

MAHARASHTRA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION					
Tender No: 04/2026					
Tender for Providing Ancillary Security Services during Examinations Conducted by MPSC					
Replies to queries raised by the bidders - Date 09/05/2026					
Sr. No.	Document Clause No.	Clause Title	Query	Justification by Bidder	Clarification/Decision
1	Clause 5.7.2.1 Objective Sub Clause- (2)(iii) (also ref. Annexure 9, Sr. No. 4)	"Palm- Capturing and Facial recognition of candidate by verifying Candidate's identity on real-time basis." (Cl. 5.7.2.1(2)(iii))	<p>Clause 5.7.2.1(2) enumerates three biometric authentication mechanisms, including at Sub Clause (iii) Palm-Capturing and Facial recognition.</p> <p>UIDAI currently supports three Aadhaar authentication modalities: fingerprint, IRIS and face recognition. Palm-based biometric authentication is not a recognized modality under the UIDAI authentication framework.</p> <p>The following clarifications are required: (a) Whether palm-capturing under Sub Clause (iii) is intended as a non-Aadhaar, alternative verification mechanism and not as an Aadhaar authentication modality; and (b) Annexure 9 Sr. No. 4 prices Biometric Authentication and Attendance Marking Services on a per-candidate-per-shift basis without a separate line item for palm-based authentication, which involves distinct hardware, software integration and operational workflow from fingerprint or IRIS-based authentication. Clarification is requested on whether palm-capturing services are priced within the existing per-candidate rate or through a separate mechanism, and under which line item.</p>	<p>Palm vein authentication hardware and associated software differ materially from STQC-certified fingerprint and IRIS devices used for Aadhaar based authentication. System design, device procurement and integration architecture for palm-capture require independent planning and costing. The absence of a distinct pricing line item and absence of clarity on the authentication framework applicable to this modality makes it impossible to accurately scope and price this service element.</p>	<p>Priced within the existing per candidates rate.</p>
2	Clause 5.7.1.5 General Instructions/Conditions Sub Clause- 19	"The Metal Detector provided for Frisking should be able to detect any prohibited metallic ornaments/electronic devices at examination sub-Centre on the day of examination except pen and admission certificate." (Cl. 5.7.1.5(19))	<p>The clause requires metal detectors to detect prohibited metallic ornaments in addition to prohibited electronic devices. It is requested that the detection scope under this clause be revised to focus exclusively on prohibited electronic devices, reading as: "The Metal Detector provided for Frisking should be able to detect any prohibited electronic devices at examination sub-Centre on the day of examination except pen and admission certificate."</p>	<p>The primary security objective of frisking in examination contexts is detection and prevention of electronic unfair means devices. Extension of mandatory detection scope to metallic ornaments such as rings, earrings, watch straps, hair accessories and metal buttons routinely triggers false alarms for lawful personal items, slowing candidate entry flow and extending secondary screening time. Focusing detection capability on electronic devices enables more efficient and targeted security screening within the examination entry time window.</p>	<p>As per tender conditions.</p>

3	Clause 5.6.28 General Terms Governing Scope of Work	<p>"The service provider also has to incorporate emerging technologies such as AI, Blockchain, WhatsApp and open-source frameworks for scalability and maintainability as per requirements." (Cl. 5.6.28)</p>	<p>Clause 5.6.28 mandates incorporation of AI, Blockchain, WhatsApp and open-source frameworks as blanket contractual obligations across all services under this tender. It is requested to consider exclusion of this clause or, alternatively, revision to specify that any emerging technology requirements shall be defined examination-wise through the applicable Work Order rather than as a universal base-scope obligation.</p>	<p>Frisking, QR scanning, biometric authentication, CCTV surveillance and SIP telephony each operate on distinct technology stacks with well-defined functional requirements. Mandating AI, Blockchain and WhatsApp as universal requirements introduces architectural prescriptions disconnected from the operational needs of specific services. Blockchain has limited applicability to real-time examination-day authentication workflows. WhatsApp is a commercially licensed third-party messaging platform not suited to secure government examination communications. Technology requirements, if specific, are appropriately defined through examination-wise Work Orders, allowing MPSC to specify and scope them against actual need without imposing blanket compliance costs on all service components.</p>	As per tender conditions.
4	Clause 5.7.5.2 Scope and Functional Requirement Sub Clause- 7	<p>"Complete recordings of the entire examination duration, sub-centre-wise and room-wise, shall be submitted to MPSC in the prescribed format within Ten (10) days of successful completion of the examination, unless otherwise specified in the Work Order." (Cl. 5.7.5.2(7))</p>	<p>Clause 5.7.5.2(7) requires submission of complete CCTV recordings to MPSC within 10 days of examination completion. We request this timeline be revised to 30 days from successful completion of the examination.</p>	<p>A single MPSC examination may involve up to 1,475 sub-centres and 19,433 rooms across multiple shifts. At the minimum deployment ratio of one camera per 24 candidates, total camera count may reach or exceed 19,433 units. Compiling quality-checked, room-wise and sub-centre-wise indexed recordings, applying digitalhash verification as required under Clause 5.7.5.4(8), and completing encrypted upload or physical handover of recording volumes potentially in the range of several hundred terabytes within 10 days is technically infeasible at this scale. A 30-day submission window is operationally proportionate to the scope and consistent with delivery timelines in comparable large-scale government examination CCTV engagements.</p>	As per tender conditions.

