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This document is advisory in nature and aim to sensitize the bid management teams on good practices and harmonize/standardize the RFP clauses and terms & conditions. This document is accompanied by a template document for preparation of RFP and a sample contract agreement.

The documents are based on existing Central Government Guidelines, feedback from stakeholders and prevalent international practices. However it is possible that the State Government / Purchaser may have their own specific procurement Guidelines which may or may not be consistent with the clauses of the RFP, Guidance notes or Contract Agreement.

It may be noted that these documents do not substitute or overrule any approvals currently required by the concerned Department/State Government/ Purchaser for finalization of the RFP. Accordingly it is advised that all necessary approvals are taken from appropriate authorities, as done before publishing of these model documents.
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CVC</td>
<td>Central Vigilance Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MEITY</td>
<td>Ministry of Electronics &amp; Information Technology, Government of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EOI</td>
<td>Expression of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GFR</td>
<td>General Financial Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GoI</td>
<td>Government of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MMP</td>
<td>Mission Mode Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NeGP</td>
<td>National e-Governance Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NICSI</td>
<td>National Informatics Centre Services Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>Operations and Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Outright purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>OPE</td>
<td>Out-of-pocket expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RFE</td>
<td>Request for Empanelment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SOW</td>
<td>Scope of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T&amp;M</td>
<td>Time and Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>GoM</td>
<td>Government of Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>Directorate of Information Technology, GoM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Terms used in this Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nodal Agency/Purchaser</strong></td>
<td>The nodal agency/Purchaser which is responsible for executing the project and assists the Department in carrying out the tendering. In case the Government department itself decides to carry out the tendering and execute the project, then the term “Nodal Agency/Purchaser” should be replaced by the Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
<td>The Department is the ultimate “owner” of the project. The e-Governance is carried out within the domain of the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Optional)</strong></td>
<td>Certain clauses are optional to be put in the document and would depend on certain conditions. These may be included in the RFP, post establishing the relevance of the clause.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Getting Started

Background

Government Procurement has always been under tight budgets and with scanners for right spends. It is therefore imperative that any Government entity initiating a procurement process, clearly understands the monetary impact on the assigned/planned budget and hence should, as a conduct, adopt certain threshold values for various types of Systems Integration procurements, as well as the common procurement methods mapped to them.

General Financial Rules, 2017 (GFR) provides guidelines on threshold values of procurement planning and helping decision makers on how to go about the financial due diligence in a tendering process.

This document is a guideline for procurement of cloud services and projects and all references are governed by Cloud Computing Policy Circular dated 29.1.2018 and subsequent addendums issued thereof. All terms and conditions of the Cloud Computing Policy issued by Government of Maharashtra are binding and are to be treated in conjunction with this document.

Threshold Values Matrix

It is suggested that all public procurements should be made as suggested in GFR 2017, to ensure transparency and cost effectiveness. However, for small value procurements where bid process does not provides significant advantages, compared to time and cost required in bid process, GFR provides alternate methods of procurement, based on circumstances, accompanied by proper justification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Limited tender</th>
<th>Advertised Tender</th>
<th>GeM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goods upto the value of ‘` 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase of goods without quotation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purchase of goods costing above ‘<code> 25,000 and upto ‘</code> 2,50,000/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase of goods by Purchase Committee / Advertised Tender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Upto ‘<code> 25 lakhs for works and upto ‘</code> 10 lakhs for outsourcing of services</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>More than ‘<code> 25 lakhs for works and more than ‘</code> 10 lakhs for outsourcing of services</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goods and Services available on GeM²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ These values are in INR Lakhs. These values need to be approved by the appropriate departments, before they are to be implemented
² (i) Up to Rs.50,000/- through any of the available suppliers on the GeM, meeting the requisite quality, specification and delivery period. (ii) Above Rs.50,000/- and up to Rs.30,00,000/- through the GeM Seller having lowest price amongst the available sellers, of at least three different manufacturers, on GeM, meeting the requisite quality, specification and delivery period. The tools for online bidding and
Based on the tendering options suggested in the table above, the procurement process has to be initiated.

To assist the user, Model template Expression of Interest/Stage 1 & Request for Proposals has been provided along with these Guidance Notes for the Limited and Open tender. The user has to identify the right template which is to be filled in & customized with the help of these Guidance Notes to meet the project specific requirements.

The legal agreement is being provided separately, which can be used for a) Model RFP for SI Service Provider b) Model RFP Software Application Development & Maintenance. For a) Model RFP for Procurement of Data Entry Services and b) Model RFP for Hardware, the terms and conditions specified in the RFP meet the basic criterion. On acceptance of the same terms and condition the purposes of the contract agreement can be met.
1 Section I: Guidance Notes for First stage of Two–stage Bidding\(^1\)/ EOI

1.1 Objective

The objective of issuance of EOI document is to shortlist a potential list of bidders who have the basic competency, capacity and understanding of the solution required by the Government.

An *Expression of Interest (EOI)*, also called Request for Information (ROI), document / letter is the main channel for bringing up the tender list of a particular project when a limited two stage Bidding exercise is being processed.

1.2 Situations for Use / Context of Issuance

An EOI should be ISSUED under the following typical circumstances:

- It is not feasible to formulate detailed specifications or identify specific characteristics for the subject matter of procurement, without receiving inputs regarding its technical aspects from bidders; or
- The character of the subject matter of procurement is subject to rapid technological advances or market fluctuations or both; or
- Ministry/Department seeks to enter into a contract for the purpose of research, experiment, study or development, except where the contract includes the production of items in quantities sufficient to establish their commercial viability or to recover research and development costs; or
- The bidder is expected to carry out a detailed survey or investigation and undertake a comprehensive assessment of risks, costs and obligations associated with the particular procurement.
- Multiple solutions are possible
- Budget estimates are unclear (or flexible)

For all SI Contract where the value of the contract is more than INR 25 Lakhs\(^1\)

1.3 Procedure to Issue

1.3.1 Market Assessment

Before inviting Bidders, it is recommended that the Purchaser should:

\(^1\)Refer rule 164 of GFR 2017
• Try to identify around 8 potential interested SI agencies for this EOI—this would ensure that eventually 3-5 would bid for the tender
• Assess the capability and maturity of the market by capturing details on the likely number of interested OEMs and potential solutions

This would ensure that the EOI being developed would generate a fair competition & the Government would get best economical deal.

1.3.2 Advertisement / Invitation of Expression of Interest (Stage 1 RFP)

a. It is mandatory for all Ministries / Departments of the Central Government, their attached and Subordinate Offices and Autonomous / Statutory Bodies to publish their tender enquiries, corrigenda thereon and details of bid awards on the Central Public Procurement Portal (CPPP) and, as per GFR 2017 (https://mahatenders.gov.in).

(i) The advertisement should also be published in at least one local newspaper and one national level newspaper for open tenders as per directives of Government of Maharashtra.

(ii) Additionally the Government entity may also send an email to all concerned players in the market, specifically the empanelled SI Agencies carrying out various projects/ assignments with the Government Department, Purchaser and Department of Information Technology only for limited tenders.

b. The EOI document should include a copy of the advertisement whereby SI Agencies are invited to submit their EOI. The advertisement must, amongst other things, include
• Time frame and timing for purchasing/obtaining the EOI
• how to get a copy of the EOI document
• contact information of the Purchaser with name of contact person
• the last date of submission of EOI

c. The Purchaser should give adequate time for the response. Ordinarily, the minimum time to be allowed for submission of bids should be three weeks from the date of publication of the tender notice or availability of the bidding document for sale, whichever is later. Where the department also contemplates obtaining bids from abroad, the minimum period should be kept as four weeks for both domestic and foreign bidders.

d. In case of a Limited tender, Copies of the bidding document should be sent directly by speed post/registered post/courier/e-mail to firms which are empanelled or have been shortlisted through an EOI process.
1.3.3 Introduction to the Project

EOI document should provide introduction to the project. It should cover at least the following information:

(i) Background and objective
(ii) Geographical Coverage of the project
(iii) Availability of the funding for the project
(iv) Timelines for the project

1.3.4 Instructions to the Bidders

The instruction to the bidder should include the following:

(i) Instructions regarding nature of job
(ii) Pre-Bid Meeting
(iii) Bidders Queries and responses
(iv) Bid Submission format
(v) Last date & place of submission;
(vi) Any related instruction

If as a part of EOI process, a Corrigendum is issued then the EOI response last submission date for the Bidders may be revised and extended by at least 10 days.

1.3.5 Broad Scope of Work

At an EOI Stage, the Purchaser may not have the requisite clarity on the Scope of Work (SOW). Hence the SOW may be provided at a high level. However, SOW should have enough clarity to attract the right set of target bidders. Hence, in case any specific competence is required (like GIS, Biometric, and Mobile Technology) for carrying out the Systems Implementation engagement, the same needs to be mentioned so that it attracts the attention of competent target bidders.

This level of information will also help the bidder to provide a quality response to the EOI & provide suggestions on improving the “end solution” being conceptualized.

This should include:

(i) Description of the project
(ii) Various stakeholders which would get involved in the project with expected roles and responsibilities
(iii) Broad scope of work (however it should be specific enough to target the right potential vendors (for e.g. if expertise is required in Identity Management, Biometric technologies, Analytics, Market Research, GIS, Mobile Technology, Language Technology etc. then it should be mentioned in the EOI)
(iv) Expected deliverables and outcomes of the assignment (optional)
(v) Place of execution of the assignment.
(vi) Contractual terms & conditions

When developing the Scope of Work and/or refining it, please follow these advisory principles:

• Lay out a scope of work only to the point you understand it, not assuming things nor elaborating into unknown points
• Try to gain better understanding of your business challenges, for which solution is required, through discussions with potential bidders
• Explore and understand multiple possible solutions that could exist
• Develop, refine and define the scope of work through repeated, progressive discussions with potential Systems Implementation Agencies/System Integrators.

1.3.6 Scope of Proof of Concept

There are circumstances when the Government is looking for a solution which is an “innovative” for the Implementation Agencies OR it may be possible to have multiple solutions which could meet the same objective.

Hence it is better that the Government and/or Consultants provide a platform at the EOI stage for consultations with the industry and look at possible solutions. During this phase, there would be an increased understanding on some key advantages & disadvantages of various solutions. This would also reduce dependence on any one person or the Consultant for conceptualization of the solution.

However there are some points to be considered:

1. Software features and functionality can be described in a document and substantiated with product brochures, compliances, certificates and other artefacts. The need to have a PoC to see product features should be avoided.

2. If the Purchaser needs to test a new technology area, the PoC should be done after the technical shortlist of bidders at the RFP stage and avoided at the EOI stage. This is because every PoC involves cost and therefore should be done after other evaluation steps have been concluded. Moreover, the scope will be clearer at a later stage for the PoC to be more meaningful.
3. Typically, Implementing Agency would engage 3rd parties for hardware and software products, arranging for PoC adds up to a significant cost for the IA. At EOI stage, there is a lot of ambiguity on Scope of Work of the project. At this stage, the Implementing Agency should not be expected to incur the cost of PoC. Hence, the PoC cost should be paid for by the Purchaser.

However in case the Purchaser intends to undertake the EOI, it should do the following at the following stages:

**Preliminary:**
- Define the purpose, goals, objectives, and scope of the pilot/proof of concept demonstration project
- Establish the success criteria for the pilot, with input from all stakeholders, technical staff, records management staff, and users
- Outline the benefits of conducting a pilot and risks of not doing so
- Establish an administrative infrastructure to support and guide pilot project activities.

**Conduct of the POC:**
- Determine whether preliminary decisions and assumptions made regarding hardware and software performance, as well as service level required by technical staff, were accurate
- Develop and use tools facilitating documentation, communication/knowledge transfer, and metadata processes.

**Test and evaluation:**
- Assess hardware and software, system and database design, and procedures (for training, scheduling, system management, and maintenance)
- Test product(s) in dissimilar locations (e.g., in terms IT support delivery etc.) for functionality, usability, and benefits derived from using the solution
- Validate requirements and performance expectations.

The proof of concept can be kept as a part of the EOI or at any stage thereafter and even as a part of RFP.

**1.3.7 Forward Looking**

- EOI should act as a step towards heading into a formal Request for Proposal (RFP)
- Estimating what the project investments could be like (rough estimates) (there should be NO request for financial cost in the EOI submitted by the bidders)
• If financial understanding is very important and the project budget is limited or has been declared, it should be mentioned in the EOI along with the budget available and the possibility of increase in the outlay.
• Use vendor discussions to understand your risks as a procurer

A typical EOI, as researched and developed from study of International and Indian procurement best practices, may have a structure as represented here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Expression of Interest Sections / Clauses</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Invitation Letter for EOI</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Introduction to the Project</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Instruction to the Bidders</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Conditions of Contract</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Scope of Work / Schedule of Requirements and specification</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Pre-Qualification (PQ) / Eligibility Criteria</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Bid Submission Forms</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Compliance Sheet for Pre-Qualification</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Templates</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Request to Bidders to suggest the Solution</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Request for Bidder’s Experience in “Similar” Projects – Learning on Issues, Challenges, Solution proposed, Client Recommendations</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Request for Bidder’s Business Profile in terms of Research Work/Centres, Patents, Assets in the given project’s domain</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Designing Pre-Qualification (PQ) / Eligibility Criteria

The Eligibility / Pre-Qualification (PQ) criteria set out in any EOI document basically aims to invite proposals from only the genuine contenders and solution providers. The criteria should be set so as to encourage competition and quality responses/bidding.

The guidelines to keep in mind when establishing a set of Eligibility Criteria are:
• Ensure that the criteria/PQs or conditions to participate in the bidding process are flexible and practical; allowing international bidders too
• PQs have direct and perceptible linkage with scope of work, project’s financial worth and risk
• PQs are focused towards quality of solution and bidder competence
• Prequalification criteria guidelines for different types of Vendors (software OEM’s and hardware OEM’s should be considered separately) as many points requiring support, spare parts, manufacturing needs will be different.

Hence, after significant deliberations with various Government and Industry Stakeholders, on eligibility criteria, the following advisory (in the sections below) has been prepared. It is suggested that these should be followed under normal circumstances to prevent the eligibility criteria from becoming restrictive in nature.

During the discussion with various Government and Industry stakeholders, it emerged that evaluation criterion is to be carefully drafted. Discussions were held on the merit of each criterion and how it helped the Purchaser in getting the most suitable agency to execute the assignment. Accordingly, several prevalent Technical evaluation criterion were rationalized (dropped or their weightages were reallocated).

In case the criterion or the marks allocated in this model RFP requires change, the Purchaser should assure itself that the change does not lead to restriction in the competition.

The “litmus test” for drawing up the requirements for “Company Profile” below should be that Nodal officers should assure himself that at least 8 bidders would be able to score maximum marks.

If the Government entity/Purchaser wishes to limit the number of suppliers responding to the EOI, in case the market assessment resulted in too many suppliers, then the following additional PQ criteria may be utilized:

• Suggested Solutions (one or more than one)
• Bidder’s Experience in “Similar” Projects (for which Work Order / Completion Certificates can be provided)
• Bidder’s Competence

1.4.1 <SI1> Related Turnover

This criterion is important for the Purchaser as it ensures a free and fair competition by encouraging eligible bidders. The Purchaser should ensure that any of the shortlisted bidders

1 Purchaser should keep in mind that the “Nature of Work” is not too specific as the Bidders may not be keeping their books of accounts if the nature of work is too specific. Typically “System Implementation” is a term which most of the bidders would be able to back it up with in the Annual Reports or be able to provide the statement / certificate. However in case the Purchaser wants to use some specific turnover requirement, it should check with the potential bidders if they would be able to provide the Auditor certificate. In any case, the Purchaser should be cautious that this is not used to restrict competition.
should have the ability to execute the assignment. The minimum Nature of work related turnover should be that it attracts at least 8 bidders.

As a thumb rule, one can keep the minimum Scope of Work related Turnover as five (5) times the estimated value$^1$ of the assignment being tendered.

1.4.2 Sales Turnover

Sales Turnover requirement does not add value in increasing the competition or encouraging bidders who can provide quality solution. Hence it is suggested that this condition should NOT be generally put as a PQ criterion in the EOI. To mitigate a risk of eliminating the PQ criterion on financial strength of the bidder, it is suggested that the PBG may be increased.

However the Purchaser may still like to retain this PQ criterion for large projects (suggested 20 crores or more) where significant initial financial investments are required and large cash flows are needed for operating them.

1.4.3 Net worth Requirements

This PQ criterion should generally NOT be used as it does not add any incremental value to the profile of bidders and may restrict competition. However this may be useful for high risk and large Capex and Opex projects. In those cases, it helps the Government de-risk itself from choosing a partner who might default. Hence this criterion should be used in the following situation:

- It is a long term project (more than 3 years)
- The payment terms are of the nature that the bidder would have to keep on having negative cash flows for more than half the project period

The above situations would generally be applicable for the PPP projects and hence the net worth requirements should be a PQ criterion for all the PPP projects, given the risks involved in these projects.

