

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
1	Page No. 12 & Page No. 52 (Point No. 03)	Relevant Technical Experience	The Bidder must have demonstrable experience in the design, development, implementation, and maintenance of advanced technology solutions, including but not limited to AI/ML-based systems, document processing platforms, workflow automation systems, and Generative AI / NLP / Large Language Model (LLM)-based solutions. Such experience should encompass functionalities such as intelligent document understanding, automated bid/document generation, content summarization, data extraction, and AI-driven decision-support systems, preferably in the context of procurement, governance, or enterprise workflows. The Bidder must have successfully completed at least one (1) project of similar nature with a minimum contract value of INR 25 Lakhs during the last five (5) years as on the bid submission date. Client Type: (State or Central Government / State or Central PSU / Public Sector Banks / Public Listed Companies).	It is noted that the Pre-Qualification Criteria (Point No. 3 – Relevant Technical Experience) does not explicitly mandate that the required experience must be limited to Government/PSU/Public Sector/Listed entities. However, Annexure-4 (Project Details), Page No. 52, Point No. 3 restricts the Client Type to such categories. In this regard, it is requested to kindly revise the provision to allow consideration of relevant experience executed for enterprise, corporate, and private sector organizations, subject to submission of valid work orders/agreements along with client credentials.	Refer Corrigendum
2	15	4.1	Technical Demonstration Evaluation Criteria	<p>It is requested to kindly clarify whether bidders are permitted to use an already developed and deployed product or a prototype/version of the solution for the purpose of the Live Demonstration.</p> <p>Further, please confirm whether the demonstration must strictly be conducted on a fully production-ready deployment, or if a functional prototype/staging environment with required features and workflows would be considered acceptable for evaluation.</p> <p>This clarification will help bidders prepare an appropriate demonstration aligned with the RFP requirements.</p>	<p>1. Bidders shall be required to provide a demonstration of an already developed product.</p> <p>2. The demonstration shall reflect a production-ready solution with all required functionalities; however, it may be conducted using a staging environment.</p>
3	-	-	General Query	<p>As per the RFP, the solution is required to be deployed on the State Data Centre (on-premises environment). In this regard, it is requested to kindly clarify the following:</p> <p>Whether the entire AI/ML modules (including any Large Language Model components) are required to be fully hosted within the on-premises infrastructure, or if a hybrid deployment (partially on-premises and partially cloud-hosted within India) would be permitted.</p> <p>In case of strict on-premises deployment, whether the required compute infrastructure (GPU/accelerators, storage, etc.) will be provisioned by the Purchaser or is expected to be part of the bidder's scope.</p> <p>Whether use of pre-trained models is allowed, and if so, whether they must be fully deployed within the State Data Centre without external API dependencies.</p> <p>Any specific guidelines or restrictions on model hosting, fine-tuning, and inference architecture within the procurement system.</p> <p>This clarification will help bidders design a compliant and technically feasible solution architecture aligned with the RFP requirements.</p>	Refer Corrigendum
4	Page No. 12 & Page No. 52 (Point No. 03)	Relevant Technical Experience	The Bidder must have demonstrable experience in the design, development, implementation, and maintenance of advanced technology solutions, including but not limited to AI/ML-based systems, document processing platforms, workflow automation systems, and Generative AI / NLP / Large Language Model (LLM)-based solutions. Such experience should encompass functionalities such as intelligent document understanding, automated bid/document generation, content summarization, data extraction, and AI-driven decision-support systems, preferably in the context of procurement, governance, or enterprise workflows. The Bidder must have successfully completed at least one (1) project of similar nature with a minimum contract value of INR 25 Lakhs during the last five (5) years as on the bid submission date. Client Type: State/Central Government / PSU / Public Sector Banks / Public Listed Companies.	<p>It is stated that under the Pre-Qualification Criteria (Point No. 3 – Relevant Technical Experience), bidders are required to have demonstrable experience in advanced technology solutions including AI/ML, document processing, workflow automation, and Generative AI/NLP/LLM-based systems, covering functionalities such as intelligent document processing, automated document generation, content summarization, data extraction, and AI-driven decision-support systems. Further, at least one similar project of minimum value INR 25 Lakhs in the last five (5) years is required. However, in Annexure-4 (Project Details), Page No. 52, Point No. 3, the Client Type is restricted to Government/PSU/Public Sector Banks/Public Listed Companies.</p> <p>In this context, it is requested that experience of similar nature executed for enterprise, corporate, and private sector organizations may also be considered, subject to submission of valid work orders/agreements along with client certificates or CA-certified documents (with UDIN). Accordingly, it is requested that the provision may be suitably amended to allow such experience, ensuring broader and technically qualified participation.</p>	Refer Corrigendum

