MITL reply to Pr-Bid queries recived for the tender No.: . MITL/ICT/2026-27/001 , dt-28th Aug 2024				
Name of work: - “RFP for Selection of Service Provider (Cloud Hosting and Managed Service) to Setup, Migrate, and Manage Data Centre (DC) and Disaster Recovery (DR) Site for MITL on Cloud"				
Sr.No.	**RFP Reference (Section / Page)**	**Provision as per RFP**	**Query / Clarification Sought**	**MITL Reply**
1	Section 2.1, Eligibility Criteria (Item #2d) & Section 3.1.2, pg-13 and 21	"The CSP should be the single point of contact for the entire migration... and providing Cloud services for the entire contract period."	Request for Clarification / Amendment: Kindly clarify whether MeitY-empaneled global hyperscaler cloud providers offering Government Virtual Private Cloud (GPC/VPC) with logical isolation, dedicated security boundaries (VPC Service Controls), customer-managed encryption (CMEK), and isolated tenant environments are eligible to participate alongside physically segregated GCC setups.	The bidder has to be the SPOC for the entire scope, in consideration that the bidder is a Meity-empanelled GCC Provider
2	Section 2.1 Eligibility Criteria (Item #2e), pg-13	The CSP should be the single point of contact for the entire migration... and providing Cloud services for the entire contract period	Request for Amendment: We request MITL to amend this clause to state that either the Managed Service Provider (MSP) OR the Cloud Service Provider (CSP) can act as the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for project execution, migration, and operational support.	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
3	Sec 2.1, PQ Criteria #2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 (Pg 13-15)	All eligibility criteria under Section 2.1 are addressed to "the CSP" (MeitY empanelment, STQC-audited Data Centre, Tier-III certification, ISO/PCI certifications, multiple GCC data centres, turnover, net worth, GCC project capability).	Kindly confirm that a bidder may participate as a Managed Service Provider (MSP) proposing a MeitY-empanelled Cloud Service Provider (CSP), and that the CSP-designated criteria shall stand satisfied on the strength of the proposed CSP's documents together with a CSP authorization letter issued in favour of the bidder. If a specific format of authorization is required, kindly provide the same by way of corrigendum.	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
4	Sec 2.2, TQ Criterion 1 (Pg 16) read with Sec 2.1, PQ #4 (Pg 13)	TQ Criterion 1: "The Bidder should have minimum average annual turnover of at least 150 Crore in last three audited financial years"; PQ #4: "A CSP should have a minimum average annual turnover of at least 150 Crore".	The two clauses reference different entities (Bidder vs. CSP). Kindly harmonize the clauses and confirm that the turnover of the Bidder OR its proposed CSP shall be considered for both PQ #4 and TQ Criterion 1. Alternatively, kindly prescribe a proportionate bidder-level turnover requirement for MSP bidders, in line with Government of India procurement guidelines encouraging wider participation, with the balance requirement covered through the proposed CSP.	CSP and Bidder are the same entity.
5	Sec 12, GCC - Obligations of the MSP (Subcontracting); Form T2 (Pg 115)	"The MSP shall not subcontract (unless otherwise specified in the SCC) any part of the Services required of MSP under this Contract." The RFP contains no provision for consortium/JV bidding.	(a) Kindly confirm that the proposed CSP providing cloud infrastructure under the MSP's proposal constitutes a permitted bidding structure and shall not be treated as subcontracting for the purposes of this clause. (b) Alternatively, kindly permit consortium/JV bids (maximum two members: MSP + CSP) with joint and several liability, and clarify whether PQ/TQ credentials would in that case be evaluated on a combined basis.	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
6	Sec 2.1, PQ #10 (Pg 14); Sec 2.2, TQ - Cloud Project Experience (Pg 17)	The CSP should have successfully implemented/commissioned at least five (05) projects of DC/DR with Cloud Deployment on Government Community Cloud (GCC) with order value of at least 5 Cr. each.	Kindly confirm that work orders executed by the proposed CSP (whether directly or through its authorized partners) shall be accepted as compliant evidence, since GCC hosting contracts are invariably held by the empanelled CSP. Kindly also confirm that a single contract covering both DC and DR shall be counted as one qualifying project.	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
7	Sec 2.2, TQ - ERP Project Experience (Pg 17)	The Bidder must have successfully completed or be currently providing hosting and managed services for a minimum one COTS ERP system i.e. SAP based or Oracle based system on the proposed Cloud Platform with contract value of not less than INR 3 Crore for any Govt. organization/PSU in India in last five years.	(a) Kindly confirm that references of the proposed CSP are acceptable for this criterion. (b) Kindly consider broadening the criterion to any COTS ERP (e.g., Microsoft Dynamics, Ramco, TCS iON) hosted for a Govt./PSU client. (c) Kindly confirm that "on the proposed Cloud Platform" means on the CSP's GCC platform generally, and not workloads identical to MITL's.	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
8	Sec 5 - APM (Pg 34-35); Sec 6 - DAM (Pg 35-36)	APM/DAM functional requirements include: "proprietary instrumentation agents", deployment in "fully air-gapped environments without dependency on external cloud services", "native connectors and integrations for Indian banking core systems", "Privileged User Behaviour Analytics (PUBA)", and "unified licensing model without host-based, node-based, or per-server licensing restrictions".	These specifications appear aligned to a specific OEM's datasheet and may restrict competition. Kindly amend them to generic, outcome-based requirements (e.g., full-stack APM with distributed tracing and RUM; DAM with real-time blocking and SIEM integration) and confirm that any industry-standard OEM meeting the functional outcomes is acceptable. Kindly also clarify the relevance of Indian banking-core-system connectors to MITL's municipal/industrial-township workloads.	The compliance has been selected as per the industry standards, considering the best performance the department wants. All the application to be hosted are integrated with banking systems/Payment gateways.
9	Sec 9.2.2 (Pg 43) read with Sec 14 - Penalty Terms (Pg 104)	Sec 9.2.2 prescribes application-wise RTO of 30-60 minutes and RPO of 20-45 minutes. The Penalty table in Sec 14 prescribes "RTO - 10 mins" and "RPO - 5 mins" as penalty thresholds.	The two tables conflict. Kindly confirm that the application-wise RTO/RPO values in Sec 9.2.2 shall prevail for SLA and penalty purposes, and that RTO/RPO SLAs and DR-drill obligations shall apply only if and when MITL opts for DRC/Secondary DC as a Service (per Sec 9.5 and FR 1.17-1.27).	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
10	Sec 2.7 - Performance Bank Guarantee (Pg 20)	PBG of 10% of Contract Value to be drawn for 5 years with additional claim period of 1 year.	The contract period is 26 months. Kindly align the PBG validity to the contract period plus six months (approximately 32 months), with the claim period thereafter, so that bidders are not required to price approximately three years of unnecessary bank-guarantee charges into their quotes.	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
11	Sec 14 - Penalty Terms (Pg 102-106); Sec 13.4.1 (Pg 98)	Penalties escalate "till event of default and termination"; security incident penalty of INR 10 Lakhs per incident is excluded from the overall SLA penalty cap; CSP's published SLAs and penalties are additionally applicable on the MSP.	Kindly (a) specify an overall quarterly penalty cap (e.g., 10% of Quarterly Payment, consistent with the 30% termination trigger in the Special Conditions), (b) cap security-incident penalties per quarter and confirm they apply only where the incident is attributable to MSP-managed infrastructure and not to applications managed by the MSI/SI, and (c) confirm that CSP published SLA credits and RFP penalties shall not be doubly levied for the same event.	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
12	Sec 15 - Payment Terms (Pg 107); Sec 16.1 - BoQ Notes (Pg 110)	Recurring charges billed quarterly in arrears on pay-as-per-use; "Client may ask for additional cloud resources based on Client's requirements without any minimum bill or charges"; quantities freely variable at quoted unit rates.	(a) Kindly confirm that billing shall be on resources provisioned (and not merely consumed/powered-on). (b) Since bidders must hold committed capacity and procure perpetual licenses (APM - 50 units, DAM - 15 units), kindly confirm a minimum committed consumption (e.g., 80% of the BoQ) or clarify how one-time perpetual-license costs are protected if quantities are scaled down. (c) Kindly confirm that One Time Costs are payable upon operational acceptance (D+60) without linkage to subsequent O&M milestones.	The quantities mentioned in the BoQ are tentative and indicative only. Bidders shall quote their rates against each BoQ item. Payment shall be made based on the actual quantities utilized/executed.

