrangements shall be facilitated through Government-approved networks and platforms, as applicable. (c) The platform shall support both API-based integrations and connector-based integrations, as required. (d) The Department shall facilitate necessary coordination with participating departments and support the Selected Bidder in obtaining required approvals and access, subject to applicable policies and procedures. (e) As per RFP
351	Clause 5.6.2 (AI Models Module), Page 42-43	The module requires cataloguing and publishing of AI models with format support for ONNX, HDF5 and .pt, version control and version history and the ability to build capability in the solution to integrate with code repositories and CI/CD pipelines for deployment.	We request confirmation on the functional boundary of this requirement: (a) whether model hosting, model serving or inference execution on the platform is within scope, or whether the platform's role is limited to cataloguing, versioning, metadata management and download or deployment hand-off; (b) if model inference, fine-tuning or sandbox execution is envisaged, whether GPU infrastructure will be provisioned by GSDC and to what specification; (c) the specific code repositories and CI/CD systems with which integration is required, and whether these are State-operated or contributor-owned.	As per RFP
352	Clause 5.6.4 (Toolkits and Tutorials), Page 43 and Clause 5.6.5 (Spotlight Module), Page 43-44	The Spotlight module is to showcase articles, research and testimonials and should support text, video, audio and all multimedia. Toolkits and Tutorials require downloadable resources and video and text-based tutorials.	The Department is requested to clarify: (a) whether creation of editorial content, tutorial videos, articles and testimonials is within the Selected Bidder's scope, or whether content will be supplied by DIT with the Bidder providing only the authoring and publishing capability; (b) if content creation is in scope, the indicative quantum of content per annum; (c) whether video streaming, transcoding and adaptive delivery capability is required within the platform, and whether the associated storage and bandwidth is to be provisioned by GSDC.	(a) The Selected Bidder shall provide the platform capabilities for content authoring, management, and publishing. (b) Content creation services are not envisaged as part of the core scope of this RFP. Any specific content development requirements, if required, shall be addressed separately. (c) The platform shall support hosting and delivery of multimedia content, including text, audio, video, and downloadable resources. Video streaming and content delivery capabilities, as required for platform operations, shall form part of the solution. Detailed infrastructure sizing and deployment requirements shall be finalized during the Solution Design phase in consultation with the Department.
353	Clause 5.6.8 (User, Role, Privilege Management Module), Page 44	The module requires integration with DigLocker, Citizen SSO, Office SSO, MeriPehchaan and Parichay for individual and government user authentication, and private organisation registration via EntityLocker with support for different entity types.	In respect of these six identity integrations, the Department is requested to confirm: (a) whether DIT will procure and provide API access, credentials, sandbox environments, MoUs and production onboarding approvals for each of DigLocker, EntityLocker, MeriPehchaan, Parichay, Citizen SSO and Office SSO, and the indicative timeline for each; (b) whether all six integrations are mandatory at Go-Live or may be delivered in a phased manner; (c) whether the current API specifications and integration kits for these platforms can be shared with bidders or the Selected Bidder at project initiation; (d) which user categories are to be authenticated through which identity provider, so that the identity federation design can be finalized.	(a) The Department shall facilitate coordination and provide available documentation, approvals, and support required for integration with DigLocker, EntityLocker, MeriPehchaan, Parichay, Citizen SSO, and Office SSO. The Selected Bidder shall be responsible for carrying out the integrations in accordance with the requirements and guidelines of the respective platforms. (b) As per RFP. (c) Relevant API specifications, integration guidelines, and technical documentation available with the Department or the respective platform providers shall be shared with the Selected Bidder, subject to applicable policies and approvals. (d) The detailed authentication and federation model, including mapping of user categories to the appropriate identity provider(s), shall be finalized during the SRS and Solution Design phase in consultation with the Department and relevant stakeholders.
354	Clause 5.6.8 (Identity Access Management tool), Page 44	The Selected Bidder shall implement an Identity Access Management tool with RBAC and ABAC capabilities for user registration and management across departments, startups, academia and industry users.	We request clarification as to: (a) whether an existing State-level IAM platform is to be leveraged, or whether the Selected Bidder is to deploy a new IAM within the AI Sangrah environment; (b) if the latter, whether an open-source IAM such as Keycloak with enterprise support is acceptable, or a Commercial Off-The-Shelf IAM product is mandated; (c) the expected registered user base at Go-Live and its projected growth over the contract period, which is required for sizing any user-based IAM component; (d) the ABAC attributes envisaged, for example organisation type, sector, clearance level or data classification.	(a) The platform shall support integration with existing Government identity providers and authentication systems. The Selected Bidder shall also provision and implement an IAM solution with RBAC and ABAC capabilities as part of the proposed solution, where required. (b) The Selected Bidder may propose either an open-source or Commercial Off-The-Shelf IAM solution, provided it meets the functional, security, scalability, and compliance requirements specified in the RFP. (c) The expected user base and adoption projections are indicative in nature and may evolve over time. Bidders are required to propose a scalable IAM architecture capable of accommodating future growth. (d) The detailed RBAC and ABAC framework, including user roles, attributes, access policies, organisational hierarchies, and data access controls, shall be finalized during the SRS and Solution Design phase in consultation with the Department.

355	Clause 5.6.9 (Search, Discovery, Filtering and Sorting Recommendation Engine), Page 44	A unified search, discovery, filtering, sorting and recommendation capability is required across the Dataset, Model, Use-case and Ranking modules, with keyword-based search, autocomplete and faceted filtering by tags, sector and organisation.	The Department is requested to clarify the expected sophistication of the recommendation capability, specifically whether metadata and rules-based recommendation is acceptable, or whether machine-learning based collaborative or content-based recommendation is expected. Bidders further request confirmation that: (a) semantic or vector-based search is not a mandatory requirement unless expressly stated; (b) an open-source search engine with enterprise support is acceptable in lieu of a commercial search product; (c) full-text search within uploaded documents and datasets is not within scope, the requirement being limited to metadata-level search.	The detailed requirements shall be finalised during the SRS stage. Bidders are required to propose a fit-for-purpose solution based on industry standards and established best practices adopted across Government implementations. Bidders may propose an appropriate technology stack, including open-source or commercial solutions, provided the requirements of the RFP are met.
