

Corrigendum – II**Responses to Pre-bid queries from bidders**

Tender Notice No.	NREDCAP/APICE Policy 2024/ Single Desk Portal/2026, Dt.21.07.2026
Name of Work	Request for Proposal for Design and Development of Unified/ Single Desk Portal with Annual Technical Support & Maintenance for Clean Energy Projects and Renewable Energy Manufacturing Projects under Andhra Pradesh Integrated Clean Energy Policy 2024.

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
1.	Page No. : 40, 61-62 Clause No: 17.8, 30, 32.7 Bid Document Fee & MSE exemptions. Non-refundable Bid Document Fee of INR 25,000/- (+taxes) (Cl.17.8). EMD is exempted for Udyam-registered MSMEs (Cl.32.7); Cl.30.2 lists eligible NIC codes (62011/62012/62013/62020/62091/62099/63112/63119/63121/63122).	Clarification/relaxation sought. We note & welcome the EMD exemption for Udyam MSEs (Cl.32.7). Request NREDCAP to (a) extend the same MSE/DPIIT-startup exemption to the non-refundable Bid Document Fee of Rs.25,000; and (b) confirm the Bidder's Udyam NIC code(s) fall within Cl.30.2, or accept related IT/ITeS (62/63 series) NIC codes for MSE benefits.	1. Exemption of Bid Document fee: Tender conditions shall prevail. The Bid Document Fee is applicable uniformly to all bidders. No exemption from payment of the Bid Document Fee shall be available to MSEs or DPIIT-recognized startups. 2. EMD exemption shall be available only to eligible MSE bidders holding a valid Udyam Registration Certificate with any of the NIC codes specified in Clause 30.2. Other related IT/ITeS NIC codes shall not be considered. DPIIT recognition alone shall not qualify a bidder for EMD exemption. Tender conditions shall prevail.
1.	Page No. : 53 Clause No. : 19.2(a) Minimum Average Annual Turnover (MAAT). MAAT for FY 2022-23, 2023-24 & 2024-25 must be >= INR 25 Lakhs.	Relaxation sought: waiver of prior-turnover criterion for MSEs & DPIIT Startups. Per GFR 2017 (Rule 173) and MoF/DPIIT relaxations, startups & MSEs are exempted from the prior-turnover criterion, subject to meeting quality/technical specs. Request NREDCAP to relax/waive the MAAT requirement for MSEs & DPIIT startups.	The cited provisions relate to Central Government procurement and do not, by themselves, create an automatic exemption in this tender. The Minimum Average Annual Turnover requirement has been prescribed considering the project's scope, implementation timeline, technical complexity, and the need for adequate financial capacity to support development and maintenance throughout the Contract period. The requirement is reasonable and

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
			proportionate to the responsibilities involved and shall apply uniformly to all bidders, including MSEs and DPIIT-recognised startups. Tender conditions shall prevail.
2.	Page No.: 47 Clause No. : 19.1(a) & 19.1(b) Prior Experience & 'Similar Work'. Bidder must have >= 5 years experience AND completed 'Similar Work' (Portal Design & Development of e-Governance Projects to the Government) in the last 5 years: one >= Rs.50L, OR two >= Rs.32L each, OR three >= Rs.25L each.	Relaxation sought: exemption/relaxation of prior 'Similar Work' experience for MSEs & DPIIT Startups. Per GFR 2017 (Rule 173) + DPIIT/Startup India notification + MoF(DoE) guidelines, startups & MSEs shall be exempted from prior-experience & prior-turnover requirements, subject to quality/technical specs. Request NREDCAP to: (a) exempt startups/MSEs from mandatory prior 'Similar Work' under Cl.19.1(a)/(b); and/or (b) reduce the 5-year experience & Rs.50L/32L/25L thresholds for MSEs/startups; and/or (c) permit comparable portal/web-application projects for PSUs, autonomous/semi-Govt bodies & reputed private clients to qualify as 'Similar Work'.	The cited provisions relate to Central Government procurement and do not, by themselves, create an automatic exemption in this tender. The experience criteria have been formulated considering the nature and scope of the proposed Unified/Single Desk Portal, which involves workflow-based processing of Government approvals, inter-departmental coordination, stakeholder management, and integration with multiple Government systems. Experience in executing similar e-Governance projects enables the Service Provider to effectively understand regulatory processes, approval workflows, and system integration requirements, thereby facilitating timely and successful implementation of the project. Accordingly, the eligibility and qualification requirements specified under Clause 19.1 have been prescribed to ensure selection of a technically capable and experienced Service Provider. Tender conditions shall prevail.
3.	Page No.: 47 Clause No.: 19.1(b) Definition of 'Similar Work'. Limited to 'Portal Design and Development of e-Governance Projects' delivered 'to the Government'.	Clarification/relaxation sought: broaden the definition of 'Similar Work'. Request NREDCAP to broaden 'Similar Work' to include portal/single-window/workflow-automation and web-application design & development delivered to PSUs, autonomous bodies, large enterprises &	The cited provisions relate to Central Government procurement and do not, by themselves, create an automatic exemption in this tender. The definition of "Similar Work" has been framed keeping in view the specific requirements of the proposed Unified/Single Desk Portal. The project involves understanding Government approval processes, workflow-based