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
5	Page No. 12 & Page No. 52 (Point No. 03)	Relevant Technical Experience	The Bidder must have demonstrable experience in design, development, implementation, and maintenance of advanced technology solutions including AI/ML systems, document processing platforms, workflow automation systems, and Generative AI / NLP / LLM-based solutions. Such experience should include intelligent document understanding, automated bid/document generation, content summarization, data extraction, and AI-driven decision-support systems. The bidder must have completed at least one similar project of minimum value INR 25 Lakhs in last 5 years. Client Type: Government/PSU/Public Sector Banks/Public Listed Companies.	It is noted that under Pre-Qualification Criteria, it is not explicitly stated that experience must be limited to specific client types. However, Annexure-4 restricts client type to Government/PSU/Public Sector Banks/Public Listed Companies. It is requested to allow experience from enterprise, corporate, and private sector organizations as well, subject to submission of valid supporting documents/work orders, and amend the provision accordingly.	Refer Corrigendum
6	Page No. 12 & Page No. 52 (Point No. 03)	Relevant Technical Experience	The Bidder must have demonstrable experience in the design, development, implementation, and maintenance of advanced technology solutions, including but not limited to AI/ML-based systems, document processing platforms, workflow automation systems, and Generative AI / NLP / Large Language Model (LLM)-based solutions. Such experience should encompass functionalities such as intelligent document understanding, automated bid/document generation, content summarization, data extraction, and AI-driven decision-support systems, preferably in the context of procurement, governance, or enterprise workflows. The Bidder must have successfully completed at least one (1) project of similar nature with a minimum contract value of INR 25 Lakhs during the last five (5) years as on the bid submission date. Client Type: State/Central Government / State/Central PSU / Public Sector Banks / Public Listed Companies.	It is observed that the Pre-Qualification Criteria (Point No. 3 – Relevant Technical Experience) does not explicitly restrict eligibility of experience to specific client categories. However, Annexure-4 (Project Details), Page No. 52, Point No. 3 limits the Client Type to Government/PSU/Public Sector Banks/Public Listed Companies. In view of this, it is requested that experience of similar nature executed for enterprise, corporate, and private sector organizations may also be considered, subject to submission of valid work orders/agreements along with client credentials. Accordingly, the provision may kindly be revised to incorporate such experience, thereby enabling broader participation from technically qualified bidders.	Refer Corrigendum
7	Page No. 09 (Point No. 15)	EMD Exemption	EMD exemption is applicable for Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) registered in Madhya Pradesh and Start-ups recognized under the Madhya Pradesh Start-up Policy or DPIIT. MSEs must be registered under relevant service categories as per the RFP and verification shall be based on Udyam Certificate. Only Start-ups registered in Madhya Pradesh and recognized under the MP Start-up Policy or DPIIT are eligible for EMD exemption, subject to submission of valid certificates.	It is submitted that we hold a valid NSIC registration as per Government norms. Therefore, it is requested to kindly extend the benefit of EMD and tender fee exemption to NSIC-registered bidders as well, in line with prevailing Government of India / State Government provisions.	As per the Madhya Pradesh State Purchase Rules (SPR), exemption from payment of Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) is applicable only to Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) and Startups registered in Madhya Pradesh.
8	25	6.2 (E): On-Premises Deployment Requirement	The RFP mandates deployment at the State Data Centre (SDC) and notes the selected bidder must install the solution on infrastructure provided by the purchaser.	What are the exact hardware specifications available for this project? Specifically, what is the allocated number of GPUs, CPU cores, RAM, and storage type?	GPU - H100SXM or Higher CPU, RAM & Storage shall be provisioned by MPSEDC based on the justified requirement of the successful bidder.