5	Clause 5.7.5.3 Detailed Scope of Work Sub Clause- 8	<p>"...as a mechanism to handle the live CCTV coverage of about 2000 venues at the MPSC Control Room, the Service Provider is required to arrange a Video Management Software Platform and adequate internet connectivity..." (Cl. 5.7.5.3(8))</p>	<p>Clause 5.7.5.3(8) specifies that the Control Room Video Management Software Platform must be equipped to handle live CCTV coverage from approximately 2,000 venues. Table 5.3.3 of this tender, however, sets the maximum sub-centres for a single MPSC examination at 1,475. These two figures are inconsistent. We request MPSC to confirm the definitive maximum venue count to assess the cost implications and arrive at the best competitive rate.</p>	<p>A 35% differential between 1,475 (Table 5.3.3) and 2,000 (Clause 5.7.5.3(8)) represents a material difference in infrastructure investment. Accurate confirmation is necessary before infrastructure design and cost estimation can be completed.</p>	<p>As per tender conditions.</p>
6	Clause 5.7.5.4 Technical Features of Cameras/Machines Sub Clause- 8	<p>"Audio recording shall be enabled only if specifically required in Work Order and permitted by applicable guidelines. All recordings shall be retained securely as per the Tender conditions unless otherwise specified. Recordings shall be digitally hashed (SHA-256 or equivalent) to ensure integrity and shall be accessed/downloaded only by authorised roles with complete audit trail logs." (Cl. 5.7.5.4(8))</p>	<p>Clause 5.7.5.4(8) provides for audio recording capability, conditional on specific enablement through Work Orders. The Price Schedule at Annexure 9 does not include a separate pricing line item for audio-enabled recording; only per-camera-per-shift rates are prescribed under Sr. Nos. 5, 6 and 7. We request confirmation of our understanding that: When audio recording is invoked through a Work Order, a separate pricing mechanism will be established to cover the additional cost of audio-capable device deployment, increased bandwidth utilization and higher storage requirements; and audio recording is not expected to be delivered within the existing per-camera-per-shift rate without additional compensation.</p>	<p>Audio-enabled recording requires cameras with integrated microphone capability, additional codec processing, higher upload bandwidth for audio-video streaming and greater storage allocation compared to video-only recording. The cost differential between audio-video capable and video-only camera systems is material from a hardware procurement and deployment standpoint. Inclusion of audio capability within the same per-camera rate as video-only recording would create an unremunerative obligation for Service Providers in examinations where audio recording is invoked.</p>	<p>As per tender conditions.</p>
7	Clause 5.7.5.4 Technical Features of Cameras/Machines Sub Clause- 2 (also ref. Clause 5.6.4)	<p>"The camera should have battery backup of at least 10 hours of continuous working." (Cl. 5.7.5.4(2)) read with "...the Service Provider shall arrange a minimum power backup of fifteen (15) minutes only for CCTV Surveillance Services at each examination sub-centre..." (Cl. 5.6.4)</p>	<p>Clause 5.7.5.4(2) requires cameras to have 10 hours of self-contained battery backup. Clause 5.6.4 of the same tender prescribes a minimum power backup of 15 minutes for CCTV Surveillance Services at each sub-centre. We request MPSC to amend the minimum power backup requirement to 15 minutes consistently throughout the tender document.</p>	<p>A 10-hour self-contained battery requirement implies a fundamentally different camera hardware architecture, involving integrated battery modules, higher device weight and significantly increased unit cost, compared to standard PoE or DC-powered cameras with a sub-centre-level UPS for 15-minute failover. The contradiction between the two clauses makes it impossible to finalize camera hardware specification, power architecture design and cost estimation. Standardizing to 15 minutes across the document removes the inconsistency and aligns with the power backup obligation already established under Clause 5.6.4.</p>	<p>Cameras to have 10 hours of self-contained battery backup.</p>

8	Clause 5.7.12 API Management Platform Sub Clause- 5.7.12(1), 5.7.12(2) and 5.7.12(5)	"The service provider shall propose and build a proper enterprise API management solution and it should not be an integrated/bundled software with any business application; it should be deployed as an independent platform." (Cl. 5.7.12(1))	<p>Two clarifications are sought in respect of Clause 5.7.12:</p> <p>(a) The present engagement is examination-event-based and primarily involves operational services with defined data exchange interfaces to MPSC systems, UIDAI and district-level platforms. Clarification is requested on whether a dedicated, independently deployed enterprise API Management Platform as specified in Clause 5.7.12(1) is a mandatory deliverable under the base scope of this contract, or whether compliance with the integration and interoperability requirements of Chapter 5 through secure, standards-compliant API interfaces will be considered sufficient.</p> <p>(b) Clause 5.7.12(2) requires an "open standards-based API management" solution while Clause 5.7.12(5) specifies that "API must be open source and easy to integrate." The terms "open standards-based" and "open source" represent distinct technical and licensing concepts. Clarification is requested whether the term "open source" refers specifically to Free and Open Source Software (FOSS) platforms with published source code, or whether commercially licensed API management solutions based on open industry standards would also be acceptable, provided all functional, security and integration requirements under the tender are complied with.</p>	Dedicated enterprise API Management Platforms with lifecycle governance, analytics, access control and independent gateway deployment are generally implemented in large-scale multi-system environments involving extensive enterprise integrations. The integration requirements under the present tender primarily relate to secure exchange of examination-related data with external systems and operational platforms. Clarification regarding the intended deployment architecture and applicability of open-source requirements is therefore necessary for appropriate solution design, infrastructure planning and cost estimation.	Compliance with the integration and interoperability requirements of Chapter 5 through secure, standards-compliant API interfaces will be considered sufficient.
9	Clause 5.8 Ownership of Source Code and Licensing Sub Clause- 5.8.1 to 5.8.4	"All Software including source code, plans, drawings, CASE tools, specifications, designs, reports and other documents prepared by the service provider in the execution of the contract shall become and remain the exclusive property of the MPSC..." (Cl. 5.8.1)	Clause 5.8 requires all software including source code developed by the Service Provider to become the exclusive property of MPSC with IPR vesting with MPSC. In this regard, it is requested to kindly consider excluding Clause 5.8 from the scope of the present contract or alternatively clarify that the said provision shall apply only to custom developments specifically created for MPSC under this engagement and shall not extend to the Service Provider's pre-existing proprietary platforms, frameworks, software components and related intellectual property.	The services envisaged under the tender, including biometric authentication, candidate verification, surveillance management and examination workflow processing, are generally delivered through established proprietary technology platforms, software frameworks and integration tools developed and deployed across multiple projects and clients. Such platforms are subject to continuous enhancement and represent substantial long-term technology and implementation investment. MPSC's ownership and control over all examination-related data, reports, recordings and deliverables are already adequately addressed under other provisions of the tender. Clarification regarding applicability of source code and IPR transfer provisions is therefore necessary for appropriate understanding of the contractual scope and technology deployment framework.	As per tender conditions.

10	Clause 3.4.4 Service Levels and Penalty Sub Clause- Sr. No. 16	<p>"Performance/Activities: SIP enabled Phone not being supplied and/or not working as per work Order. Penalty: (1) Amount of leftover Exam centre would not be paid (2) 100% amount would be penalized as of SIP enabled Phone for that specific Exam sub-centre (Number of Candidate in that Exam Centre x Per Candidate Per Shift rate)." (Cl. 3.4.4, Sr. No. 16)</p>	<p>Annexure 9 Sr. No. 8 prices SIP enabled phones on a Per Phone Per Shift basis. The penalty under Sr. No. 16 sub-clause (2), however, computes the deduction as Number of Candidates in that Exam Centre x Per Candidate Per Shift rate, a per-candidate basis that is inconsistent with the per-phone pricing unit in the BOQ. Clarification is requested on how the penalty under sub-clause (2) is aligned with the Per Phone Per Shift pricing basis in the BOQ, and it is requested that sub-clause (2) be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>Technology services are priced on deployed-unit economics: each SIP phone is a discrete unit of service delivery with a defined cost per shift. Computing the penalty on candidate count for a per-phone priced service creates a structural mismatch between the service unit and the penalty unit, potentially resulting in penalty amounts disproportionate to the revenue attributable to the specific service element not delivered. Aligning the penalty computation with the BOQ pricing unit ensures proportionate and commercially consistent accountability.</p>	As per tender conditions.
11	Annexure 9 Price Schedule Note 2 and Note 3	<p>"(2) Average of the Unit Rate Quoted for all the services shall be taken into account for deciding Lowest Bidder (L-1). (3) The successful bidder has to match all the lowest offers from other bidders for proposed services."</p>	<p>Two clarifications are sought in respect of Annexure 9:</p> <p>(a) Note 2 states that the average of unit rates shall determine L-1. Clarification is requested on the derivation methodology for this average: specifically, whether it is a simple arithmetic mean of the nine unit rates, a weighted average based on estimated volumes, or another formula. The pricing units across services are not uniform, being per-candidate per shift, per-camera per shift and per phone per shift, and the method of computing a comparable average from non-uniform units requires explicit definition.</p> <p>(b) Note 3 requires the successful bidder (L-1) to match the lowest individual rate quoted by any other bidder for each line item. L-1 is determined on the basis of the lowest average rate. These two conditions may conflict: a bidder achieving the lowest average may be required post-award to accept rates on specific line items that are below its quoted individual rates for those items, potentially below cost. Clarification is requested on how Notes 2 and 3 are intended to operate together and in what sequence post-award rate matching under Note 3 would be applied.</p>	<p>Commercial evaluation under a multi-service and multi-unit price schedule requires clear definition of the methodology adopted for determination of L-1 and subsequent application of rate matching provisions. Clarification regarding the evaluation and price alignment mechanism would ensure transparency, consistency and appropriate commercial assessment by bidders while preparing the financial proposal.</p>	As per tender conditions.