MITL reply to Pr-Bid queries recived for the tender No.: . MITL/ICT/2026-27/001 , dt-28th Aug 2024				
Name of work: - "RFP for Selection of Service Provider (Cloud Hosting and Managed Service) to Setup, Migrate, and Manage Data Centre (DC) and Disaster Recovery (DR) Site for MITL on Cloud"				
Sr.No.	**RFP Reference (Section / Page)**	**Provision as per RFP**	**Query / Clarification Sought**	**MITL Reply**
13	Sec 10.3 - Roles of MSI and SI (Pg 48); Sec 13.4.2 (Pg 98)	MSI/e-LMS SI are responsible for application architecture, licenses, database, application-level performance and uptime; MSP is responsible for infrastructure availability only. Downtime attributable to MITL/its SIs is excluded, but the MSP must prove attribution.	Kindly confirm (a) that infrastructure-SLA penalties shall not be levied for outages attributable to applications/MSI/SI, with a joint RCA mechanism for attribution rather than a unilateral burden of proof on the MSP, and (b) that the incumbent MSI/e-LMS SI are contractually obligated to support migration within the D+30/D+45 window, with proportionate schedule relief to the MSP where their dependencies (application binaries, DB dumps, licenses) are delayed.	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
14	Sec 11 - Implementation Schedule (Pg 49); Sec 9.2 (Pg 41-43)	Migration of all applications by D+45 and Stabilization/Operational Acceptance by D+60.	Since migration depends on data export from the incumbent environment and MSI/SI coordination, kindly confirm (a) that MITL will facilitate the incumbent's cooperation and data egress at no cost to the new MSP, and (b) that the schedule shall be proportionately extended, without penalty/LD, for dependencies beyond the MSP's control. Kindly also share the current environment details (existing CSP name, VM/storage inventory, database versions, data volumes, public IPs/DNS) by corrigendum or at the pre-bid meeting, as sizing and migration effort cannot be validated without them.	Regarding this corrigendum will be published and consider the indicative BOQ for migration activity
15	Sec 1.5 - EMD (Pg 12); Tender Notice (Pg 6)	EMD of INR 10,00,000 in the form of Bank Guarantee; non-refundable tender fee of INR 35,400.	Kindly confirm whether MSME/Startup (Udyam-registered) bidders are exempt from EMD and/or tender fee in line with Government of India and Government of Maharashtra procurement policies, and if so, the acceptable proof of exemption (Udyam Registration Certificate).	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
16	Sec 2.1, PQ #7 (Pg 14)	The Data Centre & DR site should be at least Tier III standard; "Primary Site should be in Maharashtra (preferably in Mumbai/Navi Mumbai region)".	Kindly confirm that location of the Primary Site within Maharashtra is the mandatory requirement and that Mumbai/Navi Mumbai is a preference only, carrying no evaluation or eligibility weightage; and that the DR site may be located in any other seismic zone within India.	Primary Site in Maharashtra (in the Mumbai/Navi Mumbai region) is preferred only. Primary site should be MeitY-empaneled GCC provider within India.
17	Sec 8 - Email as a Service (Pg 38-39); BoQ (Pg 109)	Enterprise email for user IDs specified in the BoM (80 IDs, 50 GB per mailbox); migration of existing mailboxes and data from the incumbent email environment at no additional cost.	Kindly share the current email platform, active mailbox count and total mailbox data volume to enable sizing of the migration effort; and confirm whether a MeitY-empanelled SaaS email offering hosted within India on the GCC meets this requirement.	Current plan is on Microsoft Exchange 2 but need to be migrated to an Indian Service provider where the data should reside in India only, and compliances for the same will be published in the corrigendum
18	Sec 2.2, TQ Criterion 2 (Pg 16) read with Sec 2.1, PQ #11 (Pg 14-15)	PQ #11 requires 200 IT professionals on payroll, of which at least 50 must be cloud professionals. TQ-2 allocates marks as "50 to 100 - 1 Mark; 100 to 150 - 3 Marks; >150 - 5 Marks".	Kindly clarify whether the TQ-2 marking scale refers to the count of cloud solution professionals or to total IT professionals, and kindly confirm the format of the HR/Director-certified manpower certificate.	RFP conditions remain unchanged. Manpower certificate as per the bidder standard format
19	Sec 4.2 - Administration, Configuration & Training (Pg 31)	"CSP shall arrange training for 5 nos. department personnel on proposed cloud platform from OEM with certification."	Kindly confirm that the training pertains to the proposed CSP's cloud platform (with CSP/OEM-issued certification acceptable), and kindly specify the expected duration and mode (online/classroom) so that the same may be priced uniformly by all bidders.	Training should be on the proposed CSP Cloud platform, Training Duration and mode will be shared with the successful bidder
20	Sec 13.3 - Service Levels Monitoring (Pg 97)	If at any time the accuracy and reliability of SLA measurement tools is found to be compromised, the Client reserves the right to invoke up to double the penalty of the respective quarterly phase.	Kindly confirm that this provision applies only to established manipulation of the SLA measurement tools and not to bona fide tool malfunctions or errors, and that the MSP shall be afforded an opportunity of representation and cure before any doubling of penalty is invoked.	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
21	Section 9.2, Page 43 — RTO/RPO Requirements Table (all application rows: Utility Billing Software/ERP, e-Land Management System, E-Governance functionalities, Portal, Website, Electricity Procurement Application, Mobile Apps, Any other application)	e-Land Management System and Website: RTO <=30 Mins, RPO <=20 Mins. Utility Billing Software/ERP, E-Governance functionalities, Portal, Electricity Procurement Application, Mobile Apps and Any other application: RTO <=60 Mins, RPO <=45 Mins.	We respectfully submit that the RTO and RPO values specified in this table are more stringent than the Recovery Time and Recovery Point Objectives prescribed under the MeitY Cloud Service Provider (CSP) empanelment framework, against which all empanelled Government Community Cloud providers are already audited and certified. We kindly request the Authority to align these values with the MeitY empanelment baseline. We request that the RTO and RPO for all applications be amended to read as: "RTO <= 4 Hours and RPO <= 2 Hours (in line with the MeitY CSP empanelment SLA)."	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
22	Section 14, Page 102 — Penalty Terms for Quality of Services; Service Level Objective: "Availability/Uptime of cloud services and Resources for CSP's Infrastructure" (Penalty Clause column)	"<99.95% & >=99.5% — 2.5% of Quarterly Payment; <99.5% & >=99% — 5% of Quarterly Payment; Subsequently, every 0.5% drop in SLA criteria — Additional 2.5% of Quarterly Payment till event of default and termination."	We respectfully submit that the escalating penalty, without a defined ceiling, has a significant financial implication. We kindly request the Authority to amend the Penalty Clause for this parameter to read as: "<99.95% & >=99.5% — 1% of Quarterly Payment; <99.5% & >=99% — 2% of Quarterly Payment; <99% — 5% of Quarterly Payment, subject to a maximum of 5% of the Quarterly Payment for this parameter."	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
23	Section 14, Page 102 — Penalty Terms; Service Level Objective: "Data Security, Data Privacy Incident… Reporting – Percentage of timely incident report" (Penalty Clause column)	"<95% and >=90% within 1 hour — 5% of Quarterly Payment; <90% and >=85% within 1 hour — 10% of Quarterly Payment; Subsequently, every 5% drop in SLA criteria — Additional 5% of Quarterly Payment till event of default and termination."	We respectfully submit that the escalating penalty, without a defined ceiling, has a significant financial implication. We kindly request the Authority to amend the Penalty Clause for this parameter to read as: "<95% and >=90% within 1 hour — 1% of Quarterly Payment; <90% and >=85% within 1 hour — 2% of Quarterly Payment; <85% — 5% of Quarterly Payment, subject to a maximum of 5% of the Quarterly Payment for this parameter."	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