9	19, 23	6.1: Scope of Work (Tender Document Ingestion) & 6.2 (C): AI-Based Evaluation Criteria Generation	Section 6.1 requires automated extraction and processing, while 6.2 (C) requires calibration of AI agents, which necessitates an underlying orchestration layer.	As this AI powered application would require GPUs, we request to mandate the seamless allocation, sharing, and orchestration of hardware accelerators (GPUs) across multiple data science teams, we request the authority to explicitly mandate an enterprise-grade MLOps and orchestration platform like Red Hat OpenShift AI. This will ensure the State receives a unified environment with native GPU integration, model serving, and pipeline automation, rather than just raw hardware and disjointed open-source libraries.	Refer Corrigendum
10	26	6.2 (F): Training, Documentation & Handover	This section lists stakeholder groups for training; currently, it focuses on Procurement Officers and Admins, but would be the section to include Data Engineers.	Requesting MPSEDC to please mention that GPU Agnostic MLOPS must be also part of the overall solution where the Data Scientist and Data engineer is going to work on.	Refer Corrigendum
11	27, 28	6.3 (C): Restriction on Use of External APIs & 6.3 (H): Security Standards	Section 6.3 (C) prohibits public APIs unless in isolated, government-approved environments, aligning with the need for enterprise-supported, secured stacks.	Requesting MPSEDC to please clarify the Kubernetes and Modern AI/ML pipelines, LLM deployments, and GPU workloads are also must be open-source with enterprise support.	The selection of tools and technologies for implementing the solution shall be at the discretion of the bidder, subject to compliance with the functional, technical, security, and performance requirements specified in the RFP. However, MPSEDC has a preference for the use of open-source technologies wherever feasible.

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
12	19	6.1	No fresh development of a core platform is envisaged; configuration, parameterization, and customization to align with purchaser processes are within scope.	Can MPSEDC confirm whether bespoke feature development, customization of new modules, or integration with new departments during the 3-year contract will be treated as in-scope under existing unit rates or as paid change requests?	No fresh development of core modules are anticipated, any change required for the product quality and accuracy enhancement will be under existing unit rates.
13	24	6.2.C.5	The solution shall support Works Contracts, Goods Contracts, and Services Contracts.	Clause lists Works, Goods, and Services; however, the sample BoQ appears service-oriented. Kindly confirm whether traditional Works contracts (civil BoQs, rate analysis, SoR, MBs) are in scope.	Yes
14	BOQ / Separate File	BOQ	BOQ contains two line items — Bid Preparation and End-to-End Bid Evaluation — each with 200 units “Per RFP”.	Kindly clarify whether 1 RFP counts as 1 unit for each line item (Preparation + Evaluation), or each line item represents a separate RFP.	Each line item represents a separate RFP.
15	16	4.2.5	Bidder must be assessed as “Qualified” in all parameters.	Kindly specify acceptable divergence threshold between bidder output and actual historical outcome (e.g., L1 exact match vs ±1 ranking tolerance, PQ pass/fail criteria).	The Technical Evaluation Committee shall assess the solution by comparing the outputs generated by the system with historical outcomes. Based on this comparison, each functionality shall be evaluated as “Qualified” or “Not Qualified” by the designated committee. There is no provision for ranking of bidders.
16	16	4.2	Purchaser will provide five completed RFP cases for demonstration.	How many days prior to the demo will sample RFPs be shared? Adequate time is required for preparation and calibration.	The sample RFP shall be made available to the PQ-qualified bidders on the day of demonstration.
17	24	6.2.C.2	AI agents shall be calibrated using MPSEDC-specific procurement documents.	Will MPSEDC provide a corpus of historical RFPs, bids, corrigenda, and evaluation reports? If yes, volume and time period per category?	Yes, shall be shared with successful bidder, volume and time period will be decided mutually.
18	23	6.2.B	System shall support scanned PDFs, native PDFs/Word files, and multi-file packages.	What is the predominant language (English/Hindi/bilingual)? What % are scanned vs native digital files?	English would be the predominant language. Bid proposal generally contains 50% scanned pages.