1.4.4 Project Experience: Number and Value of Projects

The PQ for project experience required from the bidder with reference to the context of the solution to be delivered, as defined in the tender document, should aim to achieve the following:

---

$^1$ In places where there are no estimates available, the same may be estimated by discussing with the experts in the Government or industry
a) **One project** of similar nature costing not less than the amount equal to 80 – 100% of the estimated value² of assignment to be awarded

b) **Two projects** of similar nature costing not less than the amount equal to 50 – 60% of the estimated value² of assignment to be awarded

c) **Three projects** of similar nature costing not less than the amount equal to 40-50% of the estimated value² of assignment to be awarded

The following should also be ensured:

- **Definition of “similar” work should be clearly defined with references to domain, sector or industry and functional area of scope of work**
- **Also anything more specific than this requirement, may result in restricting competition and should be done when only for cases when there is significant justification for its requirement. However, in any case, at least 8 potential bidders attending pre-bid conference should qualify**

1.4.5 **Power of Attorney**

Power of Attorney’s (POA) of the listed companies are made with the approval of the Board of the Company. It may be noted that the Board’s approval is a time consuming process and hence it is not possible for having customized POA’s for every tender. Hence the POA of a listed company should be accepted in the format available with the bidding agency, as long as it authorizes the signatory to sign on the bid documents on behalf of the company.

1.4.6 **Manpower Strength**

In general, the RFP for SI Projects should not have a PQ criterion pertaining to Manpower strengths. This clause does not add any incremental vale to the process. However this requirement may be introduced as a pre-qualification (as an exception) ONLY when there is a large and complex project.

1.4.7 **Certifications**

The requirement of any certification as a part of Pre-Qualification criterion in an EOI should only be encouraged when it is relevant to the Scope of work. Further it should be clear to the Purchaser on how these certifications would affect the quality of the Deliverables and what checks and balances have been designed to ensure that such certifications would add value.

Generally the following Certifications may add value and may be put as a Pre-Qualification criterion, provided they meet the condition specified above:
• **ISO 9001 certification**
ISO 9000/9001 certification is a certification required for quality systems. It provides a set of generic requirements relating to the processes of development and production, and how they will be managed, reviewed and improved in order achieve customer satisfaction. This is a basic hygiene check for a company bidding and should be a requirement in normal case. Hence this certification is relevant for projects needing industry accepted quality management standards for the processes and transactions involved in solution delivery.

• **ISO 27001 certification**
ISO/IEC 27001 formally specifies a management system that is intended to bring information security under explicit management control. The security controls in operation typically address certain aspects of IT or data security, specifically, leaving non-IT information assets (such as paperwork and proprietary knowledge) less well protected on the whole. This should be asked for only for cases, where the scope of work specifically mentions security assessment and design of security system. Hence, this is relevant for projects requiring Information security standards, such as Network security, database/data security.

• **(SEI) CMMI certification**
Is relevant for projects where software implementation or application development is being done.

• **ISO 14001 certification**
Is relevant to projects having need of Environmental management standards, such as those involving Site preparation, large power consuming Hardware installations.

• **ISO/IEC 20000 certification**
Is relevant where projects need standards on service management, such as Application support and Hardware support.

It was also observed during this assignment that various certifications like CMMI are being put as Pre-Qualification criterion in the EOI document for projects which are not related to software development. Hence, the Purchaser should assure that any certification should add value to the tender and should not lead to limiting the competition.

1.4.8 Registered Legal Entity
Companies registered under companies Act 2013 is one of the Pre-qualifications criterion in the Consulting tenders. This may limit the competition to a few Indian firms for assignments of specific size or may not generate response from firms which have a niche in a specific area.
Several of the government reforms in Maharashtra, India / developing countries are directly led by foreign firms with local offices in respective countries. Hence the Purchaser should assess the requirement of the legal entity being registered under the Companies Acts.

It is suggested that the Purchaser should look at allowing partnership firms to participate in bid process for e-Governance projects in Maharashtra, India.

The following entities may be allowed to participate in the bid process:

- Companies registered under Companies Act 2013
- Partnership firms registered under Limited Liability Partnerships (registered under LLP Act, 2008)
- Partnership firms registered under Indian Partnership Act, 1932

1.4.9 Consortiums

Since part of the objective during the EOI stage is to get a good understanding of the possibilities of the solution (through experience, best practices and suggestions of the bidders), allowing the consortiums for the EOI may add value to the process.

However in case the Purchaser disallows consortiums at a later stage (i.e. the RFP stage, for reasons specified in Section 2.4.9), it should allow the erstwhile consortium members shortlisted at EOI stage to participate in the RFP process individually.

1.4.10 Conflict of Interest

At the EOI stage conflict of interest clause should not be put in the Pre-Qualification criterion because the scope of work and its outcomes are not clear and certain.

However if there is an absolute clarity that the engagement emerging out of this EOI would lead to “Conflict of Interest” as defined in Section 2.4.10 of this Document, the “Conflict of Interest” clause may be incorporated.

1.4.11 Integrity Pact

The pact essentially envisages an agreement between the prospective vendors/bidders and the buyer, committing the persons/officials of both sides, not to resort to any corrupt practices in any aspect/stage of the contract. Only those vendors/bidders, who commit themselves to such a Pact with the buyer, would be considered competent to participate in
the bidding process. In other words, entering into this Pact would be a preliminary qualification. The essential ingredients of the Pact include:

- Promise on the part of the principal not to seek or accept any benefit, which is not legally available;
- Principal to treat all bidders with equity and reason;
- Promise on the part of bidders not to offer any benefit to the employees of the Principal not available legally;
- Bidders not to enter into any undisclosed agreement or understanding with other bidders with respect to prices, specifications, certifications, subsidiary contracts, etc.
- Bidders not to pass any information provided by Principal as part of business relationship to others and not to commit any offence under PC/IPC Act;
- Foreign bidders to disclose the name and address of agents and representatives in Maharashtra, India and Indian Bidders to disclose their foreign principals or associates;
- Bidders to disclose the payments to be made by them to agents/brokers or any other intermediary,
- Bidders to disclose any transgressions with any other company that may impinge on the anti-corruption principle.

Integrity Pact, in respect of a particular contract, would be operative from the stage of invitation of bids till the final completion of the contract. Any violation of the same would entail disqualification of the bidders and exclusion from future business dealings.

**Implementation procedure:**

a. Adoption of IP is voluntary for any organization, but once adopted, it should cover all tenders/procurements above a specified threshold value.
b. The threshold value for the contracts to be covered through IP should be decided after conducting proper ABC analysis and should be fixed so as to cover 90-95% of the total procurements of the organization in monetary terms.
c. Apart from all high value contracts, any contract involving complicated or serious issues could be brought within the ambit of IP, after a considered decision of the management
d. The Purchase / procurement wing of the organization would be the focal point for the implementation of IP.
e. The Vigilance Department would be responsible for review, enforcement, and reporting on all related vigilance issues.
f. It has to be ensured, through an appropriate provision in the contract, that IP is deemed as part of the contract so that the parties concerned are bound by its provisions.
g. IP should cover all phases of the contract, i.e. from the stage of Notice Inviting Tender (NIT)/pre-bid stage till the conclusion of the contract, i.e. the final payment or the duration of warranty/guarantee.

h. IP would be implemented through a panel of Independent External Monitors (IEMs), appointed by the organization. The IEM would review independently and objectively, whether and to what extent parties have complied with their obligations under the Pact.

i. Periodical Vendors’ meets, as a familiarization and confidence building measure, would be desirable for a wider and realistic compliance of the principles of IP.

Information relating to tenders in progress and under finalization would need to be shared with the IEMs on monthly basis.

A draft integrity pact has been included as a part of all Model RFPs. For further details pertaining to adoption of Integrity Pact, users are requested to refer to CVC Circular No. 10/5/09, 13/01/2017 and 28/09/2018.
2 Section II: Guidance Notes for second stage of two stage Bidding/ RFP

2.1 Objective

A Request for Proposal (RFP), also at times known as Request for Tender (RFT), is issued at a stage in a procurement process, where an invitation is presented to the potential bidders, to submit a proposal on a specific service. The RFP process brings structure to the procurement decision and is meant to allow the risks and benefits to be identified clearly upfront, so that the bidders can factor in while responding to the invitation.

The RFP is aimed towards selecting the most competent bidder with the economically advantageous price. The RFP directly addresses Government’s need and intent to procure.

2.2 Situations for Use / Context of Issuance

This System Integration RFP should be ISSUED under the following typical circumstances:

- Scope of work and deliverables are standard, reasonably well known and/or can be clearly specified
- Typically involves time bound delivery
- Budget is known, approved OR availability of budget is assured
- Need to procure the most economical tender, through open competitive bidding - generate adequate buying advantage by ensuring competition amongst at least 3 to 5 bidders.
- If all the above is applicable and estimated\(^1\) value of the assignment is less than 25 lakhs\(^2\) then the Purchaser can directly release this RFP instead of releasing the EOI and then RFP. This RFP may consist of Technical evaluation criteria and/or Pre-qualification criteria with financial details.

An RFP should not be published if:

- Scope of work and deliverables are not well known (standard) and clearly defined
- There’s lack of a known budget
- There is only one vendor which has the requisite skills to deliver the project
- When already a rate empanelment has been done by the Line Ministry/ State Government responsible for executing the project (In this case the empanelled agencies should be contacted directly and evaluated on the basis of a presentation & profiles of resources proposed to be deployed in the engagement.

\(^{1}\)In places where there are no estimates available, the same may be estimated by discussing with the experts in the Government or industry \(^{2}\)Rule 162(III), GFR, 2017
2.3 Addressing the Cloud Policy and related details for a proposal
For procurement of cloud services for a project DIT cloud policy and all references governed by Cloud Computing Policy Circular dated 29.1.2018 and subsequent addendums issued thereof along with all terms and conditions of the Cloud Computing Policy issued by Government of Maharashtra are binding and are to be treated in conjunction with this document. In case of any contrary provisions are contained in the RFP, DIT cloud policy GR and its subsequent addendums will prevail. Kindly refer appendix 3.5 regarding same.

2.3.1 Addressing the Swiss challenge (Unsolicited/innovative proposals)
Swiss Challenge is a procurement strategy used specifically when the government authority receives an unsolicited proposal for a project. The private entity submitting the unsolicited proposal is termed as the Original Project Proponent (OPP). The government evaluates the proposal submitted by the OPP and, if it finds merit in the proposal, it invites other parties to submit competing proposals. The other parties are expected to match or better the terms of the OPP’s proposal. In turn, and to compensate for its effort in bringing the original proposal, the OPP is given a chance to match or better any competing proposal at par with the original.

The Swiss Challenge system enables the public sector to introduce some competitive pressure, thereby avoiding some of the non-competitive concerns raised by unsolicited proposals. The private sector is invited to match or better the OPP’s proposal through innovation, quality and efficiency. Despite this, the system is not entirely competitive since it is difficult to avoid a bias in the evaluation towards the OPP. Moreover, there could be some reluctance by competitors to make their best effort since they would expect the OPP to have an advantage. This could be because the OPP has more information than its competitors. Swiss Challenge might also not meet the conditions for procurement prescribed by relevant legislations. Both the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, for instance, while recognizing the importance of likely innovation through the encouragement of unsolicited proposals, do not allow such procedures under their published procurement guidelines. However this method of procurement may be an option before awarding any project on nomination basis.

2.4 Procedure to Issue
2.4.1 Market Assessment

Before inviting Bidders, the Purchaser should do the following:

- Assess the capability and maturity of the market by capturing details on the likely number of interested suppliers and solutions
- Try to identify around 8 potential interested consulting agencies for this RFP—this would ensure that eventually 3-5 would bid for the tender

This would ensure that the RFP being developed would generate a fair competition & the Government would get best economical deal.
2.4.2 Advertise / Invitation of RFP

a. It is mandatory for all Ministries / Departments of the Central Government, their attached and Subordinate Offices and Autonomous / Statutory Bodies to publish their tender enquiries, corrigenda thereon and details of bid awards on the Central Public Procurement Portal (CPPP) and, as per GFR 2017 (https://mahatenders.gov.in).

(i) The advertisement should also be published in at least one local newspaper and one national level newspaper for open tenders as per directives of Government of Maharashtra.

(ii) Additionally the Government entity may also send an email to all concerned players in the market, specifically the empanelled SI Agencies carrying out various projects/ assignments with the Government Department, Purchaser and Department of Information Technology only for limited tenders.

b. The RFP document should include a copy of the advertisement whereby SI are invited to submit their RFP. The advertisement must, amongst other things, include

• Time frame and timing for purchasing/ obtaining the RFP
• how to get a copy of the RFP document
• contact information of the Purchaser with name of contact person
• the last date of submission of RFP

c. In case of a Limited tender, Copies of the bidding document should be sent directly by speed post/registered post/courier/e-mail to firms which are empanelled or have been shortlisted through an EOI process.

d. The Purchaser should give adequate time for the response. Ordinarily, the minimum time to be allowed for submission of bids should be three weeks from the date of publication of the tender notice or availability of the bidding document for sale, whichever is later. Where the department also contemplates obtaining bids from abroad, the minimum period should be kept as four weeks for both domestic and foreign bidders.

2.4.3 Background Information

The RFP document should contain the following information, at the minimum:
2.4.3.1 Project Details

The Government entity issuing the RFP should clearly mention what are the dependencies that the project is dependent on, such as:

- Availability/provision of certain information/infrastructure or people that could affect the deliverables or timelines
- Funds approval and its availability for project
- Buy in requirements from other Stakeholders (define the stakeholder & area of buy in required)
- Sign offs required at relevant stages from stakeholders

2.4.3.2 Stakeholder Involvement Details

The following Stakeholder(s) and their involvement details should be provided:

- Designated stakeholders who would be driving the project and those who would be impacted by its outcomes
- Definition of stages and levels of stakeholder dependent deliverable approvals and the involvement of stakeholders at various levels of sign offs and final payments
- Designated stakeholders for interim QA and review of deliverables
- Provide a detailed matrix table of roles and responsibilities for all stakeholders
- Designated stakeholders involved in Change requests

The above would help ensure that the Implementation Agency coming on board would be clear on its role and responsibilities for delivering the service/solution and would also know what level of stakeholder buy in would be required.

A typical RFP, as researched and developed from study of International and Indian procurement best practices, would have a structure as represented here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Request For Proposal Sections / Clauses</th>
<th>Desirability¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Fact Sheet</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Invitation for Request for Proposal (RFP)</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Background Information</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Instructions to Bidders</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Mandatory: Necessarily should be put in the RFP Document; Optional: Should be put depending on the situation; Desirable: As a best practice should be included
| 5. | Pre-Qualifications (PQ) / Eligibility Criteria | Mandatory |
| 6. | Evaluation Methodology | Mandatory |
| 7. | Scope of Work and specifications | Mandatory |
| 8. | Deliverables | Mandatory |
| 9. | Timelines | Mandatory |
| 10. | Payment Schedules | Mandatory |
| 11. | Commercial Bid Template | Mandatory |
| 12. | Legal Terms & Contract Conditions | Mandatory |
| 13. | Service Level Agreement | Mandatory |
| 14. | Skills Required | Recommended |
| 15. | Outcomes of Scope of Work | Recommended |
| 16. | Exit Criteria | Recommended |
| 17. | Deliverable Approval Mechanism/Process | Recommended |
| 18. | Change Request Mechanism | Recommended |
| 19. | Funds Available for the Project | Recommended |
| 20. | Project Extension | Optional |
| 21. | Success Fee | Optional |

2.4.4 Instruction to the Bidders

2.4.4.1 Bid Submission Extension due to Corrigendum Issuance

If the RFP has a Corrigendum issued at a later date, then the RFP response submission date for the Bidders should be revised and extended to at least 2 weeks (14 days)\(^1\) later, so that it provides adequate time to the bidders to consider the changes in their responses.

2.4.4.2 Modification in the Bid document

(a) In case any modification is made to the bidding document or any clarification is issued which materially affects the terms contained in the bidding document, the procuring entity shall publish or communicate such modification or clarification in the same manner as the publication or communication of the initial bidding document was made.

(b) In case a clarification or modification is issued to the bidding document, the procuring entity shall, before the last date for submission of bids, extend such time limit,

\(^{1}\) It may be noted that the recommended minimum extension period for EOI & RFP is different. This is because there is higher effort required in incorporating changes in the RFP as compared to EOI.
if, in its opinion more time is required by bidders to take into account the clarification or modification, as the case may be, while submitting their bids.

(c) Any bidder who has submitted his bid in response to the original invitation shall have the opportunity to modify or resubmit it, as the case may be, or withdraw such bid in case the modification to bidding document materially affect the essential terms of the procurement, within the period initially allotted or such extended time as may be allowed for submission of bids, after the modifications are made to the bidding document by the procuring entity: Provided that the bid last submitted or the bid as modified by the bidder shall be considered for evaluation.

Handling Deviations
The bidders should be allowed the flexibility to provide deviations to the RFP terms and conditions. It may be noted that once the deviations are provided, the bidder would not be allowed to withdraw the deviations submitted. The Proposal Evaluation Committee would evaluate each of the deviations proposed by the bidder and classify them as “Material Deviation” or “Non-Material Deviation”. In case of Material Deviations, the Committee may decide to monetize their value, which has to be added to the price bid submitted by the bidder or reject the bid.

The bidders would be informed on the Committee’s decision on the deviation, prior to the announcement of technical scores.