24	Section 14, Page 102 — Penalty Terms; Service Level Objective: "Data Security, Data Privacy Incident… Reporting – Percentage of timely incident resolutions" (Penalty Clause column)	"<95% and >=90% within 1 hour — 5% of Quarterly Payment; <90% and >=85% within 1 hour — 10% of Quarterly Payment; Subsequently, every 5% drop in SLA criteria — Additional 5% of Quarterly Payment till event of default and termination."	We respectfully submit that the escalating penalty, without a defined ceiling, has a significant financial implication. We kindly request the Authority to amend the Penalty Clause for this parameter to read as: "<95% and >=90% within 1 hour — 1% of Quarterly Payment; <90% and >=85% within 1 hour — 2% of Quarterly Payment; <85% — 5% of Quarterly Payment, subject to a maximum of 5% of the Quarterly Payment for this parameter."	Regarding this corrigendum will be published

MITL reply to Pr-Bid queries recived for the tender No.: . MITL/ICT/2026-27/001 , dt-28th Aug 2024				
Name of work: - “RFP for Selection of Service Provider (Cloud Hosting and Managed Service) to Setup, Migrate, and Manage Data Centre (DC) and Disaster Recovery (DR) Site for MITL on Cloud"				
Sr.No.	**RFP Reference (Section / Page)**	**Provision as per RFP**	**Query / Clarification Sought**	**MITL Reply**
25	Section 14, Page 103 — Penalty Terms; Service Level Objective: “Percentage of timely vulnerability corrections” (Penalty Clause column)	“<99.95% and >=99% — 10% of Quarterly Payment; <99% and >=98% — 15% of Quarterly Payment; Subsequently, every 1% drop in SLA criteria — Additional 5% of Quarterly Payment till event of default and termination.”	We respectfully submit that the penalty commences at 10% and escalates without a defined ceiling, which has a significant financial implication. We kindly request the Authority to amend the Penalty Clause for this parameter to read as: “<99.95% and >=99% — 1% of Quarterly Payment; <99% and >=98% — 2% of Quarterly Payment; <98% — 5% of Quarterly Payment, subject to a maximum of 5% of the Quarterly Payment for this parameter.”	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
26	Section 14, Page 103 — Penalty Terms; Service Level Objective: “Percentage of timely vulnerability reports” (Penalty Clause column)	“<99.95% and >=99% — 10% of Quarterly Payment; <99% and >=98% — 15% of Quarterly Payment; Subsequently, every 1% drop in SLA criteria — Additional 5% of Quarterly Payment till event of default and termination.”	We respectfully submit that the penalty commences at 10% and escalates without a defined ceiling, which has a significant financial implication. We kindly request the Authority to amend the Penalty Clause for this parameter to read as: “<99.95% and >=99% — 1% of Quarterly Payment; <99% and >=98% — 2% of Quarterly Payment; <98% — 5% of Quarterly Payment, subject to a maximum of 5% of the Quarterly Payment for this parameter.”	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
27	Section 14, Page 103 — Penalty Terms; Service Level Objective: “Security and Privacy breach including Data Theft / Loss / Corruption / Mining” (Penalty Clause column)	“Any security incident detected INR 10 Lakhs. This penalty is applicable per incident. These penalties will not be part of overall SLA penalties cap.”	We respectfully submit that a flat penalty of INR 10 Lakh per incident, kept outside the overall SLA penalty cap, has a severe financial implication, and the term “security incident” is not defined. We kindly request the Authority to amend this Penalty Clause to read as: “For each security incident directly attributable to the CSP’s scope of services — 1% of Quarterly Payment; for a High Severity incident — 2% of Quarterly Payment; for a serious breach involving confirmed data theft, corruption or privacy breach — 5% of Quarterly Payment, subject to a maximum of 5% of the Quarterly Payment for this parameter, and the Authority may invoke its termination remedies for a serious breach.”	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
28	Section 14, Page 103 — Penalty Terms; Service Level Objective: “Meeting Recovery Time Objective (RTO)” (Penalty Clause column)	“RTO - 10 mins — 5% of Quarterly Payment shall be deducted; For every increase of 10 mins in RTO — Additional 5% of Quarterly Payment till event of default and termination.”	We respectfully request that, consequent to alignment of the RTO with the MeitY CSP empanelment baseline, this penalty be recomputed against the corrected RTO and measured only during a declared DR drill or an actually invoked failover, excluding force-majeure and delays attributable to the Department or its application vendor. We kindly request the Penalty Clause be amended to read as: “Up to the first 30 minutes beyond the agreed RTO — 1% of Quarterly Payment; beyond 30 minutes and up to 60 minutes — 2% of Quarterly Payment; beyond 60 minutes — 5% of Quarterly Payment, subject to a maximum of 5% of the Quarterly Payment for this parameter.”	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
29	Section 14, Page 103 — Penalty Terms; Service Level Objective: “Meeting Recovery Point Objective (RPO)” (Penalty Clause column)	“RPO – 5 mins — 5% of Quarterly Payment shall be deducted; For every increase of 10 mins in RPO — Additional 5% of Quarterly Payment till event of default and termination.”	We respectfully request that, consequent to alignment of the RPO with the MeitY CSP empanelment baseline, this penalty be recomputed against the corrected RPO and measured only during a declared DR drill or an actually invoked failover, excluding force-majeure and delays attributable to the Department or its application vendor. We kindly request the Penalty Clause be amended to read as: “Up to the first 30 minutes beyond the agreed RPO — 1% of Quarterly Payment; beyond 30 minutes and up to 60 minutes — 2% of Quarterly Payment; beyond 60 minutes — 5% of Quarterly Payment, subject to a maximum of 5% of the Quarterly Payment for this parameter.”	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
30	Section 14, Page 104 — Penalty Terms; Service Level Objective: “Availability of the network links at DC and DR/Secondary DC” (Penalty Clause column)	“Availability for each of the network links: >=99.5% — No Penalty; <99.5 and =>99% — 10% of quarterly payment; <99 and =>98.5% — 20% of quarterly payment; <98.5% — 30% of quarterly payment.”	We respectfully submit that a penalty reaching 30% of the Quarterly Payment has a significant financial implication, and network-link availability may depend on segments outside the CSP’s control. We kindly request the Authority to amend the Penalty Clause to read as: “>=99.5% — No Penalty; <99.5% and >=99% — 1% of Quarterly Payment; <99% and >=98.5% — 2% of Quarterly Payment; <98.5% — 5% of Quarterly Payment, subject to a maximum of 5% of the Quarterly Payment for this parameter,” and to confirm that it applies only to network links provisioned and managed by the CSP.	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
31	Section 2.1 – Eligibility Criteria, Sr. No.2 (MeitY Empanelment)	The CSP should be MeitY Empanelled (as on bid submission date).	Kindly clarify that an Authorized Managed Service Provider (MSP) / System Integrator (SI) of a MeitY Empanelled Cloud Service Provider (CSP) shall also be eligible to participate in the bidding process, provided the bidder submits a valid Manufacturer's Authorization Form (MAF) / Authorization Letter from the proposed MeitY Empanelled CSP confirming its support for the entire project and contract period.	The bidder has to be the SPOC for the entire scope, in consideration that the bidder is a Meity-empanelled GCC Provider
32	Section 2.1 – Eligibility Criteria (MeitY Empanelment)	The RFP is for selection of an MSP, whereas the Eligibility Criteria are defined for the CSP.	Kindly clarify whether an MSP is permitted to participate by proposing a MeitY Empanelled CSP through a valid authorization/back-to-back agreement, or whether only the MeitY Empanelled CSP itself is eligible to bid.	MeitY Empanelled GCC CSP only is eligible to bid, and the RFP is for the selection of CSP
33	Section 9 & Section 10 – Roles & Responsibilities	Responsibilities are shared among MSP, MSI and e-LMS SI.	Kindly provide a detailed Responsibility Matrix (RACI) clearly defining the responsibilities of MSP, MSI, e-LMS SI and MITL for migration, application support, database administration, backup, DR, security and operations.	The Bidder and CSP should be the same entity and should be a single point of contact for the full migration activity. MITL will provide the necessary support for migration .
34	Section 10.3	MSI is responsible for application architecture, application performance, backup strategy and application operations.	Kindly confirm that the MSP's responsibility is limited to cloud infrastructure provisioning and managed infrastructure services, while application-related issues, database tuning and application performance remain under MSI/e-LMS SI responsibility.	It is the CSP responsibility for cloud infrastructure provisioning and related managed infrastructure services.