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
		reputed private institutions, so capable MSEs/startups are not excluded solely for want of a prior Government contract.	clearances, inter-departmental coordination, and integration with multiple Government systems through APIs and other approved mechanisms. Further, the portal is required to be designed, developed, integrated, tested, and deployed within a timeline of three months. Accordingly, experience in executing e-Governance projects has been considered relevant for demonstrating the technical capability required for successful implementation of the project. Therefore, Tender conditions shall prevail.
4.	Page No.: 49 Clause No.: 19.1(e) - Crit.4 CMMI Certification (Technical Score). Marks for CMMI Level 3 (1) and Level 4/5 (2), alongside ISO 9001/20000/27001.	Relaxation sought: relaxation of the CMMI requirement for MSEs & DPIIT Startups. CMMI appraisal is cost/time-intensive and typically held by large enterprises; MSEs/startups usually hold equivalent ISO 9001/27001. Request NREDCAP to (a) treat CMMI as optional/non-scoring for MSEs & startups, or (b) award equivalent marks against valid ISO 9001/27001 in lieu of CMMI.	CMMI is a globally recognized process maturity framework that assesses an organization's capability to consistently deliver quality software solutions through well-defined, managed, and continuously improving processes. For a project of this nature involving multiple stakeholders, integrations with Government systems, timelines, security requirements, and long-term maintainability, process maturity is an important consideration in assessing the capability of the bidder. The criteria specified in the RFP, including the scoring framework for certifications, have been designed to facilitate objective evaluation of bidders' organizational capabilities. Therefore, tender conditions shall prevail.
5.	Page No. : 48-49 Clause No. :19.1(e) - Crit.2 & 3 Sector & Single-Desk-Portal experience. 15 marks for developing Unified/Single Desk	Relaxation sought: rationalise scoring/qualifying threshold for MSEs & Startups. These parameters favour incumbents with prior Govt single-desk-portal & energy-sector engagements and	The minimum qualifying Technical Score of 70 marks out of 100 is intended to establish the minimum technical capability required for implementation of the project. The same technical evaluation and qualifying

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
.	Portals for State/Central Govt; 10 marks for Energy/Power-sector clients. Qualifying Technical Score = 70/100.	exclude new MSE/startup entrants. Request NREDCAP to (a) rationalise the minimum qualifying Technical Score for MSEs/startups, or (b) allow equivalent enterprise portal, single-window & workflow-automation experience to be scored under Criteria 2 & 3.	threshold shall apply uniformly to all bidders, including MSEs and DPIIT-recognised startups. Experience under Criteria 2 and 3 shall be evaluated strictly in accordance with the respective scope and documentary requirements specified in the RFP and the clarifications issued through this Corrigendum. Tender conditions shall prevail.
6.	Page No.: 49-51 Clause No.: 19.1(e) - Crit.5 Key Personnel experience. Personnel scored only if they possess prior Single Window System / e-Governance experience across the specified roles.	Relaxation sought: count equivalent personnel experience. Request NREDCAP to permit equivalent large-scale portal, API/SSO integration, database-optimisation & payment-gateway experience of proposed key personnel to be counted, and to relax the mandatory 'Government single-window' pre-requisite for MSE/startup bidders with comparable enterprise-grade experience.	The personnel evaluation criteria have been formulated considering the specific requirements of the proposed Unified/Single Desk Portal, which involves Government approval workflows, inter-departmental coordination, and integration with multiple Government systems. Experience in e-Governance projects provides relevant exposure to the functional, operational, and regulatory aspects essential for successful implementation of the project. Accordingly, the personnel evaluation criteria prescribed in the RFP shall remain applicable. Tender conditions shall prevail.
7.	Page No.: 19, 24, 64 Clause No.: 6.3, 5.20(j)(xv), Milestone 3 Hosting infrastructure vs SLA responsibility. Portal to be hosted at AP State Data Centre/APSDC or environment designated by NREDCAP/ITE&C/APTS (Cl.6.3, 5.20(j)(xv)); yet Milestone 3 says 'Hosting of Version-0 System	Clarification sought (apparent contradiction). Request NREDCAP to clarify: (a) whether hosting infrastructure (servers, storage, data-centre, bandwidth) at APSDC is provided by the State at no cost to the Vendor, or is to be borne by the Vendor - Cl.6.3 and Milestone 3 conflict; (b) confirm that Portal-Availability & Security-Breach penalties shall NOT apply to downtime/incidents attributable to the State Data Centre, NREDCAP-provided infrastructure or connectivity outside the	a) After issuance of the LOA and commencement of the work, the Selected Bidder shall assess and recommend the required server sizing, storage, bandwidth, backup, security services, and other infrastructure specifications required for hosting on APSDC based on the finalized solution requirements. The Selected Bidder shall submit the finalized infrastructure requirements to NREDCAP. NREDCAP shall coordinate with APSDC for provisioning the required infrastructure and make the applicable hosting payments directly to APSDC. Accordingly, bidders