2.4.4.3 Negotiations with Successful Bidder

Negotiation with bidders after bid opening must be severely discouraged. However, in exceptional circumstances where price negotiation against an ad-hoc procurement is necessary due to some unavoidable circumstances, the same may be resorted to only with the lowest evaluated responsive bidder. The Government shall reserve the right to negotiate with the bidder(s) whose proposal has been ranked best value bid on the basis of Technical and Commercial Evaluation to the proposed Project, as per the guidance provided by CVC.

Central Vigilance Commission
Office Order No.68/10/05
The relevant extracts of the Order are provided below

1. “Following the deliberations in the above mentioned Workshop, the following issues are clarified with reference to para 2.4 of Circular No.8(1)(h)/98(1) dated 18th November, 1998 on negotiation with L-1, which reflect the broad consensus arrived at in the workshop.
a. There should not be any negotiations. Negotiations if at all shall be an exception and only in the case of proprietary items or in the case of items with limited source of supply. Negotiations shall be held with L-1 only. Counter offers tantamount to negotiations and should be treated at par with negotiation.

b. Negotiations can be recommended in exceptional circumstances only after due application of mind and recording valid, logical reasons justifying negotiations. In case of inability to obtain the desired results by way of reduction in rates and negotiations prove infructuous, satisfactory explanations are required to be recorded by the Committee who recommended the negotiations. The Committee shall be responsible for lack of application of mind in case its negotiations have only unnecessarily delayed the award of work/contract.

2. Further, it has been observed by the Commission that at times the Competent Authority takes unduly long time to exercise the power of accepting the tender or negotiate or retender. Accordingly, the model time frame for according such approval to completion of the entire process of Award of tender should not exceed one month from the date of submission of recommendations. In case the file has to be approved at the next higher level a maximum of 15 days may be added for clearance at each level. The overall time frame should be within the validity period of the tender/contract.

3. In case of L-1 backing out there should be re-tendering as per extant instructions"

Central Vigilance Commission
Office Order No.68/10/05

The relevant extracts of the Order are provided below

“(i) As post tender negotiations could often be source of corruption, it is directed that there should be no post-tender negotiations with L-1, except in certain exceptional situations. Such exceptional situations would include, procurement of proprietary items, items with limited sources of supply and items where there is suspicion of a cartel formation. The justification and details of such negotiations should be duly recorded and documented without any loss of time.

(ii) In cases where a decision is taken to go for re-tendering due to the unreasonableness of the quoted rates, but the requirements are urgent and a retender for the entire requirement would delay the availability of the item, thus jeopardizing the essential operations, maintenance and safety, negotiations would be permitted with L-1 bidder(s) for the supply of a bare minimum quantity. The balance quantity should, however, be procured expeditiously through a re-tender, following the normal tendering process.

(iii) Negotiations should not be allowed to be misused as a tool for bargaining with L-1 within dubious intentions or lead to delays in decision-making. Convincing reasons must be recorded by the authority recommending negotiations. Competent authority should exercise due diligence while accepting a tender or ordering negotiations or calling for a
re-tender and a definite timeframe should be indicated so that the time taken for according requisite approvals for the entire process of award of tenders does not exceed one month from the date of submission of recommendations. In cases where the proposal is to be approved at higher levels, a maximum of 15 days should be assigned for clearance at each level. In no case should the overall timeframe exceed the validity period of the tender and it should be ensured that tenders are invariably finalized within their validity period.

(iv) As regards the splitting of quantities, some organizations have expressed apprehension that pre-disclosing the distribution of quantities in the bid document may not be feasible, as the capacity of the L-1 firm may not be known in advance. It may be stated that if, after due processing, it is discovered that the quantity to be ordered is far more than what L-1 alone is capable of supplying and there was no prior decision to split the quantities, then the quantity being finally ordered should be distributed among the other bidders in a manner that is fair, transparent and equitable. It is essentially in cases where the organizations decide in advance to have more than one source of supply (due to critical or vital nature of the item) that the Commission insists on pre-disclosing the ratio of splitting the supply in the tender itself. This must be followed scrupulously.

(v) Counter-offers to L-1, in order to arrive at an acceptable price, shall amount to negotiations. However, any counter-offer thereafter to L-2, L-3, etc., (at the rates accepted by L-1) in case of splitting of quantities, as pre-disclosed in the tender, shall not be deemed to be a negotiation.

2. It is reiterated that in case L-1 backs out, there should be a re-tender.

2.4.4.4 Earnest Money Deposit

The EMD amount should be within 2-5% of the estimated\(^1\) cost of the bid, under ordinary circumstances. The bidder should be provided an option to submit the EMD in the form of Account Payee Demand Draft, Fixed Deposit Receipt, Banker’s Cheque or Bank Guarantee from any of the commercial banks, or payment online in an acceptable form.

Bid Security should not be asked from MSME or when the RFP is being floated for a list of empanelled suppliers.

---

\(^1\)In places where there are no estimates available, the same may be estimated by discussing with the experts in the Government or industry
Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) or are registered with the Central Purchase Organisation or the concerned Ministry or Department. The bidders should be asked to furnish bid security along with their bids. Amount of bid security should ordinarily range between two percent to five percent of the estimated value of the goods to be procured. The amount of bid security should be determined accordingly by the Ministry or Department and indicated in the bidding documents. The bid security may be accepted in the form of Account Payee Demand Draft, Fixed Deposit Receipt, Banker’s Cheque or Bank Guarantee from any of the Commercial Banks or payment online in an acceptable form, safeguarding the purchaser’s interest in all respects. The bid security is normally to remain valid for a period of forty-five days beyond the final bid validity period. (ii) Bid securities of the unsuccessful bidders should be returned to them at the earliest after expiry of the final bid validity and latest on or before the 30th day after the award of the contract.

(iii) In place of a Bid security, the Ministries/ Departments may require Bidders to sign a Bid securing declaration accepting that if they withdraw or modify their Bids during the period of validity, or if they are awarded the contract and they fail to sign the contract, or to submit a performance security before the deadline defined in the request for bids document, they will be suspended for the period of time specified in the request for bids document from being eligible to submit Bids for contracts with the entity that invited the Bids.

Rule 171 Performance Security

(i) To ensure due performance of the contract, Performance Security is to be obtained from the successful bidder awarded the contract. Unlike contracts of Works and Plants, in case of contracts for goods, the need for the Performance Security depends on the market conditions and commercial practice for the particular kind of goods. Performance Security should be for an amount of five to ten percent of the value of the contract as specified in the bid documents. Performance Security may be furnished in the form of an Account Payee Demand Draft, Fixed Deposit Receipt from a Commercial bank, and Bank Guarantee from a Commercial bank or online payment in an acceptable form safeguarding the purchaser’s interest in all respects.

(ii) Performance Security should remain valid for a period of sixty days beyond the date of completion of all contractual obligations of the supplier including warranty obligations. (iii) Bid security should be refunded to the successful bidder on receipt of Performance Security.

2.4.4.5 Inclusion of MSME in Project Delivery

This clause has been introduced to provide perceptible and quantifiable skill and economic advantage to the local community/ regional economy and help in the development of skills and competency in that region. The inclusion of MSMEs shall also be exercised in the socio-
economic interests of the local community. Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) have notified procurement policy under section 11 of the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Act, 2006. (GFR 2017, Rule 153 Reserved Items and other Purchase/Price Preference Policy). The MSME policy dated 23.03.2012 should be adhered, which mandates that the Central and State Governments shall procure minimum of 20% of their annual value of goods & services from Micro and Small Enterprises.

Bidders for larger contracts are required to submit an MSME Inclusion Plan that includes quantitative information on employment, investment and other impacts and comment on their local industry engagement in supply chains.

Bidders should consult the relevant Government agency (ies) (Central/State/Local) for the purposes of developing their local industry engagement strategies and identifying potential suppliers. This will also help to refresh knowledge of industry and supplement lists of suppliers.

**MSME Inclusion Plan Criteria**

MSME Inclusion Plan includes those activities undertaken relating to the development, design and management of a project, delivery of goods or selected services. This includes activities that the service provider will undertake as well as those that will be contracted out to other parties.

**Activities typical (and not limited) to a MSME Inclusion Plan are:**

- Data Entry and Digitization
- Maintenance Services
- Training
- Software Installations, Programming
- Local Citizen related Data Collection/Collation and Citizen Service Desk/Kiosk Management
- Handholding in large transformations for Citizen Service delivery

For procurement involving implementation, MSME inclusion may be factored into evaluation in all cases through a requirement on all Bidders to submit proof of an MSME Inclusion Plan.

**MSME Inclusion Plan**

Service providers are to develop an Industry Participation Plan and include it in their proposals where the value of goods and services are being procured. The MSME Inclusion Plan should provide:

**Mandatory**

- The INR value of the contract
• The value of investment in project related assets that will result from the contract
• The number of local suppliers that will win work as a result of the contract and their employment numbers
• Regional economic impact, skills enhancement and technology transfer into that region that will result from the contract.
• The number of apprentices and trainees supported by the contract

Optional
• Arrangements (including supply chain management) for managing the requirements, monitoring performance and reporting under the plan
• Other contributions the supply arrangement will make to local industry and economies;
• Following evaluation of tender responses, the MSME Inclusion Plan prepared by the successful Bidder forms part of the contract with the agency on the basis of impact on jobs, investment, skills development and technology transfer.

Evaluation of MSME Inclusion Plan

SI Procurement should include a tender evaluation criterion that assesses the industry participation plans. The weighting of this criterion is to be at least 6%. The evaluation of tender responses should include assessment of the MSME Inclusion Plan on the basis of following criteria:

• The INR value of the contract
• The value of investment in project related assets that will result from the contract
• The number of local suppliers that will win work as a result of the contract and their employment numbers
• Regional economic impact, skills enhancement and technology transfer into that region that will result from the contract.
• The number of apprentices and trainees supported by the contract

A MSME Inclusion Plan Evaluation Model for the purposes of tender evaluation should weigh the relevant criteria taking into account a range of factors, such as:

• Size and value of the contract
• Nature of the procurement, for example, acquisition of services only, acquisition of goods only or a mix of goods and services
• Government policy settings, such as in relation to innovation, economic development, rural economic development, climate change and sustainability, training etc.
2.5 Designing 1st Stage Evaluation: Pre-Qualification (PQ) Criteria

The Eligibility / Pre-Qualification (PQ) criteria set out in any RFP document aims to invite proposals from the genuine contenders and solution providers. The criteria should be set so as to encourage competition and quality responses/ bidding.

The guidelines to keep in mind when establishing a set of Eligibility Criteria are:

- Ensure that the PQs criteria or conditions to participate in the bidding process are flexible and practical; allowing international bidders too
- PQs have direct and perceptible linkage with scope of work, project’s financial worth and risk
- PQs are focused towards quality of solution and bidder competence

Hence, after significant deliberations with various Government and Industry Stakeholders, on eligibility criteria, the following advisory (in the sections below) has been prepared. It is suggested that these should be followed under normal circumstances to prevent the eligibility criteria from becoming restrictive in nature. If the Government entity wishes to limit the number of suppliers responding to the RFP, in case the market assessment resulted in too many suppliers, then the following additional PQ criteria can be provided:

- Suggested Solutions (one or more than one)
- Bidder’s Experience in “Similar” Projects (for which Work Order / Completion Certificates can be provided)
- Bidder’s Competence

2.5.1 Financial Stability: Sales Turnover and Net Worth

Financial stability of a Supplier is vital for large Capex and Opex projects.

- Sales Turnover and Net worth requirements should be included only for System Integration Turnkey projects that require significant initial investments from the bidders and reasonably high levels of operating expenditure. In such projects, the Sales Turnover multiplier used should be around 20 times the annual value of the project and the Net Worth requirements should be set as “Positive”.

- Since Sales Revenue is a criterion to assure the Government about the financial strength of the bidder, the Government entity/ department may, instead of using Sales Turnover and Net Worth as criteria to assess the financial strength of a bidder, choose an increased amount of Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) as a replacement to provide assurance.
In cases where the Government is procuring hardware on a Cash basis (or payment schedule is structured where the payments are loaded early), the Sales Turnover and Net Worth requirements should NOT be applied.

2.5.2 <Nature of Work> Related Turnover

This criterion is important for the Purchaser as it ensures a free and fair competition by encouraging eligible bidders. The Purchaser should ensure that any of the shortlisted bidders should have the ability to execute the assignment. The minimum Nature of work related turnover should be that it attracts at least 8 bidders.

As a thumb rule, one can keep the minimum Scope of Work related Turnover as five (5) times the estimated\(^1\) value of the assignment being tendered. Further the Purchaser should keep in mind that the “Nature of Work” is not too specific as the Bidders may not be keeping their books of accounts if the nature of work is too specific. Typically “Systems Implementation” is a term which most of the bidders would be able to back it up with in the Annual Reports or be able to provide the statement / certificate.

2.5.3 Project Experience: Number and Value of Projects

The PQ for project experience required from the bidder with reference to the context of the solution to be delivered, as defined in the tender document, should aim to achieve the following:

- **d)** One project of similar nature costing not less than the amount equal to 80 – 100% of the estimated value of assignment to be awarded
- **e)** Two projects of similar nature costing not less than the amount equal to 50 – 60% of the estimated value of assignment to be awarded
- **f)** Three projects of similar nature costing not less than the amount equal to 40-50% of the estimated value of assignment to be awarded

The following should also be ensured:

- Definition of “similar” work should be clearly defined with references to domain, sector or industry and functional area of scope of work
- Also anything more specific than this requirement, may result in restricting competition and should be done only for cases where there is a significant

---

\(^1\) In places where there are no estimates available, the same may be estimated by discussing with the experts in the Government or industry
justification for its requirement. However, in any case, at least 8 potential bidders attending pre-bid conference should qualify.

2.5.4 Power of Attorney

Power of Attorney’s (POA) of the listed companies are made with the approval of the Board of the Company. It may be noted that the Board’s approval is a time consuming process and hence it is not possible for having customized POA’s for every tender. Hence the POA of a listed company should be accepted in the format available with the bidding agency, as long as it authorizes the signatory to sign on the bid documents on behalf of the company.

2.5.5 Manpower Strength

In general, Manpower requirements (restrictive numbers) should NOT be applicable to Systems Implementation / System Integration projects, as before or during delivery the resources can be hired by the bidder and deployed on such large projects.

The same may be mandated, when the requirement of manpower is more than 20 resources on full time/ near full time.

2.5.6 Certifications

Certification requirements (Quality, Capability maturity etc.) should be linked purely with the nature of work being delivered on the project. The following should be understood in this regard:

- **ISO 9001 certification**
  ISO 9000/9001 certification is a certification required for quality systems. It provides a set of generic requirements relating to the processes of development and production, and how they will be managed, reviewed and improved in order to achieve customer satisfaction. This is a basic hygiene check for a company bidding and should be a requirement in normal case.

  Hence this certification is relevant for projects needing industry accepted quality management standards for the processes and transactions involved in solution delivery.

- **ISO 27001 certification**
  ISO/IEC 27001 formally specifies a management system that is intended to bring information security under explicit management control. The security controls in operation typically address certain aspects of IT or data security, specifically, leaving
non-IT information assets (such as paperwork and proprietary knowledge) less well protected on the whole. This should be asked for only for cases, where the scope of work specifically mentions security assessment and design of security system. Hence this is relevant for projects requiring Information security standards, such as Network security, database/data security.

• **(SEI) CMMI certification**
  CMMI certification is relevant for projects where software implementation or application development is being done

• **ISO 14001 certification**
  Is relevant to projects having need of Environmental management standards, such as those involving Site preparation, large power consuming Hardware installations

• **ISO/IEC 20000 certification**
  Is relevant where projects need standards on service management, such as Application support and Hardware support

[It was also observed during this assignment that various certifications like CMMI are being put as Pre-Qualification criterion in the RFP document for projects which are not related to software development. Hence, the Purchaser should assure that any certification should add value to the tender and should not lead to limiting the competition.]

2.5.7 **Debarment from Bidding**

All Government entities should follow the following debarment rules, prescribed in GFR, 2017.

(i) A bidder shall be debarred if he has been convicted of an offence—

(a) under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988; or

(b) the Indian Penal Code or any other law for the time being in force, for causing any loss of life or property or causing a threat to public health as part of execution of a public procurement contract.

(ii) A procuring entity may debar a bidder or any of its successors, from participating in any procurement process undertaken by it, for a period not exceeding two years, if it determines that the bidder has breached the code of integrity. The Ministry/Department will maintain such list which will also be displayed on their website.

(iii) The bidder shall not be debarred unless such bidder has been given a reasonable opportunity to represent against such debarment.
2.5.8 Registered Legal Entity

Companies registered under Companies Act 2013 is one of the Pre-qualifications criterion in the SI tenders. This may limit the competition to a few Indian firms for assignments of specific size or may not generate response from agencies which may have a niche in a specific area.

Several of the government reforms in India / developing countries are directly led by foreign firms with local offices in respective countries. Hence the Purchaser should assess the requirement of the legal entity being registered under the Companies Acts.