35	Section 1.2 & Section 9.2	Existing applications will be migrated from the current cloud.	Kindly provide the detailed inventory of existing workloads including VM count, vCPU, RAM, storage, OS, database, middleware, backup size and current cloud resource utilization to enable accurate commercial estimation.	Please consider the RFP BOQ for migration

MITL reply to Pr-Bid queries recived for the tender No.: . MITL/ICT/2026-27/001 , dt-28th Aug 2024 Name of work: - "RFP for Selection of Service Provider (Cloud Hosting and Managed Service) to Setup, Migrate, and Manage Data Centre (DC) and Disaster Recovery (DR) Site for MITL on Cloud"				
Sr.No.	**RFP Reference (Section / Page)**	**Provision as per RFP**	**Query / Clarification Sought**	**MITL Reply**
36	Section 9.5 – Disaster Recovery	DR is applicable only upon Client approval.	Kindly clarify whether the Disaster Recovery infrastructure and recurring charges are to be considered for bid evaluation or shall be procured separately upon approval by MITL.	The recurring charges for the Disaster Recovery (DR) site shall not be considered for bid evaluation. However, MITL reserves the right to procure the DR services from the successful bidder at the quoted rate card in the future, as per the corrigendum
37	Section 13 – SLA	SLA penalties are applicable during operations.	Kindly confirm that scheduled maintenance approved by MITL, outages attributable to MSI, application issues, OEM/CSP issues beyond MSP control, ISP/NIC failures and Force Majeure events shall be excluded from SLA calculations.	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
38	Section 14 – Penalty	SLA penalties are applicable.	Kindly clarify whether there is any upper cap on cumulative SLA penalties during a quarter or contract year.	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
39	Section 15 – Payment Terms	Payment terms are specified.	Kindly clarify the payment cycle for recurring cloud services, invoice certification process and payment timeline after invoice submission.	As per RFP
40	Section 16 – BOQ	Cloud resources are specified in the BOQ.	Kindly confirm whether the BOQ quantities are indicative and whether additional or reduced cloud resources during the contract period shall be handled through a Change Request at the quoted unit rates.	The quantities specified in the BoQ of the RFP are indicative only
41	Section 2.1 – Eligibility Criteria (MeitY Empanelment)	The RFP is for selection of an MSP, whereas the Eligibility Criteria are defined for the CSP.	Kindly clarify whether an MSP is permitted to participate by proposing a MeitY Empanelled CSP through a valid authorization/back-to-back agreement, or whether only the MeitY Empanelled CSP itself is eligible to bid.	MeitY Empanelled GCC CSP only is eligible to bid, and the RFP is for the selection of CSP
42	Scope of Work / Eligibility	The RFP requires cloud services to be hosted on Government Community Cloud.	Kindly clarify whether any **MeitY Empanelled Cloud Service Provider** meeting all technical, security, compliance and SLA requirements shall be acceptable, irrespective of the cloud deployment terminology used by the CSP.	As per RFP & MeitY Empanelled Cloud Service Provider with GCC is a mandatory compliance
43	Technical Specifications	The RFP specifies cloud platform requirements.	Kindly confirm that equivalent native cloud services offered by the proposed MeitY Empanelled Hyperscale CSP shall be considered compliant, even if the service names or implementation approach differ from those mentioned in the RFP.	As per RFP & MeitY Empanelled Cloud Service Provider with GCC is a mandatory compliance
44	Monitoring & Management	MSP is required to provide monitoring and reporting.	Kindly confirm whether the native monitoring, logging, billing and reporting capabilities of the proposed MeitY Empanelled Hyperscale CSP are acceptable wherever they meet the functional requirements.	As per RFP & MeitY Empanelled Cloud Service Provider with GCC is a mandatory compliance
45	Managed Services	MSP is responsible for managing the cloud infrastructure.	Kindly confirm whether cloud-native managed services (Managed Database, Backup, IAM, KMS, Load Balancer, Logging, Monitoring, etc.) offered by the proposed MeitY Empanelled Hyperscale CSP may be used wherever they meet the technical specifications.	As per RFP & MeitY Empanelled Cloud Service Provider with GCC is a mandatory compliance
46	Disaster Recovery	DR architecture is required.	Kindly confirm whether the proposed solution may utilize the native multi-zone/multi-region architecture of the proposed MeitY Empanelled Hyperscale CSP while meeting the prescribed RPO/RTO requirements.	As per RFP & MeitY Empanelled Cloud Service Provider with GCC is a mandatory compliance
47	Section 9 & Section 10 – Roles & Responsibilities	Responsibilities are shared among MSP, MSI and e-LMS SI.	Kindly provide a detailed Responsibility Matrix (RACI) clearly defining the responsibilities of MSP, MSI, e-LMS SI and MITL for migration, application support, database administration, backup, DR, security and operations.	To be shared with the successful bidder
48	Section 10.3	MSI is responsible for application architecture, application performance, backup strategy and application operations.	Kindly confirm that the MSP's responsibility is limited to cloud infrastructure provisioning and managed infrastructure services, while application-related issues, database tuning and application performance remain under MSI/e-LMS SI responsibility.	It is the CSP responsibility for cloud infrastructure provisioning and related managed infrastructure services.
49	Section 1.2 & Section 9.2	Existing applications will be migrated from the current cloud.	Kindly provide the detailed inventory of existing workloads including VM count, vCPU, RAM, storage, OS, database, middleware, backup size and current cloud resource utilization to enable accurate commercial estimation.	To be shared with the successful bidder, Please refer the BOQ for estimation
50	Section 9.5 – Disaster Recovery	DR is applicable only upon Client approval.	Kindly clarify whether the Disaster Recovery infrastructure and recurring charges are to be considered for bid evaluation or shall be procured separately upon approval by MITL.	The recurring charges for the Disaster Recovery (DR) site shall not be considered for bid evaluation. However, MITL reserves the right to procure the DR services from the successful bidder at the quoted rate card in the future, as per the corrigendum
51	Section 13 – SLA	SLA penalties are applicable during operations.	Kindly confirm that scheduled maintenance approved by MITL, outages attributable to MSI, application issues, OEM/CSP issues beyond MSP control, ISP/NIC failures and Force Majeure events shall be excluded from SLA calculations.	Please refer corrigendum
52	Section 14 – Penalty	SLA penalties are applicable.	Kindly clarify whether there is any upper cap on cumulative SLA penalties during a quarter or contract year.	Please refer corrigendum
53	Section 15 – Payment Terms	Payment terms are specified.	Kindly clarify the payment cycle for recurring cloud services, invoice certification process and payment timeline after invoice submission.	Mentioned in the RFP
54	Section 16 – BOQ	Cloud resources are specified in the BOQ.	Kindly confirm whether the BOQ quantities are indicative and whether additional or reduced cloud resources during the contract period shall be handled through a Change Request at the quoted unit rates.	The BOQ quantities are indicative, and any changes in the quantity will be billed as per the unit prices submitted by the bidder
55	1.5 Earnest Money Deposit, Pg-12	An Earnest Money Deposit(EMD) in the form of a Bank Guarantee in format provided in Prequalification Criteria Document, from a scheduled Indian Bank in favour of 'Maharashtra Industrial Township Limited', valid for 180 (one hundred and Eighty) days from the PDD, payable at Mumbai,	Can we submit the EMD in from of Demand Draft?	EMD shall be submit in the form of DD as mentioned in RFP

MITL reply to Pr-Bid queries recived for the tender No.: . MITL/ICT/2026-27/001 , dt-28th Aug 2024				
Name of work: - "RFP for Selection of Service Provider (Cloud Hosting and Managed Service) to Setup, Migrate, and Manage Data Centre (DC) and Disaster Recovery (DR) Site for MITL on Cloud"				
Sr.No.	**RFP Reference (Section / Page)**	**Provision as per RFP**	**Query / Clarification Sought**	**MITL Reply**
56	1.5 Earnest Money Deposit, Pg-12	An Earnest Money Deposit(EMD) in the form of a Bank Guarantee in format provided in Prequalification Criteria Document, from a scheduled Indian Bank in favour of 'Maharashtra Industrial Township Limited', valid for 180 (one hundred and Eighty) days from the PDD, payable at Mumbai,	As per bank rules, Customer Bank details requires to prepare the Bank Gurantee mainly IFSC code. Request you to Share us the Bank details.	Submit the DD, as mentioned in the RFP
57	2.1 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA , pg-13	**4.Turnover** A CSP should have a minimum average annual turnover of at least 150 Crore in last three audited financial years (FY 2022–23, FY 2023–24, and FY 2024–25.)	**4.Turnover** A CSP/Bidder should have a minimum average annual turnover of at least ~~150~~ 100 Crore in last three audited financial years (FY 2022–23, FY 2023–24, and FY 2024–25.)	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