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
.	(infrastructure to be provided by the Vendor). Vendor bears 99.9% uptime & security-breach SLA penalties.	Vendor's control; and (c) confirm whether data-centre/hosting cost is outside the quoted price, or provide sizing so all bidders price it uniformly.	are not required to include APSDC hosting costs in the Price Bid. b) Bidders may refer to Clause 12.2(b)(v) of the RFP. SLA penalties shall not be applicable for downtime, performance issues, or incidents arising from factors beyond the Vendor's control, including infrastructure or connectivity failures attributable to third parties. c) Data centre/hosting costs are outside the quoted price. The Bidder shall not include the cost of hosting infrastructure in the Price Bid.
8.	Page No.: 64-66 Clause No.: 34, 35 Payment schedule (Design & Development). 10% on Milestone 1 (LOA/PBG/Agreement); 80% only on Go-Live + security-audit clearance (~D+90); 10% one month after Go-Live on SLA compliance. No mobilisation advance.	Relaxation sought: mobilisation advance & front-loaded milestones. The D&D payment is heavily back-loaded (80% at Go-Live), imposing a significant working-capital burden on MSE/startup bidders funding ~3 months of development upfront. Request NREDCAP to (a) provide a mobilisation advance of 10-15% against a bank guarantee, and/or (b) introduce an interim milestone payment on approval of the SRS/Design (e.g., 15-20% on design sign-off) to align payment with effort incurred.	As per Clause 35.1 of the RFP, 10% of the Software Development Phase value shall be released upon achievement of Milestone 1, including submission of key documents, Performance Security, and execution of the Contract Agreement. The subsequent 80% payment is linked to Go-Live of the Version-1 System and issuance of the security audit clearance certificate. The remaining 10% shall be released one month after successful Go-Live, subject to compliance with the specified SLA requirements and certification by the Officer-in-Charge of NREDCAP, ensuring payment against successful completion of the major development deliverables. The existing payment structure provides initial financial support while appropriately linking the remaining payments to measurable project outcomes. Therefore, Tender conditions shall prevail.
9.	Page No.: 63 Clause No.: 33.1 Performance Security. Unconditional PBG/Insurance	Relaxation sought: reduced Performance Security for MSEs/Startups. In line with public-procurement relaxations for MSEs & DPIIT startups, request NREDCAP to	The Performance Security of 5% of the Total Contract Value has been prescribed to ensure due performance of the contractual obligations throughout the project period. The option to furnish