The following entities may be allowed to participate in the bid process:

- Companies registered under the Indian Companies Act, 2013
- Partnership firms registered under the Limited Liability Partnerships (registered under LLP Act, 2008)
- Partnership firms registered under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932

2.5.9 Consortiums & Sub-contracting

2.5.9.1 Consortiums

A consortium is an association of two or more companies, organizations (or any combination of these entities) with the objective of participating in a common activity or pooling their resources for achieving a common goal.

Consortiums, it should be noted, are mostly encouraged to allow multiple (different) Vendors to participate in Government projects for the capital, sharing the risks, skills, resources, maturity and the characteristics of the market, facilitating participation of smaller vendors, facilitate the company to protect its core interests and Intellectual Property rights or trade secrets or copyrights.

It has been observed that in many cases, the detailed understanding of the roles and responsibilities between the consortium members gets finalized after the bid has been won. This leaves a lot of “grey” areas for the Purchaser as it may be completely oblivious to the details terms and conditions between the consortium members at the time of evaluation of the bids.

On the other side, Consortiums also bring value to the end client as it allows the lead bidder to leverage the strengths of the other co-bidders (Consortium members) and also ensure their commitments. It is suggested that Consortiums may be allowed if it meets any of the following conditions:

- The value of the project is large (for e.g. more than 50 Crores)
• There are very few potential bidders which have the competence required to execute the entire project
• There is a merit in promoting a consortium vis-à-vis sub-contracting.

In such a situation, it is suggested that the RFP should be structured in such a manner which allows or disallows the consortium based on the “value” brought in the procurement process.

The RFP should lay down some of the basic conditions if the consortium route is to be proposed by the bidder:
• The lead bidder should be responsible for works which are estimated to be at least 50% of the total value of the contract
• The lead bidder should be liable for the entire scope of work and risks involved thereof (the liability should be for the entire value of the contract)
• The non-lead bidders should be liable for the scope of work for which they are responsible along with the lead bidder (liability should be limited to the value of the scope of work; while the lead bidder still carries the liability for the entire scope of work. Hence the Purchaser has 2 entities who are liable for the work carried out by the consortium partner) Any change in the consortium member at a later date should not be allowed for cases where the consortium has benefited from the non-lead bidders credentials/ experience

In case consortiums are to be allowed, the Purchaser should
• Request clarity on the roles and responsibility of each member
• Enforce a condition that a particular company can be a member of only one consortium
• Enforce that all the members are part of the contractual arrangement between themselves before submitting the bid
• All member of the Consortium:
  ✔ should be registered legal entity
  ✔ in India
  ✔ should have signed Integrity Pact
None of the members of the Consortium should be a blacklisted entity
• Allow for some pre-qualification criterions to be met by any of the consortium members:
  ✔ At least one member of consortium should meet the turnover requirement
  ✔ At least one member of consortium should meet the financials requirement

At least one member firm of consortium should meet the manpower requirement.

---

1 The “value” could be in the form of increased competition OR in terms of specialized skill-set.
2 In places where there are no estimates available, the same may be estimated by discussing with the experts in the Government or industry
In any case, the Purchaser should assure itself that there would be at least 8 agencies which will meet the PQ & Technical evaluation’s minimum requirements – either independently or through consortia.

For large and complex projects, where the value of project is significantly high (for e.g. more than 500 crores) there may be a merit in allowing consortia, through formation of a Special Purpose Vehicle for execution of the assignment. This recommendation is as per with the Report of the Technical Advisory Group for Unique Projects (TAGUP) 2011, where the term National Information Utility (NIU) has been introduced for formation of an SPV.

2.5.9.2 Sub-contracting

Especially for large end-to-end turnkey projects, it has been observed that none of the Bidders would have the capacity to implement the project without any sub-contracting. Even for the large Implementation Agencies, it has been observed that they may require outsourcing a part of their work (for e.g. related to data entry, site preparation, training, internet / internet bandwidth etc.).

The Purchaser should provide the flexibility to bidders to sub-contract part of the work, provided it is not more than 50% of the estimated fair value of the contract. However allowing sub-contracting should not dilute the responsibility & liability of the bidder.

Further the Vendor may change the sub-contractor, provided it does not impact the quality of services being delivered. However the Vendor needs to inform the Purchaser on its intention to change the sub-contractor and reason thereof.

Accordingly the liability for performance rests with the lead bidder and not with the sub-contractor (The lead bidder may separately have a contract with the sub-contractor where it is free to define the liabilities. However the Purchaser is generally not a party to this contract.)

2.5.10 Conflict of Interest

The RFP specifies that the “Conflict of interest” situation should not arise. The concerned agencies / individuals are required to give an undertaking that there is no conflict of interest situation. In case there is a conflict of interest situation, the concerned agency/individual should not be involved / considered for that particular activity. The below paragraphs detail out the situations where conflict of interest situation exists.

---

1In places where there are no estimates available, the same may be estimated by discussing with the experts in the Government or industry
For a Systems Implementation Agency / System Integrator

Conflict of interest would exist if:

- There are existing contracts of the bidder with the concerned Purchaser / Government entity/department.
- There is clear and certain possibility that the services executed / delivered by the bidder as part of the scope of work would lead to outcomes wherein the bidder can have vested business interests / benefits

The following Guidance Notes further explain and illustrate the provisions of conflict of interest for Engaging “System Integrators/Implementation Agencies” for E-Governance Projects.

a. The process for selection of System Integrators/Implementation Agencies should avoid both actual and perceived conflict of interest. System Integrators/Implementation Agencies should be deemed to be in a conflict of interest situation if it can be reasonably concluded that their position in a business or their personal interest could improperly influence their judgment in the exercise of their duties. Hence, the System Integrators/Implementation Agencies should not be allowed to take up the directly derived SI work in the same area of department/agency (area of influence).

b. Conflict of interest may arise between the Purchaser and a SI or between SI and present or future Contractors/ System Integrators/ Implementation Agencies. Some of the situations that would involve conflict of interest are identified below:

i. Purchaser and SI vendor:

   (i) Potential SI vendor should not be privy to information from the Purchaser /Government Department which is not available to others.

   (ii) Potential SI vendor should not have recently worked for the Purchaser overseeing the project in a role which is even perceived as “influential role” for drafting of SOW and evaluation criterion.

ii. SI vendor and Consultants:

   (i) No SI vendor should have an ownership interest or a continuing business interest or an on-going relationship with an existing Consultant working with the Purchaser under the same “Program” or “Scheme” and interacting with the same officials of the Purchaser.

   (ii) No SI vendor should be involved in owning or operating entities resulting from the project (unless upfront indicated in case an SPV is required to be formed).
c. One of the normal ways to identify conflicts of interest is through self-declaration by Implementing Agency. (It is expected that wherever a conflict exists, which has not been declared, competing companies are likely to bring this to the notice of the Purchaser, for which the Purchaser should seek clarification). All conflicts must be declared as and when the SI become aware of them.

For the Purchaser & Proposal Evaluation Committee

A conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest may occur if member(s) of the Evaluation team are directly or indirectly involved with an organization that has submitted a proposal for evaluation.

Prior to reviewing any proposals, member(s) of the Evaluation team must inform the Purchaser of any potential conflicts of interest or the appearance thereof. If members of the Evaluation team become aware of any potential conflict of interest as they review a proposal, they must immediately notify the Proposal Evaluation Committee chairman. Member(s) of the Evaluation team may withdraw as an RFP evaluator if they find themselves in a way that could create the appearance of bias or unfair advantage with or on behalf of any competitive bidder, potential bidder, agent, subcontractor, or other business entity, whether through direct association with contractor representatives, indirect associations, through recreational activities or otherwise.

Examples of potentially biasing affiliations or relationships are listed below:

1. Member(s) of the Evaluation team’s solicitation, acceptance, or agreement to accept from anyone any benefit, pecuniary or otherwise, as consideration for your decision or recommendation as it pertains to your evaluation of any proposal.

2. Member(s) of the Evaluation team’s affiliation with a bidding company or institution. For example, a conflict may exist when they or their immediate family members:
   a. are employed by or are being considered for employment with the company or institution submitting any bid or hold a consulting, advisory, or other similar position with said company or institution;
   b. hold any current membership on a committee, board, or similar position with the company or institution;
   c. hold ownership of the company or institution, securities, or other evidences of debt;
   d. Are currently a student or employee in the department or school submitting a proposal, such as the case?
It is suggested that the members of Proposal Committee should sign a self-declaration. A sample Self-Declaration Proforma, for this case, can be of the following form:

“I have read the RFP document and understand my obligations as explained in the document. I declare that myself or any of my family members are not part of the organizations which have bid for the proposal.
I further understand that I must advise the Purchaser if such a situation currently exists or arises during my term of service as a Proposal evaluator.

I further understand that I must sign and deliver this statement to the Purchaser prior to participating in the evaluation process.

Date:
RFP#:
Evaluator Signature:
Evaluator Name (Printed)”

2.5.11 Relaxation in PQ criteria for start-ups

For all public procurement, the central Ministries/Department have to ensure that the criterion of prior turnover and prior experience for all start-ups is relaxed subject to their meeting of quality and technical specifications. (Kindly refer D/o Expenditure Office Memorandum No. F20/2/2014-PPD(Pt.) dated 20.09.2016)

Extract from Rule 173 Transparency, competition, fairness and elimination of arbitrariness in the procurement process.

(i) The condition of prior turnover and prior experience may be relaxed for Start-ups (as defined by Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion) subject to meeting of quality & technical specifications and making suitable provisions in the bidding document. However there may be circumstances (like procurement of items related to public safety, health, critical security operations and equipment’s etc.) where procuring entities may prefer the vendors to have prior experience rather than giving orders to new entities. For such procurement wherever adequate justification exists, the procuring entities may not relax the criterion of prior experience /turnover for the Start-ups.

2.6 Designing the 2nd Stage Evaluation Process

The Evaluation phase covers the procurement process from close of offers to the selection of the preferred supplier and the selection of the successful bidder. The key components of an Evaluation process could also be illustrated as:
This outcome is achieved by carefully considering each offer on an equal basis, against the evaluation criteria. In providing a broad framework for the selection of the best value-for-money supplier, the following have been covered.

The Evaluation Process (depending on whether a one- or two stage procurement method is used) will generally follow the following steps:

- Evaluation team members complete conflict-of-interest declarations
- Evaluation team members are briefed on the evaluation process and receive training if necessary.
- Copies of the suppliers’ offers, scoring scale and evaluation forms are distributed to each evaluation team member.

**Note:** If a two-envelope method is being used (i.e. price has been requested in separate, sealed envelopes) only the non-price parts of the offers are distributed to the evaluation team members, with the price envelopes remaining unopened and securely stored.

- Evaluation team members complete individual assessments of the suppliers’ offers. This ensures each evaluation team member has adequately reviewed the offers prior to the team evaluation meeting and that no single team member is able to exert inappropriate influence on the outcome by being better prepared.
• The evaluation team members meet and complete a “team” evaluation. Team scores may be reached by a number of methods, with averaging the individual scores and reaching a team consensus score being the two most common. Of the two, the consensus scoring method is the most frequently used, as it allows a score to be agreed based on consideration of all the evaluation team members’ opinions and observations. The averaging method does ensure a persuasive or dominant individual is not able to exercise undue influence. However, it also means an individual’s scores that, based on reconsideration of the supplier response in light of other team members’ comments would have been higher or lower, still form part of the calculation for a final score.

• If price has been requested in separate, sealed envelopes, these envelopes are opened after the team scoring of the non-price criteria and a ranking agreed by the evaluation team. The ranking method will be determined by the evaluation model used. For example:
  ✓ lowest-priced conforming (LPC) offer is automatically the most responsive bidder
  ✓ highest-scoring bidder based on an QCBS assessment is the most responsive bidder

• As a matter of “Good Practice” the presentation should be avoided OR undue weightage should not be given to the presentation. The key reason being that the presentations are quite often delinked from the proposal submitted and hence may not be contractually binding on the bidder. However the bidders may be invited to come and discuss the areas requiring clarifications in the bids OR they can be asked to present the documents in the form submitted to the Purchaser highlighting all the evaluation areas. In this manner the evaluation committee can review the evaluation done by one member / support team. However this may require a higher time to be budgeted for such discussions. It may be noted that the bidders should not be allowed to change any documents (for e.g. new project citation and work order cannot be taken into cognizance at this stage). However any document substantiating the clarifications asked by the evaluation team may be provided.

• Reference-checking or further due diligence is carried out if the bidder is not well known to the Purchaser. The purpose of the reference-checking is to verify the assessed level of performance, capability or expertise and to satisfy the agency generally that the supplier is likely to deliver what it has offered. Further due diligence, such as financial viability checks, is generally only conducted where the procurement is high risk, high profile or high value.

A rightfully defined and objective technical evaluation criteria & methodology ensures that the most competent bidder offering the right quality solution/service and price is selected - the Most Responsive Bidder— best solution and not just best price.
2.6.1 Designing Technical Evaluation

As a part of the design for Technical evaluation, the Purchaser has to make decisions/choices on the following things, but not limited to:

- Evaluation model: lowest price/weighted attribute etc.
- Develop Rating Scale to guide evaluation panel scoring
- Determine panel decision making process: mathematical average/panel moderation
- Identify the information required from suppliers: supplier details/response to requirements/pricing/format etc.
- Identify any required additional steps: interview/presentation/site visit(s) etc.
- Identify any optional additional steps: reserve the right to interview/presentation/site visit etc.
- The need for Government department, Ministry due diligence requirements (if any).

The potential evaluation models are detailed out subsequently:

2.6.1.1 Technical Evaluation Models and Methods

Technical Evaluation Methods define the process that would be adopted to select the most competent and bidder with the best value solution offering.

Contract should ordinarily be awarded to the lowest evaluated bidder whose bid has been found to be responsive and who is eligible and qualified to perform the contract satisfactorily as per the terms and conditions incorporated in the corresponding bidding document. However where the lowest acceptable bidder against ad-hoc requirement is not in a position to supply the full quantity required, the remaining quantity, as far as possible, be ordered from the next higher responsive bidder at the rates offered by the lowest responsive bidder (GFR 2017, Rule 173 (xvi)).

However various procurement models have been mentioned to be considered in case extraordinary situations.
### Snapshot of few Evaluation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>How it works?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Based Selection (CBS) / Lowest cost or L1</strong></td>
<td>This method of selection may be used for the assignments of following nature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Assignment where any experienced Systems Implementation Agency / System Integrator can deliver the services without requirement of specific expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Under this category, the RFP is for projects where there is high level of clarity on the technology and the solutions. These would be typical implementation of COTS/ERP projects OR any State MMPs. In e-Governance space, these projects would be applications which have a simple citizen application workflow. In such projects, the risk of technology feasibility is less. In such RFP technical evaluation should emphasize on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. The solution should provide clarity and should provide a Bill of Material in the RFP document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The Evaluation should focus on the customer satisfaction in the past projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) | Under QCBS / CQCBS, the technical proposals will be allotted weightage of &lt;70%&gt; while the financial proposals will be allotted weightages of &lt;30%&gt;.

The following points may be noted:
Under this category, the RFP is for projects where there is inadequate clarity on the solution.
In such projects a due diligence should be done on the critical parameters of the project covering System Functionality, Technology, Specific implementation experience, Training methodology, performance in Proof of concept (in case PoC is planned), Certifications, Past experience of the vendor in executing similar assignments, size of those assignments, profile of team members and Project Methodology.
The Proposal Evaluation Committee in this case should have expertise or should have access to expertise to objectively evaluate & compare the various solutions components proposed by the bidders. |
|---|---|
| Fixed Budget Selection (FBS) | The RFP shall indicate the available budget and request the Systems Implementation Agencies / System Integrators to provide their best technical and financial proposals in separate envelopes, within the budget.

The Points as mentioned in QCBS, are applicable in this case also. |

### 2.6.1.2 Cost Based Selection

This method will be used when the assignment is simple and can be precisely defined, and when the budget is fixed. The RFP should indicate the available budget and request the Systems Implementation Agencies / System Integrators to provide their best technical and financial proposals in separate envelopes, within the budget. TOR should be particularly well prepared to make sure that the budget is sufficient for the Systems Implementation Agencies / System Integrators to perform the expected tasks.

In this case, the Purchaser should be cautious about the risk that bidders who have not understood the scope of work OR may be targeting to get the work order without having the technical competence to execute the project. This risk can be mitigated by having a rigorous evaluation of the technical bid and fixing a high score as minimum qualification for opening of financial bid.
2.6.1.3 Quality cum Cost Based Selection

QCBS uses a competitive process among firms that takes into account the quality of the proposal and the cost of the services in the selection of the successful firm. Cost, as a factor of selection, is to be used judiciously. The relative weight to be given to the quality and cost will be determined for each case, depending on the nature of the assignment.

The weight associated with Quality i.e. Technical Proposal may be as high as 80% and that associated correspondingly with cost i.e. Financial Proposal may be 20%. However the most common & effective QCBS which may be used is 70:30 (Technical Score weightage: Financial Score Weightage). In case of Cloud (IaaS/PaaS/SaaS) based procurement specific weightages are to be added based on the CSP’s experience and the specific requirement and complexity of the assignment.