356	Clause 5.6.11 (Analytics and Dashboard Module), Page 45	The module requires interactive charts, graphs and maps, dynamic filtering, permission-scoped analytics, artefact-level statistics and export of reports and dashboard views to PDF, CSV and image formats. The RFP states that GIS or mapping capability is not intended as a mandatory core requirement requiring specialised GIS licensing unless specifically proposed by the bidder.	We request confirmation that: (a) The acceptable technical approach to immutability, for example WORM-enabled object storage with object lock, an append-only ledger database, cryptographic hash-chaining, or a distributed ledger; (b) the stated carve-out for GIS licensing is confirmed, and geospatial visualisation may be delivered using open-source mapping libraries with open base-map tiles; (c) the indicative number of standard dashboards and reports to be delivered at Go-Live; (d) whether near real-time refresh is required, or whether periodic batch refresh of analytics is acceptable.	The detailed requirements and implementation approach for search, discovery, filtering, sorting, and recommendation capabilities shall be finalised during the SRS and Solution Design phase. Bidders are required to propose a fit-for-purpose solution aligned with industry standards, prevailing best practices, and comparable Government implementations. The proposed solution may leverage appropriate technologies and architectures to meet the requirements of the RFP.
357	Clause 5.6.12 (Integrations), Page 45	The platform shall integrate and publish APIs with the State API Gateway or Hub, and shall provide an API Management and Access module with API-related monitoring and reporting capabilities.	The Department is requested to identify the State API Gateway or Hub by name and underlying technology, and to clarify: (a) whether AI Sangrah is required only to publish its APIs through the State Gateway, or also to consume APIs from it; (b) whether API management functions such as developer portal, key management, rate limiting and throttling are provided by the State Gateway, or whether the Selected Bidder must additionally deploy an API management layer within the AI Sangrah environment; (c) whether the API specification, onboarding guidelines and sandbox for the State Gateway can be made available.	(a) The State API Gateway/Hub details, including relevant access information, onboarding guidelines, and available documentation, shall be shared with the Selected Bidder, as applicable. (b) Relevant APIs and integration mechanisms required for the project shall be made available. The Selected Bidder shall propose an appropriate API architecture and determine whether any API management capabilities are required within the AI Sangrah platform to meet the functional and non-functional requirements of the solution. (c) The detailed integration approach, API management requirements, onboarding process, and interface specifications shall be finalised during the SRS and Solution Design phase in consultation with the Department.
358	Clause 5.6.13 (Audit and logging), Page 45 read with Clause 5.8.2(i), Page 51-52 and Clause 5.7.1(i), Page 48	Logging is to be implemented in an immutable database, with immutable audit logs maintained for user access, data access, data modification data sharing, administrative activities and API transactions, retained as per Government policy. GSDC provides the log storage infrastructure while the Selected Bidder is responsible for log sizing, retention and archival strategy.	The Department is requested to clarify: (a) The acceptable technical approach to immutability, for example WORM-enabled object storage with object lock, an append-only ledger database, cryptographic hash-chaining, or a distributed ledger; (b) The mandated log retention period under applicable Government policy; (c) The log storage capacity that GSDC will make available, so that the retention and archival design can be sized against a known ceiling; (d) Whether logs are additionally required to be forwarded to the State SOC or a central SIEM, and if so, the interface and format expected.	(a) To be finalised at SRS stage (b) It will be as per applicable policies- retention periods vary as per record type and need. (c) The log storage infrastructure shall be provisioned by GSDC. The Selected Bidder shall be responsible for sizing, retention, archival planning, and estimation of storage requirements as part of the proposed solution. Details of available infrastructure shall be shared with the Selected Bidder during the project execution phase. (d) To be finalised during SRS stage.
359	Clause 5.6.14 (Consent), Page 46	The Consent requirement is stated as 'Integration ability', 'Consent Validation for provided data' and 'Consent application while data sharing for classified data', without identifying the counterparty system or the consent artefact standard.	We request clarification as to whether: (a) A native consent management module is to be built within AI Sangrah, or integration with an external consent manager is envisaged and, if so, the specific system, for example a State consent framework or a DEPA-compliant Consent Manager; (b) The consent artefact standard and schema to be adopted; (c) Whether consent is to be captured from Data Principals directly on the platform, or validated as an attestation furnished by the contributing department; (d) Whether consent revocation and the consequential withdrawal or restriction of already-published datasets is within scope.	The consent framework shall be compliant to the DPDP act.
360	Clause 5.6.2 (Application Security and Vulnerability Management), Sub-clause C, Page 46-47	A mandatory remediation window of 24 to 48 hours is prescribed for Critical and High severity vulnerabilities identified through NVD, CERT-in and equivalent advisories.	We hereby request confirmation that: (a) The remediation window commences from the Selected Bidder becoming aware of the advisory, and relates to remediation readiness rather than production deployment; (b) Where production deployment requires a GSDC change-management window or Departmental approval, the time so consumed is excluded from the window; (c) Vulnerabilities arising in GSDC-owned components, namely the operating system images, network Web Application Firewall, physical load balancer and server-level antivirus, are the responsibility of GSDC and lie outside the Selected Bidder's remediation obligation.	(a) The prescribed remediation timelines shall apply to vulnerabilities within the scope of the Selected Bidder's solution and operations. The Selected Bidder shall be responsible for timely assessment, remediation planning, and implementation of corrective measures in accordance with the timelines specified in the RFP. (b) Where implementation of remediation requires approvals, maintenance windows, or activities dependent on the Department, GSDC, or other third parties, the timelines shall be considered subject to such dependencies. (c) Responsibility for remediation shall remain with the party responsible for managing, operating, and maintaining the affected component. The detailed responsibility matrix shall be finalised during the Solution Design and implementation stages.
361	Clause 5.7 (Integration and Deployment), Page 47	The Selected Bidder shall ensure integration with existing government platforms and third-party services, with the details of required integrations to be finalised during the Requirement Gathering and Solution Design phase in consultation with DIT.	As the integration landscape is not enumerated in the RFP, the Department is requested to provide an indicative list of the government platforms, departmental applications and third-party services with which integration is envisaged at Go-Live, together with the integration mode for each, so that the integration effort can be assessed on a uniform basis by all bidders. We further request confirmation that integrations identified subsequent to SRS approval will be taken up through the approved Change Request process.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalised during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSI/DIT.