58	2.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria , Pg-16	**Type** **1.Company Financials & Profile** **Qualification Criterion** The Bidder should have minimum average annual turnover of atleast 150 Crore in lastthree audited financiayears (FY,2022- 2023,2023-2024,20242025) **Marks Allocated** 150 - 250cr:10 Marks >250cr: 20 Marks	**Request to change as** **Type** **1.Company Financials & Profile** **Qualification Criterion** The Bidder should have minimum average annual turnover of atleast ~~150~~ 100 Crore in lastthree audited financiayears (FY,2022- 2023,2023-2024,20242025) **Marks Allocated** ~~150~~ 100 - ~~250~~ 125 cr:10 Marks >~~250~~ 125 cr: 20 Marks	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
59	2.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria , pg-17	**Type** **5.Cloud Project Experience** **Qualification Criterion** The Bidder have successfully completed/Ongoing/ Currently hosted Data Centre/ Disaster recovery Cloud Services on Government community cloud for any Govt. organization / PSU with order value of at least 5 Cr. each in last five financial years. **Marks Allocated** 5 Projects- 5 Marks >5 Projects – 10 Marks	**Request to change as** **Type** **5.Cloud Project Experience** **Qualification Criterion** The Bidder have successfully completed/Ongoing/ Currently hosted Data Centre/ Disaster recovery Cloud Services on Government community cloud for any Govt. organization / PSU with order value of at least ~~5 Cr~~ 20Cr. each in last five financial years. **Marks Allocated** ~~5~~ 1 Projects- 5 Marks >=~~5~~ 2 Projects – 10 Marks	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
60	2.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria	**Type** **4.ERP Project Experience** **Qualification Criterion** The Bidder must have successfully completed OR be currently providing hosting and managed services for a minimum One (1) COTS (Commercially off the Shelf) ERP System i.e SAP based or Oracle based System on the proposed Cloud Platform with a contract value of not less than INR 3 Crore for any Govt. organization/ PSU in India in last five years. **Marks Allocated** 1-3 Projects- 5 Marks >3 Projects – 10 Marks	SAP/Oracle experience and Cloud MSP experience are independent. Since the current RFP is related to Cloud services, we request that these evaluation points be removed and the corresponding marks be allocated related to cloud services. I.e.CSP turnover criteria marking etc.	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
61	2.7 Performance Bank Guarantee, pg-20	Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) of value of 10% of Contract Value need to be provided by the successful bidder as per the format given in RFP. PBG should be drawn on Nationalised / Scheduled Bank for 5 years with additional claim period of 1year from the date of expiry providing for encashment at Mumbai Branch.	As per the RFP, the contract period is 26 months mentioned in 1.1 Project Objective. However, the Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) has been requested for a validity of 5 years. Kindly clarify	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
62	Performance Security:, pg-95	The Performance Security shall be INR 3% of the contract Value (Grand Total/Evaluated Bid Price (C) as per Form 1.3 of Financial Proposal) including taxes in INR;	Kindly clarify whether the Performance Security (3%) is an additional requirement over and above the Performance Bank Guarantee (10%),	Regarding this corrigendum will be published
63	2.1 #1 Eligibility & Consortium, pg- 13	Eligibility criteria are listed against 'the CSP' throughout, with no explicit clause permitting or prohibiting Joint Venture / Consortium bidding.	Please confirm whether bidding is permitted through a Consortium/JV of a MeitY-empanelled CSP (data centre owner) together with a System Integrator/Managed Services partner, with defined lead-bidder and consortium-partner responsibilities.	Consortium / JV is not allowed. Please refer corrigendum
64	2.1 #2 Eligibility & Consortium, pg-13	'MeitY Empanelment' requires the proposed Data Centre to be MeitY-empanelled, STQC-audited, and running an active Government Community Cloud (GCC), with the CSP as single point of contact for the entire contract period.	If a consortium is permitted, can the MeitY-empanelled CSP be a named sub-contractor/OEM partner rather than the lead bidder, while the lead bidder (SI/MSP) remains the single point of contact for MITL?	Consortium / JV is not allowed. Please refer corrigendum
65	2.1 #4 Eligibility & Consortium, pg-13	Minimum average annual turnover of ₹150 Cr over FY 2022-23, FY 2023-24 and FY 2024-25.	In a consortium bid, can the turnover criterion be met by the combined/consolidated turnover of consortium members, or must the lead bidder independently meet the full ₹150 Cr threshold?	Consortium / JV is not allowed. Please refer corrigendum
66	2.1 #7 / #9 Eligibility & Consortium, pg-14	Data Centre & DR site must be Tier III (TIA-942/Uptime Institute), ITIL-aligned, primary site preferably in Maharashtra (Mumbai/Navi Mumbai); CSP must operate a minimum of two MeitY-empanelled data centres in India.	Please clarify: (a) is the Mumbai/Navi Mumbai primary-site preference mandatory or merely preferred for scoring purposes; (b) can the two required empanelled data centres belong to a consortium/sub-contracted CSP rather than the lead bidder.	a.Primary Site in Maharashtra (in the Mumbai/Navi Mumbai region) is preferred only. Primary site should be MeitY-empanelled GCC provider within India. consortium / JV is not allowed Please refer corrigendum
67	2.1 #11, Eligibility & Consortium, pg-14	CSP must have a minimum of 200 IT professionals (data centre/networking/system administration/cloud services/cloud security) on payroll, with at least 50 in cloud solution deployment and management.	In a consortium bid, can this manpower threshold be met by the combined payroll strength of all consortium members, or does the lead bidder alone need 200+ IT professionals on its own payroll?	Consortium / JV is not allowed. Please refer corrigendum
68	2.1 #10, Eligibility & Consortium, pg-14	CSP must have successfully implemented/commissioned at least 5 DC/DR-on-GCC projects with order value of at least ₹5 Cr each.	Please confirm whether 'successfully implemented/commissioned' includes projects that are currently live and operational but not yet formally closed out, and whether projects executed as a sub-contractor/consortium partner (rather than as prime) qualify as reference experience.	Consortium / JV is not allowed. Please refer corrigendum

MITL reply to Pr-Bid queries recived for the tender No.: . MITL/ICT/2026-27/001 , dt-28th Aug 2024				
Name of work: - "RFP for Selection of Service Provider (Cloud Hosting and Managed Service) to Setup, Migrate, and Manage Data Centre (DC) and Disaster Recovery (DR) Site for MITL on Cloud"				
Sr.No.	**RFP Reference (Section / Page)**	**Provision as per RFP**	**Query / Clarification Sought**	**MITL Reply**
69	2.1 #13, Eligibility & Consortium,pg-15	CSP must hold accreditations for Trust Services principles — SOC 1, SOC 2.	Please confirm whether accreditation held by the underlying MeitY-empanelled CSP/data-centre partner satisfies this requirement for the lead bidder in a consortium structure, or whether the lead bidder must independently hold SOC 1/SOC 2.	Consortium / JV is not allowed. Please refer corrigendum
70	2.2, Technical Evaluation, pg-16	Technical Presentation is worth 30 of 100 marks, evaluated on Understanding of Scope of Work, Approach & Methodology, Implementation Strategy, Complexity of Software, and Project Plan/Timelines — with no published sub-weightage.	Please share the detailed marking rubric/sub-weightage for each of the five presentation criteria, the composition of the evaluation committee, and the format/duration allotted for the technical presentation.	As per RFP
71	2.2, Technical Evaluation, pg-17	Minimum qualifying score for Technical Qualification is stated as 70 of 100 marks overall.	Please confirm there is no separate minimum cut-off per individual evaluation criterion (e.g., presentation, certifications) and that only the aggregate 70-mark threshold applies.	As per RFP
72	2.5, Commercial & Payment,pg-19	Award is via QCBS with Technical 70% / Commercial 30% weightage; formula B = (T/Thigh × 70) + (Clow/C × 30).	Please confirm the exact Commercial Bid line items that feed 'C' in the formula (i.e., does it include only recurring pay-as-you-use charges, or also One-Time Costs from Form 1.4), given the RFP references both a one-time and a recurring pricing form.	Total Contract value to be considered
73	166.1 vs 3.1 Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-108	Section 16.1 (Bill of Quantity) specifies fixed line-item quantities (21 VM Packs, 50 TB high-performance storage, 40 TB backup, 20 TB object storage, specific OS/DB license counts), while Section 3.1.1(9) states 'Cloud services shall be available on pay as per usage model.'	Please confirm whether the BOQ quantities in Section 16.1 represent the fixed Day-1 baseline the bidder must price exactly as listed (with over/under-utilisation trued up separately), or whether they are illustrative sizing only and actual monthly billing floats with real consumption under a true metered pay-as-you-go model.	The quantities specified in the BoQ of the RFP are indicative only.