2.6.1.4 Selection under a Fixed Budget (FBS)

This method is appropriate only when the assignment is simple and can be precisely defined and when the budget is fixed. The RFP shall indicate the available budget and request the Systems Implementation Agencies / System Integrators to provide their best technical and financial proposals in separate envelopes, within the budget. Evaluation of all technical proposals shall be carried out first as in the QCBS method. Then the price proposals shall be opened in public and prices shall be read out aloud. Proposals that exceed the indicated budget shall be rejected. The Systems Implementation Agency / System Integrator who has submitted the highest ranked technical proposal among the rest shall be selected and invited to negotiate a contract.

This is not a prevalent method of procurement as of now, but is relevant for the situations in which e-Governance procurements are done.

2.6.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria

Technical Evaluation Criteria are the bid response parameters on which the evaluation is carried out to arrive at a final (technical) score for each qualified agency.

Hence, the Technical Evaluation Criteria SHOULD:

- Be as objective as possible, breaking the scoring down to individual identifiable components
• Have direct and perceptible linkage to nature and scope of work
• Use the most relevant scoring / weighting scheme to evaluate; weighting should be basis their importance to the Government or project’s outcomes. The weightings must be disclosed in the tender document.
• Establish the scoring guidelines prior to contacting vendors/creating the RFP. Then, when the proposals are received, score them based on the criteria established in the RFP
• Have scoring for each component of the solution rather than an overall score for the solution
• Provide weights / maximum marks for each Technical evaluation criterion; weights should be as per their importance to the project or project’s outcomes and must be disclosed in the tender document.
• In case of a software solution, evaluate the coverage of or degree of match to functional and technical requirements by the solution

It may be a good practice that the evaluations should be done with the maximum score of 1000 marks, so that appropriate resolution could be provided to the criterions having less marks / sub criterions.

Based on the above advisory, the evaluation criterion has to be chosen very carefully, as it defines the filtering criterion on which the final Implementation Agency is to be shortlisted. Generally based on qualitative assessment, one can categorize the projects in two categories:

**Category ONE:**
Under this category, the RFP is for projects where there is high level of clarity on the technology and the solutions. These would be typical implementation of COTS/ERP projects OR any State MMPs. In e-Governance space, these projects would be applications which have a simple citizen application workflow. In such projects, the risk of technology feasibility is less.

In such RFP technical evaluation should provide clarity on solution till the Bill of Material stage in the RFP document. It may be noted that in this case, the responsibility of technical feasibility of the proposed solutions rests with the Purchaser.

Typically these should be on L1 basis.

**Category TWO:**
Under this category, the RFP is for projects where there is inadequate clarity on the solution. For e.g. these may be any large scale implementation of any Central MMP. These are risky projects and should be on QCBS evaluation <70:30> (quality: Cost).
It may be noted that in this case, the responsibility of technical feasibility of the proposed solutions rests with the Bidder. However the Proposal Evaluation Committee in this case should have expertise or should have access to expertise to objectively evaluate & compare the various solutions components proposed by the bidders.

In such projects the Purchaser should do a due diligence critical parameters of the project covering System Functionality, Technology, current performance on key technologies proposed in isolation & together as a stack, details on implementation experience of the bidder, Training methodology, performance in Proof of concept (in case PoC is planned), Certifications, Past experience of the vendor in executing similar assignments, size of those assignments, profile of team members and Project Methodology.

2.6.2.1 Category One: Suggested Technical Evaluation

[The X1, X2 and X3 values in the table below has to be filled in such a manner that a) it is above the value provided in the eligibility criterion b) it allows at least <8 agencies> to score minimum marks for the criterion]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Basis for valuation</th>
<th>Max Marks</th>
<th>Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPANY PROFILE</td>
<td>Greater than or equal to &lt;X1&gt;: 10 marks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Extracts from the audited Balance sheet and Profit &amp; Loss; OR Certificate from the statutory auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average turnover from System Integration/ICT Systems Development and Implementation Work in last 3 years (Turnover in Rs Crores)</td>
<td>Between X2 and X1: 8 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between X3 and X2 : 6 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than X3: 0 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[X1&gt;X2&gt;X3 and are average Revenue Turnover for last 3 financial years]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELEVANT STRENGTHS</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Basis for valuation</td>
<td>Max Marks</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Hardware &amp; Network Equipment Supply, maintenance service</td>
<td>When No. is:_equal to or more than 5 projects (4 for Cloud Projects): 20 marks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Completion Certificates from the client; OR Work Order + Self Certificate of Completion (Certified by the Statutory Auditor); OR Work Order + Phase Completion Certificate (for ongoing projects) from the client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloud Services &amp; Managed Services to be demonstrated in a maximum of &lt;5 Nos.&gt; engagements of value more than &lt;50% of the estimated value of the hardware being procured under this project. The work order should have been issued within the last 5 years, as on &lt;date&gt;.</td>
<td>equal to 4 projects (3 for Cloud Projects): 16 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The projects should have been either completed or an ongoing project where deliverable or milestone has been successfully met.</td>
<td>equal to 3 projects (2 for Cloud Projects): 12 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weightages (W)</strong></td>
<td>equal to 2 projects (1 for Cloud Projects): 8 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case project is completed and letter of satisfaction available: 100% weightage</td>
<td>Less than 2 projects (1 for Cloud Projects): 0 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case project in progress and the Work Order is more than 18 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 80% weightage</td>
<td>The maximum marks for each project is 4 marks. These marks would be multiplied by the weightage as defined in the previous column to arrive at a cumulative score.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case project in progress and the Work Order is between 12-18 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 50% weightage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
satisfaction available: 50% weightage

In case project in progress and the Work Order is less than 12 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 25% weightage

| 3. | Software Development & maintenance services to be demonstrated in a maximum of <Nos.> engagements of value more than <50% of the estimated value of the Software being procured under this project> that have either been completed or an ongoing project where deliverable or milestone has been successfully met relevant to the experience. The work order should have been issued within the last 5 years, as on <date>. | When No. is:

- equal to or more than 5 projects: 20 marks
- equal to 4 projects: 16 marks
- equal to 3 projects: 12 marks
- equal to 2 projects: 8 marks
- Less than 2 projects: 0 marks

The maximum marks for each project is 4 marks. These marks would be multiplied by the weightage as defined in the previous column to arrive at a cumulative score. | 20 | Completion Certificates from the client; OR Work Order + Self Certificate of Completion (Certified by the Statutory Auditor); OR Work Order + Phase Completion Certificate (for ongoing projects) from the client |

<p>| <strong>Weightages (W)</strong> In case project completed and letter of satisfaction available: 100%. In case project in progress and the Work Order is more than 18 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 80%. In case project in progress and the Work Order is between 12-18 months old and letter |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Basis for valuation</th>
<th>Max Marks</th>
<th>Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of satisfaction available: 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case project in progress and the Work Order is less than 12 months old and letter of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction available: 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Turnkey services or Cloud Implementation Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>When No. is:</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Completion Certificates from the client; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to be demonstrated in a maximum of &lt;Nos.&gt; engagements of value more than &lt;50% of the estimated</td>
<td>equal to or more than 5 projects (4 for Cloud Projects): 20 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work Order + Self Certificate of Completion (Certified by the Statutory Auditor); OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value of the turnkey services being procured under this project&gt; that have either been</td>
<td>equal to 4 projects ( 3 for Cloud Projects): 16 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work Order + Phase Completion Certificate (for ongoing projects) from the client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completed or an ongoing project where deliverable or milestone has been successfully met</td>
<td>equal to 3 projects (2 for Cloud Projects): 12 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relevant to the experience. The work order should have been issued within the last 5 years, as</td>
<td>projects : 8 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on &lt;date&gt;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weightages (W)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case project completed and letter of satisfaction available: 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case project in progress and the Work Order is more than 18 months old and letter of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction available: 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum marks for each project is 4 marks. These marks would be multiplied by the weightage as defined in the previous column to arrive at a cumulative score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH &amp; METHODOLOGY</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Solution Proposed Demonstration of understanding of the Department’s requirements</td>
<td>Qualitative assessment based on Demonstration of understanding of the Department’s requirements through providing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Approach and work in this Methodology perform the assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Project work break down structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESOURCE PROFILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Resume of all key technical resources proposed for the assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INCLUSION OF MSME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case to case basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Bidder’s inclusion of MSMEs in project delivery through allotment of at least <10%> of contract value to the project

| As per requirement. | As per requirement. [2 to 5 marks to be allotted] | Letter of evidence and commitment that MSME will be contracted for the required value of work. |

### TOOLS & ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case to case basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### TOOLS & ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Basis for valuation</th>
<th>Max Marks</th>
<th>Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Tools and Assets which could be leveraged for the assignment [for e.g. Test Case Builders, Effort Estimators, PMU Tool, Load testing etc., depending on the relevance to the Scope of work]</td>
<td>As per requirement.</td>
<td>As per requirement.</td>
<td>A note and relevant supporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Project/ Contract Completion for Cloud (IaaS/PaaS/SaaS) will be defined as Completed Project where in the base implementation including customization, configuration and production deployment is successfully completed. Such projects may however still have an on-going subscription but shall be considered as “Completed Projects” for the purpose of Pre-qualification.

#### 2.6.2.2 Category Two: Suggested Technical Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Basis for valuation</th>
<th>Max Marks</th>
<th>Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>System Functionality</td>
<td>Meeting the requirements of &lt;department&gt; in terms of how close the proposal is to the functional requirements for the solution as have been proposed for &lt;department&gt; (In case it is COTS, it should be measured by degree of customization required)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Compliance Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Demonstrated robustness of the technology deployed across other</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | **installations around the world, including – Scalability**
|   |   – Security
|   |   – Ease of implementation
| **3** | Maharashtra, India Specific Capabilities | Qualitative assessment based on the number of Projects of similar nature in Maharashtra, India and size of those projects. | **7%** | Note; and Completion Certificates from the client; OR
|   |   Work Order + Self Certificate of Completion (Certified by the Statutory Auditor); OR
|   |   Work Order + Phase Completion Certificate (for ongoing projects) from the client
| **4** | Industry Specific Capabilities | Qualitative assessment based on the Past experience of the bidder in executing similar assignments, size of those assignments. [*The definition of “similar” should be such that it focuses on the areas which are “innovative” or where the technical feasibility is a challenge in the context of the project*] | **7%** | Note; and Completion Certificates from the client; OR
|   |   Work Order + Self Certificate of Completion (Certified by the Statutory Auditor); OR
|   |   Work Order + Phase Completion Certificate (for ongoing projects) from the client
| **5** | Training | Trainings proposed by the vendor and the amount of emphasis laid on Training the employees schedule details, locations, sessions and their description | **7%** | Note
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Certifications and Credentials</th>
<th>Relevant certifications (SEI-CMMI, ISO, etc.)</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>Copy of certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Profile of proposed team members</td>
<td>Relevant assignment experience / Years of experience / Number of Certifications in Technology specific to Solution proposed</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>CVs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8 | Project Methodology, Support and Documentation | Qualitative assessment based on
  - Understanding of the objectives of the assignment: The extent to which the Systems Implementer’s approach and work plan respond to the objectives indicated in the Statement/Scope of Work
  - Completeness and responsiveness: The extent to which the proposal responds exhaustively to all the requirements of all the Terms of Reference | 7% | Note |
| 9 | Inclusion of MSMEs in Project Delivery | As per requirement. | 7% | Letter of evidence and commitment that MSME will be contracted for the required value of work. |

Each of these should be evaluated further in detail based on the following checklist. There would be page, paragraph and line references for each criterion for easy reading and scoring by the evaluation Committee.

**Detailed Methodology for Evaluation and Parameters**

1. **System Functionality: 20 Points**
   The Evaluation template should contain the Functional & Non Functional requirements as specified in Section 2.7.4 of this Document. A sample of the Evaluation checklist which should be made is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Sample Demo</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2.1</td>
<td>Projected Demand for Service</td>
<td>Store data on the Projected Demand for Service over a planning horizon (say 3-5 years as decided by &lt;DEPARTMENT&gt;).</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2.2</td>
<td>Information on Licensing Procedures</td>
<td>Store information on Licensing Procedures and related information that needs to be shared with the Applicant (This information could be displayed in the public website / printed in hard copies and dispatched to interested parties)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the comments column of the Evaluation Template, give a score from 0 to 10 for each of the functionality.

For convenience divide the score as follows:
- Effort - 0-5 points
- Experience - 0-4 points
- Sample Demo - 0-1 points

For each functionality give scores as follows:
- "Effort" - Lower the effort, more the score
- "Experience" - Higher the experience, more the score
- “Sample Demo” - Points only if answer is "Yes".

E.g.
Vendor A: If Effort = 5 days, Experience = 3, Demo = N, then score = 7(4+3+0). Vendor B: If Effort = 8 days, Experience = 1, Demo = Y, then score = 4(2+1+1).

Add scores given to each functionality (each row) for all the Modules to arrive at System Functionality Score. Convert the each Vendor Total Score to a 20-Point Scale.

Consider the following Example for explanation.
Assume that the entire Module has 160 functionalities. Each of the functionalities would carry 10 Points; hence the Full Score would be 1600. Assume that a Vendor gets a Vendor Total Score of 1100 out of the Full Score of 1600.

Then the Score on 20 Point Scale is \((1100/1600) \times 20 = 13.75\)

For large projects, even if it is a COTS solutions, the evaluation can be carried out in this manner. However the scoring needs to be carried out on the following basis.

- If functionality required is readily available: 5 Points (Maximum points)
- If functionality NOT readily available but can be customized through a work-around - 4 Points
- If functionality is NOT available and cannot be customized, but can be made available in a future version within 3 months: 2 Points
- If NOT available at all: No Points – 0 (minimum).

Add score for each functionality for ALL modules to arrive at the System Functionality Score Convert the each Vendor Total Score to a 20-Point scale in the similar way as described above.

2. **Technology: 20 Points**

The responses by Vendors would be reviewed for the following technology aspects of the proposed solution:
- Specifications (platform, software, database design, etc.) - Security and Scalability:
- Ease of Implementation

Also information would be collected from Vendor or references (other clients for which solutions were implemented). Vendor furnishing comprehensive information closest to <DEPARTMENT>’s expectations as listed in shall be awarded the maximum points.

**Overall Scoring would be on a 20 – Point Scale.**

Please refer the following table for Scoring Template. (Appendices response Doc Page 6-8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Architecture</td>
<td>Application architecture</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partitioned into three tiers (0-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criterion</td>
<td>Benchmark / Preferences</td>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility of these layers residing in different hardware platform (0-1)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification on the suggested application architecture with rationale and benefits (0-5)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base foundation of major sub-components. Maintenance and enhancements</td>
<td>Information provided on Major sub-components and whether they are proprietary OR Open (0-1)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willingness to customize for &lt;DEPARTMENT&gt; (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership of source code for Customised solution made available to &lt;DEPARTMENT&gt; (0-1)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of process adopted by Vendors on maintenance and enhancements (0-3)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed description of Software development Methodology (0-5)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Component Architecture</td>
<td>As a Best practice, and considering the scalability of the solution, a Distributed Component Architecture is preferred (0-4)</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case Bidder has suggested its own architecture other than the above, based on the reasoning provided assessment would be done (0-3)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear description on customisation of modifying existing business rules / introducing new business rules (0-3)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Security
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Description of user authentication procedure for the proposed application (0-3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Integrity</td>
<td>Details on Access Controls and Privileges through application (0-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Encryption</td>
<td>Encrypted storage of Username and Passwords (0-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Details on restriction of access to data content in the database (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of firewalls and security components (such as intrusion detection systems)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. System Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average volume handling capacity (0-4)</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Database update response time (0-3)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Database retrieval response time (0-5)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with over and above the minimum requirement specified for concurrent users</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark studies on technology components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance details for previous projects in case of developed solution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of Graphs, Tables, Whitepapers and related statistics of benchmarked studies on performance (0-5)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scalability

Descriptions of procedure for scaling up the application for additional users and additional features furnished. (0-3)

Extent of dependency on the Vendor for inclusion of new features (0-2)

Compliance with increasing the user base to the desired level, as specified by <DEPARTMENT> with least effort (time and cost) would be given higher score (0-5)

Need for additional infrastructure such as system software licenses / new hardware requirements etc. Lower the need higher the score (0-2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported Platform O/S</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server platforms</td>
<td>Detailed information on server platform with adequate rationale would be assessed for. More options for server platforms - higher the score (0-2).</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating System (OS)</td>
<td>Details of OS the product would support. More the options – higher the score (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform/OS combination</td>
<td>Statistical information on the platform / OS combination to support the rationale furnished. (0-3)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client Hardware/OS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware/OS combinations for client</td>
<td>Details of hardware / OS combination proposed for client systems with rationale. (0-3)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Interfaces</td>
<td>Browser based user interfaces would be preferred for suggested application, considering the accepted standards in use currently. (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case browser based user interface not suggested, the alternatives would be judged based on the reasoning provided by vendor (0-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Database/ Directory Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>Relational databases which are being supported adequately in present day context would carry max score (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical / flat files databases – low score (0-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product information (MS / Oracle)</td>
<td>Information on the Database products with recommendation and rationale (0-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Services</td>
<td>Information on system support to Directory Services (0-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Data Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical and/or physical data model.</td>
<td>Description of the proposed data models for the application, supported by data models of earlier developed applications (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customisation</td>
<td>Assess build-in flexibility for introducing changes at field level (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control features for data</td>
<td>Details on Control features to ensure data integrity (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>integrity</td>
<td>such as updates, totals, cross-checks, validations etc. (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction management system</td>
<td>Details of the transaction management system (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database layout</td>
<td>Information on Database layout supported with whitepaper(s) on database (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. System management</td>
<td>Description of database failover, rollback, recovery provisions and fault tolerance (0-3)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollback, recovery, and fault tolerance</td>
<td>Details on provision of accepted system management tools and utilities, with appropriate notification features for effective system administration. (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System management tools</td>
<td>Details on accessibility of system management interfaces and provision for remote administration. (02)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of system management interfaces.</td>
<td>Facility from vendor on Web-based support (on-line) would be preferred (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Web Server Support

| Web servers compatibility | Considering a future scenario of web-enablement, integration with Web Server would be assessed (0-5) | 0-5 |
| Functionality reside on the web server. | Number of functionalities that can reside on the web server and the level of difficulty associated in making it possible (0-3) | 0-3 |