19	22	6.2.A.6	Export/publishing in standard formats with compatibility to e-tendering systems.	Is bi-directional integration with MP Tenders (NIC GePNIC) required, or standalone? Will APIs be provided or bidder to coordinate with NIC?	Integration is not required with mptenders.gov.in or GeP NIC portal
20	25–26	6.2.E	Bidder shall coordinate with SDC authorities for deployment.	Will MPSEDC facilitate coordination with NIC for GePNIC integration, including approvals and test environments?	NIC for GePNIC integration is not required
21	26	6.2.E.5	Platform shall implement RBAC.	What SSO mechanism is expected — SDC IAM, Active Directory, MeriPehchaan, or other federated identity provider?	State has own MPSSO which is following open standards
22	25–26	6.2.E	Deployment at State Data Centre / State IT Centre.	Kindly share GPU specs — number, model (A100/H100/L40S), VRAM, and whether dedicated/shared.	GPU infrastructure based on H100 SXM or higher configuration may be provisioned in either shared or dedicated mode, based on project requirements and approval.”
23	25–26	6.2.E	Infrastructure will be provided by purchaser.	Kindly share CPU, RAM, storage (NVMe/SAN), network bandwidth, and whether storage is expandable.	In case of Fully On-Premises deployment or Hybrid deployment involving SDC infrastructure, the required compute resources, including GPU/accelerators, storage, and related infrastructure, shall be provisioned by Madhya Pradesh State Electronics Development Corporation based on the justified requirement of the successful bidder.
24	25–26	6.2.E	On-prem deployment is mandatory.	What is the deployment environment — Kubernetes, VMs, or OpenStack? Is container registry available? Any restrictions?	There are no specific restrictions from MPSEDC regarding the deployment environment. The bidder may propose the deployment architecture, including Kubernetes, Virtual Machines (VMs), OpenStack, container registry, or any other suitable technology stack, based on the project requirements and proposed solution architecture.
25	27	6.3.A	Data must remain within India; no external/cloud LLM usage without approval.	Will outbound connectivity be allowed for updates and model downloads? If not, what is the process?	Yes, outbound connectivity will be allowed with designated IP/URL and for limited period as per requirement for patch and model update.
26	27	6.3.B	No project data to be used for external model training.	Is fine-tuning of self-hosted models within SDC (e.g., LoRA) permitted for MPSEDC-only use?	No project/Government data shall be stored, retained, or used for model training, retraining, fine-tuning, analytics, or any purpose other than execution of project services.  The bidder shall ensure compliance with applicable Government security and data protection guidelines.
27	27–28	6.3.A–6.3.C	Restrictions on external/cloud LLMs.	Kindly clarify acceptable deployment: (a) self-hosted models, (b) sovereign APIs in India, or (c) only fully on-prem models allowed.	Refer Corrigendum
28	10–11, 27–29	State AI Mission / 6.3	AI governance and compliance requirements.	Any preference/mandate for India-origin models (BharatGPT, Krutrim, etc.)? Is it mandatory, scoring-based, or optional?	No

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
29	27-29	6.3	Compliance and licensing requirements.	Are licenses like Llama, Mistral, Qwen acceptable, or only OSI-approved licenses (Apache/MIT)?	There are no specific restrictions from MPSEDC regarding the use of particular AI/LLM licenses. The bidder may propose suitable models and licensing frameworks, including but not limited to Llama, Mistral, Qwen, Apache, MIT, or other permissible licenses, based on the proposed solution architecture and project requirements.  However, any licensing, subscription, usage, or compliance obligations associated with the proposed solution shall be the sole responsibility of the bidder, and no additional payment beyond the approved BOQ line items shall be admissible.
30	30-31	7.1	Implementation within 30 days from Work Order.	Will SDC infra be ready on Day 0? If not, request extension to 45-60 days.	It is clarified that the readiness of SDC infrastructure shall be ensured by MPSEDC as per the overall project rollout plan. The bidder is expected to plan implementation activities in coordination with the available infrastructure readiness status.  However, considering dependencies related to infrastructure provisioning, integration, and on-ground readiness, any requirement for extension beyond the stipulated 30 days shall be reviewed on a case-to-case basis. Suitable extension, if required, may be considered by MPSEDC depending on project conditions, without altering the overall intent of timely implementation and Go-Live readiness.