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
	Surety Bond of 5% of Total Contract Value within 21 days of LOA.	reduce the Performance Security for such bidders (e.g., from 5% to 3% of TCV). We note the Insurance Surety Bond option (Cl.33.1) and request it be expressly retained.	the Performance Security through either a Bank Guarantee or an Insurance Surety Bond, as provided under Clause 33.1, shall continue to be available to the Selected Bidder.
10.	Page No.: 35 Clause No.:13.1 Limitation of liability. Total liability capped at Total Contract Value, but the cap does NOT apply to fraud, wilful misconduct, gross negligence, breach of confidentiality, data breach or IP infringement (i.e., unlimited for these).	Clarification/amendment sought. Request NREDCAP to (a) limit the Vendor's aggregate liability - including for data breach & confidentiality - to the Total Contract Value, retaining unlimited liability only for fraud & wilful misconduct; and (b) expressly exclude indirect, incidental, consequential & loss-of-profit damages. Standard IT-contracting practice, particularly as the Portal is hosted on State-controlled infrastructure.	Clause 13.1 already limits the Vendor's total liability to the Total Contract Value. However, this limitation does not apply to fraud, wilful misconduct, gross negligence, breach of confidentiality, data breach, intellectual property infringement, or violation of applicable law, considering the sensitive Government and project data handled through the Portal. The proposed exclusions and further limitation of liability are therefore not envisaged. Therefore, Tender conditions shall prevail.
11.	Page No.: 36-38 Clause No.:15, 16.6 Risk purchase / completion by third party. NREDCAP may engage another vendor 'at the risk and cost of the existing Vendor'; Vendor liable for the excess cost of completion (uncapped).	Amendment sought: cap & due process. Request that the Vendor's liability under risk-purchase/third-party-completion provisions be capped (e.g., within the overall liability cap or the value of unexecuted work), and that a reasonable cure period & prior written notice be provided before risk purchase is invoked.	The applicability of risk purchase and the Vendor's liability shall be governed by Clauses 13, 15, and 16 of the RFP, as applicable. Tender conditions shall prevail.
12.	Page No.: 33 Clause No.:12.2(b) Security-breach SLA penalty. 5% of monthly payment for EACH security breach/data-loss incident 'regardless of severity'; compounding for 4+ incidents; cumulative penalty	Relaxation sought: severity-based & capped penalties. Request NREDCAP to (a) make the security-breach penalty severity-based (aligned to Severity Levels 1-3) rather than a flat 5% regardless of severity; (b) apply an overall cap on cumulative SLA penalties (e.g., 10% of the relevant monthly/quarterly payment); and	The security-breach SLA provisions have been prescribed considering the sensitivity of Government and project data handled through the Portal. Incidents attributable to circumstances beyond the Vendor's control shall be governed by the exclusions specified under Clause 12.2(b)(v).

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
.	>= 10% for two consecutive months -> termination + PS forfeiture.	(c) exclude incidents from vulnerabilities in NREDCAP-provided infrastructure/third-party components, or zero-day exploits promptly remediated by the Vendor.	The penalty and termination provisions under Clause 12.2(b) shall remain applicable. Tender conditions shall prevail.
13.	Page No. : 20, 25 Clause No.: 5.15, 10.1 Intellectual property. All IPR in the Portal vests solely in NREDCAP; the Vendor 'will not have the right to use or reproduce the software in whatsoever manner, even after the end of this Contract.'	Amendment sought: carve-out for pre-existing/reusable IP. Request NREDCAP to carve out the Vendor's pre-existing IP, proprietary tools, frameworks, libraries & generic reusable components from the IP assignment - granting NREDCAP a perpetual, royalty-free licence to use such components as embedded in the Portal, while assigning ownership of all bespoke, project-specific deliverables. Standard practice; enables cost-efficient delivery.	All intellectual property rights and data generated, submitted, or stored in any form within the ecosystem of Unified/ Single Desk Portal shall only remain the sole property of NREDCAP.
14.	Page No.: 25 Clause No.:7.1, 8.2 Software licences. All software licences/tools to be arranged by the Vendor at no additional cost, perpetual and in NREDCAP's name (Cl.7.1); open-source adoption encouraged (Cl.8.2).	Clarification sought. Request confirmation that an open-source technology stack (e.g., Linux, PostgreSQL, open-source application server/CMS) is acceptable to avoid recurring proprietary-licence costs; and clarify whether the cost of any mandated commercial licences (if a specific proprietary product is required) is to be included in the quoted price or reimbursed at actuals.	a) Where open-source software or tools are proposed, the Service Provider shall use stable and secure versions. The same shall be reviewed as part of the security audit conducted by a CERT-In empaneled auditor. b) In case of using Open-Source Software, the Government of India has notified the 'Policy on Adoption of Open-Source Software for Government of India' in the Gazette of India on 02.04.2015, which must be followed for adoption of Open-Source Software in all e -Governance systems. c) All software licences and tools required for development and deployment, including database and application-server licences, shall be arranged by the Service Provider without additional cost to NREDCAP. The associated costs, if any, shall be included in the quoted price.