10. Application Server Support

| Application Server integration | Proposed Solution running on Application Server that is established and well known would be preferred (0-3) | 0-3 |
| Interface between your product and applications servers | Details on the interface of the proposed solution with application servers would be assessed (0-2) | 0-2 |

11. Single Sign-on

| Integration with any Single Sign-On packages | Provision to integrate with single-sign on packages (0-1) | 0-1 |

12. Presentation requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interfacing with a presentation system</strong></td>
<td>Information on presentation system would be assessed for details (0-4)</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of in-house customisation possible</strong></td>
<td>Ability to customise screens (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Browsers support</strong></td>
<td>Cross-browser support would be preferred (e.g. IE / Mozilla) (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embedded browser languages</strong></td>
<td>Accepted scripting language within the boundaries of sand-box. (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client side Active-X controls would not be preferred.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interface design compliance with standards</strong></td>
<td>Usage of Standards such as optimised images / 256 colour palette would be preferred (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Session Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concurrent users, multiple sessions</strong></td>
<td>Description on handling of concurrent users, multiple sessions, session cookies. (0-3)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System's policy on session time-outs.</strong></td>
<td>Policy details on session time-outs (0-1)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Integration Capabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration capabilities with external, third party applications</strong></td>
<td>Not a very significant point at this stage for &lt;DEPARTMENT&gt;. However, if the vendor can substantiate capability of the proposed solution with commercially known third party solution, it would be surely preferable. (0-1)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Auditing / Reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Log files</strong></td>
<td>Complete audit trails and log filing features of the proposed COTS as well as Custom solution would be evaluated (0-5)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Log files be customization</strong></td>
<td>Ability of the log files to be customized and scheduled; (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access rights to view log files (0-1)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Querying capabilities</strong></td>
<td>Details of querying capabilities, and user-friendliness of the user logs (0-2)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Procedure of audit trails

Procedure of audit, reporting and review of the proposed solution (0-2)

### Evaluation Criterion | Benchmark / Preferences | Rating Scale
--- | --- | ---
16. Disaster Recovery and Back-up

| Disaster recovery procedures | Description of the disaster recovery procedures for data, application and client. Details of the procedure address adequate scenarios and the actions thereof (0-3) | 0-3 |
| Archival policy | Details of archival policy and procedure for the proposed solutions. Higher the degree of automatic features / scheduling in the archival procedures, more would be score (0-3) | 0-3 |

### 17. General

| Additional utility package required | Completeness in the list of any additional utilities (software / infrastructure) would be assessed (0-2) | 0-2 |
| Any limitations in the software/operating system/file manager | Description of the limits in terms of number of table entries, database size would be assessed (0-2) | 0-2 |
| Interdependencies in the modules | Details of the interdependencies across modules and possible implementation constraints would be assessed. (0-2) | 0-2 |
| Import / export facilities | Provision of import / export utilities especially to facilitate data entry / report generation (0-2) | 0-2 |
| End-of-day processes | Clear write-up on the end-of-day processes and the associated dependencies (0-2) | 0-2 |
| Application support | Compatibility with WLAN environment (0-3) | 0-3 |
| **Total** | | **183** |

Assign scores for each of the line items based on Vendor responses.

Arrive at sum totals for Vendor Total Scores.

**Example:**
Let’s say the Vendor A gets 120 out of 183.
Conversion of above score on a 20-point scale is as follows:

\[
\frac{120}{183} \times 20 = 13.115
\]

3. **Maharashtra, India Specific Capabilities: 8 Points**

For assessing this criterion, the projects may not be limited to Maharashtra, India, and can also include similar countries having federal structure [or any other categorization as relevant] as Maharashtra, India

Basis for awarding scores for this criterion is as follows:

- Number of clients using the product: 0-4
  - Points If No. of clients using the product are:
    - More than 15: 4 Points
    - Between 10- 14: 3 Points
    - Between 5 – 9: 2 Points
    - Between 1- 4: 1 Point

- Maximum Size of the Installations by vendor: 0-4 Points
  - More than 150 Users: 4 Points
  - Between 50 – 150 Users: 3 Points
  - Between 25 - 50 users: 2 Points
  - Upto 25 Users: 1 Point

**Example:**
Number of Clients in Maharashtra, India are 12; The Score is 3
Average No. of users = 100,
Then Vendor Total Score is 6 (i.e., Sum Total of 3 and 3).

Scoring would be on an 8-Point Scale

4. **Government Specific Deployment : 7 Points**

Number of Govt. clients using the product: 0-4 Points

- More than 15: 4 Points
- Between 10- 14: 3 Points
Between 5 – 9: 2 Points  
Between 1- 4: 1 Point
Average Size of the Installations: 0-3 Points

- More than 100 Users: 3 Points
- Between 50 – 100 Users: 2 Points
- Upto 50 Users: 1 Point Scoring

would be on 7-Point Scale

**Example:**
Number of Clients in Maharashtra, India are 8; The Score is 2
Average No. of users = 75,
Then Vendor Total Score is 4 (i.e., Sum Total of 2 and 2).

Only in this case the projects will have to be specific for the Government / Public Sector.

Based on the information provided by Vendor, <Purchaser> would assess the client referenced in relevant areas. The Vendors must agree to allow <Purchaser> to check relevant details / feedback from clients OR make site visits.

Vendor would provide information on each reference assignment for which the firm was legally contracted. Based on an overall assessment, a score on a 7- point scale will be given.

5. **Training: 10 Points**

It will be based on the emphasis the Vendor lays on providing training to the employees of <DEPARTMENT>.

This can be measured primarily at the time of Vendor Presentation, and on a secondary basis through the following:
- Training Methodology (including the handing over of the training material to the Purchaser, CBT or web based, Toolkits etc.)
- Layers of Training
- Time devoted for Training
- Training Kit
- Assessment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Course Content would be checked if it addressed all the relevant modules / functionalities specified by &lt;DEPARTMENT&gt; (0-4)</td>
<td>Layers of Training proposed based on types of users: Top Management, Core Team and End User Group</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phases of Training depending on the Project Time Lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Basic Training during the beginning phase (0-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Module specific training as the system is configured and Pilot is being build (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Hands-on Training when the system is read for User Acceptance Tests (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Post implementation Training (0-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Approach</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train the Trainer</td>
<td>As an accepted good practice, ‘Train the Trainer’ approach would be preferred (0-1)</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Training Programs, Duration of each Program and Evaluation methods suggested for the Train the trainer would be assessed (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Alternative Approaches | In case the Vendor suggests any other alternative approaches, it would be evaluated suitable based on the rationale provided (0-3) | 0-3  |

| Training Deliverables |                                                                 |      |
Training Aids

In form of handouts detailing each module with suitable examples and assignments, as and when class-room trainings are organised

Complete Training Manual on completion of all trainings, before the Go-live which would cover final configuration of the solution

Prior Training Experience

Prior training imparted during earlier project could be furnished for the following details:

- Training Programme
- Client
- Duration
- Number of Batches and Trainees

Sample Training Documentations in earlier projects could be furnished by vendors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Aids</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification,</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Vendor Responses, assign score to each line item detailed in the table above. Add up scores to arrive at a Vendor Total Score and convert the total score to 10-Point Scale.

For Example: If the Vendor Total is 25 out of the Total Score 40

On a 10-Point Scale the Score would be 25/40 * 10 = 6.25

6. Certification, Credentials: 7 Points

This criterion would be used to assess the reputation of the company in the market that it is operating in. Here companywide certifications should be given scores.

The scores for this criterion may also be supplemented by response received from the Vendor references (prior clients). Responses from the Vendor References would be based on telephonic discussions / personal visits to the referred personnel (as specified by the vendors) based on Credentials submitted by Vendors in the format in the RFP document.

The following table provides the evaluation guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certifications of Vendors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMMI Level for the organisation (1 point for each level)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO Certification / Six Sigma Certification</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other recognised certification from reputed authority for the organisation.</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from Vendor Responses</td>
<td>Based on discussions with / visits to vendor referred clients scores would be awarded.</td>
<td>0-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Vendor responses and Referred client feedback, assign score to each line item in above table and arrive at the Vendor Total Score.

Convert the score to 10-Point Scale. (e.g. If a vendor gets 14 out of 17, then a 7-Point Scale equivalent is 5.76 \((14/17*10)\))

7. **Profile of Proposed Team Members: 20 Points**

A consolidated spread sheet for the sub-criteria would be tabulated in an excel sheet for easier evaluation

The scoring for this criterion will be simple yet significant.

The key parameters for evaluating the team members would be:
- Team Composition
- Years of Experience (out of which relevant experience would be considered for evaluation)
- Qualification
- Certifications
- Number and type of assignments handled
- Proficiency in Local Language
Please refer following table for line-wise breakup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Overall Project Team Structure              | Composition of the Project Team Structure proposed by Vendor  
- Appropriate Number of Team members with justification  
- Roles and Responsibilities clearly defined                                                                                                                      | 0-5          |
| Total Years of Professional Experience      | Project Manager preferably to have 8 years of experience  
Functional Consultants & Technical Leads (to preferably have 5 years of experience  
Database Administrators to preferably have 5 years of experience  
Developers to have at least 3 years of experience  
Process Consultant for Process Documentation                                                                                                                   | 0-16         |
| Qualification                               | Basic Qualification for each team member should be either of the following:  
- Bachelor’s degree in Engineering  
- Master’s degree in Computer Science / Information Systems / MBA  
- Membership from reputed Chartered Accountancy institute  
- MCA / PGDCA                                                                                                                                                | 0-8          |
| Certifications                              | Project Management Certification for Project Manager  
Technology Specific certification for Team Members                                                                                                                                                                      | 0-2          |
| Number of similar assignments              | Project Manager must have handled preferably 8 assignments of similar nature                                                                                                                                              | 0-4          |
Other team members must have worked in at least 2 complete implementation / development experience in Government Sector / Utilities

0-4

Proficiency in Local Language
At least 1 team member from each module must be conversant in Local Language Speaking and Writing
More members in the team knowing Local language would be seen as an advantage

0-5

0-3

Total
75

Based on vendor responses, assign score to each line item detailed in the table above add up scores to arrive at a vendor total score convert the total score to 20-point scale

EXAMPLE:

If the Vendor Total is 45 out of the Total Score 75

On a 20-Point Scale the Score would be 45/75 * 20 = 12

8. Project Methodology, Support and Documentation: 8 Points

Refer to Main Document and Addendums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Benchmark / Preferences</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Methodology</td>
<td>Software Development Methodology using the accepted standards; evaluation would be based on the rationale and clarity furnished in the vendor response</td>
<td>0-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation methodology of solution would be evaluated to assess vendor’s understanding of &lt;DEPARTMENT&gt;’s requirements to comply with the deliverables, training, handholding and post-implementation support required to make project successful.</td>
<td>0-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Problem reporting and resolution mechanism</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Support Feature</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotline Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous Support of various releases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to support customisation of solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling Change Requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of User Discussion Forum (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>List the documents provided with your custom solutions</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User manuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Administration manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System manuals – Architectures, Entity-Relationship diagrams, Source code etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation updates to correspond with each software releases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score**: 23

Based on Vendor Responses, assign score to each line item detailed in the table above. Add up scores to arrive at a Vendor Total Score. Convert the total score to an 8-Point Scale.

Example:
If the Vendor Total is 15 out of the Total Score 23
On a 8-Point Scale the Score would be 15/23 * 8 = 5.22

2.7 How to conduct the Bid Evaluation Proceedings

2.7.1 Activities in the Bid Evaluation Process

The evaluation of the proposals should be carried out in three stages:

- Pre-Qualification / Eligibility evaluation
- Technical (bid) evaluation
- Commercial bid evaluation

2.7.1.1 Stage 1: Pre-Qualification Evaluation

Step 1: Basic Data
Before starting the actual evaluation it is necessary to collect all the key information pertaining to the bidding so that it is readily available and the evaluation process is kept in proper perspective.

**Step 2: Record of Bid Opening**
All bids received prior to the deadline fixed for submissions shall be opened at the time, date and place specified in the bidding documents. All bidders that have submitted bids and their representatives shall be permitted to be present at the opening of bids, and all those present at the bid opening shall be required to sign the attendance sheet.

A Record of Bid Opening, identifying all the bids received, alternative bids if any, and the presence or absence of the requisite EMD, read out at the public opening of bids, should be formally prepared.

The record of the bid opening should be signed by all members of the bid opening committee or persons responsible for bid opening. It is also recommended that all bidders present sign the record of the bid opening in order to ensure that the data has been read out and recorded correctly.

**Step 3: Preliminary Examination for Completeness of Bids**
The purpose of this step is to examine whether the bids received were complete as required by the bidding documents before further detailed evaluation. The areas to be covered by the examination are (i) whether required Bid securities have been furnished or not; (ii) whether bid documents have been properly signed or not; (iii) whether a power of attorney for the authorized person has been submitted or not; (iv) whether documents establishing the eligibility of bidders and goods have been furnished or not; (v) whether Technical Bid & Financial Bids in separate sealed envelope documents required to assess the post qualification of a bidder with respect to its financial and technical capability to undertake the contract have been provided or not; and (vii) whether bids are generally in order for further evaluation.

**Step 4: Pre-qualification / Eligibility evaluation**
Based on the pre-qualification criterion mentioned in the RFP document, the documents / proofs submitted by the bidder should be verified to establish the eligibility of the Bidder. The subsequent process for evaluation of the bids would be carried out only if the bidder qualifies through the prequalification requirement.

2.7.1.2 Stage 2: Technical Bid Evaluation

The scrutiny of bids for substantial responsiveness to the provisions of the bidding documents is one of the most important aspects of the evaluation of bids. A bid is
considered substantially responsive if it does not contain any "Major Deviations" from the bidding documents or conditions which cannot be determined reasonably in terms of monetary value for financial adjustment. A major deviation is one which (a) has an effect on the validity of the bid; or (b) has been specified in the bidding documents as grounds for rejection of the bid; or (c) is a deviation from the commercial terms or the technical specifications in the bidding documents whose effect on the bid price is substantial but cannot be given a monetary value. **The purpose of the exercise is to reject bids which are not substantially responsive to major commercial and technical requirements.**

**Step 1: Preparation of Table of Bidders with technical evaluation details.**
The information contained in the Record of Bid Opening needs to be supplemented with the actual bid evaluation and comparison of technical evaluation criterion. Therefore, it will be necessary to prepare the Table of Bidders and technical evaluation criterion setting out details such as Nature of work related turnover, relevant experience, approach & methodology, work plan etc. for detailed comparison.

**Step 2: Substantial Responsiveness to Technical Requirements.**
All bids must be checked for substantial responsiveness to the technical requirements of the bidding documents. Examples of non-conformance to technical requirements, which are justifiable grounds for rejection of a bid, are as follows:

(a) Failure to bid for the required scope of work (e.g., for the entire SOW or a complete schedule) as instructed in the bidding documents and where failure to do so has been indicated as unacceptable; (b) failure to meet major technical requirements (e.g., offering completely different types of solution from the types specified.)

**Step 3: Preparation of Table of Substantive Responsiveness of Bids**
In order to ensure that a thorough check of the substantive responsiveness of all bids is carried out, a Table of Substantive Responsiveness to Technical evaluation criterion should be prepared. The tables should list all major conditions for Technical evaluation criterion which the bidders must meet for their bids to be considered substantially responsive. The responsiveness of each bid received should then be checked against this list and its conformance or partial conformance, or non-conformance to each item should be entered in the tables. Bids which fail to conform to any of the major conditions should normally be considered nonresponsive and should be rejected.

In the process of evaluation, bidders may be requested to provide clarifications of their bids where such clarifications are deemed necessary. Bidders are not permitted, however, to change the substance or price of their bids. The records of all clarifications sought and received must be kept by the Purchaser responsible for bid evaluation.

**Step 4: Detailed Evaluation.**
The next step is to scrutinize the selected bids systematically in order to compare and evaluate the bids on a common basis. The appropriate way to present the evaluation is in the form of tables, so as to record and compare the salient features of all bids to be evaluated in detail for technical requirements.

