



Response to Observations of Dept of Information Technology, Govt of HP Shimla

S No	Section	Page #	Observations	Remarks
1.	4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 4.9	18-22	There will be challenge in coordination and integration of different components of solutions as different bidders may submit bid for different components of project, hence it is suggested to allow consortium where there should be one Prime bidder, who will have whole responsibility of project and rest may be consortium partner, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities of each.	The intent is already covered in these sections. However, section 3.3 of the RFP stands amended to reflect the same in more clarity. Moreover, the system integration and coordination services have been asked separately in schedule G and the newly inserted schedule H of the RFP.
2.	4.13 4.14	24-25	During the bid evaluation it will be challenging to justify the technically how marks has been given to different bidders, hence it is suggested to clearly define the criteria or conditions how marks shall be given to bidders or evaluated, it is suggested to divide the marks on different groups/category such as "Organizational Capability", "Relevant Past Experience ", "Experience of Generic Web Application Development and Implementation", "Experience of specific Web Application Development and Implementation as requested in RFP", "Experience of setting up Data Centre", "Experience of setting of network", "Proposed Solution and presentation", "Adequacy and Quality of Resources proposed for Deployment", "Work Plan approach and proposed methodology" etc.	No change is warranted. The evaluation criteria are very objective in nature.  In case of hardware, apart from meeting the pre-qualification conditions and conforming to the desired technical specifications, lowest commercial offer is taken as the only criteria for arriving at L1 bidder. There is no subjectivity whatsoever in this.  In case of software, some technical score has been associated with how closely the offered software meets the functional requirements. It is fairly established that no software is expected to meet all the requirements in totality. Thus this scoring has been proposed. The bid is going to be evaluated on QCBS. It becomes all the more subjective in case scores are attached to the points stated in the observations. The scoring proposed is absolutely devoid of any subjectivity as apprehended.
3.	4.17 4.18 4.19	25-26	Payment has not been linked with overall project milestones, hence it is suggested first define logically overall project milestones with high level tasks which needs to be completed then link the payments with milestones of the project.	No change is warranted.  The payments schedule is scattered throughout the execution of the project and is linked to tangible and



				realistic milestones in these sections.
4.	4.20	26	In Time Schedule it is mentioned that the project must be completed within duration of 18 months, it is suggested 18 months must be broken into different project milestones with high level tasks which needs to be completed by bidder with clearly defined deliverables and acceptance criteria of these deliverables.	Document is suitably amended and a Gantt Chart of all the high level tasks to be performed by various bidders has been added and the section is made more detailed and clear.
5.	5.1.5	30	Makes of some OEM has been mentioned to complete the project. This will lead to limit the choice of bidder which will lead to increase the tender price, therefore it is suggested do not mentioned the OEMs / makes but only mention the functional and technical requirements of the equipment or product.	<p>The makes mentioned in the RFP are fairly exhaustive. They have been kept to indicate a level of quality and workmanship.</p> <p>The section 5.1.4 makes it explicit that other brands / makes are also eligible to participate in the bid. This section has been made more elaborate in the revised RFP.</p> <p>It is expected that this provision in the RFP will not artificially escalate the overall cost of the project. On the other hand absence of this provision may lead to substandard goods and services getting procured.</p> <p>Moreover, a pre bid conference has already been concluded and no reasonable objections were received.</p>
6.	6.8 6.9 6.10 6.11 6.12 6.13 6.14 6.15	206- 215	a. Quoted price must be in Indian rupees, presently it is left for bidder to mention the currency	Document is suitably amended in section 3.10 page 17 and section 6.8.1 page 206.
			b. Gross bid should be broken in two parts namely CAPEX and OPEX	Document is suitably amended in section 6.8.1 page 206.
			c. For Schedule G 3 years cost only asked in lump sum, it is suggested to break this also in CAPEX and OPEX	Document is suitably amended in section 6.8.1 page 206.
			d. It is suggested to ask details of cost break-up of each schedule i.e. Schedule A,B.. as this details may be used in project to procure further items.	The intent is already covered in sections 6.9 – 6.15 and a newly inserted section 6.16.



			<p>e. It is suggested to discover following costs also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Data Migration and digitization cost details</li> <li>ii. Training and Capacity Building cost details</li> <li>iii. Cost details of IT Infrastructure and system software</li> </ul>	<p>There is no legacy data in RPGMC. Training costs have been already taken care of. IT infrastructure and system software are part of hardware schedules. The cost details have been already asked for.</p>
7.	General	NA	<p>a. Service Levels and penalties for following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Project implementation and development</li> <li>ii. Project support maintenance</li> <li>iii. Application performance related SLAs</li> </ul>	<p>The penalties and high level SLAs have already been defined in the respective sections and components of the RFP. The detailed SLAs and AMCs will be given to the selected bidder only.</p>
			<p>b. User Acceptance Testing Criteria</p>	<p>Standard UAT criteria are to be followed. The detailed UAT criteria will be given to the selected bidder only.</p>
			<p>c. Deliverables by bidder such as Project Plan, Functional Requirement Specifications, Design documents (High Level Design (HLD), Low Level) Design (LLD)), User Manuals, Test Plan, Test Cases etc.</p>	<p>The desirable deliverables by the bidder are already specified in the respective sections and components of the RFP.</p>
			<p>d. STQC Certification</p>	<p>This will not be needed as all the software products, whether COTS or custom developed are asked from very reputed bidders only as they are already filtered by the eligibility criteria.</p>
			<p>e. Scope of Support Maintenance Activities</p>	<p>The scope of support and maintenance activities is already specified in the respective sections and components of the RFP.</p>
			<p>f. Data Digitization details and master data entry</p>	<p>No legacy data is available in RPGMC hence there is nothing to be digitized. Master data entry is already covered in the respective sections and components of the RFP.</p>
			<p>g. Capacity building details i.e. type of trainings and number of trainings</p>	<p>The broad scope of trainings is already specified in the respective sections and components of the RFP. The detailed training curricula and schedule will be given to</p>



				the selected bidder only.
			h. Number of Human resources to be deployed by bidder during development and support period	The number and nature of human resource to be deployed during development as well as support period is already specified in the respective sections and components of the RFP.
			i. Help desk support activities	The help desk activity is already specified in schedule G and H of the RFP.
			j. DR (Disaster recovery) solution details and SLAs	No DR site is planned at this stage. It will entail extra expenditure. For now the SDC in Shimla or the Data Centre in NIT Hamirpur may be used.
			k. Exit Management details	The RFP stands amended and suitable exit clause has been inserted.
			l. Proposed Solution details, Team Composition details	Solution details have been already specified in the RFP and the Team Composition is irrelevant in this situation. Experts from NIT Hamirpur shall be available for all such needs.
			m. Details about use of source Code and Intellectual Property Rights	Such details about use of source Code and Intellectual Property Rights are already covered in the RFP.
			n. Details of existing IT applications and integration with same of proposed solution such as Payment & SMS Gateway,	There are no legacy / existing IT applications in RPGMC.
			o. Information Security Management details and SLAs	Details about the security devices has been covered in the schedule B of the RFP and detailed policies will be given to the selected bidder only.