362	Clause 5.7.1(i), Page 47-48	GSDC shall provide the required hardware and infrastructure for the Production environment only, based on finalised hardware sizing and availability.	As several proposed components are licensed on a per-core, per-socket or per-node basis, we are unable to finalise the Bill of Material without an indicative infrastructure envelope. Therefore, the Department is requested to share the indicative compute, memory and storage envelope available at GSDC for the AI Sangrah Production environment, namely the number of virtual machines, vCPU or physical cores, RAM and usable storage capacity. As an alternative, we request confirmation that licence and subscription quantities will be traded up following approval of the hardware sizing document, without commercial implication to the Selected Bidder. Please confirm!	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalised during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSI/DIT.
363	Clause 5.7.1(i), Page 47-48 read with Clause 5.5(d), Page 38	The GSDC support table at Clause 5.7.1 is headed 'Staging/Production Environment', while the accompanying remark states that GSDC provides infrastructure for the Production environment only. Clause 5.5(d) provides that Development, Testing, Staging, UAT and Training environments may be hosted on bidder-managed cloud at the Bidder's own cost.	The Department is requested to resolve this inconsistency and confirm whether the Staging environment is entirely within the Selected Bidder's scope and will be hosted on the bidder-managed cloud, and that GSDC infrastructure will be provisioned exclusively for the Production environment. Please confirm	As per RFP.
364	Clause 5.7.1(i), Page 48	GSDC shall provide the database Virtual Machine, while the Selected Bidder shall provide the database licence and be responsible for installation, configuration, performance tuning and management.	For sizing the database licence and designing the data tier, the Department is requested to indicate: (a) the number of database Virtual Machines that will be provisioned; (b) the vCPU or core count and memory per Virtual Machine; (c) whether Virtual Machines for a high-availability cluster configuration will be provided, and in what topology; (d) whether GSDC prescribes or restricts the database technologies that may be deployed on its infrastructure.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalised during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DSI/DIT.
365	Clause 5.7.1(i), Page 48	GSDC shall provide centralised logging infrastructure, while log sizing, retention and archival strategy shall be defined and managed by the Selected Bidder.	We request clarification as to the centralised logging platform operated by GSDC and its ingestion interfaces, and confirmation as to whether the Selected Bidder may additionally deploy its own log aggregation and analytics stack within the AI Sangrah environment for application-level observability and SLA computation.	Bidder may use preferred open-source tools, subjected to approval from Tenderer, with enterprise support license for application level logging.
366	Clause 5.7.1(i), Page 48	GSDC shall provide the physical or network Web Application Firewall infrastructure, while application-specific WAF rules, tuning and monitoring shall be configured and managed by the Selected Bidder, with any additional commercial WAF licences to be borne by the Bidder.	The Department is requested to indicate the make, model and version of the Web Application Firewall deployed at GSDC, so that rule compatibility, the integration mechanism and the effort required for rule authoring, tuning and monitoring can be assessed. We further request confirmation as to whether the Selected Bidder will be granted the administrative access necessary to author and tune application-specific rules, or whether such changes must be routed through GSDC.	Bidder may use preferred open-source tools, subjected to approval from Tenderer, with enterprise support license for WAF. All changes must be routed through GSDC
367	Clause 5.8(b), Page 49 read with Clause 5.6.2(A), Page 46	Security testing including Vulnerability Assessment and Penetration Testing shall be undertaken prior to Go-Live at the Selected Bidder's cost. Through CERT-In empanelled auditors, to obtain Safe-to-host status. Post Go-Live, VAPT is to be conducted by the CERT-In empanelled agency engaged by the State SOC, with the Selected Bidder responsible for remediation.	The Department is requested to confirm: (a) Whether the Selected Bidder is free to appoint any CERT-In empanelled auditor of its choice for the pre Go-Live cycle, or whether the engagement must be routed through the State SOC panel; (b) The number of audit and revalidation cycles to be assumed for planning purposes; (c) Which party is responsible for scheduling the auditor and for obtaining the Safe-to-Host certificate; (d) The frequency at which post Go-Live VAPT will be conducted during the O&M period.	(a) As per RFP (b) As per RFP (c) Bidder will be responsible. (d) The System Integrator (SI) shall be responsible for conducting Vulnerability Assessment and Penetration Testing (VAPT), remediation of identified vulnerabilities, and obtaining VAPT clearance prior to Go-Live. Post Go-Live, VAPT activities shall be carried out by the CERT-In empanelled agency engaged by the SOC, Government of Gujarat. The SI shall, however, be responsible for remediating all vulnerabilities identified during such assessments throughout the contract period.

368	Clause 5.8(c), Page 49 read with Clause 7.7, Page 66	Performance and load testing is to validate system stability under a minimum load of 1,000 concurrent users, while the service level requirement stipulates an average response time not exceeding 500 milliseconds at the gateway, measured against peak-hour requests.	We request clarification on the following non-functional parameters: (a) Whether 1,000 concurrent users is the design and sizing target, or only a load-test threshold beyond which the platform is expected to scale elastically; (b) The expected registered user base and the anticipated peak transactions per second; (c) Confirmation that the 500 millisecond response-time requirement applies to API responses and page renders, and expressly excludes bulk dataset upload and download, large object transfer, third-party SSO redirection latency, federated queries served by source departmental systems, and client-side network conditions; (d) The measurement point and the monitoring tool by reference to which response time will be assessed.	(a, b) Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT. (c) As per RFP (d) Industry standard open source tools.
369	Clause 5.8.2(b) Data Breach Notification, Page 51	The Selected Bidder shall notify the Department and the State Data Authority of any actual or suspected data breach within 6 hours of becoming aware of such incident, in the prescribed Data Breach Notification Format.	We request confirmation that: (a) The six-hour period commences from the Selected Bidder's actual awareness of the incident; (b) The obligation extends to incidents arising within the Selected Bidder's sphere of control, and that incidents originating in GSDC-owned infrastructure layers will be notified by GSDC; (c) An initial notification containing the facts then available satisfies the six-hour requirement, with the impact assessment and corrective action detail to follow in a supplementary report; (d) Whether the prescribed Data Breach Notification Format can be shared.	(a) As per RFP. (b) As per RFP. (c) As per RFP. (d) Tenderer will share the required format to the successful bidder.