The Table of Technical Requirements should set out the technical evaluation criterion and their performance characteristics. Every bid being evaluated should then be scrutinized in detail and its salient features entered into the table against the listed items of the bidding documents. Any substantial advantage/disadvantage/highlight from the technical requirements of the bidding documents should be listed and it should be determined whether a financial adjustment to the bid is necessary or the bid should be rejected as non-complying.

The Purchaser may wish to correspond with the bidders for clarifications of their bids. Almost invariably the Purchaser will require meetings/presentations separately with all eligible bidders who are selected for detailed evaluation, in order to clarify their bids. Details of approach & Methodology, scheduling and resourcing are usually the principal subjects of such bid clarification meetings. Since the information provided by bidders in such meetings often forms the basis of the conclusions of the Purchaser, the minutes of the meetings should be recorded and these minutes should be attached to the evaluation report for the use of the Proposal Evaluation Committee in reviewing the findings of the Purchaser.

The bidders should be evaluated on the basis of the above table prepared against the marks allocated to each of the technical evaluation criterion. The evaluator must be cautious to apply the same yardstick of evaluation for each of the bidders. Post evaluation, the bidders who meet the minimum qualifying marks in the technical evaluation, are eligible for opening of the financial bid.

**Minimum Qualifying Score** in Technical Evaluation for moving to the subsequent stage of opening of Financial Bid is suggested as follows:

- **<75%>** of the total maximum score in case of L1 (lowest price bid) based selection because in a lowest cost bid the risk of any vendor bidding frivolously without understanding the scope of work or having the strengths to deliver it is high, so Evaluation committee is responsible to ensure that the proposal has a certain high degree of Quality
- **<60 %>** of the total maximum score in case of QCBS. This provides a better leverage to differentiate Quality amongst the bidders.
2.7.1.3 Stage 3: Announcement of Technical Scores

Evaluators of technical proposals should not have access to the commercial bids until the technical evaluation is concluded. The envelope containing the financial proposal is not opened till the technical evaluation is complete.

**Step 1:** Declaration/Announcement/Publishing of Technical Scores
The technical Scores of the bidders should be read out loudly before the Financial Bid is opened. Thereafter the Purchaser should share the detailed evaluation sheet providing details to the last level of evaluation to all the bidders.

2.7.1.4 Stage 4: Commercial Bid Evaluation

**Step 1:** Declaration/Announcement/Publishing of Technical Scores
The technical Scores of the bidders should be read out loudly before the Financial Bid is opened.

**Step 2:** Preparation of Table of Bidders and Bid Prices.
The financial bids should be opened in front of the bidders who have secured the minimum marks in the technical evaluation.

Firstly, the bids should be examined for arithmetical errors and the errors, if any, should be corrected as specified in the bidding documents. The bidders must accept the corrections of arithmetical errors in accordance with the bidding documents. If a bidder refuses to accept the corrections of errors calculated in accordance with the provisions of the bidding documents, its bid shall be rejected and its EMD shall be forfeited.

**Step 3:** Substantial Responsiveness to Commercial Terms and Conditions.
All bids must be checked for substantial responsiveness to the commercial terms and conditions of the bidding documents. Examples of non-conformance to commercial terms and discussed below: (a) Failure to sign the Commercial Bid Form and Price Schedules by the authorized person or persons;

(b) Conditional bids, i.e., conditions in a bid which limit the bidder’s responsibility to accept an award (e.g. acceptance of the award is subject to government's approval for availability of critical material available in the market, or a bid submitted with a price escalation condition when a fixed price bid is specified, or qualifications to the Conditions of Contract);

(c) Inability to accept the price adjustment formulae of the bidding documents;

Evaluators of technical proposals should not have access to the commercial bids until the technical evaluation is concluded. The envelope containing the financial proposal is not opened till the technical evaluation is complete.
STAGE 5: DETERMINATION OF MOST RESPONSIVE BID

After going through the above stages, the most responsive bid shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of the bidding documents while ensuring transparency, competition, fairness and elimination of arbitrariness in the procurement process. The following criteria for determining responsiveness are to be taken into account for evaluating the bids such as:

a. Time of delivery.
b. Performance/ efficiency/ environmental characteristics.
c. The terms of payment and of guarantees in respect of the subject matter of procurement price.
d. Cost of operating, maintaining and repairing etc.

Bids received should be evaluated in terms of the conditions already incorporated in the bidding documents; No new condition which was not incorporated in the bidding documents should be brought in for evaluation of the bids. Determination of a bid’s responsiveness should be based on the contents of the bid itself without recourse to extrinsic evidence.

Contract should ordinarily be awarded to the lowest evaluated bidder whose bid has been found to be responsive and who is eligible and qualified to perform the contract satisfactorily as per the terms and conditions incorporated in the corresponding bidding document. However, where the lowest acceptable bidder against ad-hoc requirement is not in a position to supply the full quantity required, the remaining quantity, as far as possible, be ordered from the next higher responsive bidder at the rates offered by the lowest responsive bidder.

2.7.2 Rejection of Bids which are Outliers

There have been situations where the Nodal Agencies have to deal with frivolously low bids and the project may stand the risk of failure as the successful bidder may not be able to deliver at the price quoted. Bidding Documents should include a clause that “if a firm quotes NIL charges/ consideration, the bid shall be treated as unresponsive and will not be considered”.

As per GFR 2017, [Rule 173 (xix)], rejection of all Bids is justified when

a. Effective competition is lacking.
b. All Bids and Proposals are not substantially responsive to the requirements of the Procurement Documents.
c. The Bids /Proposals prices are substantially higher that the updated cost estimate or available budget; or
d. None of the technical Proposals meets the minimum technical qualifying score.
Lack of competition in rule 173(xix) shall not be determined solely on the basis of the number of Bidders. Even when only one Bid is submitted, the process may be considered valid provided following conditions are satisfied:

- The procurement was satisfactorily advertised and sufficient time was given for submission of bids.
- The qualification criteria were not unduly restrictive; and
- Prices are reasonable in comparison to market values

When a limited or open tender results in only one effective offer, it shall be treated as a single tender contract.

2.7.3 Evaluation Team

The composition of the evaluation team depends on the size and complexity of the particular procurement, however as a general rule the evaluation team includes:

- A sourcing/procurement specialist, who in addition to any other role ensures the evaluation process is managed in a fair, robust and defensible manner, understands the rules of the evaluation and ensures they are followed
- Commercial/financial expertise
- Appropriate technical expertise required for E-Governance and ICT Systems development and implementation projects

In most small to medium-size procurements, a team of three or four is adequate, however in particularly large or complex procurements there may be separate teams for the different components of the evaluation e.g. technical Solution, security, commercial, reference checks etc. This is specifically important for evaluation of QCBS bids.

2.7.4 Supplier Debriefing Post Score Announcement

Supplier debriefing is considered an important part of the evaluation process, as this provides suppliers with the opportunity to receive feedback on their offers and gain an understanding of where they can improve their offers to better meet the needs of the agency in future. It is a good practice for debrief to be provided to a supplier where one is requested.

2.7.5 Risks in Evaluation Phase

Generic risks identified by agencies relating to the evaluation phase of the procurement life cycle include:

- Failure to plan the evaluation as part of the procurement planning phase, which results in an evaluation process that does not identify the best value-for-money offer.
• failure to brief and train the evaluation team adequately in the evaluation rules and process, which may lead to an evaluation process that does not identify the best value-for-money offer:
  ✓ breaches of the evaluation rules, which result in an adverse public profile, embarrassment to the agency and/or formal complaints from the bidders
  ✓ failure to confirm the availability of evaluation team members as part of the planning process, which may lead to delays and slippage in the evaluation
  ✓ failure to ensure all evaluation team members complete conflict-of-interest declarations, which may lead to: -delays once a conflict of interest has been identified while a replacement person is found -a need to repeat the tender or evaluation process if the conflict of interest is not identified until after the evaluation process
  ✓ embarrassment to the agency if a conflict of interest comes to light after the procurement is completed, and possible

2.7.6 Preference to domestically manufactured electronic products in Government procurement (PMA)

The Central Government may, by notification, provide for mandatory procurement of any goods or services from any category of bidders, or provide for preference to bidders on the grounds of promotion of locally manufactured goods or locally provided services (GFR 2017, Rule 153(iii))


The tender conditions would ensure that domestically manufactured electronic products are encouraged and are not subjected to restrictive product specifications or mandatory requirement of prior experience. The procuring agency may also rationally identify and evaluate predatory pricing by any bidder. However procuring Department or Agency may incorporate such stipulations as may be considered necessary to satisfy themselves of the security, production capability and product quality of the domestic manufacturer.

In case of turnkey/ system-integration projects, eligibility of a bidder as a domestic manufacturers would be determined on the domestic value addition calculated only for the value of notified Domestically Manufactured Electronic Products (DMEPs) i.e. forming part of the turnkey/system integration project and not on the value of whole project.
The products notified by MeitY & Department of Telecommunications (DoT) for providing preference to domestic manufacturers are as follows:

**By MeitY**

1. Desktop PCs
2. Dot Matrix Printers
3. Tablet PCs
4. Laptop PCs
5. Contact Smart Cards
6. Contactless Smart Cards
7. LED Products
8. Biometric Access Control/Authentication Devices
9. Biometric Finger Print Sensors
10. Biometric Iris Sensors

**By DoT**

1. Encryption/UTM platforms (TDM and IP)
2. Core/ Edge/ Enterprise routers
3. Managed Leased line Network equipment
4. Ethernet Switches (L2 and L3), Hubs, etc.
5. IP based Soft Switches, Media gateways
6. Wireless/ Wireline PABXs
7. CPE (Including WiFi Access points and Routers, Media Converters), 2G/3G Modems, Leased - line Modems, etc.
8. Set - Top Boxes
9. SDH/ Carrier - Ethernet/ Packet Optical Transport equipment
10. DWDM/CWDM systems
11. GPON equipment
12. Digital Cross- Connects/MUXs
13. Small size 2G/ 3G GSM based Base Station Systems
14. LTE based broadband wireless access systems (eNodeB, EPC, etc.)
15. (Access Point, Aggregation Block, Core Block, etc.)
16. Microwave Radio systems (IP/Hybrid)
17. Software Defined Radio, Cognitive Radio systems
18. Repeaters (RF/RF- over- optical), IBS, and Distributed Antenna system
19. Satellite based systems - Hubs, VSAT etc.
20. Copper access systems (DSL/DSLAM)
21. Network Management systems
22. Security and Surveillance communication systems(video and sensors based)
23. Optical Fiber Cable
A copy of the aforesaid Notifications/Guidelines can be downloaded from MeitY website i.e. URL www.MeitY.gov.in/esdm. Purchase preference for domestic manufacturer, methodology of its implementation, value addition to be achieved by domestic manufacturers, self-certification, and compliance and monitoring shall be as per the aforesaid Guidelines/Notifications. The Guidelines may be treated as an integral part of the tender documents.

**Tender procedure for procurement**

1. The procuring agencies, whether Government Ministries/Departments or other government agencies, shall follow standard procurement procedures, in accordance with instructions of Ministry of Finance and CVC, while providing preference to DMEP.
2. The tender document for procuring notified electronic products should explicitly specify the modalities through which the preference for DMEP shall be operated. The details, apart from usual tender conditions, should specify the following:
   a. The electronic products for which preference will be provided to bidders of DMEP.
   b. Total quantity of procurement and the quantity of procurement for which the preference will be provided to bidders of DMEP.
   c. Percentage of domestic value addition which qualifies the electronic product to be classified as domestically manufactured.
   d. The procedure for certification and assessment of the percentage of domestic value addition in an electronic product.
   e. The preference to DMEP shall be subject to meeting technical specifications and matching the L1 price.
   f. The procedure for awarding the contract to bidder of DMEP and the treatment of the quantity earmarked for the bidders of DMEP if no bidder of DMEP is available, in accordance with the clause 4.2.2 of the policy.
   g. For each electronic product proposed to be procured, among all technically qualified bids, the lowest quoted price will be termed as L1 and the rest of the bids shall be ranked in ascending order of price quoted, as L2, L3, L4 and so on. If L1 bid is from the bidder of DMEP, the said bidder will be awarded full value of the order. If L1 bid is not from the bidder of DMEP, the value of the order awarded to L1 bidder will be the balance of procurement value after reserving specified percentage of the total value of the order for the eligible bidder of DMEP. Thereafter, the lowest bidder among the bidders of DMEP, whether L2, L3, L4 or higher, will be invited to match the L1 bid in order to secure the procurement value of the order earmarked for the DMEP. In case first eligible bidder of DMEP fails to match L1 bid, the bidder of DMEP with next higher bid will be invited to match L1 bid and so on. However, the procuring agency may choose to divide the order amongst more than one successful bidder as long as all such bidders match L1 and the criteria for allocating the tender quantity amongst a number of
successful bidders is clearly articulated in the tender document itself. In case all eligible bidders of DMEP fail to match the L 1 bid, the actual bidder holding L 1 bid will secure the order for full procurement value. Only those bidders of DMEP whose bids are within 20% of the L 1 bid would be allowed an opportunity to match the L 1 bid.

h. The tender conditions would ensure that domestically manufactured electronic products are encouraged and are not subjected to restrictive product specifications or mandatory requirement of prior experience. The procuring agency may also rationally identify and evaluate predatory pricing by any bidder. However, procuring Ministry/ Department or Agency may incorporate such stipulations as may be considered necessary to satisfy themselves of the security, production capability and product quality of the domestic manufacturer.

i. The policy for providing preference to domestically manufactured electronic products shall also be applicable to the DMEPs covered in turnkey/ system integration projects, which have been notified under the policy. In such cases the preference to DMEPs would be applicable only for the value of notified DMEPs forming part of the turnkey/ system-integration projects and not on the value of whole project. It shall be mandatory on the part of the bidders in the tender to quote separately for the notified DMEPs forming part of the turnkey/ system integration projects.

**Tender evaluation**

Total Bill of Material (Total-BOM) may be calculated based on one of the following depending on data available. Each of these calculations should provide consistent result.

a. Sum of the costs of all inputs which go into the product (including duties and taxes levied on procurement of inputs except those for which credit / set-off can be taken).

b. Ex-Factory Price of product minus profit after tax, minus warranty costs.

c. Market price minus post-production freight, insurance and other handling costs minus profit after tax, minus warranty costs minus sales and marketing expenses. The percentage of domestic value-addition may be calculated based on information furnished as per the following formula:

\[
\text{Percentage of domestic value-addition} = \frac{\text{Dom}}{\text{BOM}} \times 100
\]

Total-BOM It is recommended that each agency assessing should calculate the domestic value addition using at least two of the above formulae so as to validate the assessments in this regard and ensure that the domestic value addition that is claimed is consistent.

It shall be the responsibility of the domestic manufacturer to ensure that the products so claimed are DMEP in terms of the domestic value addition prescribed for the product. The domestic manufacturer shall also be required to provide a value addition certificate on half-yearly basis (Sep 30 and Mar 31), duly certified by the Statutory Auditors of the domestic manufacturer, that the claims of value-addition made for the product during the preceding 6
months are in accordance with the Policy. Such certificate shall be filed within 60 days of commencement of each half year, to the concerned Ministry / Department.

In the event of unavailability of Indian manufacturers, the goods can be procured from foreign vendors on L1 quote.

2.8 Scope of Work

2.8.1 Procurement Choice between ONE or MULTIPLE RFPs

It is quite common in the Government to club the entire Scope of Work into one RFP document. The benefit being that there is only one vendor who would be responsible for ensuring the end-to-end solution. However on the other side is if all the scope of work is clubbed together without defining the specifications of the end deliverables, the output received is often a sub-optimal one.

This happens because of the following reasons:

- The bidder tries to reduce the cost to the extent possible. Hence if the bid asks for a computer table and a chair without providing details on the quality certification and warrantee, the cheapest available products would be quoted for. So in case a generator of any capacity is required, he would always quote for petrol Gen-set, as it is cheaper, but which may not be the most economical solution in the long run.
- The bidder may not be an expert in procuring and/or delivering anything distant from its area of business/competence (civil constructions, modular furniture, generator, data entry etc.).
- The prices which would be available to bidders for such products would be not based on bulk purchase; hence, there may be no real price advantage. Further the bidding organization will put in some margin of their own.
- There is lesser ownership of the concerned officer (may be at a junior level) for specific modules of the project or incomplete knowledge of module related to localization. For e.g. if data entry has to be done by the successful bidder, he would generally faces issues in getting the quality check done and certified for the data entered by him. However if the data entry agency is selected through a separate RFP process by complete ownership of the officer responsible for the data entry, it would have a better chance of “owning” the quality of data entry. This becomes more crucial in case of data entry in local language(s), where noncompliance to the latest Unicode standard may render the data unusable. Utmost care, therefore becomes necessary to make sure that applications/tools/keyboard managers that have full compliance to the latest Unicode (version 6.0 or above) for character encoding get used for data entry by the selected agency. Most of the issues related to character encoding and typing errors can be avoided if the in script keyboard layout (BIS recommended standard) is used. Latest version is the enhanced in script keyboard layout, which should preferably get used.
2.8.1.1 Guidelines for segregation of RFPs

Before deciding on the scope of work for a particular RFP, there should also be an evaluation/analysis done on how the System Integrator vendor can provide cost effective deliverable for activities which are not core to their profile, for e.g. Site preparation, Data Digitization, Training etc. In the following situations, the RFPs should be segregated if:

a) There is a expertise available within the Purchaser for the procurement OR conversely, the bidding agencies do not have expertise in the procurement of the item
b) There is no confusion on the point of failure (for e.g. if a software fails to work, the problem could be lack of clarity on the point of failure - hardware, network, software etc. However if the data entry or a furniture has problems, there is no confusion on the point of failure).

c) The quality of product being procured can be compromised with

In case the answers to the above questions are YES for each segregated area of work, then a separate RFP should be prepared. Or else, it should be clubbed in one RFP. However if two or more work are clubbed then SOW should clearly specify end-deliverables (o/p) of each of the individual assignment, so that focus is not only on the end deliverables but on output at all stages

Further in case the decision based on the above, is to have separate RFPs, the Agency selected can be scoped to assist the Purchaser in the Bid Process Management.