74	Scope — Infrastructure & Migration	The BOQ fixes specific quantities per component, e.g., 72 SIEM units, 50 APM perpetual licences, 15 DAM perpetual licences, 100 Mbps internet bandwidth, 21 VM Packs across 21 defined configurations.	Please confirm whether bidders must quote against these exact BOQ line items and quantities with no substitution, or may propose an alternative architecture/sizing that meets the same functional and performance requirements at a different configuration or cost.	All Bidder to quote as per the BOQ provided in the RFP
75	16.1, Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-109	Internet Bandwidth in the BOQ is fixed at 100 Mbps (speed-based) for the entire hosted application estate (citizen portal, ERP, GIS, e-LMS, utility billing, email), while Section 3.1.4 states 'there should not be any constraints on the services.'	Please confirm whether 100 Mbps is the current baseline only (with dynamic scaling per Section 3.1.4 expected to expand it as load grows, billed as additional consumption), or a fixed contractual ceiling for the full 26-month term.	The quantities specified in the BoQ of the RFP are indicative only but the bidder should have the capability to scale when needed.
76	10.3 / 9.2.1, Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-48	Section 10.3 assigns application-level architecture, RTO/RPO specification, licensing, database provisioning, and all application installation/operations to the Master System Integrator (MSI) and e-LMS SI — separate entities from the MSP being procured under this RFP — with the MSP responsible only for underlying infrastructure per their recommendations.	Please confirm the identity of the current/incumbent MSI and e-LMS SI, whether they hold live contracts with MITL that will run concurrently with this MSP's term, and what specific interface/cooperation SLA (response times, API/access provisioning) exists between the incoming MSP and these entities for migration planning and ongoing operations.	To be shared with successful bidder
77	3.1.3, Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-22	CSP must propose IPv6-compatible architecture and multi-VLAN segregation of applications/databases.	Please confirm whether IPv6 compliance is mandatory for all internal/backend connectivity, or only for public-facing citizen/consumer endpoints.	As per RFP
78	9.2.2,Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-43	Section 9.2.2 states 'MSP shall provide Disaster Recovery as a Service based on Client's discretion in the future,' while Section 14's RTO/RPO penalty table appears to apply the SLA regardless, and a footnote in Section 14 says RTO/RPO penalties apply '(If Secondary DC/DRC as a Service is taken by the Client).'	Please confirm definitively whether DR/Secondary DC is in scope and priced from Day 1 of the contract, or is a future opt-in at MITL's discretion with no DR obligation (and therefore no RTO/RPO penalty exposure) until exercised.	DR prices are not part of the evaluation and the department can ask for the same when needed during the contract period on the rate card prices submitted by bidder
79	9.2.2, Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-43	RTO/RPO targets are specified per application (e.g., e-LMS ≤30 min RTO / ≤20 min RPO; others ≤60 min RTO / ≤45 min RPO).	Please confirm the current (existing Government Community Cloud) baseline RTO/RPO being achieved today, and whether these targets are newly introduced requirements or a continuation of the existing SLA.	To be shared with successful bidder
80	3.2FR, Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-26	Functional requirements call for DC facility to support multiple database engines (PostgreSQL, MySQL, Oracle, SAP HANA, MS SQL Server) and platform services (Analytics, IoT/Big Data, Mobile).	Please confirm which of these database engines and platform services are actually in active use today across the listed applications, versus which are speculative/future-proofing requirements.	To be shared with successful bidder
81	11 / GCC (Delay LD), Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-49	Section 11 fixes implementation milestones (Project Plan D+7, infra setup D+15, e-LMS/CDCPR-GIS/BPAS migration D+30, remaining application migration D+45, Stabilisation & Operational Acceptance D+60), while the General Conditions of Contract separately reference a 'cap on delay liquidated damages' without stating the percentage in the extracted text.	Please confirm the specific delay liquidated damages rate and cap (as a % of contract/milestone value) applicable if the D+7 to D+60 implementation milestones in Section 11 are missed, and confirm this is a distinct penalty pool from the Section 13/14 operational-phase SLA penalties rather than overlapping with them.	Please refer corrigendum
82	9.3, Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-44	Operational Acceptance requires all migrated applications to be monitored for 15 days post-migration before formal sign-off, with MSP responsible for addressing any deficiency at no additional cost.	Please confirm whether the 15-day stabilisation monitoring period runs application-by-application as each is migrated, or only after the entire application estate has been fully migrated and cut over.	As per RFP
83	Section 1.2 (App list),Scope — Application & CGRF Overlap, pg-11	The AURIC e-Governance and ERP (AEE) application list includes a 'Citizen Grievance Redressal Module' as an existing, already-operational system to be migrated and hosted (not built).	Please confirm whether this existing 'Citizen Grievance Redressal Module' is the same system referenced as the 'existing MITL complaint portal' in the separate CGRF Portal architecture requirement (Office Note File No. MITL-180166/41/2026-JMD), i.e., the first-level complaint mechanism that CGRF consumers must reference before filing Schedule A — or whether it is intended to be superseded/replaced by that new CGRF build.	This are separate portals
84	Section 1.2 (App list), Scope — Application & CGRF Overlap, pg-11	The AEE application bundle includes Legal Module, Trade License Module, RTI Module, BPAS (Building Plan Approval System), MIS/KPI dashboards, Digital Locker, and citizen smart card functions, all bundled as one hosted component.	Please provide a breakdown of relative traffic/criticality/data volume across these sub-modules, and confirm whether they share a single database/application instance or are logically separable for migration sequencing.	To be shared with successful bidder
85	3.2 (B1), Scope — Application & CGRF Overlap, pg-24	Business Requirement B1 lists specific applications to migrate 'and any other project application as finalised by the Client.'	Please confirm whether any additional applications (beyond the named list) are already planned or under active discussion for inclusion before contract signing, so they can be accounted for in the technical and commercial bid.	To be shared with successful bidder

MITL reply to Pr-Bid queries recived for the tender No.: . MITL/ICT/2026-27/001 , dt-28th Aug 2024				
Name of work: - "RFP for Selection of Service Provider (Cloud Hosting and Managed Service) to Setup, Migrate, and Manage Data Centre (DC) and Disaster Recovery (DR) Site for MITL on Cloud"				
Sr.No.	**RFP Reference (Section / Page)**	**Provision as per RFP**	**Query / Clarification Sought**	**MITL Reply**
86	13.2 / 14, SLA & Penalty, pg-96	Penalties are levied per SLA parameter individually and added together for total quarterly penalty; the Security/Privacy Breach penalty (₹10 lakh per incident) is explicitly stated as 'not part of overall SLA penalties cap per quarter.'	Please confirm whether there is an overall cap on the combined quarterly penalty across all non-security SLA parameters (uptime, incident response, vulnerability correction, RTO/RPO, helpdesk), expressed as a percentage of quarterly payment, or whether penalties can stack without limit.	Please refer corrigendum
87	13.4.2, SLA & Penalty, pg-98	Downtime calculation excludes outages due to MITL-owned hardware/software, MITL/agent negligence, or third-party services not provided by the MSP — but 'it shall be the responsibility of the MSP to prove that the outage is attributable to MITL.'	Please clarify the evidentiary process and turnaround time for MITL to certify/authenticate that a given outage is attributable to MITL or a third party, so this doesn't default to being counted against the MSP's SLA by omission.	Please refer corrigendum
88	13.1.2 (Scheduled Maintenance),SLA & Penalty, pg-96	Scheduled maintenance is capped at 4 hours, maximum 4 times per year, requiring 15 days' prior written approval from MITL, during non-peak hours.	Please confirm whether emergency/critical security patching (e.g., a zero-day vulnerability requiring immediate action) is exempt from the 15-day prior-approval requirement, given the vulnerability-correction SLA elsewhere demands action within 30/90 days of disclosure.	Please refer corrigendum
89	14 (Average call lost rate), SLA & Penalty, pg-106	Average call lost rate SLA references 'total no. of calls lost because they were not attended by an operator / total incoming calls,' implying a live voice helpdesk.	Please confirm the expected helpdesk channel(s) in scope — voice/IVR, email, ticketing portal, or a combination — and whether MITL will provide/mandate a specific helpdesk/ITSM tool, or whether the MSP proposes its own.	Please refer corrigendum
90	17.11.2 / 15 Note 4, Commercial & Payment, pg-127	Financial Proposal Form 17.11.2 ('Monthly Recurring Costs') prices the exact BOQ line items (VM Packs, storage, licences) at a Qty × Unit Price × Monthly structure, while Section 15 Note 4 states recurring charges are billed 'on a pay-as-per-use basis' and the Financial Proposal Submission Form states Form 1.5 recurring costs are 'indicative...for evaluation purposes only' with 'actual payments...based on pay-as-per-use model.'	Please confirm the actual invoicing mechanics: will quarterly invoices be (a) the fixed Form 17.11.2 amount regardless of real consumption, (b) a true metered bill reflecting actual monthly usage which may run above or below the BOQ figures, or (c) the BOQ amount as a committed minimum with metered overage billed separately.	The quantities mentioned in the BoQ are tentative and indicative only. Bidders shall quote their rates against each BoQ item. Payment shall be made based on the actual quantities utilized/executed.