370	Clause 5.10.1, Page 53	Software components should primarily be based on open-source licences with enterprise support, and proprietary or closed-source components require a documented global user base, established market presence and a long-term support roadmap.	We request confirmation that: (a) An annual enterprise subscription from the OEM or an authorised support partner satisfies the enterprise support requirement for open-source components; (b) Community editions supported solely by the Selected Bidder's own team are not acceptable; (c) Where a component is available only as a community open-source distribution with no commercial support offering. Bidder-provided L3 support backed by a documented internal competency may be proposed with justification in Annexure 19.	(a) As per RFP (b) Not Acceptable. (c) As per RFP
371	Clause 5.11.1 (Page 54-56) read with Clause 5.11.2 (Page 56-57)	The O&M team composition prescribed at Clause 5.11.2 comprises four resources, namely a Business Analyst and Project Coordinator or Consultant, a Backend Developer, a Frontend Developer and a Data Engineer. The O&M scope at Clause 5.11.1 however requires L1, L2 and L3 support, database administration and performance tuning, application-level BSM rule configuration and tuning, patch management within a 24 to 48 hour window, VAPT remediation, infrastructure and log monitoring and analysis, and maintenance of the stipulated availability level. No System Administrator, Database Administrator, DevSecOps or Security Engineer, or QA resource is included in the prescribed team.	The Department is requested to clarify whether: (a) These specialist technical functions are to be discharged from within the four prescribed onsite resources; or (b) The Selected Bidder may deploy System Administrator, Database Administrator, DevSecOps or Security and QA specialists on an off-site or shared-services basis, in addition to the four onsite resources, in order to deliver the stated technical scope and service levels. Clarity on this point is necessary to ensure that all bidders propose a comparable O&M delivery model.	As per RFP
372	Clause 5.11.2, Page 56-57 read with Clause 7.7, Page 66	The O&M team is to be deployed only at the onsite location, while the service level requirement stipulates a minimum uptime of 99.95% together with incident resolution timeliness measured in hours for Severity L1, L2 and L3 incidents. The RFP does not specify the required support window.	The Department is requested to confirm: (a) The mandated support coverage, whether 24x7, 6x9 or 24x7, and the shift model expected; (b) Whether the availability requirement is to be measured on a 24x7 basis or only during the defined support window; (c) Whether remote or on-call support outside the defined support window is acceptable for after-hour escalation; (d) The definitions and illustrative examples of Severity L1, L2 and L3 incidents, which are referenced in the service level table but not defined in the RFP.	As per RFP Clause 7.3
373	Clause 6.1(C), Page 60	The agency shall be responsible for implementing open-source tools for project management, bug tracking, service level monitoring, CI/CD pipeline and version management.	We request clarification as to: (a) Whether the Selected Bidder's existing enterprise DevOps toolchain may be used during the implementation phase, provided that all artefacts, repositories, backlogs and reports are handed over to DIT; (b) Whether these tools are required to be hosted within GSDC or may be hosted on the bidder-managed non-production environment; (c) If hosting within GSDC is required, whether GSDC infrastructure will be provisioned for the purpose, given that Clause 5.7.3 commits GSDC infrastructure for the Production environment only.	(a) Bidder may propose industry standard open source tools with enterprise support. (b) All tools needs to be hosted in GSDC premises for production environment, and for others bidder sourced environments are acceptable as per specifications mentioned in RFP. (c) GSDC infrastructure will be provisioned to bidder only for Production environment.
374	Clause 7.5.7 and 7.5.8, Page 64 read with Clause 5.7.1, Page 47-48	The Selected Bidder must provide its own comprehensive monitoring capability, use the same tool for integrated service level monitoring, and provide automated real-time SLA monitoring and reporting.	As the Selected Bidder's monitoring tool can observe only the application and the virtual machines exposed to it, the Department is requested to confirm: (a) Whether the Selected Bidder will be granted the access, agent deployment permissions and telemetry from GSDC-managed components, namely the physical load balancer, network WAF, storage, hypervisor and network layers, required to compute end-to-end availability and response time; (b) Whether GSDC's own monitoring data will be made available for reconciliation of service level reports; (c) That where such access or data is not made available, service levels will be computed on the basis of the Selected Bidder's application-layer monitoring.	Tenderer will share the required details to successful bidder.
375	Clause 7.7 (Minimum Uptime), Page 66 read with Clause 5.7.1, Page 47-48	A minimum uptime of 99.95% measured on a quarterly basis is stipulated. Under Clause 5.7.1, the compute and hardware, physical load balancer, network Web Application Firewall, SSL certificates, server-level antivirus, database virtual machine, infrastructure backup and log storage are provided and operated by GSDC.	As a technically sound and uniformly applied availability model, the Department is requested to confirm: (a) That availability will be measured at the application layer through the Selected Bidder's monitoring tool as contemplated by Clause 7.5.7; (b) That unavailability attributable to GSDC infrastructure, GSDC network, GSWAN, power, internet link failure and GSDC-declared planned maintenance windows is excluded from the availability computation; (c) That mutually agreed scheduled maintenance windows for patching and releases are excluded; (d) That unavailability of dependent third-party systems, namely SSO providers, the State API Gateway and federated source departmental systems, is excluded; (e) Whether the GSDC back-to-back availability commitment can be shared, so that a defensible end-to-end availability design can be prepared.	(a) As per RFP (b) As per RFP (c) Only for pre-planned events, mutually agreed upon and approved in advance by the tenderer. (d) As per RFP, all bidder provided tools must comply to SLA, the only exemption is events outside bidder control subjected to tenderer approval on RCA binding evidences. (e) Such commitments cannot be guaranteed.