12	Clause 5.6.25 General Terms Governing Scope of Work (also ref. Clause 5.6.26)	"SIM based routers shall be used for full coverage of the network connectivity." (Cl. 5.6.25)	Clause 5.6.25 mandates SIM-based routers as the network connectivity technology for examination sub-centres. We request MPSC to consider exclusion of this clause.	SIM-based routers deliver variable throughput dependent on cellular network conditions at each sub-centre, which may be further degraded by MPSC's signal jamming operations under Clause 5.6.26.	SIM based routers or Leased line shall be used for the full coverage of network connectivity as per convenience.
13	Clause 5.6.19 General Terms Governing Scope of Work	"The Service Provider shall take special care of PwBD candidates allotted at the venues to ensure that no inconvenience is caused to them incompletion of the given process and they may be allowed separate/privileged entry wherever possible." (Cl. 5.6.19)	Clause 5.6.19 includes the provision relating to "separate/privileged entry wherever possible" within the scope of the Service Provider's obligations. It is requested to kindly consider removing this portion from the Service Provider's scope under the said clause.	Separate or privileged physical entry arrangements for PwBD candidates depend upon the infrastructure and access layout available at individual examination sub-centres and are generally administered by the Centre In-Charge / MPSC. The Service Provider can facilitate priority handling within the authentication and entry workflow process; however, physical entry management may not be entirely within the operational control of the Service Provider. Clarification in this regard would help avoid ambiguity in operational responsibility.	As per tender conditions.
14	Clause 3.8 Consequences of Termination Sub Clause- 3.8.1(1)	"Ask the Vendor to leave the job and return the entire material in an 'as is where is' condition, and / or." (Cl. 3.8.1(1))	Clause 3.8.1(1) provides that upon termination, the Vendor may be required to return the entire material in "as is where is" condition. In the present technology-enabled examination services engagement, the scope primarily involves digital platforms, cloud-hosted data, authentication records, CCTV recordings and software-based service infrastructure, for which physical return of material may not be operationally applicable. It is further noted that Clause 3.8 includes no provision for payment of services satisfactorily completed up to the effective date of termination. It is therefore requested to kindly consider revising the clause to suitably address termination obligations relevant to technology-based service delivery, including orderly handover of ongoing examination activities, secure transfer of examination-related data and records, and settlement of payment for satisfactorily completed services up to the effective date of termination.	Technology service delivery involves digital assets, cloud infrastructure, API integrations and data repositories that have no physical return equivalent. The termination clause as drafted is calibrated to goods supply or physical works contracts and does not address the nature of an event-based technology services engagement. The absence of a payment provision for completed work creates financial uncertainty for technology providers who have incurred cloud infrastructure, API integration and deployment costs prior to the termination event.	As per tender conditions.

15	<p>Clause 4.1 Period of Contract Sub Clause- 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3 (also ref. Clause 4.2.2 and Annexure 10 Section 8)</p>	<p>"The contract shall be initially for a period of 12 months reckoned from the date as notified in the Letter of Award (LOA). The maximum period of contract will be 5 years subject to extension in the interval of 12 months." (Cl. 4.1.1)</p>	<p>Tender Chapter 4.1 establishes an initial contract period of 12 months extendable up to 5 years in intervals of 12 months. The SLA in Annexure 10, which forms part of this Contract under Clause 2.2, establishes the same maximum duration as 3 years extendable by 2 years. Both frameworks result in the same 5-year maximum but differ structurally. It is requested that Tender Chapter 4.1 be aligned with Annexure 10 to adopt a 3-year initial period extendable by 2 years. Additionally, Clause 4.2.2 states that the contract automatically terminates at the end of the contract period. Under an annual renewal structure, it is unclear whether automatic termination occurs at each 12-month interval or at the end of the 5-year maximum. The 3+2 structure resolves this ambiguity with a defined initial term and a single extension. It may be noted that this request does not alter the maximum total contract duration of 5 years.</p>	<p>Technology platform deployment involves software licensing cycles, cloud infrastructure provisioning agreements, API service arrangements, and hardware refresh planning tied to specific engagement timelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual renewal uncertainty in a 1+1+1+1+1 structure prevents technology investment planning, introduces unnecessary contractual fragmentation and creates platform upgrade uncertainty at each renewal point. • A 3-year initial commitment aligns with standard technology deployment and optimization cycles. The SLA in Annexure 10 already establishes a 3+2 structure; alignment of the main contract removes an internal inconsistency between two documents forming part of the same contractual arrangement. 	<p>Initial contract period of 12 months extendable up to 5 years in intervals of 12 months.</p>
----	---	---	---	--	---

<p>16</p>	<p>Clause 4.1 Period of Contract Sub Clause- 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.6, 4.1.11 (also ref. Clause 3.7.1(5))</p>	<p>"The service provider shall not have the right to withdraw from the contract during the agreed contract period." (Cl. 4.1.6)</p>	<p>The following provisions create asymmetric exit conditions under this contract:</p> <p>(a) Mutual Exit: Clause 4.1.6 does not permit the Service Provider to withdraw, while Clause 3.7.1(5) grants MPSC unrestricted termination at its convenience. Inclusion of a Service Provider exit provision requiring a minimum 90-day prior written notice is requested. (b) Extension Consent: Clause 4.1.3 requires the Service Provider to mandatorily accept extension orders. Clause 8.1 of the SLA (Annexure 10) already provides for renewal on terms mutually decided by both parties. Alignment of the main contract with the mutual consent principle in the SLA is requested.</p> <p>(c) Post-Expiry Continuation: Clause 4.1.11 requires the Service Provider to continue services until a new agency is appointed, with no defined time limit and no rate revision provision. It is requested that post-expiry continuation be made optional at the Service Provider's discretion and that any such continuation be on commercially renegotiated terms including rate escalation.</p> <p>Clarification is sought on whether the 6-month mandatory continuation under Clause 4.1.4 applies where MPSC terminates at its convenience under Clause 3.7.1(5), or only upon natural expiry of the agreed contract period.</p>	<p>The present provisions relating to contract continuation, extension and termination require clarification for proper understanding of long-term service obligations and associated operational planning under the engagement. Clear provisions regarding continuation period, renewal mechanism and exit conditions would support effective contract management for both parties. The SLA already establishes mutual consent as the basis for renewals; alignment of the main contract provisions with this principle creates equitable and commercially workable exit and continuation terms.</p>	<p>As per tender conditions.</p>
-----------	--	---	--	---	----------------------------------