91	15 Note 5 (AMC for perpetual licences), Commercial & Payment, pg-106	AMC for perpetually-licensed components 'including the APM and DAM solutions' is referenced as included at no additional cost during the initial contract, with terms to be agreed for any extension.	Please confirm which specific APM (Application Performance Monitoring) and DAM (Database Activity Monitoring) tools/OEMs are pre-selected or mandated by MITL, versus open to the bidder's proposal, and whether these licences are already owned by MITL or need to be procured by the MSP.	APM and DAM need to be provided on a perpetual basis with respect to the compliance mentioned in the RFP, MITL doesn't own any license currently.
92	2.7, Commercial & Payment, pg-20	Performance Bank Guarantee of 10% of contract value, drawn for 5 years with an additional 1-year claim period, against a 26-month contract term.	Please confirm the rationale for a PBG tenure (6 years total) that is more than double the contract term (26 months), and whether this is standard MITL policy or open to alignment with contract duration plus a shorter claim tail.	Please refer corrigendum
93	Data sheet, Commercial & Payment, pg-3	Non-refundable processing fee of ₹35,400 and Bid Security (EMD) of ₹10,00,000 are specified.	Please confirm accepted payment instruments for the processing fee and EMD (online payment gateway, demand draft, or bank guarantee), and the EMD refund timeline for technically or commercially unsuccessful bidders.	As per RFP
94	Tender Schedule, Contractual & Process, pg-6	Pre-Bid Meeting is scheduled for 3 Aug 2026, with queries due 31 Jul 2026 and MITL's response due 4 Aug 2026 — a very short window between response and the 17 Aug 2026 bid submission deadline.	Please confirm whether the Pre-Bid Meeting will be held in person only, or whether a virtual/hybrid attendance option is available, and whether any bid due-date extension is anticipated given the compressed 13-day window between query responses and bid submission.	As per RFP
95	GCC — Limitation of Liability, Contractual & Process, pg-63	The GCC caps the MSP's aggregate liability to the Client at 'the total cost of Performance Security' (i.e., 10% of contract value), carved out for IP-infringement indemnity, while the Section 14 penalty table separately levies an uncapped ₹10 lakh-per-incident security/privacy breach penalty stated as 'not part of overall SLA penalties cap.'	Please confirm whether the ₹10 lakh-per-incident security breach penalty (Section 14) is itself subject to, or additional to, the overall GCC liability cap (10% of Performance Security value) — i.e., can cumulative security-incident penalties alone exceed the general liability cap, and if so, is that intentional.	As per RFP
96	SCC — Insurance, Contractual & Process, pg-95	The Special Conditions of Contract specify Third-Party Liability Insurance of INR 25 Lakh, but the Professional Liability Insurance clause states coverage should be the higher of INR 25 Lakh or insurance proceeds, 'with a minimum coverage of [insert amount and currency]' — an unfilled template placeholder in the published RFP.	Please confirm the final minimum Professional Liability Insurance coverage amount, since the clause as published contains an incomplete bracketed placeholder rather than a stated figure.	As per RFP
97	GCC — Exit Management, Commercial & Payment, pg-65	The GCC's Exit Management clause requires a comprehensive Exit Management Plan/SOP within 90 days of contract signing, full knowledge transfer, and retention of Client data for 3 months post-termination 'without any additional cost to the Client' — but no corresponding line item for exit-management effort appears in the Grand Summary Cost Table (Section 17.11) or One-Time/Recurring Cost forms.	Please confirm whether the cost of preparing the Exit Management Plan/SOP and performing exit/transition-out activities should be absorbed within the quoted One-Time or Recurring Costs, or whether bidders may add a distinct 'Other one-time costs' line item (Section 17.11.1, row 3) specifically for this.	As per RFP
98	Section 8 (Email SLA cross-ref), Contractual & Process, pg-39	Section 8, Functional Requirement 14 (Email as a Service) states service availability is 'governed under the SLA and penalty framework defined in Section 11 of this RFP,' but per the Table of Contents, Section 11 is 'Implementation Schedule' — the actual SLA and Penalty sections are 13 and 14.	Please confirm the correct section reference for the Email-as-a-Service SLA/penalty framework, since the cross-reference as published points to the wrong section.	Noted
99	Sections 5–7 (APM/DAM/PIM-PAM), Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-34	The APM and DAM functional compliance checklists (Sections 5 and 6) include requirements such as 'native connectors and integrations for Indian banking core systems' and audit reports 'aligned with RBI, SEBI and CERT-In compliance,' which read as BFSI-sector requirements rather than requirements for an industrial township authority.	Please confirm whether full banking-grade compliance (RBI/SEBI-aligned reporting, core-banking connectors) is genuinely required for MITL's use case, or whether these clauses were carried over from a template prepared for a different (financial-sector) client and can be simplified or removed.	The compliance has been selected as per the industry standards, considering the best performance the department wants. All the application to be hosted are integrated with Core banking systems.
100	Section 7 (PIM/PAM), Scope — Infrastructure & Migration, pg-36	Section 7 defines a full 36-requirement Privileged Identity/Access Management (PIM/PAM) scope as a distinct managed service, but PIM/PAM is not mentioned in the narrative Scope of Work (Section 3) or MSP Scope of Work (Section 9).	Please confirm whether PIM/PAM (along with APM, DAM, and Email-as-a-Service) must be delivered directly by the lead bidder/CSP, or may be fulfilled through named specialist OEM sub-vendors under the MSP's overall contractual accountability, consistent with how these are typically sourced as point security products rather than core hyperscale cloud services.	Delivered by the CSP as the lead bidder on a service model

MITL reply to Pr-Bid queries recived for the tender No.: . MITL/ICT/2026-27/001 , dt-28th Aug 2024				
Name of work: - "RFP for Selection of Service Provider (Cloud Hosting and Managed Service) to Setup, Migrate, and Manage Data Centre (DC) and Disaster Recovery (DR) Site for MITL on Cloud"				
Sr.No.	**RFP Reference (Section / Page)**	**Provision as per RFP**	**Query / Clarification Sought**	**MITL Reply**
101	Eligibility Criteria – Turnover (Clause 2.1, Sr. No. 4)	A CSP should have a minimum average annual turnover of ₹150 Crore in the last three audited financial years (FY 2022-23, FY 2023-24 & FY 2024-25).	Request to revise the minimum average annual turnover requirement from ₹150 Crore to ₹50 Crore.	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
102	Eligibility Criteria – Data Centre Facility (Clause 2.1, Sr. No. 7)	Primary Site should be in Maharashtra (preferably in Mumbai/Navi Mumbai region).	Request to allow the Primary Data Centre to be located anywhere in India, provided it is a MeitY-empanelled, STQC-audited Government Community Cloud (GCC) Data Centre.	Primary Site in Maharashtra (in the Mumbai/Navi Mumbai region) is preferred only. Primary site should be MeitY-empanelled GCC provider within India.