31	26, 31	6.2.E.6 / 7.2	SLA: ≤ 3 sec response time.	Does SLA apply only to UI operations? Request separate SLA for AI generation tasks.	Refer Corrigendum
32	31	7.2	Accuracy ≥ 95%, acceptance ≥ 90%.	Kindly share measurement methodology — sampling, evaluator, and frequency.	Refer Corrigendum
33	BOQ	BOQ Clause 6	Quantities may vary.	Kindly confirm if there is a minimum guaranteed volume or billing is purely consumption-based.	Purely consumption-based.
34	47	12.1	Contract up to 3 years.	Will rates remain fixed for 3 years or is escalation (CPI/indexation) allowed?	The approved rates shall remain fixed for a period of three (3) years (In case of extension)
35	45	11.8	Copyright vests with MPSEDC.	Kindly clarify that this applies only to custom deliverables, not to bidder's COTS product, IP, or pre-trained models.	Yes
36	42	10.12	Sub-Contracting	We request you to kindly allow Sub-contracting, JV/ Consortium partnership, this shall enable us to offer best suitable solution for your requirements	No change, as per RFP
37	13	3	Pre-Qualification Criteria; Note point 1	We request you to kindly allow Sub-contracting, JV/ Consortium partnership, this shall enable us to offer best suitable solution for your requirements	No change, as per RFP
38	12	3	Pre-Qualification Criteria; Point 3. Relevant Technical experience	Kindly allow the project experience of partnership firms also	No change, as per RFP
39	-	-	-	We request you to provide atleast 21 days post pre-bid clarification response/ corrigendum issue date. This shall enable us to complete our internal compliances and prepare suitable proposal	No change, as per RFP
40	-	-	-	Since the AI platform is to be deployed in State Data Centre. We understand that purchaser will have a SPOC for providing access and technical support for deployment in SDC	Yes, MPSEDC shall designate an appropriate Single Point of Contact (SPOC) to facilitate coordination, access provisioning, and necessary technical support for deployment of the solution within the State Data Centre (SDC)
41	32	8.1	EMD	Kindly allow EMD to be submitted in Bank Guarantee form and provide format for the same. Same is a valid instrument of EMD as per GFR rules.	No change, as per RFP
42	62	Annexure-12.2	Annexure-12.2 – Financial Bid Form:	In Financial Bid Form, Point 2: "End-to-End Bid Evaluation (PQ + Technical + Commercial + Report Generation)", we understand that Unit rate asked is for Per proposal evaluated against a RFP. Kindly confirm if our understanding is correct	The quoted unit rate shall be considered for evaluation of all proposals received under the RFP, including end-to-end bid evaluation comprising Pre-Qualification (PQ), Technical Evaluation, Commercial Evaluation, and Report Generation.
43	8	15	EMD Exemption	We are Delhi based company. But MSME and Start registered under DIPP. Can we eligible for claiming exemption in EMD	As per the Madhya Pradesh State Purchase Rules (SPR), exemption from payment of Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) is applicable only to Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) and Startups registered in Madhya Pradesh.
44	19	1	AI-assisted drafting and standardization of tender/RFP documents, including NIT, eligibility criteria, scope of work, and commercial terms	Will MPSEDC provide historical RFP datasets for training the AI models?	Yes
45	19	1	Template-based document creation aligned with MPSEDC standards	Are standard templates already available or need to be created from scratch?	Standard templates are already available and shall be shared with the successful bidder
46	19	1	Pre-bid query management with AI-assisted response drafting	What level of automation vs manual approval is expected?	The tool should generate draft responses for pre-bid queries, which shall subsequently be reviewed and validated manually.

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
47	30	2	OCR and ingestion pipeline operational	What languages (English/Hindi/others) must OCR support?	OCR must support both English & Hindi Language
48	30	4	Minimum 95% accuracy	What benchmark dataset will be used to validate OCR accuracy?	Refer Corrigendum
49	General	General	Multi-document ingestion	What is the max file size / number of documents per tender?	Average file size per proposal is between 30-50 MB, average number of proposal per tender is 3-5
50	19	3	AI-Driven Evaluation Criteria Generation	Will predefined scoring logic be provided or generated dynamically?	The scoring methodology is defined in the respective RFP and shall be adopted by the solution for evaluation purposes.