2.8.1.2 Guidelines for clubbing of RFPs

In case the Purchaser has decided to club various areas of work in one RFP, it should consider the following:

1. In cases where “Indicative specifications” are being provided, it should be ensured that
   a. The specifications are available with multiple OEM\(^1\).
   b. Indicative specification should be done after the Capacity balancing to ensure optimal usage of the hardware

In case consultants are involved, an undertaking should be taken from them to ensure the above 1-(a) and 1-(b) points.

\(^1\) It is important and useful that a range of the performance indicators should be provided, so that it does not favour a particular OEM/technology)
2. The Scope of work should be finalized in consultations with the prospective bidders/panel. This should be done so that the scope of work and deliverables are commonly understood between bidders and buyers. Inadequate clarity at an early stage of procurement of System Integration/Implementation work, results in inadequate information in RFP, leading to risk in implementation.

3. The Scope of Work should not include activities / hardware, cost of which cannot be quantified. For example, the effort estimation for making changes in the software on introduction of GST should not be within the scope of work. It should be taken up as “Change Request” subsequently. This would minimize the cost and risk for both the parties.

2.8.2 Key Validating Questions for Scoping

The following questions may help in developing the specifications of requirements:

- **Why** are we doing this?
- **What** results do we need to achieve?
- **How** will the services be delivered?
- **How well** – what quality and standards apply?
- **How much** – what business/process reports, knowledge pieces, insight, research output are required?
- **Where** will the services be delivered?
- **When** will the services be delivered – term of contract?
- **Who** will be involved in the delivery: supplier / contract manager etc.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>The specification of requirements is contained in one document with no missing information. If the nature of the procurement requires more than one document, the documents must be clearly structured and linked with no repetition or overlap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unambiguous</td>
<td>Each requirement is concisely stated without recourse to technical jargon, acronyms (unless defined elsewhere in the document). It expresses objective facts, not subjective opinions. Vague language is avoided. Negative statements and compound statements are discouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>Each requirement is consistent with all others and any external documents that are referenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Each requirement is current and can, in some cases, be future focused to meet planned or predicted future needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible</td>
<td>Each requirement can be implemented within the constraints of the project including the budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traceable  Each requirement can be traced back to a stated public policy / business / stakeholder need and is authoritatively documented.

Verifiable  The implementation of the requirement can be determined through one of four possible methods: inspection, demonstration, test or analysis.

The Rights

Don’t forget to test your specification of requirements against the following Rights:

- Right quality
- Right place
- Right time
- Right price

2.8.3 Templates for Scope of Work

Scope of Work (SOW) is the most important component of any tendering process. It is for this that the whole bidding process is entered – to execute the scope of work and deliver outcomes that the Government strives for.

Templates for Scope of work for various e-Governance projects are provided in this section for your detailed study and enhanced comprehension on the respective topics. The user (Government entity/department) has to/must contextualize and make necessary changes in these documents before using it to include or build in a RFP document.

Scope of work directly affects:

- Time to deliver the project
- Cost of delivering the project
- Intended business outcome for the Government
- Delivery of Citizen benefits/services

Scoping of work to be done during a project is dependent upon what is to be done and what is to be eventually delivered. Purchaser shall provide the necessary information to the SI, for estimation of system requirements, such as:

1. Total Departmental Users
2. Peak Concurrent departmental Users
3. Total External Users
4. Peak Concurrent External Users
5. Mobile Users
6. Help Desk Users
7. MIS Users
8. Peak Concurrent MIS Users
9. Data size Per User (Internal Users)
10. Data size Per User (External Users)
11. Expected Growth (%) Internal Users
12. Expected Growth (%) External Users
13. Transaction Volume
14. Total Batch Jobs
15. Execution Timing of Batch Jobs
16. Expected Transactions Per Batch Jobs
17. Expected data Per Batch Job
18. Current Data Size

The scoping process mostly varies as per the nature of procurement – product, solution. Below we have suggest some guiding principles on drafting the scope of work for different projects.

For System Integration Turnkey projects, drafting Scope of Work involves the following Tracks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work – Tracks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Software: Development (Custom Application), Implementation (COTS / ERP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Hardware Installations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Networking Installations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Data Digitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Training and Change Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Site preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Handholding Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) O&amp;M Support (inclusive of Manpower Provisioning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Cloud Implementations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8.3.1 Template for Summary of Scope of Work, Deliverables & Timelines

An illustrative format for laying down the Summary of the above said Scope of Work is given here below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Project Track</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Timelines (From Signing of Contract)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Guidance Notes: Model RFP Templates for Implementation Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Project Track</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Timelines (From Signing of Contract)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0      | Project Initiation & Solution Design                                           | • Suggesting Re-engineered processes (as per the industry’s best practices) after studying & validating the existing documents  
• Software Requirement Specifications & Design Documents  
• In case there is decision or clear reason to choose a COTS product/software, performing mapping report of COTS product with the FRS / To-Be processes as defined |                                                                                                                                          |
| 1.     | Development / customization and implementation of the Software Solution to meet the requirements of the Client | Development / customization and implementation of the <Phase No.> modules  
Development / customization and implementation of the <Phase No.> modules...                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                   |
| 2.     | Procurement, deployment and commissioning of the necessary Hardware at various define locations | Deployment of the hardware in appropriate quantity and as per the specified technical specifications at the appropriate locations to support functioning of <Phase No.>  
Deployment of the hardware in appropriate quantity and as per the specified technical specifications at the appropriate locations to support functioning of <Phase No.> |                                   |
3. **Procurement, deployment and commissioning of the necessary Networking equipment and Connectivity**

   - Deployment of the necessary networking equipment and connectivity as per the requirements to support functioning of <Phase No.>

4. **Data Entry and digitization of the records available in the paper files and migration of the data available in the existing databases**

   - Digitized and verified data for <Phase No.> modules

5. **Training to the staff members and stakeholders of the Corporation and necessary Change Management**

   - Satisfactory training sessions to the staff members of the <Name of the Purchaser> for the <Phase No.> modules

6. **Operations and maintenance (inclusive of Service Levels)**

   - Operations and maintenance support for <Phase No.> modules

   - To be started from successful implementation of <Phase No.> modules till end of project
Operations and maintenance support for <Phase No.> modules for a period of <Years/Months> from successful implementation of <Phase No.>

Details on each of the above mentioned Tracks of Scope of Work should be provided in the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief Background</th>
<th>&lt;Brief Description of the Track&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work and Activities to Perform</td>
<td>&lt;Detailed Scope of Work for the Track&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables and Estimated Timelines</td>
<td>&lt;List of Deliverables and associated timelines for each&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Levels (if applicable)</td>
<td>&lt;Service level requirement for each solution/Track delivered&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information provisioning Standards in Scope of Work**

The RFP should provide information with requisite details which can help in the bidders estimating the right effort & solution. This template needs to be provided to ensure that:

1. **Appropriate (beyond intuitive) level of details provided**
2. **Performance requirements are detailed rather than technical specifications**
3. **Clarity in In-scope/ Out-scope definition**
4. **Scalability requirement (beyond a statement of intent)**
5. **Interoperable requirement (beyond a statement of intent)**
6. **Open Standards**

This needs to be provided with respect to each component of the RFP. Based on experiences from EGovernance projects, it is learnt that the following types of Scope of Work meet the requirements for most of the RFPs. The exact nature of work would be specific for each project; however, the effort here is to set standards for providing information in the RFP, so that the bidders are able to design the solution most apt for the situation. The Guidance Notes provide e-Governance RFP information provisioning standards for the following:

1. Application Requirements (Functional and Non Functional)
2. Hardware
3. Networking
4. Capacity Building & Training
5. Site Preparation
6. Data Digitization
7. State Data Centre (if applicable)
8. Operations & maintenance support for the above activities.
2.8.4 Template for Software application (needs to be customized as per project requirements)

The selected Systems Implementation Partner / System Integrator should be responsible for the following:

i. Develop / customize and Implement the Software Solution (keeping the bespoke development to the minimum) as per the requirements of the <Purchaser>. The bidder will ensure that the Best Practices for Software Development as well as Localization are used during the software development / customization and implementation phase. The Development & Support Model, like Onshore/Offshore will be decided in consultation with the Purchaser. Further, the Purchaser will inform about the facilities provided to SI in both the model (Desktop, Laptop, Internet connection, phone Lines, VPN client connections, bandwidth etc.). In case, if Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) results in value addition like process simplification or cost saving, then the details of BPR will be decided by mutual consultation.

ii. The bidder will be solely responsible for arranging any software tools required during the development of the software application at his own cost and <Purchaser>, in no case will be responsible for arranging any such software / tools. If any existing software/hardware needs to be used for new solution then complete details will be provided by Purchaser, such as:
   a) Layer: App/DB etc.
   b) Environment: Prod/DR etc.
   c) Service Description: DB/Web Server/BI etc.
   d) Server Make/Model
   e) O.S & Version
   f) Cores
   g) No. of nodes
   h) RAM per Core

Software Details like:
   (i) Software
   (ii) Environment
   (iii) Unit of Measurement
   (iv) Number of Licenses
   (v) Version
   (vi) License Expiry Date

Data backup policy with relevant information, such as:

   a) Type of Data: DB/Messaging/EMS etc.
b) Frequency, schedule and kind of Backup such as
   • Daily Backup : Incremental
   • Weekly Backup : Full
   • Monthly Backup: Full
   • Yearly Backup : Full

c) Retention duration for different kinds of Data like: Monthly/Quarterly/Daily etc.

d) Backup Format and File types

iii. Supplying and implementing the database and related software, integration tools and
describing the process to be followed for installing the same. The RDBMS proposed should
be from one of the top 5 as per the latest IDC / Gartner report.

iv. The selected Systems Implementation Partner will ensure the validation of the Software
solution deployed from the OEM of the solution to ensure that the best possible solution
/ specifications / methodology has been used for implementation of the given Solution.
This validation should cover (but not limited to) Hardware sizing, Certification of
Installations, System Integration, Solution quality and Certification of System Performance
(to maintain SLA) before go live.

v. Integration of all the application modules for seamless sharing of data across divisions
with adoption of UNICODE 6.0 standard onwards. Purchaser will inform about all
interfaces to the existing applications, Interaction mechanism and protocol, type of data
exchanged, frequency of data exchange, size of data to exchange etc.

vi. MIS Reports: The Systems Implementation Partner would be required to provide /  
facilitate centralized MIS reports to meet the reporting requirements. The Systems
Implementation Partner will also ensure anytime-anywhere availability of these MIS
reports. Various MIS reports, but not limited to, required for the project have been
detailed as a part of FRS in the RFP document. For MIS reporting system the Systems
Implementation Partner will ensure that:
   a. The MIS system should be able to export the report data to industry standard
      read only formats, word processing, spreadsheet etc.,
   b. The MIS reports should be dynamic in nature and should provide the user the
      freedom to select the data fields as per his / her requirements,
   c. The books of accounts and other statutory reports should be available for audit
      by the <CAG or Purchaser > or its agencies,
   d. The selected Systems Implementation Partner will map the default reports of
      the selected Software Solution with the actual requirements of the project and
      will develop the additional reports which are not available as part of Software
      solution,
e. The Systems Implementation Partner will also develop any other MIS reports required by <Purchaser> or its stakeholders from time-to-time.

vii. Develop and implement a suitable Payment Gateway to meet the requirement of online financial transactions. It will be the sole responsibility of the Systems Implementation Partner to tie up with banks / payment aggregator for arranging the payment gateway at his own cost.

viii. Develop and implement the Enterprise Portal for the <Purchaser> as per the Best practices for Portal development meeting the requirements of <Purchaser> (as specified in the FRS),

ix. Carry out the intermediate and final testing of the configured solution and obtaining sign-offs from <Stakeholders>,

x. Coordinate and provide necessary support for acceptance testing and systems audit (functionality, process, performance & security controls) to be performed by a third party to be nominated by <Purchaser>.

xi. Implement necessary access security and data validation controls during the development of the software application,

xii. Preparation of necessary User and Trouble Shooting manuals for the Solution.

The Functional and Technical Architecture of the proposed solution has been detailed <Reference>. While the proposed architecture has been provided in the RFP, the selected Systems Implementation Partner will have to validate / re-design the architecture as per the needs to the solution. The list of software modules which Systems Implementation Partner will implement as a part of the project shall be as follows:

- Modules to be developed in Phase X:

  ........
  ........

- Modules to be developed in Phase Y:

  ........
  ........

Please Note:

- The detailed functional requirement specifications along with MIS requirements for all the above mentioned modules have been detailed out
- The name of the modules should be read along with the Functional Requirements specified in the documents. The Functional Requirements defined in this RFP are as per the requirements of <Purchaser>, which may or may not meet the exact functionalities of the proposed Software solution provided by the Bidder. Hence, the bidders are suggested to study the requirements and do a due diligence while
proposing their solution and accordingly map the requirements with the proposed Software products.

- *Systems Implementation Partner should ensure that the system supports the <Languages >, data input and output.*

The module wise users for the above mentioned list of modules is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Name of the module</th>
<th>Users (for design purposes) (Nos.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.8.4.1 Standard Template for Functional Requirements

For a solution being proposed by the bidder, the following information should be sought and detailed as part of the Functional Requirements Specifications (FRS)

1. At an overall level, each Module, key sub-modules (or any process) need to be detailed out as follows:

   **Purpose:**

   **KRA of Process:**
   - ......

   **KRA of Sub-Process:**
   - ......
   - ......
   - ......

2. The “Swim Lane” or the Cross-Functional Flow Chart diagram for each sub-process has to be provided with the following information superimposed on the diagram.
3. The sub-process needs to be detailed out by providing information in the following format provided purely as Illustration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process steps</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Referenced Documents</th>
<th>System Interfaced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. System generates automatic alerts and reminders against agreement renewal, 30 days before agreement expiry date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Citizen submits renewal fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In case agreement is not renewed by the Tehsildar as per the norms, system automatically starts the process of Application Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the above, the Application may be defined as modules and sub-module. Each submodule identified should be detailed to provide expected functionalities with expectations on its integration with other module or sub-module – internal or external to the system. For illustration, the table is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Functionality</th>
<th>Priority (Essential / Desirable / Nice to have)</th>
<th>Integration Requirements</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>System should generate alerts / reminders based on the Payment terms with the customer</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>System should generate codes for new jobs / projects received by &lt;department&gt;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project / Job codes be generated in user defined formats</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project / Job Codes to be changed in future by adding suffixes and Pre-fixes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job / project code be treated as a cost centre</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>System to allow more than one cost centres mapped to job / Project code</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>System to maintain a list of job / project codes in &lt;department&gt;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Functionality</td>
<td>Priority (Essential / Desirable / Nice to have)</td>
<td>Integration Requirements</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>System to store all transactions related to a job against the Job code</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>System to maintain work completion certificate for a project</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>System to maintain time sheets / records for the project</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>System to generate Invoices for a project based on automatic capture of data</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>System to generate Invoice Verification Certificate</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>System to allow user defined formats for the invoices</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>System also to allow users of PMM to generate invoices</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>System to allow users of PMM to capture the approval of these invoices</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>System to allow project level approvals for service and manpower obtained from vendors / sub-contractors</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>System to allow users of FMS to verify invoices</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>System to generate reminders and alerts for invoiced and due from customers</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>System to generate receipt for cash / cheque payments</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wherever required in the above template, it should go into the field level. Simply for illustration purpose, a table is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Functionality (ILLUSTRATIVE)</th>
<th>Priority (Essential / Desirable / Nice to have)</th>
<th>Integration Requirements</th>
<th>Available in proposed ERP / COTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td>System to allow for the following fields in the transaction record:</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Name of the module with which this has to integrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- vendor code</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- vendor reference invoice number</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- transaction reference for internal use</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- invoice type</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- terms</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- invoice date</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- invoice receipt date</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- posting date</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- due date</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- period</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Functionality (ILLUSTRATIVE)</th>
<th>Priority (Essential / Desirable / Nice to have)</th>
<th>Integration Requirements</th>
<th>Available in proposed ERP / COTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- gross amount</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- discount</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- penalty deducted for late delivery</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- other deductions</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- net amount</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- quantity</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- unit price</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- transaction currency</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- currency rates</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- payment method e.g. cheque, Internet transfer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- bank details</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- narrative</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- GL code</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>