17	Clause No. 1.26.9 and Clause 1.30.1 under Evaluation Process	"Minimum qualifying marks for acceptance of the Technical Bid would be 70. The Bidder, who scores less than this shall be rejected at this stage and the Commercial Bids of such Bidders shall not be opened." (Cl. 1.26.9)	It is requested to kindly consider reducing the minimum qualifying marks in the Technical Evaluation Criteria from 70 marks to 60 marks for eligibility towards opening of the Commercial Bid.	<p>The present qualifying threshold of 70 marks appears comparatively high considering that: (i) The tender already prescribes detailed Pre- Qualification requirements under Clause 1.13 covering financial capability, technical experience, project execution experience and certifications, which collectively ensure participation of adequately qualified and experienced bidders.</p> <p>(ii) Out of the total 100 marks under Technical Evaluation, 25 marks are allocated for Presentation (TQ7), whereas detailed scoring methodology for the presentation has not been specified in the tender document. (iii) Clause 1.30.1 of the tender itself contemplates the possibility of only one bidder qualifying technically. A qualifying threshold of 60 marks may facilitate broader technical participation and competitive price discovery while still maintaining adequate technical screening standards.</p>	As per tender conditions.
18	Clause No. 1.26.6 - TQ2	Upgraded or additional certifications (e.g. CMMIS, etc.): 10 Marks"	The s.no 2 under Clause 1.26.6 provides a separate scoring category of 10 marks for "upgraded or additional certifications"; however, the basis for award of marks under this category has not been clearly defined. In this regard, it is requested to kindly clarify whether ISO certifications under the latest applicable versions/standards, such as ISO 9001:2015 and ISO 27001:2022, would be considered as "upgraded certifications" for the purpose of evaluation under the 10-mark category. Further, clarification is also requested on whether additional ISO certifications apart from ISO 9001 and ISO 27001 shall also be considered for award of marks under this category.	certification standards and consideration of additional ISO certifications would ensure uniform interpretation of the evaluation criteria and enable bidders to appropriately assess the technical scoring basis.	As per tender conditions.

19	Clause No. 1.26.6 under Evaluation	<p>TQ4: Experience of providing Frisking Services in Examination, and</p> <p>TQ5: Experience of providing biometric based Impersonation control services in Examination, and</p> <p>TQ6: Experience of providing CCTV Surveillance Service in Examination</p>	<p>The candidate volume assessment parameters prescribed under Sr. No. 4, 5 and 6 under the Technical</p> <p>Evaluation criteria extend up to "10Lakh and above" candidates in a single examination shift. However, based on the examination capacity details indicated in the tender document, the anticipated examination scale under the present assignment appears comparatively lower and distributed across multiple centres and sessions. Accordingly, it is requested to kindly review the higher candidate-volume benchmarks prescribed in the said clauses and consider aligning with the practical operational scale contemplated for examinations under this tender.</p>	<p>Higher candidate-volume benchmarks beyond the anticipated operational scale of the tender may not provide proportionate additional value in assessment of bidder capability since:</p> <p>(i) Frisking services are primarily dependent upon proportional deployment of trained manpower and screening equipment. (ii) Biometric impersonation control capability is dependent upon system readiness, authentication workflow, device management and real-time data handling architecture.</p> <p>(iii) CCTV surveillance capability is determined through deployment planning, live monitoring infrastructure and operational management of surveillance systems. The above capabilities are operationally demonstrable at the candidate volumes envisaged under the tender itself. A more aligned evaluation framework would support balanced technical assessment and broader competition in line with the principles of transparent and competitive public procurement under GFR 2017.</p>	As per tender conditions.
----	------------------------------------	---	--	---	---------------------------

<p>20</p>	<p>Clause No. 5.6.15 r/w Clause 5.6.16 (also ref. Clause. 5.7.4(14) and Cl. 5.7.5.2(1))</p>	<p>"The examination schedule, detailed list of examination sub-centers/venues and number of candidates for each venue will be provided to the Service Provider 2 to 3 weeks prior to commencement of the examination for making on-site preparation in consultation with the Centre In Charge." (Cl. 5.6.15) "MPSC will provide candidate details (Name, Roll No., Photo etc.) seven (7) days prior to the date of commencement of Exam for use in the Aadhaar based Authentication process and QR Code Scanning of e- Admission certificates." (Cl. 5.6.16)</p>	<p>The referred clauses provide the different timelines for sharing the examination schedule and candidate details. For an examination involving up to 1,475 sub-centres across 36 districts, this window is operationally insufficient. It is requested to revise the timeline under Clause 5.6.16 to align with Clause 5.6.15, providing candidate details at least 14 days prior to the examination.</p>	<p>Hardware deployment including biometric devices, CCTV cameras, SIP phones and connectivity infrastructure requires advance logistical preparation at each sub-centre. Loading centre-wise candidate data onto individual devices, verifying device functionality and completing preexamination testing within a 5-day window across 1,475 sub-centres is operationally challenging and increases the risk of last-minute device failures.</p>	<p>As per tender conditions.</p>
-----------	---	---	---	--	----------------------------------

<p>21</p>	<p>Clause No. 5.6.20 under 5.6 General Terms Governing Scope of Work</p>	<p>After the completion of the entire process as per the Scope of Work, the Service Provider has to hold the data on its Secured Cloud Server with 256-bit encryption for a minimum period of one (01) year from the date of the examination or 30 days after the declaration of final result of the examination,</p>	<p>The clause prescribes data retention for the later of one year from the examination date or 30 days after declaration of final result. For examinations conducted in the later years of the contract period, the declaration of final result may occur after the expiry of the contract term, as MPSC recruitment</p>	<p>A retention period extending beyond the contract term creates open-ended postcontract obligations for the Service Provider without corresponding commercial provision. A retention period of three (03) months from the date of examination is consistent with provisions in similar examination security tenders and is adequate for post-examination verification and audit purposes. Additionally, retention of biometric records, CCTV recordings and attendance logs across multiple examinations over a 5 years contract period represents a substantial recurring infrastructure cost that is difficult to estimate accurately at bidding stage.</p>	<p>As per tender conditions.</p>
-----------	--	---	--	--	----------------------------------