51	General	General	Criteria generation	Is explainability mandatory for each generated criterion?	No, but the criteria should be defined in accordance with applicable procurement norms
52	General	General	Document ingestion formats	Are scanned handwritten documents expected?	Yes
53	General	General	AI calibration	What is the expected timeline and acceptance criteria for calibration?	Within the deployment timeline specified in the RFP
54	20	4	PQ evaluation automation	Should system integrate with external verification APIs (GST, MCA)?	No
55	15	5	Shortfall Identification & Clarification Management	Is there a predefined format for deficiency reports?	No
56	General	General	Technical evaluation engine	Should scoring be rule-based, ML-based, or hybrid?	Hybrid
57	21	6	Price normalization and bidder ranking (L1, L2, L3, QCBS, H1, H2, H3, etc.)	Will normalization rules be provided by MPSEDC?	Yes
58	General	General	Workflow approval	What is the approval hierarchy for each evaluation stage?	The approval hierarchy shall comprise a three-stage process, initiated sequentially by the Procurement Manager, Evaluator, and Approver.
59	General	General	RBAC	Should RBAC integrate with existing SSO/LDAP systems?	Yes, as per requirement
60	General	General	Data security	What encryption standards are mandated (AES-256, etc.)?	As per Government of India and State IT security policies
61	General	General	On-prem deployment	Will infrastructure (servers, GPU, storage) be provided by MPSEDC?	Yes
62	General	General	Performance requirement	How many concurrent users should system support?	5 Users
63	General	General	Availability (99.5%)	Is DR (Disaster Recovery) setup required?	No, separate Disaster Recovery (DR) setup is not required under the scope of this project
64	General	General	Training module	Is LMS or training platform required or just sessions?	Just sessions are required
65	General	General	External API restriction	Are private LLMs allowed if deployed fully on-prem?	Yes
66	General	General	AI governance	What level of explainability (logs, reasoning) is expected?	The level of explainability should be such that all AI-generated outputs influencing or supporting procurement and evaluation decisions are fully traceable and auditable.
67	General	General	Human validation	Is approval mandatory at every stage or configurable?	Yes
68	General	General	Data retention	What is the retention period for tender data?	Tender data need to be retained for a minimum period of six months.
69	General	General	VAPT requirement	Will MPSEDC conduct VAPT or bidder responsibility?	VAPT is bidder's responsibility as per CERT-IN Guidelines and needs to be conducted by CERT-IN empanelled agency
70	General	General	Bias detection	Are there defined fairness metrics for AI evaluation?	No
71	General	General	Deployment timeline (30 days)	Is phased rollout acceptable (module-wise deployment)?	No
72	General	General	Integration	What systems need integration (e-tender, ERP, etc.)?	Solution may needs to be integrated with SSO as per requirement
73	General	General	Reporting module	Are report templates predefined or configurable?	Configurable

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
74	26	6.2.E	6.2.E - On-Premises Deployment Requirement - Point No 5, where 5 user types have been listed.  The Platform shall implement comprehensive Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) for all defined user roles, including: o System Administrator o Procurement Manager o Evaluator (PQ / Technical / Commercial) o Approver / Competent Authority o Read-only Auditor	RBAC roles briefing on Procurement Manager vs Approver role	The Procurement Manager initiates the bid preparation and evaluation process; however, the Approver provides the final approval of the finalized bid documents and evaluation outcomes.
75	19	6.1	Scope of Work Activity 1 - Tender Document Preparation	State the manual process steps you follow for RFP creation	The standard RFP preparation process is being followed at MPSEDC, ensuring compliance with the State Purchase Rules and Central Procurement Guidelines.
76	25	6.2.E	6.2 - Functional Requirement 6.2.E - On-Premises Deployment Requirement	Is the on-premise deployment hybrid with a cloud provider like AWS or purely on MPSEDC's server?	Refer Corrigendum
77	27	6.3.A 6.3.B	6.3 - Data Security, AI Governance, and Compliance Requirements 6.3.A- Data Residency and Processing 6.3.B - Restriction on AI Model Usage	Should the LLM be open source, or close source also fine?	Both are allowed.