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
15.	Page No.: 22 Clause No.: 5.21(c)(ii) Change Requests beyond 10 man-days. CRs up to ~10 man-days performed by the Vendor within maintenance; CRs beyond 10 man-days 'mutually agreed' - no pricing basis specified.	Clarification sought: rate card for additional effort. Request NREDCAP to define a man-day rate card (or a Schedule-of-Rates line item) for Change Requests exceeding 10 man-days, so additional-effort work is priced transparently & consistently across bidders.	Where a Change Request is assessed to require more than 10 man-days of effort, the scope and estimated effort shall be determined on a case-to-case basis and mutually agreed upon between NREDCAP and the Service Provider prior to commencement of the Change Request. The price for such additional effort shall be determined by applying the relevant man-month rate quoted by the Bidder in the Man-Month Rate template uploaded along with Formats 12 and 13. The Change Request shall be undertaken only after obtaining prior written approval from NREDCAP. Please refer to Format 17 in Corrigendum III.
16.	Page No.: 42,67 Clause No.: 18, 36.1 Local office / AP GST registration. Clause 18 (Eligibility) does NOT stipulate a local/branch/registered office in Andhra Pradesh as an eligibility condition. However, Cl.36.1: 'The Vendor shall mandatorily obtain registration under the GST Law in Andhra Pradesh.'	Clarification/relaxation sought. Request NREDCAP to (a) confirm that a local/branch/registered office or physical presence in Andhra Pradesh is NOT a pre-condition for eligibility or award, and a Company registered elsewhere in India (with Udyam/DPIIT registration) is fully eligible; and (b) relax Cl.36.1 to permit the Vendor to render services on an inter-State basis under its existing (home-State) GSTIN charging IGST, OR require the AP GST registration only after issuance of the LOA (post-award, not at bid stage). An AP GSTIN necessitates a place of business in the State and imposes a disproportionate up-front cost on out-of-State MSEs/startups.	a) A local, branch, or registered office in Andhra Pradesh is not an eligibility condition. A company registered elsewhere in India may participate, subject to fulfilment of the eligibility and qualification requirements specified in the RFP. b) As per Clause 36.1, the Vendor shall obtain GST registration in Andhra Pradesh. However, such registration may be obtained after issuance of the Letter of Award and before commencement of services or submission of invoices under the Contract.
17.	Page No.: 20,23 Clause No.: 5.5, 5.12, 5.21(f)	Relaxation/clarification sought: remote delivery. As the solution is delivered remotely and hosted on the State Data	During the Design and Development phase, the Project Manager shall attend the weekly project review at NREDCAP, Vijayawada, in person unless

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
	On-site presence obligations. The Project Manager 'shall visit NREDCAP, Vijayawada once every week' (Cl.5.5); team to adhere to NREDCAP duty hours (Cl.5.12); ATS 'primarily off-site' but on-site support team may be required for urgent needs (Cl.5.21(f)).	Centre, request NREDCAP to (a) permit weekly project reviews to be conducted virtually (video-conference), with in-person visits on a periodic (e.g., monthly)/as-required basis; and (b) confirm on-site support under Cl.5.21(f) is strictly need-based and that a permanent local office/dedicated on-site team is not mandated. Enables cost-efficient delivery by MSE/startup bidders without a permanent AP establishment.	NREDCAP permits a particular review to be conducted through video conference. Additional in-person visits may be required for requirement workshops, departmental consultations, UAT, training, security-audit closure and Go-Live. During the ATS period, support may ordinarily be provided off-site. The Project Manager or relevant technical personnel shall attend NREDCAP in person when required for critical incidents, major releases, review meetings, training, or other urgent requirements, without additional cost to NREDCAP.
18.	Page 61 Clause 30 Public Procurement Policy for MSMEs: EMD exemption provided upon submitting Udyam Registration.	Please confirm if relaxed eligibility standards regarding Prior Turnover and Prior Experience under Rule 173(i) of General Financial Rules (GFR) / Public Procurement Policy are applicable for registered DPIIT Startups and Micro/Small Enterprises (MSMEs). Justification / Policy Context: Encourages participation from innovative technology startups and registered MSMEs in accordance with Central and State Public Procurement Directives.	The cited provisions relate to Central Government procurement and do not, by themselves, create an automatic exemption in this tender. The eligibility requirements relating to Prior Turnover and Prior Experience have been prescribed considering the nature, complexity, and implementation timeline of the project and shall apply uniformly to all bidders. No separate relaxation is provided for DPIIT-recognised Startups or registered Micro and Small Enterprises. Tender conditions shall prevail.
19.	Page 48 Clause 19.1(e)(i) Sr. No. 2 Technical Evaluation Criteria: Scoring for experience in serving clients specifically in the Energy/Power sector (Max: 10 Marks).	We request broadening this evaluation parameter to include State/Central Government Departments, Municipal Corporations, or Public Utility Boards. Proposed Text: "Experience in serving clients in Energy, Power, Public Utility, or e-Governance domain".	This criterion is not a minimum qualifying requirement. It is intended to award additional technical marks to bidders with experience in Energy/Power sector, subject to their fulfilment of the minimum eligibility and qualification criteria specified in the RFP. Tender conditions shall prevail.