22	TQ4, TQ5, TQ6 of Clause 1.26.6	Technical Evaluation — Inconsistency in Number of Scoring Slabs between TQ1–TQ3 and TQ4–TQ6	<p>Observation 1: As per Section 5.3.3 of this Tender, the maximum number of sub-centres for a single MPSC examination is 1,475 and the maximum number of candidates at a single venue is 504. Based on these figures, the maximum total candidate counts for a single MPSC examination, even at full scale, works out to approximately 7 to 7.5 Lakh — and this is spread across multiple shifts, not a single shift. The single-shift candidate count for MPSC examinations would therefore be well within 5 Lakh under normal circumstances. In this context, the scoring slabs of 7 Lakh and 10 Lakh and above in TQ4, TQ5, and TQ6 go beyond the realistic scale of MPSC's own examination requirements. Observation 2: It is also observed that the technical evaluation criteria follow different scoring patterns for different parameters. TQ1, TQ2, and TQ3 each use three scoring slabs to arrive at the maximum marks. However, TQ4, TQ5, and TQ6 use five scoring slabs with candidate thresholds set at 3 Lakh / 4 Lakh / 5 Lakh / 7 Lakh / 10 Lakh for a single examination shift, resulting in unequal mark increments of +2, +3, +2, +3 which is not proportionate. Suggestions: In view of the above, we therefore request MPSC to kindly revise the scoring slabs for TQ4, TQ5, and TQ6 as follows:</p> <p>(i) $\geq 3,00,000$ and $< 4,00,000$: 5 Marks (ii) $\geq 4,00,000$ and $< 5,00,000$: 10 Marks (iii) Candidates Count $\geq 5,00,000$: 15 Marks</p>	<p>a) Evaluation slabs that exceed the maximum foreseeable single-shift candidate count of MPSC's own examinations do not measure any additional capability relevant to this specific assignment and may not serve the intended purpose of the evaluation.</p> <p>b) The suggested revision aligns the evaluation slabs with the actual scale of MPSC examinations as defined in Section 5.3.3 of this Tender, and ensures proportionate and transparent scoring increments consistent with the three-slab pattern of TQ1–TQ3.</p>	As per tender conditions.
23	3.4.4(6) — Penalty Terms	Penalty — Frisking Stage Leftover	<p>Clause 3.4.4(6) prescribes a penalty of INR 500 per candidate per session for each error in respect of candidates left unattended during the frisking stage. We request MPSC to kindly consider reducing the penalty quantum from INR 500 per candidate per session to INR 50 per candidate per session for each such error.</p>	<p>A penalty of INR 500 per candidate is disproportionate to the per-candidate frisking service rate. The penalty quantum should bear a reasonable relationship to the service value and the actual financial impact of the error. INR 50 per candidate provides adequate deterrence while remaining proportionate to the service economics.</p>	As per tender conditions.

24	3.8 Consequences of Termination	Return of Material Upon Termination — Orderly Closure and Payment for Completed Work	<p>Clause 3.8.1(1) currently provides that upon termination, MPSC may ask the Vendor to "leave the job and return the entire material in an 'as is where is' condition." It is submitted that this provision is not applicable to the present contract. As per the Scope of Work defined in Chapter 5, all services under this contract are strictly event-based in nature. The Service Provider deploys its equipment for the duration of each examination and retrieves the same upon completion of each event. No material belonging to the Service Provider remains at any examination sub-centre or at MPSC premises between examination events. Accordingly, the question of returning material in "as is where is" condition does not arise in the context of this contract. It is further observed that Clause 3.8 does not include any provision for payment of services satisfactorily rendered up to the date of termination. We therefore request MPSC to kindly consider revising Clause 3.8.1(1) to address obligations that are relevant to this contract, namely:</p> <p>(a) Completion or proper handover of any examination work orders that are in progress at the time of termination; and</p> <p>(b) Secure handover of all examination data, recordings and reports in the custody of the Service Provider to MPSC upon termination; and Payment for all undisputed services satisfactorily performed by the Service Provider up to the effective date of termination.</p>	<p>The current clause is operationally inapplicable to event-based service contracts where the Service Provider retrieves all equipment after each examination event and no material remains at MPSC premises. The absence of any provision for payment of completed work creates financial uncertainty for the Service Provider.</p>	As per tender conditions.
25	4.1 Period of Contract and 4.2 Commencement and Expiration	Contract Duration: Request to Align Main Tender with SLA Framework and Resolve Ambiguity in Clause 4.2.2	<p>Tender Chapter 4.1 establishes an initial contract period of 12 months extendable up to 5 years in intervals of 12 months. However, the SLA in Annexure 10, which forms part of this Contract as per Clause 2.2, establishes the same duration as 3 years extendable by 2 years — a 3+2 framework. Both result in the same maximum of 5 years but differ in structure. We request MPSC to kindly revise Tender Chapter 4.1 to adopt the 3+2 framework.</p>	<p>The request is made for the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) Consistency with Contract Agreement: The SLA in Annexure 10 already uses the 3+2 structure. Aligning the main tender with the SLA will remove the existing inconsistency between two documents forming part of the same contract.</p> <p>(b) Better Financial Planning: A 3-year initial commitment allows the Service Provider to plan resources and pricing over a longer horizon, likely resulting in more stable and competitive pricing for MPSC.</p> <p>(c) Clarity on Automatic Termination: Clause 4.2.2 states that the contract automatically terminates as soon as the period of contract is over. Under the current annual renewal structure, it is unclear whether the contract terminates at the end of each 12-month interval or continues uninterrupted for 5 years. The 3+2 framework resolves this ambiguity by defining a clear initial period with one defined extension. It may be noted that this revision does not alter the maximum total contract duration of 5 years.</p>	As per tender conditions.