103	Eligibility Criteria – Capability (Clause 2.1, Sr. No. 10)	The CSP should have successfully implemented/commissioned at least five (05) projects of DC/DR with Cloud Deployment on Government Community Cloud (GCC), each having an order value of ₹5 Crore.	Request to revise the eligibility to at least three (03) projects, each having an order value of ₹5 Crore or above.	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
104	Technical Evaluation Criteria – Company Financials & Profile (Clause 2.2, Sr. No. 1)	Existing Marks:• ₹150–250 Crore – 10 Marks• Above ₹250 Crore – 20 Marks.	Revised Marks:• ₹50–100 Crore – 10 Marks• Above ₹100 Crore – 20 Marks	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
105	Technical Evaluation Criteria – MeitY Empanelled Cloud Services under Government Community Cloud (Clause 2.2, Sr. No. 3)	Existing Marks:• Two Locations – 5 Marks• Three Locations – 10 Marks• Four or More Locations – 15 Marks.	Revised Marks:• Two (2) or More MeitY Empanelled GCC Data Centre Locations in India – 15 Marks	RFP conditions remain unchanged.
106	Cloud Infrastructure BoQ	VM quantities are provided in consolidated form.	Kindly provide VM-wise resource breakup (vCPU, RAM, Operating System and Storage) instead of consolidated quantities to enable accurate commercial estimation.	Resource breakup has been provided, Please refer RFP.
107	Cloud Infrastructure BoQ	Current infrastructure utilization details are not provided.	Kindly provide current average and peak utilization reports (CPU, Memory, Storage and Network) for sizing validation.	To be shared with Successful Bidder
108	Cloud Infrastructure BoQ	Application-wise infrastructure mapping is not available.	Kindly provide application-wise infrastructure mapping for Production, UAT and Non-Production environments.	To be shared with Successful Bidder
109	Storage	Storage performance requirements are not specified.	Kindly specify the storage performance requirements (IOPS, Throughput and Latency) for each workload category.	To be shared with Successful Bidder
110	Storage	Storage tier requirements are not defined.	Kindly specify the storage tier expected for Database, Application and Backup workloads.	To be shared with Successful Bidder
111	Backup	Backup data size is not specified.	Kindly provide the estimated backup data volume and expected daily backup growth.	Mentioned in the RFP and further details to be shared with Successful bidder
112	Backup	Immutable backup requirement is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether immutable backup storage is required as part of the solution.	Backup to be considered immutable
113	Backup	Backup retention policy is not specified.	Kindly specify backup retention requirements for Daily, Weekly, Monthly and Yearly backups.	As per Meity Guidelines
114	Backup	Cross-region backup requirement is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether cross-region backup copies are required in addition to Disaster Recovery replication.	As per Meity Guidelines
115	DR Infrastructure	Application-wise RPO/RTO is not specified.	Kindly specify application-wise Recovery Point Objective (RPO) and Recovery Time Objective (RTO) wherever different service tiers are expected.	Please refer corrigendum
116	DR Infrastructure	DR compute provisioning methodology is not defined.	Kindly clarify whether DR compute resources shall remain continuously provisioned or may be provisioned only during DR declaration.	As per Meity Guidelines
117	DR Infrastructure	Database replication licensing responsibility is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether database replication licenses shall be provided by MITL or by the successful bidder.	Bidders Responsibility
118	Network	Internet bandwidth requirement is not specified.	Kindly provide expected Internet ingress and egress bandwidth requirements.	To be shared with Successful Bidder
119	Network	Internet traffic volume is not available.	Kindly provide expected monthly Internet data transfer volume.	Mentioned in the RFP and further details to be shared with Successful bidder
120	Network	East-West traffic details are unavailable.	Kindly specify expected east-west traffic between application and database tiers.	To be shared with Successful bidder
121	Load Balancer	Number of Load Balancers is not specified.	Kindly specify the expected number of Public and Internal Load Balancers required.	Mentioned in the RFP and further details to be shared with Successful bidder
122	Firewall	Firewall sizing details are unavailable.	Kindly specify the expected Firewall throughput and concurrent session requirements.	Mentioned in the RFP and further details to be shared with Successful bidder
123	Web Application Firewall (WAF)	Protected applications are not specified.	Kindly specify the approximate number of Web Applications and Domains to be protected using WAF.	To be shared with Successful bidder
124	DDoS Protection	Protected bandwidth is not specified.	Kindly specify the expected protected Internet bandwidth for DDoS mitigation.	1 Gbps
125	SSL Certificates	SSL certificate ownership is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether Public SSL Certificates shall be procured by MITL or by the bidder.	Bidders Scope
126	Monitoring	Monitoring data retention is not specified.	Kindly specify the required infrastructure monitoring metrics retention period.	As per Meity Guidelines
127	Logging	Log volume is not specified.	Kindly provide the estimated monthly log generation volume.	To be shared with Successful bidder
128	Monitoring / SIEM	SIEM scope is not defined.	Kindly clarify whether centralized SIEM log ingestion is part of the infrastructure scope or under a separate security scope.	Please refer corrigendum
129	VM Provisioning	VM provisioning SLA is not specified.	Kindly specify the expected SLA for provisioning new Virtual Machines during operations.	Please refer corrigendum
130	Compute	GPU requirement is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether GPU-based compute resources are expected during the contract period.	Not Part of current Scope
131	Storage	Storage billing methodology is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether Object Storage, File Storage and Block Storage capacities shall be billed separately.	As per BOQ
132	Commercial	Price reduction mechanism is not defined.	Kindly clarify whether future Cloud OEM price reductions shall be passed on to MITL during the contract period.	Prices will be fixed for the total duration of contract
133	Commercial	Pricing methodology for new services is not specified.	Kindly clarify the methodology for pricing newly introduced cloud services not covered in the BoQ.	Please refer corrigendum
134	Commercial	Procurement methodology for additional infrastructure is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether additional infrastructure beyond the BoQ shall be procured using quoted unit rates or through a separate approval process.	Please refer corrigendum
135	Commercial	Billing reduction mechanism is not specified.	Kindly confirm whether reduction in infrastructure resources shall proportionately reduce the Monthly Recurring Charges (MRC).	All the services are to be billed on the pay as you consume model

MITL reply to Pr-Bid queries recived for the tender No.: . MITL/ICT/2026-27/001 , dt-28th Aug 2024				
Name of work: - "RFP for Selection of Service Provider (Cloud Hosting and Managed Service) to Setup, Migrate, and Manage Data Centre (DC) and Disaster Recovery (DR) Site for MITL on Cloud"				
Sr.No.	**RFP Reference (Section / Page)**	**Provision as per RFP**	**Query / Clarification Sought**	**MITL Reply**
136	Commercial	DR drill billing is not specified.	Kindly clarify the billing mechanism for temporary infrastructure provisioned during Disaster Recovery drills.	Bidder scope and all the charges are to be incurred by the bidder
137	Commercial	Burst resource billing is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether burst compute and storage consumption during peak events shall be payable on actual usage.	All the services are to be billed on the pay as you consume model
138	Commercial	Marketplace software subscription treatment is not defined.	Kindly clarify whether Cloud Marketplace software subscriptions shall be reimbursed at actuals.	Department to bill on the prices discovered of BOQ line items only , any other charges should be consumed by the bidder
139	Commercial	UAT/Staging infrastructure billing is not defined.	Kindly clarify the commercial treatment of infrastructure required for UAT, Staging and Training environments if additional to the BoQ.	Refer the BOQ
140	Commercial	Future resource addition process is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether future resource additions shall require separate Purchase Orders or may be consumed under the existing contract.	Please refer corrigendum
141	Commercial	Statutory tax variation mechanism is not specified.	Kindly specify the price adjustment mechanism in case of changes in GST or other statutory levies during the contract period.	As per the government guideline
142	Infrastructure	HA standby billing is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether idle standby resources reserved for High Availability shall be considered billable infrastructure.	SLA to be maintained, and billing will be done at actual consumption, any other hidden cost should be taken care of by the bidder
143	Storage	Snapshot billing is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether storage consumed by snapshots shall be considered part of the quoted storage capacity or billed separately.	Considered in the quoted storage
144	Network	Inter-AZ / Inter-DC transfer billing is not specified.	Kindly clarify whether Inter-AZ and Inter-Data Centre data transfer charges shall be included in the commercial bid.	Inter AZ and Inter DC data transfer charges to be incurred by the Bidder
145	Disaster Recovery	DR replication bandwidth charges are not specified.	Kindly clarify whether Disaster Recovery replication bandwidth charges shall be included in the quoted infrastructure pricing.	Please refer corrigendum