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
		Justification / Policy Context: The primary scope is the software design and development of an e-Governance Single Desk Portal. Workflow automation, API integration, and user dashboards are technically identical across government departments and public utility domains. Broadening the clause ensures maximum competitive participation.	
20.	Page 49 Clause 19.1(e)(i) Sr. No. 3 Technical Evaluation Criteria: Experience in developing Unified/Single Desk Portals for State/Central Government (Max: 15 Marks).	Please confirm that web-based software applications/portals delivered to Government bodies featuring online application submission, scrutiny workflows, approval routing, or public service delivery will be evaluated under this criterion. Justification / Policy Context: Many functional government workflow applications deliver Single-Window / Single-Desk functionality regardless of whether the official project nomenclature explicitly contains the words "Single Desk".	A project shall be considered a Unified/Single Desk Portal under this criterion where it has been developed for a State Government, Central Government, or their respective departments/bodies, and the documentary evidence establishes that the portal integrates multiple Government departments or approval authorities through a defined end-to-end workflow for processing applications, documents, queries, scrutiny and approvals. Such integration may be implemented through APIs or other approved mechanisms with existing departmental portals, and/or through direct processing by departmental officials within the common portal. Payment-gateway functionality, where implemented, may be considered as an additional relevant feature but shall not be mandatory for classification as a Unified/Single Desk Portal. The project need not specifically bear the title "Unified/Single Desk Portal." Equivalent terminology such as "Single Window Clearance System," "Integrated Clearance Portal" or "Single Desk Clearance System" may be considered, provided the

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
			submitted documentary evidence establishes equivalent functionality.
22	Page 49 Clause 19.1(e)(i) Sr. No. 4 Quality Certifications: ISO 9001 (1 mark), ISO 20000 (1 mark), ISO 27001 (1 mark), CMMI Level 3/4/5 (2 marks).	Please confirm if a bidder holding CMMI Level 3 or higher, along with ISO 9001 and ISO 27001, is eligible to receive full marks under this parameter, or if ISO 20000 is strictly mandatory. Justification / Policy Context: Standardizes quality maturity evaluation for software engineering organizations.	The certifications listed under Serial No. 4 of Clause 19.1(e)(i) are not mandatory eligibility requirements. Subject to meeting the minimum eligibility criteria, the bidder shall receive marks for each valid certification submitted, as per the scoring criteria. For a bidder holding ISO 9001, ISO 27001 and CMMI Level 3, the score shall be: a) ISO 9001: 1 mark b) ISO 27001: 1 mark c) CMMI Level 3: 1 mark d) ISO 20000: 0 marks Total: 3 marks out of 5 If the bidder holds CMMI Level 4 or 5, instead of Level 3, the total score shall be 4 marks out of 5. ISO 20000 is required only for the additional 1 mark allocated to that certification.
23	Pages 15, 18 Clause 3.1(d) & 3.8 System Integration: SMS, Email, and WhatsApp Gateway integration for notifications and bi-directional communications.	Please confirm whether NREDCAP / GoAP will provide access to the State's centralized WhatsApp Business API (WABA) and SMS Gateway credentials, or if transactional message costs need to be factored into the vendor's commercial bid. Justification / Policy Context: Provides operational clarity regarding third-party API subscription costs versus direct state infrastructure utilization.	The Service Provider shall arrange the necessary WhatsApp Business API and SMS Gateway services. All associated subscription, integration, and transactional messaging costs shall be factored into the Price Bid, without any additional cost to NREDCAP.
24	Pages 16-17 Clause 3.3(f)	In the event an external department portal does not currently support open RESTful	Where RESTful APIs are unavailable, the Service Provider shall assess the existing departmental