26	4.1 Period of Contract	Exit Rights, Extension Terms and Post-Expiry Continuation — Request for Equitable Provisions	<p>The following observations are submitted for MPSC's kind consideration in respect of the Period of Contract provisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mutual Exit Provision: Clause 4.1.6 does not allow the Service Provider to withdraw from the contract, while Clause 3.7.1(5) grants MPSC the right to terminate at convenience. We request inclusion of a provision allowing the Service Provider to exit by providing reasonable prior written notice of not less than 90 days. 2. Extension by Mutual Consent: Clause 4.1.3 requires the Contractor to mandatorily accept extension orders. However, Clause 8.1 of the SLA (Annexure 10) already provides for renewal "on terms and conditions as mutually decided between the Parties." We request MPSC to align the extension provision in the main contract with the mutual consent principle already stated in the SLA. 3. Post-Expiry Continuation: Clause 4.1.11 requires the Service Provider to continue services till a new agency is appointed, without any defined time limit or provision for revision of rates. We request MPSC to kindly consider: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Making such post-expiry continuation optional at the discretion of the Service Provider; and b) Providing for mutually agreed commercial terms, including provision of rate escalation, for any such continuation period. 4. Clarification on Clause 4.1.4: We request MPSC to kindly clarify whether the mandatory 6-month continuation obligation under Clause 4.1.4 is applicable in cases where the contract is terminated at MPSC's convenience under Clause 3.7.1(5), or whether it applies only upon natural expiry of the agreed contract period. 	<p>The current contract terms create an asymmetric relationship where MPSC has multiple exit mechanisms while the Service Provider has none. Clause 4.1.11 mandates indefinite continuation at locked rates without any time limit, which is commercially unviable. The SLA already acknowledges mutual consent for renewals — aligning the main contract provisions with this principle would ensure equitable terms for both parties</p>	As per tender conditions.
27	4.6 — Security Deposit / Performance Guarantee	Contract Terms — Performance Guarantee Basis and Enhancement Triggers	<p>Clause 4.6.1 stipulates a Performance Guarantee of 3% of "notional contract value," defined as the estimated annual value of services for the first year as communicated in the Letter of Award. However, Clause 4.1.7 establishes this as a framework contract under which MPSC issues examination-wise Work Orders from time to time, without committing to any minimum annual volume. Accordingly, the notional contract value remains undefined at the bidding stage, limiting bidders' ability to assess financial exposure. Further, Clause 4.6.3 provides for PG enhancement in case of a "material increase" in Work Order value, without specifying thresholds or prior notice requirements. Request you to kindly clarify below so that the financial obligation can be appropriately assessed during bid preparation: (a) An indicative range for the notional contract value that will form the PG computation basis;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (b) The threshold of increase in Work Order value and Notice period prior to any PG enhancement; (c) Whether PG enhancement during an ongoing examination cycle will be deferred until the completion of that cycle. 	<p>Bidders are unable to plan working capital obligations without knowing the PG amount at the bidding stage. Clause 4.6.1 requires PG submission within 15 days of the LoA — yet the PG amount is disclosed only in that same LoA. Undefined thresholds and notice periods for enhancement create additional financial uncertainty.</p>	As per tender conditions.

28	Page 23, Clause 4.12	Sub Contract	In the referred clause, it is requested to add the following provision: "However, PSU shall be permitted to execute the work through their duly empanelled partners/vendors without compromising the quality and service obligations under the contract, while retaining overall responsibility and accountability towards MPSC."	PSU organizations generally execute large-scale and geographically distributed projects through established empanelment frameworks and approved implementation partners. Such an arrangement enables efficient nationwide deployment and operational support while maintaining full contractual accountability with the bidder organization.	As per tender conditions.
29	5.6.15 and 5.6.16 — Data Provision Timelines; S.no (1) of 5.7.2.3	Scope of Work — Insufficient Lead Time for Candidate Details and Operational Impact	Clause 5.6.15 provides for sharing of the examination schedule, list of sub-centres and candidate count 2 to 3 weeks prior to the examination. However, Clause 5.6.16 and Clause 5.7.2.3 S.no (1) provide for sharing of candidate details only 7 days prior to the scheduled examination. It is requested that MPSC kindly revise the timeline under Clause 5.6.16 to align with the data provision timeline prescribed under Clause 5.6.15.	7 days is insufficient for the operational preparation that depends on candidate-level data, for the following reasons: (a) As per Clause 5.7.4(14), device data sync is required to be completed 2 days before the examination and device testing 1 day before. After receiving candidate data 7 days prior, the Service Provider has effectively only 5 days to process data for potentially lakhs of candidates, load it onto devices and ensure readiness across all sub-centres in 36 districts. (b) As per Clause 5.7.7(6), photograph quality check results are required to be submitted within 1 week of data sharing by MPSC. If photograph data is shared only 7 days before the examination, the results would be due by the examination date itself, leaving no time for review or corrective action. A minimum 14-day lead time is required to ensure operational readiness across all sub-centres.	As per tender conditions.
30	Page 25, Clause 5.6.19	Care of PwBD Candidates — Scope Clarification	Clause 5.6.19 requires the Service Provider to take special care of PwBD candidates and further states that "they may be allowed separate/privileged entry wherever possible." We request MPSC to kindly consider removing the phrase "and they may be allowed separate/privileged entry wherever possible" from the scope of the Service Provider's obligations under this clause.	Provision of separate/privileged entry depends on the physical infrastructure of each examination sub-centre and is operationally controlled by the Centre In-Charge / MPSC. Inclusion of this requirement under the Service Provider's scope creates accountability ambiguity. The principal obligation of ensuring no inconvenience to PwBD candidates remains intact in the preceding text of the clause.	As per tender conditions.
31	5.3.3 (3)	5.3 Geographical Coverage and Scale	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify the indicative maximum number of venues to be considered for sizing the Control Room infrastructure (video wall, VMS, bandwidth).	Clause 5.7.5.3 (8) refers to handling live CCTV coverage of about 2000 venues at the MPSC Control Room, whereas Clause 5.3.3 indicates a maximum of 1475 sub-centres for a single examination.	As per tender conditions.

32	5.3.3 (5)	5.3 Geographical Coverage and Scale	Bidder requests MPSC to confirm whether Bidder should size for 19,433 rooms or for a higher peak figure, and whether MPSC will share historical centre/room/camera counts of past examinations to enable accurate planning.	Considering the CCTV ratio of 1 camera per 24 candidates plus Entry/Exit Gate and Control Room cameras, the indicative camera count per examination can exceed 25,000 units.	No change.
33	5.3.3 (7)	5.3 Geographical Coverage and Scale	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify whether the deployment ratio is to be calculated venue-wise (504/72 = 7 active + 4 standby per venue) or sub-centre-wise, and whether minimum machine count per venue is fixed irrespective of candidate strength.	Clause 5.7.2.2 (2) specifies one QR code scanning machine per 72 candidates and one standby for every 144.	No change.
34	5.5.4	5.5 Purpose / Objective	Will MPSC publish, post-award, an indicative annual volume break-up across each of the six service categories so that the Service Provider can plan inventory, manpower and infrastructure? Kindly confirm whether any indicative offtake commitment exists for each service line.	Clause 4.1.10 states no minimum volume is guaranteed.	No change.
35	5.6.15	5.6 General Terms Governing Scope of Work	Bidder requests MPSC to confirm whether 7 days is sufficient to download data into all hand-held devices (Clause 5.7.4 (14) requires data sync 2 days before exam), and whether MPSC will allow secure pre-loading of partial data more than 7 days in advance.	Clause 5.6.16 states that candidate details (Name, Roll No., Photo) will be shared 7 days prior.	No change.
36	5.6.17	5.6 General Terms Governing Scope of Work	Will MPSC mandate empanelment of cloud service providers from MeitY-empanelled list, or any specific cloud (e.g. GoI Cloud / GI-Cloud / specific CSP)? Also, kindly clarify the expected RPO/RTO for DR and whether the cost of DR setup is to be amortized in the per-candidate/per-camera unit rates.	The Service Provider shall maintain the entire database and Application Server at two different seismic zones within India, making one site as DC (Data Centre - Cloud-based) and other site as DR (Disaster Recovery – Cloud-based).	No change.
37	5.6.20	5.6 General Terms Governing Scope of Work	Bidder requests MPSC to harmonize and confirm the exact data retention period as mentioned in Clause 4.7.6 (4) of Chapter 4 and Clause 5.6.20.	Clause 4.7.6 (4) of Chapter 4 states data shall be destroyed one year after conduct of examination or declaration of result whichever is later. The two clauses appear consistent in spirit but differ in the threshold (30 days vs 1 year post result).	No change.
38	5.6.26	5.6 General Terms Governing Scope of Work	Are VAPT / CERT-In empanelled audits mandatory, and if yes, how frequently during the contract period?	To ensure compliance and budget for third-party security audits	As per law.
39	5.6.28	5.6 General Terms Governing Scope of Work	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify the specific use-case envisioned for Blockchain and WhatsApp under this engagement (e.g. immutable audit trail / candidate notifications), and whether such integration is included within the quoted unit rates or treated as Change requests under Clause 2.6.	Incorporation of software technologies such as AI, Block chain, WhatsApp and open-source frameworks shall be done prior to the Go-Live of the Project i.e. prior to provision of services for first exam under the project and any requirement pursuant to the Go-Live shall fall under change request mechanism and shall require additional cost.	No change.
40	5.7.1.3 (6)	5.7.1.3 Frisking/Screening through Hand Held Metal Detectors (HHMD)	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify whether the minimum is per Centre (location) or per Sub-centre/Venue (each building/premises), since the gender ratio at MPSC examinations can be highly skewed.	Clause 5.7.1.5 (7) further states that at every sub-centre minimum one frisking enclosure for female, 1 female and 1 male staff with metal detector has to be deployed.	No change.