376	Clause 3.23.2 (Page 29-31) read with Clause 3.22.3 (Page 25-26) and Clause 4.1 (Page 31)	Clause 3.23.3 prescribes a detailed technical evaluation of 100 marks across six parameters, including Understanding of Scope and Approach & Methodology, Proposed Platform Architecture & Technology Stack, Data Storage & Ingestion, Innovation, Open Standards and Open-Source Adoption, and Project Implementation Methodology and Delivery Plan. Clause 4.1 however states that "The GeM will intimate L1 bidder as a Successful Bidder", indicating that the award is proposed to be made on a least-cost (L1) basis amongst technically qualified bidders.	(a) Sangrah is a technology-intensive platform involving AI-ready data architecture, DPDP-compliant data classification and anonymisation, federated and real-time data access, multiple national identity integrations and a five-year Operations & Maintenance commitment, in which the quality of the technical solution will materially determine the outcome realised by the Department. Therefore, Award on a purely least-cost basis does not enable the Department to derive the benefit of the detailed technical evaluation it has itself prescribed at Clause 3.23.2, and tends to reward the lowest price rather than the most capable and sustainable solution. We therefore request the Department to consider adopting the Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) methodology for this procurement, with a technical to financial weightage of 70:30 or, in the alternative, 60:40, consistent with the Quality and Cost Based Selection method contemplated under the General Financial Rules, 2017 and with prevailing Government of Gujarat practice for consultancy and system integration engagements of this nature.	As per RFP
377	Clause 5.5.1 Data Storage Architecture, Page 38-39	The Selected Bidder shall design and implement a secure, scalable, resilient and AI-ready data storage architecture capable of handling large volumes of structured, semi-structured and unstructured datasets, including elastic scaling without major architectural changes.	The RFP does not indicate the data volume against which the storage architecture is to be designed. Kindly provide the total data volume to be hosted at Go-Live (in TB), the indicative bifurcation between structured, semi-structured and unstructured data, and the anticipated year-on-year growth across the 5-year O&M period.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
378	Clause 5.5.1 Data Ingestion, Page 40, and Clause 5.6.1 Dataset Repository Module, Page 41	The system shall support intelligent chunking/partitioning of files during upload, wherein large files are automatically divided into smaller encrypted segments. Upload, discover, filter and download AI-ready datasets with metadata.	Kindly indicate the expected number of datasets to be available on the platform at Go-Live and to be onboarded annually thereafter, together with the average and maximum size of a single dataset/file that the platform is required to support.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
379	Clause 5.8 (c) Performance and Load Testing, Page 49	Validation of system stability under a minimum load of 1,000 concurrent users to ensure zero-latency degradation during peak usage.	Kindly clarify whether the 1,000 concurrent users refers to portal browsing and search sessions or to simultaneous dataset upload/download sessions. Kindly also indicate the expected number of registered users over the contract period and the peak aggregate upload/download throughput to be supported, as these determine network and storage sizing.	Clarification: 1. As in RFP 1000 concurrent user shall perform mixed activities in the portal. 2. Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
380	Clause 5.5.1 Data Storage Architecture, Page 39, and Clause 5.7.1 Sr. 6 Centralized Logging, Page 48	The storage system shall support storage versioning, lifecycle management policies, and immutable storage and retention policies. The SDA shall be responsible for log storage sizing, including estimation of storage capacity, log retention period and archival strategy.	Kindly specify the number of historical versions to be retained per dataset, the required data retention and archival policy, and the log retention period prescribed under applicable Government of Gujarat policy. These parameters have a direct multiplier effect on the storage capacity to be provisioned.	Tenderer will share the required details to successful bidder.
381	Clause 5.5.1 Data Durability, Backup and Disaster Recovery, Page 40	The proposed solution shall ensure high data durability and availability through automated replication and failover mechanisms, backup and archival policies, and disaster recovery mechanisms.	Kindly specify the Recovery Point Objective and Recovery Time Objective applicable to the platform, and confirm whether a Disaster Recovery site and the associated storage will be provided by GSDC. Kindly also indicate the expected data redundancy level, since a three-way replication requirement would triple the raw storage to be provisioned.	As per GSDC policy. The details shall be provided to successful bidder.

382	Clause 5.6.1 Dataset Repository Module, Page 42	Live data connectors to source departmental databases for secure, periodic synchronization of datasets. API-based federated dataset access, wherein the actual dataset remains at the source department and is made available to authorized users based on configured access permissions.	Kindly clarify whether the Selected Bidder is expected to provide only point-to-point API/database connectors, or a centralized data federation/virtualization layer enabling governed access across heterogeneous departmental data sources. Kindly also indicate the number of source departments and source systems to be integrated at Go-Live and over the contract period, along with the source database types involved, and confirm whether integration of sources beyond the indicated number will be treated as a Change Request.	1. The Tenderer will share the required details with the successful bidder in the later phase of requirement discovery. 2. The Tenderer will share the required details with the successful bidder in the later phase of requirement discovery. 3. As per RFP
383	Clause 5.5.1 Data Ingestion, Page 40	The architecture shall support high-volume structured and unstructured datasets, concurrent uploads and downloads, API-based ingestion, and streaming and batch ingestion mechanisms.	Kindly indicate the expected daily data ingestion volume and the permissible processing window. Kindly also confirm whether real-time streaming ingestion is required at Go-Live or whether scheduled batch and API-based ingestion would suffice, and if streaming is required, the number of real-time sources and the expected peak data rate, as a streaming layer constitutes a distinct infrastructure and licensing component.	1. Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT. 2. As per RFP
384	Clause 5.6.1 Dataset Repository Module, Page 42, and Clause 5.8.2 (5) Data Access Control Compliance, Page 51	Tools to Support Datasets for classification and Anonymization based on DPDP Act and any other prevailing acts, rules, frameworks or guidelines. The Bidder shall implement controls based on the data classification defined by the Gujarat State Data Governance Framework.	Kindly share the Gujarat State Data Governance Framework, including the applicable data classification levels, as the document is referenced in the RFP but not enclosed and directly governs the access control and anonymization design. Kindly also indicate the expected volume of data requiring classification and anonymization during the contract period.	Gujarat State Data Governance Framework can be accessed through official DST Gujarat website.
385	Clause 5.6.1 Dataset Repository Module, Page 41-42	Centralized Metadata repository for data sets (appropriate standards like DCAT must be maintained). Should display AI readiness scores across different domains for model development.	Kindly clarify whether the Selected Bidder is expected to implement automated metadata extraction, data profiling and data quality assessment capabilities to populate the metadata repository and compute the AI Readiness Score, or whether metadata will be manually provided by the respective dataset contributors at the time of upload.	As per RFP.
386	Clause 5.6.2 AI Models Module, Page 42	Catalog and publish AI Models uploaded by contributors after due approval. Model upload and classification based on type, sector and licensing. Metadata management and format support, e.g. ONNX, HDF5, .pt. View/download options and version history.	Kindly indicate the expected number of AI models to be hosted at Go-Live and annually thereafter, together with the expected average and maximum size of a model artefact, as model artefact sizes vary by several orders of magnitude across model types.	Bidders are expected to propose a scalable architecture and sizing assumptions based on the functional scope and future-ready design requirements defined in the RFP. Detailed capacity planning, growth projections, and infrastructure sizing shall be finalized during the Discovery and Design phase in consultation with DST/DIT.