78	62	Annexure 12.1	Financial Bid Format, where price components have been listed down	One-time license (deployment/setup/configuration/customization) cost needs to be a component in the Financial Bid format.	No change, as per RFP
79	62	Annexure 12.1	Financial Bid Format, where price components have been listed down	AMC needs to be a component in the Financial Bid format.	No change, as per RFP
80	25-26	6.2(E)	Proposed solution shall be mandatorily deployed at the State Data Centre (SDC) / State IT Centre, Government of Madhya Pradesh, as designated by the Purchaser.	Request clarification on infrastructure interpretation. Kindly confirm what is meant by deployment at "State Data Centre (SDC) / State IT Centre" for this RFP: (a) bidder application deployed on buyer-provided shared virtualized AWS (MeitY-empannelled) cloud, or (b) Bidder-provided secure AWS Cloud or (c) any other approved model.	Refer Corrigendum
81	27-28	6.3(A)(2), 6.3(B)(1), 6.3(C)(1)	No data shall be transmitted, processed, or accessed through external or cloud-hosted LLMs or third-party systems without prior written approval. Public or third-party APIs including OpenAI/Google are prohibited unless deployed within a dedicated, isolated, government-approved environment.	Request clarification on approved model providers. Will MPSEDC provide access to the use of AI models (LLMs) such as OpenAI / Anthropic / AWS Bedrock? If yes, kindly specify the acceptable LLMs. If not, we can use our Zero Data Retention LLMs hosted on AWS Bedrock, OpenAI, under the Indian government conditions and guidelines.	MPSEDC shall permit the use of AI/LLM models deployed on cloud platforms, including services such as OpenAI, Anthropic, AWS Bedrock, or equivalent platforms, subject to compliance with applicable Government guidelines, data security requirements, and the terms and conditions of the RFP.  The bidder may propose suitable models/platforms as part of the solution architecture. However, any licensing, subscription, hosting, or usage costs associated with such models/services shall be borne by the bidder, and no additional payment beyond the approved BOQ line items shall be admissible.
82	25-26, 30	6.2(E), 7.1 Deliverable 1	Installation, configuration, and commissioning are to happen within State IT Centre infrastructure, but hosting responsibility and infra ownership are not explicitly detailed.	Request clarification on hosting responsibility and infra provisioning. Kindly confirm whether shared cloud infrastructure will be provided by MPSEDC/SDC or the bidder has to arrange and maintain a Shared cloud (MeitY empannelled AWS/Azure/etc.).	Refer Corrigendum
83	NA	General Clarification	Clarification sought regarding historical tender participation volume relevant for solution sizing and workflow planning	Kindly share the approximate number of bidder submissions typically received per tender by MPSEDC, and whether this varies significantly by tender category.	The average number of proposals received per RFP ranges between 3 to 5; however, this may vary depending upon the category of the tender.
84	12	3	Relevant Technical Experience:The Bidder must have demonstrable experience in the design, development, implementation, and maintenance of advanced technology solutions, including but not limited to AI/ML-based systems, document processing platforms, workflow automation systems, and Generative AI / NLP / Large Language Model (LLM)-based solutions. Such experience should encompass functionalities such as intelligent document understanding, automated bid/document generation, content summarization, data extraction, and AI-driven decision-support systems, preferably in the context of procurement, governance, or enterprise workflows.  The Bidder must have successfully completed at least one (1) project of similar nature with a minimum contract value of INR 25 Lakhs during the last five (5) years as on the bid submission date.	The relevant Experience should be directly implying to tender procurement to any Govt. Entities or Public Sector Undertakings. The bidder should have undertaken tender Generation /evaluation process for central Government Department/ State Government Department/ Central Autonomous Body/ Central Public Sector undertaking/ State Public Sector undertaking with experience of at least processing of 3000 bids.	No change, as per RFP

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
85	19	6.1	COTS solution with no fresh development	Whether customization and fine-tuning of AI/LLM models is permitted within scope?	Yes
86	25	6.2 (E)	The proposed Generative AI-enabled procurement solution shall be mandatorily deployed at the State Data Centre (SDC) / State IT Centre, Government of Madhya Pradesh, as designated by the Purchaser.	Since it will be SDC Deployment, Does it have GPU infrastructure? What will be the Storage and compute sizing details?	GPU - H100SXM or Higher CPU, RAM & Storage shall be provisioned by MPSEDC based on the justified requirement of the successful bidder.