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
.	API Integration: Integration with external departmental portals via secure APIs.	APIs, will NREDCAP facilitate API enablement, or will staging database sync/secure file transfers be permitted? Justification / Policy Context: Protects implementation timelines and SLA calculations during Phase 1 deployment against external department readiness dependencies.	system and propose suitable secure alternative integration mechanisms, such as middleware-based integration, secure file transfer, or controlled data synchronization, subject to approval by NREDCAP and the concerned department. No direct access to a departmental production database shall be implemented without the concerned department's written approval and required security clearance. NREDCAP shall facilitate necessary coordination with the concerned departments. Any delay attributable to the readiness or non-availability of external departmental systems shall be evaluated by NREDCAP on a case-to-case basis, considering the circumstances and supporting documentation submitted by the Service Provider.
25	Pages 21, 25 Clause 5.20(g) & 7.1 Technology Stack & Licensing: Open-source software must use stable versions.	Please confirm that industry-standard open-source web technology stacks (e.g., Node.js, Python, PostgreSQL, React, Angular) hosted on the AP State Data Centre (APSDC) are fully preferred and acceptable. Justification / Policy Context: Aligns with the Government of India Policy on Adoption of Open Source Software for e-Governance Systems.	a) Where open-source software or tools are proposed, the Service Provider shall use stable and secure versions. The same shall be reviewed as part of the security audit conducted by a CERT-In empaneled auditor. b) In case of using Open-Source Software, the Government of India has notified the 'Policy on Adoption of Open-Source Software for Government of India' in the Gazette of India on 02.04.2015, which must be followed for adoption of Open-Source Software in all e -Governance systems.
26	Pages 26, 49-51 Clause 11 / 19.1(e)(i) Sr. No. 5	Please confirm that equivalent recognized technical degrees (e.g., B.E., B.Sc-IT, M.Sc-CS/IT) along with equivalent years of relevant domain experience will be treated	The minimum educational qualifications and experience requirements for key personnel have been specifically prescribed under Clause 11, considering the nature and requirements of the

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
	Key Personnel Qualifications: Professional staff requirements (e.g., B.Tech / MCA / MBA).	on par with B.Tech/MCA for technical software roles. Justification / Policy Context: Ensures qualified technical personnel are evaluated fairly based on practical industry experience and equivalent degree standards.	project. The evaluation framework places importance on both the prescribed educational qualifications and relevant professional experience to ensure availability of suitably qualified resources for successful implementation of the project. Further, additional technical marks are awarded based on the qualifications and experience of the proposed personnel through evaluation of the CVs under Clause 19.1(e)(i), subject to meeting the minimum requirements specified in Clause 11. Tender conditions shall prevail.
27	Page No. 6 – Glossary e-Governance projects means the initiatives undertaken by the government to use information and communication technology (ICT) for delivering public services, improving administrative efficiency, enhancing transparency, and enabling effective interaction among government, citizens, businesses and employees.	Clarification: It is requested to clarify that assignments involving the design, development, implementation and maintenance of web portals and enterprise applications for government power sector utilities shall also be considered as e-Governance Projects, where such solutions improve administrative efficiency, enhance transparency, automate workflows and enable effective interaction among stakeholders. Accordingly, solutions such as Energy Portfolio Management (EPM), Bill Verification solutions and other similar digital solutions may be considered as qualifying e-Governance Projects, as they meet the objectives of e-Governance defined in the RFP.	Such assignments may be considered e-Governance Projects only where the documentary evidence establishes that the solution was developed for a Government department, Government utility or eligible public entity and involved ICT-enabled public administration, workflow automation, transparency, service delivery, or stakeholder interaction consistent with the RFP definition.
28	Page No. 49; Clause 19.1 (e) (i) Sl. No. 3	Experience in developing Unified/ Single Desk/ Web/ cloud-based Portals for State	a) Experience in developing web-based or cloud-based portals for State or Central Government,