387	Clause 5.6.2 AI Models Module, Page 42	Model Relevance Score Functionality.	The term 'Model Relevance Score' appears in the requirement list but is not defined elsewhere in the RFP. Kindly define the intended purpose of this score, the parameters against which relevance is to be evaluated, and where it is required to be displayed.	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
388	Clause 5.6.9 Search, Discovery, Filtering and Sorting, Page 44	The search and discovery engine must facilitate seamless access to the repository's diverse resources, including a Recommendation Engine across Dataset, Model, Use-case and Ranking Modules.	Kindly indicate the expected volume of content (in GB or number of records) to be indexed for search at Go-Live and per year thereafter, and the expected peak search query volume, as these determine the sizing of the search and indexing infrastructure.	For reference and estimated purpose its in Petabyte scale. However, such details will be clarified in discovery phase. The bidder shall size the solution based on the requirements specified in the RFP and provide a scalable architecture capable of accommodating future growth through modular expansion.
389	Clause 5.6.9 Recommendation Engine, Page 44, and Clause 5.8.2 Intellectual Property Rights, Page 51	Recommendation Engine across Dataset, Model, Use-case and Ranking Modules. Clause 5.8.2 separately references embeddings and vector databases in the context of intellectual property in AI-generated outputs.	Embeddings and vector databases are referenced only in the Intellectual Property clause and do not appear in the Scope of Work. Kindly confirm whether semantic/vector-based search or recommendation is within scope for the current phase. If yes, kindly indicate the expected volume of content to be embedded, so that the vector storage and indexing component can be sized.	As per RFP.
390	Clause 5.5 (b) Microservices-Based Architecture, Page 37, read with Clause 5.7.1 Sr. 1 and Sr. 4, Page 47	Design a microservices-based architecture where each component is independently deployable and scalable. GSDC shall provide the required hardware and infrastructure for the Production environment based on finalized hardware sizing and availability. GSDC will provide the VM for hosting the database server.	Kindly confirm whether GSDC will provide a container orchestration platform for the microservices deployment or whether the same is to be provisioned by the Bidder. Kindly also indicate the number of servers/VMs, cores, memory and attached storage that GSDC will make available, and confirm that capacity augmentation required during the O&M period on account of data growth will be provided by GSDC at no additional cost to the Bidder.	1. As per RFP, bidder needs to procure in the BoQ. 2. As per RFP.
391	Page no.: 33 Clause no.: 3.23.1 Pre-qualification Criteria (1.3)	The Bidder should have provided design, development, implementation, and operations & maintenance of software development or AI Dataset Platform / AI Data Exchange / Enterprise AI Data Platform Project with any state Government or Central Government or any PSU or any government organisation during last 07 years in India: At least One (1) such project of value not less than INR 5.5 Crore, OR At least Two (2) such projects each of value not less than INR 3.5 Crore, OR At least Three (3) such projects each of value not less than INR 2.8 Crore	In several Government projects, the issued Work Order is titled as "Deployment of Manpower for XYZ Project"; however, the deployed resources have executed the complete application software design, development, implementation, and operation & maintenance activities for the project. Kindly clarify whether such Work Orders will be considered towards the Technical Capability criteria, provided the bidder submits supporting documents (such as detailed scope of work, client certificate, completion certificate, or performance certificate) establishing that the project involved application software development and associated support & maintenance services.	As per RFP. Additionally, Please refer corrigendum
392	Annexure-01, Sl. No. 4 – Pre-Qualification; TQ Qualification, Sl. No. 6 – Certification	EXEMPTION FROM CMMI LEVEL 3 CERTIFICATION FOR MSME BIDDERS	The tender requires CMMI Level 3 or higher certification at the PQ stage and also provides marks for CMMI certification under TQ. We respectfully request that UDVIAM-registered MSME bidders be exempted from the mandatory CMMI Level 3 certification requirement. This would enable technically capable MSMEs to participate without the significant cost and compliance burden associated with such certification. We further request that the corresponding TQ scoring criterion also be suitably relaxed for MSMEs granted this exemption, so that the exemption remains effective at both PQ and TQ stages.	As per RFP
393	Annexure-01, Sl. No. 9 – Work Experience; Sl. No. 10 – Additional Work Experience; TQ Qualification, Sl. No. 2 – IT Project Experience	RELAXATION OF SIMILAR WORK EXPERIENCE CRITERIA	The present criteria prescribe relatively high project-value thresholds and primarily recognise experience with Government/PSU entities. We respectfully request Raffle to: i. Permit equivalent experience from private-sector organisations, accredited universities and autonomous institutions, subject to satisfactory documentary evidence; and ii. Reduce the prescribed project-value thresholds for UDVIAM-registered MSME bidders to enable wider participation of technically capable MSMEs. We specifically request that these relaxations be incorporated at both PQ and TQ stages, including the corresponding TQ scoring methodology, so that qualifying experience accepted at PQ is also recognised during technical evaluation. These measures would promote wider MSME participation while continuing to ensure evaluation of relevant technical capability and proven delivery experience.	As per RFP
394	Annexure-01, Sl. No. 4 – PQ; TQ Sl. No. 6 – Certification	CMMI Level 3 or higher required at PQ; CMMI-based marks under TQ	Exempt UDVIAM-registered MSMEs from CMMI Level 3 requirement at PQ and suitably relax corresponding TQ scoring.	As per RFP
395	Annexure-01, Sl. No. 9 – Work Experience; TQ Sl. No. 2 – IT Project Experience	High project-value thresholds; experience primarily from Government/PSU entities	Recognise equivalent private-sector/university/autonomous-institution experience and reduce project-value thresholds for UDVIAM-registered MSMEs at both PQ and TQ.	As per RFP
396	Annexure-01, Sl. No. 10 – Additional Work Experience	Candidate-volume thresholds based on Government/PSU projects	Accept equivalent candidate-volume experience from private/autonomous institutions and provide reasonable MSME relaxation.	As per RFP
397	PQ Criteria 1.3, Page 27; Technical Evaluation Criteria Sr. 2 & 3, Page 29-30	The project experience criteria recognise design/development/implementation/O&M of software or AI data-platform projects with State/Central Government, PSU or government organisations. They do not currently recognise consultancy/implementation projects executed under externally-funded (multilateral/bilateral development agency) arrangements.	Request the Department to ADD the following as an eligible route under Project Experience: "The bidder must have successfully executed at least one consultancy services / implementation project(s) or similar technical services project(s) funded by the Government of India or under any externally funded project, including projects funded through multilateral and/or bilateral development agencies/institutions, in any State Government, Central Government, Public Sector Undertaking (PSU), or Government Institution during the last five (05) years preceding the date of bid submission.	As per RFP
398	General / Tender Process – this RFP vs earlier GeM Bid No. GEM/2026/8/7608269	An identical tender for this AI Sangrah SI scope was earlier floated under GeM Bid No. GEM/2026/8/7608269, against which our organisation has already paid the EMD and submitted its proposal; that bid currently shows as "Active" on the GeM Portal. The Department has now re-floated the same tender with certain minor changes.	Please clarify: (a) whether this re-floated tender is a NEW requirement or a re-issue/replacement of GEM/2026/8/7608269; (b) the status and disposition of the earlier bid (GEM/2026/8/7608269) – will it be cancelled/withdrawn, and if so when; (c) the treatment of proposals already submitted and EMD already paid against the earlier bid – whether the earlier EMD will be refunded or can be carried forward/adjusted against this bid; and whether a fresh EMD is required; (d) whether bidders who already submitted against the earlier bid must submit afresh against this re-floated tender	Bidders are requested to participate in the currently published bid. EMD and bid submission requirements shall be governed by the provisions of the current RFP and applicable GeM processes.