41	5.7.1.4 (1)(i)	5.7.1.4 Screening through Door Frame Metal Detectors (DFMD)	Where a sub-centre has multiple entry gates that are operationalized for crowd-management, will MPSC reimburse DFMDs for each gate, or is one DFMD per sub-centre adequate? Also kindly confirm whether DFMD is mandatory for every examination, or invoked only for select examinations (since the price schedule has separate line items for HHMD and DFMD).	The Service Provider shall deploy minimum One (1) DFMD per entry gate at each Examination Sub-Centre/Venue.	No change.
42	5.7.1.5 (4)	5.7.1.5 General Instructions / Conditions	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify: (a) infrastructure for the deposit counter (tent/shed/lockers) and whether to be provided by service provider, (b) liability cap, and (c) staffing norms for the deposit counter.	Clause 5.7.1.5 (14) requires the service provider to provide a deposit counter outside exam premises (without liability for valuables).	No change.
43	5.7.1.5 (10)	5.7.1.5 General Instructions / Conditions	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify whether the 20-minute wait time is measurable per candidate from gate-arrival to entry-into-room, and whether the 20-minute SLA shall be measured by the SLA management tool referred to in Clause 3.4.2 or by some other audit mechanism.	Considering up to 1475 sub-centres for a single examination (Clause 5.3.3), sourcing 1475 verified Ex-Servicemen/Ex-Policemen for every shift is operationally challenging.	No change.
44	5.7.1.5 (33b)	5.7.1.5 General Instructions / Conditions	Will MPSC permit equivalent qualified ex-paramilitary / private security supervisors with police-verification, or is the Ex-Serviceman/Ex-Policeman criterion strictly mandatory?	Required for better estimations	As per tender conditions.
45	5.7.2.1 (2)	5.7.2.1 Objective	Will the choice of biometric mode (fingerprint / IRIS / palm) be made by MPSC examination-wise in the Work Order, or is the bidder expected to deploy any one mode universally? Kindly clarify so that pricing is aligned.	IRIS and palm devices have significantly different unit-economics from fingerprint devices	As per tender conditions.
46	5.7.2.2 (4)	5.7.2.2 Scope and Functional Requirement	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify the certification requirement for facial-recognition modules and palm-capture devices (Clause 5.7.2.1 (2)(iii)), as STQC equivalents may not exist. This should be in 5.7.3 (CIPL).	STQC certification is presently available primarily for fingerprint and IRIS scanners.	As per tender conditions.
47	5.7.2.3 (3)	5.7.2.3 Scope of Work / Services	Bidder requests MPSC to confirm that one single integrated tablet/handheld will be acceptable per 72 candidates, rather than separate devices for each function.	If the same hand-held device is to perform QR code scanning, biometric capture and facial recognition (Clauses 5.7.2 + 5.7.3).	As per tender conditions.
48	5.7.3 (20)	5.7.3 Biometric Authentication and Attendance Marking Services	Bidder requests MPSC to confirm: (a) the indicative size and material of the hologram, (b) whether the hologram cost is included in the per-candidate biometric authentication rate or treated as additional reimbursable, and (c) lead-time required by MPSC for finalizing hologram artwork before each examination.	Clause 5.7.3 (21) states the cost of hologram will be borne by the service provider, and the matter on the hologram will be finalized after mutual discussion which may be different for each exam.	As per tender conditions.
49	5.7.3 (28)	5.7.3 Biometric Authentication and Attendance Marking Services	Bidder requests MPSC to confirm whether scribe details (Aadhaar/photo) will be shared along with candidate data 7 days prior, and whether scribes are counted within the per-candidate billing or treated as additional billable units.	For Persons with Disability (PwD) candidates, the service provider has to authenticate the scribe who is present at the time of examination along with concerned candidate.	As per tender conditions.
50	5.7.4 (3)	5.7.4 General Instructions for Scanning / Verification of QR Code Biometric Authentication	Bidder requests MPSC to confirm whether the 8–10 hour backup applies to handheld biometric/QR scanners only, or also to tablets used for facial-recognition and network routers. Also kindly clarify whether external power-banks count toward this backup requirement.	All the devices provided should be in working condition for all purposes and they should have minimum 8 to 10 hours backup power supply on the day of the examination.	As per tender conditions.