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification																				
.	Experience in developing Unified/ Single Desk Portals for State or Central Government in India over the five financial years prior to the Bid Due Date. <table><tr><th>Number of Works</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td>Nil</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>1-4</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>5-7</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>>7</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Number of Works	Score	Nil	0	1-4	5	5-7	10	>7	15	or Central Government in India over the five financial years prior to the Bid Due Date. <table><tr><th>Number of Works Portal(s)</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td>Nil</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>1-4</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>5-7</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>>7</td><td>15</td></tr></table> Rationale: It is requested to include Web/Cloud Based Portals along with Unified/Single Desk Portals as both involve similar technologies and implementation capabilities. For evaluation purpose, Bidders may also be permitted to submit live portal links and demonstrations, along with work orders and Go-Live/UAT/Performance certificates, since such documents may not explicitly describe the portal as a Unified/Single Desk Portal. Evaluation may be based on the number of portals instead of the number of works to better reflect relevant experience. Further, assignments that have been successfully deployed and are under operation may also be considered for evaluation.	Number of Works Portal(s)	Score	Nil	0	1-4	5	5-7	10	>7	15	where such experience qualifies as an e-Governance project, is already covered under the minimum technical qualification criteria specified in Clause 19.1(b). The criterion under Clause 19.1(e)(i), Sl. No. 3 is intended to award additional technical marks specifically to bidders having experience in developing Unified/Single Desk Portals for State or Central Government. Accordingly, general web-based or cloud-based portal experience shall not be considered under this specific scoring criterion, as qualifying e-Governance portal experience is already covered under the minimum technical qualification criteria. Therefore, Tender conditions shall prevail. b) Bidders intending to provide live portal links may include the relevant URL in the “Description of Services” column of Form 1, titled “Relevant Services Carried Out in the Last Five Years That Best Illustrate Qualifications,” under Format 8A. c) Where the Work Order, Go-Live Certificate, UAT Certificate, Performance Certificate, or Completion Certificate does not expressly mention “Unified/Single Desk Portal,” equivalent industry terms such as “Single Window Clearance System,” “Integrated Clearance Portal,” “Single Desk Clearance System,” or similar terminology may be considered, provided the submitted documents clearly establish that the portal
Number of Works	Score																						
Nil	0																						
1-4	5																						
5-7	10																						
>7	15																						
Number of Works Portal(s)	Score																						
Nil	0																						
1-4	5																						
5-7	10																						
>7	15																						

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
			integrates multiple Government departments through defined workflows for processing investment-related approvals. Live portal links and demonstrations may be submitted as supplementary evidence.
29	Page No. 49; Clause No.: 19.1 (e)(i) Sl. No. 5 Key Personnel Experience.....	Rationale: It is requested that evaluation be based on relevant technical competencies and experience in delivering similar enterprise IT solutions, irrespective of whether the client is a government or private organization. Restricting the evaluation of key personnel to Government e Governance experience is restrictive in nature. Experience in developing web portals, enterprise applications, workflow automation systems and digital platforms should be accorded equivalent weightage, as the required technical capabilities remain the same.	The personnel evaluation criteria have been formulated considering the specific requirements of the proposed Unified/Single Desk Portal, which involves Government approval workflows, inter-departmental coordination, and integration with multiple Government systems. Experience in e-Governance projects provides relevant exposure to the functional, operational, and regulatory aspects essential for successful implementation of the project. Accordingly, the personnel evaluation criteria prescribed in the RFP shall remain applicable. Tender conditions shall prevail.
30	Page No. 24; Clause No. 5.21 (j) (XV) The Unified/Single Desk Portal shall be primarily hosted at the Andhra Pradesh State Data Centre/APSDC or any other hosting environment designated by NREDCAP/ITE&C Department/APTS. Cloud hosting shall be permitted only	Clarification: Kindly clarify the responsibility for provisioning and bearing the cost of the cloud hosting infrastructure throughout the contract period. Specifically, please confirm whether the cloud infrastructure (including cloud subscription, compute, storage, database, network, backup, security services, etc.) will be provided by NREDCAP or whether the selected bidder is required to provision and manage the	Primary hosting shall be at APSDC. After issuance of the LOA and commencement of the work, the Selected Bidder shall assess and recommend the required server sizing, storage, bandwidth, backup, security services, and other infrastructure specifications required for hosting on APSDC based on the finalized solution requirements. The Selected Bidder shall submit the finalized infrastructure requirements to NREDCAP. NREDCAP shall coordinate with APSDC for provisioning the required infrastructure and make the applicable hosting payments directly to APSDC. Accordingly, bidders

S No	Clause as per RfP	Clarification sought	Response/ Clarification
	with prior written approval of NREDCAP and the competent authorities of ITE&C/APTS, and only through MeitY empanelled India-based cloud infrastructure. The Service Provider shall not host, store, process, replicate or transfer any application data outside India or on any non-approved infrastructure.	complete cloud hosting environment as part of the scope of work.	are not required to include APSDC hosting costs in the Price Bid.
31	Bid Due Date (Bid Submission Deadline): 24.08.2026 from 17:00 Hours	We request an extension of 14 working days for bid submission from the date of issue of corrigendum.	Refer to Corrigendum III

Sd/-
VC & Managing Director