399	Fact Sheet Item 5 (EMD), Page 5-6; Sec 3.5, Page 12	EMD of INR 14,00,000 is payable via DD or Bank Guarantee (Annexure-15), valid 180 days, with the hard copy of the Letter of Authorization + EMD to be submitted physically in a sealed envelope.	Please confirm (a) whether EMD payment through electronic modes (NEFT/RTGS/online challan on GeM) is acceptable in lieu of DD/BG; and (b) the exact address and deadline (date & time) for physical receipt of the EMD and Authorization Letter, since the Fact Sheet references "as per GeM Bid norms."	EMD submission shall be as specified under Fact Sheet Sr. No. 5, Fact Sheet Sr. No. 12, and Clause 3.5 - Earnest Money Deposit (EMD).

400	Section 3 – Fact Sheet / Evaluation Methodology (Method of Selection). Page 5	The RFP provides for selection on a Least Cost Selection (L1) basis, whereby the technically qualified bidder quoting the lowest financial bid is selected.	We request the Department to kindly consider adopting a Quality-and-Cost Based Selection (QCBS) methodology in place of L1. A QCBS model (for example, 70-30 or 80-20 technical-to-financial weighting) would enable selection of the partner offering the best overall value and technical merit rather than lowest price alone	As per RFP
401	Clause 5.6.1 – 5.6.14, Page 41-46	Original RFP (B1.06.2024) [S.6.6 'Jupyter IDE (sandboxed, per-user Python notebook)' and S.6.16 'AI Firewall' are NOT present in the refoat's renumbered module list (which stops at S.6.14 Consent).	Confirm that the embedded per-user Jupyter IDE module and the AI Firewall module have been deliberately removed from scope in the refoat, and are not implicit within any other module. If they are implicit, please indicate the module and expected functional depth.	As per RFP
402	Clause. 5.7.1 (item 7).	GSDC shall provide and manage the physical/network-level Web Application Firewall (WAF) infrastructure at the GSDC ... The Selected Agency shall be responsible for defining, configuring, tuning, and maintaining application-specific WAF rules ... If any additional commercial WAF licenses, subscriptions, signatures, or specialized security services are required beyond the standard GSDC-provided infrastructure, the procurement and associated costs shall be borne entirely by the Selected Bidder.'	Confirm the specific WAF product/version deployed at GSDC and the interfaces available to bidders for rule/policy configuration and tuning; clarify whether standard OWASP CRS rulesets are pre-loaded; and confirm that no commercial signatures/subscriptions are needed to meet the RFP's OWASP Top-10 / API-Top-10 obligations.	Tenderer will share the required details to the successful bidder.
403	CI. 5.11.2, Page no. 56	Refoat O&M team: 4 resources – 'Business Analyst & Project Coordinator/Consultant', 'Backend Developer', 'Front-end Developer', 'Data Engineer'. 'At least 70% of the team members of O&M shall be retained from the implementation team ... The O&M team shall be deployed only at the onsite location.'	Confirm the onsite location (Gandhinagar/Ahmedabad/GSDC) for the 5-year O&M deployment, whether office space and workstations are provided by DIT/GSDC, and how the 70% retention is measured (headcount, role-wise, or FTE-weighted).	a)Tenderer will share the required details to successful bidder. b) As per RFP
404	Annexure 3 (Table B – refoat), B1 vs B2	Refoat B02: B1 'Licence + enterprise support (OS/DB/middleware, 2nd Yr onwards)' = 16 Quarters; B2 'Man-Month Cost for Resources per quarter (CI. 5.11.2)' = 20 Quarters. Contract term is 5 years post Go-Live.	Confirm that B2's 20 quarters covers the full 5-year O&M including Year-1 (i.e., Year-1 O&M man-month is priced in B2, and only the licence O&M/ATS in B1 starts from Year-2). Also confirm B2 is fixed-price per quarter or true time-and-material against the utilised man-months.	As per RFP
405	Clause 3.23.1 (PQ 1.4), Page 30	The mandatory certification list in the refoat is (i) ISO 9001, (ii) ISO 27001, (iii) CMMI Level 3 or Higher, ISO 20000 (present in the earlier version) is not listed.	Confirm that ISO/IEC 20000 (Information Technology Service Management) is no longer a mandatory PQ certification, and that its absence will not be treated as a deficiency at any stage of technical evaluation or O&M audit.	As per RFP
406	Clause 5.6.1 (AI Readiness).	'The AI Readiness Score methodology and evaluation framework shall be proposed by the Selected Bidder based on industry standards and best practices. The proposed framework shall be submitted to the tenderer for review and approval during the Solution Design phase.'	Confirm the timeline and criteria for DIT's review/approval of the proposed AI-Readiness Score framework in the Solution Design phase, and whether any reference framework (e.g., AIKosh) is preferred.	As per RFP
407	Clause 3.23.1 (PQ 1.3), Page 27	PQ 1.3 requires experience in 'software development OR AI Dataset Platform / AI Data Exchange / Enterprise AI Data Platform' project (1+2x5.5 Cr / 2+2x4.5 Cr / 3+2x2.8 Cr) for Govt/PSU in last 5 yrs.	Confirm whether a generic large software-development project qualifies under PQ 1.3, or whether the cited project must specifically be an AI Dataset / Data-Exchange / Enterprise AI Data Platform.	As per RFP. Additionally, Please refer corrigendum
408	Clause 3.23.1 (PQ 1.7), Page 28	...at least 100 full-time professionals ... In addition, the Bidder should have at least 5 full-time AI professionals.'	Confirm whether the 5 AI professionals are counted within the 100 or over and above, and the acceptable evidence (PF/ESIC + a skills declaration on HR letterhead).	As per RFP