51	5.7.4 (14)	5.7.4 General Instructions for Scanning / Verification of QR Code Biometric Authentication	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify whether bulk pre-sync at central warehouse and dispatch to sub-centres is acceptable, given the logistic complexity of last-mile sync at every venue.	Clause 5.6.16 indicates candidate data is shared 7 days before exam. With 1475 sub-centres requiring D-2 sync.	As per tender conditions.
52	5.7.5.2 (5)	5.7.5.2 The Scope and Functional Requirement	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify: (a) whether the 10x12 ft. video wall is to be set up only at MPSC Headquarters (CBD Belapur, Navi Mumbai) or also at examination cities, (b) whether the video wall is to be capitalized once and amortized across exams, or set up afresh per exam, and (c) whether MPSC will provide the physical Control Room space and primary power.	A video wall of minimum dimensions 10 x 12 feet, along with the requisite computers, display systems, networking equipment, and trained manpower, shall be provided and operated by the Service Provider at the Control Room.	At MPSC Headquarter.
53	5.7.5.2 (7)	5.7.5.2 The Scope and Functional Requirement	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify: (a) acceptable resolution/FPS/bitrate for archival, (b) whether handover is on physical encrypted HDD (Clause 5.7.5.4 (5)) or via secure download link, and (c) whether the 10-day window starts from last exam date or from each exam date	Considering approximately 19,433 rooms (Clause 5.3.3 (5)), the storage size for HD recordings of a single examination day can run into hundreds of terabytes.	As per tender conditions.
54	5.7.5.3 (1)	5.7.5.3 Detailed Scope of the Work	Bidder requests MPSC to confirm whether the same unit rate applies to all camera types regardless of location and field-of-view requirement.	The Price Schedule provides a uniform 'Per Camera Per Shift' rate without distinguishing between classroom cameras, entry/exit gate cameras and control-room cameras.	As per tender conditions.
55	5.7.5.4 (2)	5.7.5.4 Technical Features of Cameras / Machines	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify whether the 10-hour backup is to be designed at the camera-level (battery-built-in cameras) or at the system-level (UPS/inverter for camera + NVR + router).	Most fixed CCTV cameras draw power from a central NVR/PoE switch.	As per tender conditions.
56	5.7.6 (1)	5.7.6 SIP Enabled Phones at Examination Sub-Centres	Bidder requests MPSC to confirm: (a) whether SIP phones are to be VoIP over wired internet (immune to jammers) or cellular-VoLTE (will be blocked), and (b) connectivity medium mandated (broadband / leased line / GSM).	Mobile jammers operate at every venue (Clause 5.6.26).	SIP phones - VoIP over wired internet
57	5.7.7 (4)	5.7.7 Photograph Quality Check and Facial Comparison for Candidate Verification	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify the volume of historical photographs to be compared (e.g. last 3 years vs last 10 years), and whether MPSC has a digital archive of past candidate photographs in standardized format ready for ingestion.	The volume directly impacts compute cost for face-matching.	As per tender conditions.
58	5.7.7 (7)	5.7.7 Photograph Quality Check and Facial Comparison for Candidate Verification	Bidder requests MPSC to confirm the metric used to measure accuracy (FAR / FRR / TAR @ FAR=1%), the testing dataset, and the auditor who will certify the accuracy.	Industry-standard face-recognition reports use NIST FRVT-style metrics; kindly indicate the preferred standard.	As per tender conditions.
59	5.8.2	5.8 Ownership of Source Code and Licensing	Bidder requests MPSC to confirm that 'source code ownership' applies only to custom-developed integration/middleware and not to underlying licensed third-party software/SDKs.	Bidder typically builds on proprietary biometric SDKs, AI-analytics engines and VMS platforms that are licensed from OEMs and cannot be transferred.	As per tender conditions.
60	5.11.13	5.11 Deployment of Personnel	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify the cut-off period within which the Centre In-Charge must counter-sign the completion certificate and the recourse mechanism if sign-off is delayed beyond control of the service provider, since this affects payment release.	Centre In-Charges are MPSC-appointed officials and may not be readily available post-exam for sign-off.	As per tender conditions.

61	3.1.1	3.1 Payment Schedule	Bidder requests MPSC to consider: (a) milestone-based mobilization advance (e.g. 10–15%) against bank guarantee, or (b) reimbursement of one-time mobilization cost as a separate line item, especially for the first examination.	The service provider has to procure and deploy CCTV cameras, biometric/QR devices, DFMDs/HHMDs, video wall, VMS licences etc. — much of which is capex-intensive — but bills only post-service per candidate / per camera.	No change.
62	3.1.13	3.1 Payment Schedule	Bidder requests MPSC to consider releasing payment within 30–45 days from acceptance of services, or include a delayed-payment interest clause as per MSME Act 2006 / RBI norms.	A 90-day payment cycle on post-service billing combined with the 5-year contract creates significant working-capital strain.	No change.
63	3.4.3.1	3.4.3 SLA Monitoring	MPSC is requested to clarify regarding the responsibility of making the payment due to the proposed third party. MPSC is also requested to convey the modalities for review of the SLA reports submitted by the Service Provider.	Third Party Auditor is appointed at Authority's cost and expense.	No change.
64	3.4.4.1 (11)	3.4.4 Penalty	Bidder requests MPSC to consider capping the per-incident penalty so that aggregate penalty for a single examination remains within the 5% cap stated in Clause 3.4.1.8.	The current formulation allows multiplicative penalties (10x per camera × N missing cameras × N shifts) which can theoretically exceed the work-order value.	No change.
65	4.1.1	4.1 Period of Contract	With 5-year contract duration and India's prevailing inflation, Bidder requests MPSC to consider an annual price-escalation index (e.g. WPI/CPI-linked) from Year 2 onward.	Clause 3.3.5 states "All rates and charges once agreed in the contract shall be fixed for the entire duration of contract" and Clause 3.3.6 disallows pass-through of tax rate changes.	No change.
66	4.1.1	4.1 Period of Contract	MPSC is requested to provide a clear contract period of 05 years as the same shall facilitate the Service Provider to apportion the cost over 05 years.	Considering the scale of proposed investment to be made by the Service Provider for arranging the material and manpower in providing all the services under the project.	No change.
67	4.6.1	4.6 Security Deposit / Performance Guarantee	Bidder requests MPSC to indicate the indicative annual notional contract value for Year-1, or the basis on which it will be communicated in the LoA, so that Bidder can arrange the bank-guarantee facility in time.	Submission of Performance Security within tender timeline.	As per tender conditions.
68	4.12.1	4.12 Sub-Contract	The support of OEMs for certain tasks limited to installation / deployment / commissioning & maintenance support related to their respective product/equipment should be permitted without requirement of pre-approval for delivery of scope of work by the Service Provider.	Bidder shall utilize service of external third-party OEMs for fulfilment of scope of work.	As per tender conditions.
69	Note (2)	Annexure-9	Bidder requests MPSC to clarify: (a) whether weights are assigned to each line item based on indicative volumes, (b) whether L-1 is determined on a single composite weighted average, and (c) the rationale for averaging unit-rates that are denominated in different UoM.	The nine line-items in the Price Schedule have widely different cost structures (e.g. CCTV per camera per shift vs Photograph quality check per photograph). Computing a simple arithmetic average across heterogeneous units of measure is not commercially representative.	As per tender conditions.
70	Note (3)		Bidder requests MPSC to clarify: (a) whether the L-1 bidder must match each other bidder's lowest line-item rate (which can result in selecting prices below the bidder's own bid), (b) whether the L-1 bidder may decline to match and forfeit the award, and (c) whether the matched price will form the basis of all Work Orders for the entire 5-year contract period.	Price received post price discovery on e-portal may not be modified as per extant guidelines pertaining to public procurement.	As per tender conditions.