409	Tech Eval Criteria 1-3 vs PQ 1.3, Page 28-29	Criterion 3: 'At least One (1) eligible project involving implementation of a Data Exchange Platform, Data Ingestion Platform, or AI-based Solution/Service Integration ... in last 05 years.'	Confirm whether the SAME project may be cited simultaneously for PQ 1.3, Technical Criterion 2 (IT Project Experience) and Criterion 3 (Relevant IT Project).	As per RFP
410	Annexure 14 (MAF) vs Clause 5.10.1	Annexure 14 'Format for MAF on OEM's Letterhead' vs Clause 5.10.1 software 'primarily ... Open-Source license with enterprise support.'	Confirm whether a Manufacturer Authorisation Form (MAF) is mandatory when the proposed solution is wholly open-source with no commercial OEM product, and what is submitted in lieu.	As per RFP
411	Clause 5.7.1 (item 1), Pg. no. 47	'GSDC shall provide the required hardware and infrastructure for the Production environment only, based on finalized hardware sizing and availability.'	Provide the indicative GSDC production capacity available (vCPU, RAM, storage, network, GPU/accelerator), the process/timeline to finalise sizing, and the remedy if required sizing exceeds GSDC availability.	As per RFP
412	Clause 5.5.1, Pg 37	Object storage requirement including 'Petabyte-scale expansion, wherever required.'	Confirm whether GSDC provides the object-storage hardware/capacity, the expected initial and 5-year storage volume, and (if SI-provided) that it is hosted within GSDC.	GSDC will provide raw storage capacity and compute nodes on which the Selected Bidder must deploy, configure and operate a software-defined object store.
413	Clause 5.7 & 5.7.1	'... dedicated environments: Development, Staging, UAT, Production, and Disaster Recovery (DR); 'Staging and other non-production environments shall be managed by the SDA.'	Confirm whether DEV/Staging/UAT and DR are hosted by the SI at its cost or within GSDC, and whether GSDC provides DR infrastructure.	GSDC will provide DR infrastructure, however other environments shall be managed by the successful bidder as per RFP
414	Clause 5.5.1 (Data Durability)	'The bidder shall define Recovery Point Objective (RPO); Recovery Time Objective (RTO).'	Confirm whether DIT has target RPO/RTO values or these are entirely bidder-proposed, whether DR is active-passive, and the DR site's location/provider.	As per GSDC policy. The details shall be provided to successful bidder.
415	Clause 5.8.1	STQC Certification: Obtaining formal Quality and Security certification from the STQC where applicable.'	Confirm whether STQC certification is mandatory for this platform, which party bears the statutory STQC fee, and the expected timeline window relative to Go-Live.	As per RFP
416	Clause 5.8.2	'VAPI through CERT-in empanelled auditors at least bi-annually or after every major release.'	Confirm whether the CERT-in empanelled auditor is engaged and paid by the SI, the VAPI frequency during O&M, and whether DIT nominates the auditor.	As per RFP
417	Clause 5.8.2 (16)	'... execute the Government-prescribed Data Processing Addendum (DPA) as part of the Agreement.'	Request the DPA template in advance and confirm the bidder's classification (Data Processor) under DPDP for liability and indemnity scoping.	As per RFP. The DPA shall be shared to the successful bidder.
418	Clause 5.8.2 (10) & 3.23.1 (PQ 1.9)	'The Bidder shall not engage any subcontractor or third-party processor for handling Government data'; 'Consortium or subletting in any form is not permitted.'	Confirm that third-party open-source SaaS tooling (e.g., monitoring, scanning) is permissible provided no Government data is processed by such tools.	As per RFP
419	GeM Bid Doc, Page 1	'Type of Bid: Two Packet Bid'; 'Evaluation Method: Total value wise evaluation'; 'Bid to RA enabled: No'; 'Time allowed for Technical Clarifications: 3 Days'; 'Financial Document Indicating Price Breakup Required: Yes.'	Confirm the exact split of Packet-1 (Technical) and Packet-2 (Financial) artefacts, whether the Table-B breakup is uploaded as a separate financial document or entered as GeM line items, and how 'Additional Doc 1-4 (in ATC)' map to eligibility/technical uploads.	Bid submission requirements shall be as specified on the GeM portal and under Clause 3.9 – Submission of Proposal and Clause 3.10 – Proposal Submission Formats of the RFP.
420	GeM Bid Doc – EMD	'EMD Amount: 14,00,000'; Advisory Bank: State Bank of India. EMD Exemption allowed per GeM GTC (MSE/Startup).	Confirm whether the EMD is to be paid electronically via GeM/SBI (ePBG-style), or a physical DD/BG must be submitted in a sealed envelope in parallel; and confirm the sealed-envelope address, deadline and marking.	EMD requirements shall be governed by Fact Sheet Sr. No. 5, Fact Sheet Sr. No. 12, and Clause 3.5 – Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) .
421	GeM Bid Doc – ePBG	'ePBG Percentage(%) : 5.00'; 'Duration of ePBG required (Months): 70'.	Confirm that a bank guarantee (or ePBG on GeM) is acceptable, the beneficiary details, and the exact 70-month period (from LOI, contract signing or Go-Live).	As per GeM bid and RFP
422	GeM Bid Doc	'Minimum number of bids required to disable automatic bid extension: 3'; 'Number of days for which Bid would be auto-extended: 7'; 'Number of Auto Extension count: 3'.	Confirm whether an auto-extension changes any pre-bid, technical opening, or PBG-duration dates, and whether the ePBG duration must be recomputed if the bid end is extended.	As per GeM bid and RFP