87	12	3	Such experience should encompass functionalities such as intelligent document understanding, automated bid/document generation, content summarization, data extraction, and AI-driven decision-support systems, preferably in the context of procurement, governance, or enterprise workflows.	For a wider participation, we request you to kindly amend this clause as: Such experience should encompass functionalities such as intelligent document understanding/ automated bid document generation/ content summarization/data extraction/AI-driven decision-support systems, preferably in the context of procurement, governance, or enterprise workflows.	No change, as per RFP
88	14	4	The exemption is applicable only to PQ criteria and does not exempt the bidder from submission of bid security / EMD unless separately listed under the Bid Security Exemption Clause of this RFP.	As per our understanding MSE bidders are eligible for exemption from past experience and turnover criteria of the Pre-Qualification Criteria.  Kindly confirm.	Please refer to the Notes under Clause 3 (Pre-Qualification Criteria), wherein exemptions for MSEs are provided only with respect to the following requirements:  - Financial Turnover - GST Registration Requirement
89	NA	NA	NA	As per our understanding the hardware infrastructure for hosting the solution will be provided by MPSEDC.  Kindly confirm.	In case of Fully On-Premises deployment or Hybrid deployment involving SDC infrastructure, the required compute resources, including GPU/accelerators, storage, and related infrastructure, shall be provisioned by MPSEDC based on the justified requirement of the successful bidder.
90	NA	NA	NA	We understand that the inputs required for bid preparation will be provided by MPSEDC viz. Scope of work, PQ/TQ criteria, scope of work, etc.  Kindly confirm.	The reference scope shall be provided by MPSEDC; however, the detailed Scope of Work, PQ/TQ criteria, and other bid clauses shall be generated through the solution
91	NA	NA		Since, every RFP is unique in nature and require specific templates for each bid. Hence, we request you to kindly confirm do bidder need to prepare separate template for each RFP or 01 standardised template that can be used for every RFP.	Category-wise bid templates shall be prepared through the solution, such as templates for Goods Procurement RFPs and Service Procurement RFPs.  However, MPSEDC's existing templates shall be shared with the successful bidder for reference and configuration purposes.
92	47	12.2	The Agency shall raise invoices to MPSEDC on a quarterly basis, based on the actual usage of the solution/services during the respective billing period, duly supported by relevant usage reports and supporting documents.	Since, the payment term is based on the actual usage of the solution. Which may affect the cashflow of the bidder. Hence we request you to kindly amend the payment terms as: <u>Option-1</u> Either the payment of 200 qty should be made upfront to the bidder post UAT. <u>Option-2</u> Payment will be made to the bidder for Design, Development, testing and implementation of the AI Based solution.	No change, as per RFP
93	-	-	-	1. Kindly confirm whether we qualify for EMD exemption under the applicable MSME / Startup provisions.	As per the Madhya Pradesh State Purchase Rules (SPR), exemption from payment of Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) is applicable only to Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) and Startups registered in Madhya Pradesh.
94	-	-	-	2. The pre-requisite of prior experience with a minimum project value of ₹25 lakh appears restrictive for startups. We request you to kindly consider reducing it to ₹9 lakh or exempting this criterion.	No change, as per RFP
95	-	-	-	3. The stipulated timeline for solution deployment within one month from the date of Work Order (as mentioned on page 30) seems quite aggressive. We request you to consider a more feasible timeline.	No change, as per RFP
96	12	Sec 3, PQ Clause 2 — Financial Capacity	FY 2024-25 turnover — single-year strict or multi-year average	The RFP mandates annual turnover of at least ₹50 Lakhs in India for FY 2024-25. Is this a strict single-year requirement, or will the average of the last two or three financial years be considered in lieu — particularly for bidders with early-stage but rapidly growing revenues?	No change, as per RFP

Annexure 1

Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
97	12-13	Sec 3, PQ Clause 3 — Relevant Technical Experience	Similar nature project — scope, tech areas, RAG/chatbot, bundled engagement, private sector, 'preferably' mandatory	Regarding the 'similar nature' project requirement (minimum INR 25 Lakhs): (a) Must a single reference project cover all listed technology areas (AI/ML, GenAI, NLP, LLM, document processing, workflow automation), or is demonstrated capability in any one or combination sufficient? (b) Does an enterprise Generative AI chatbot, RAG deployment, or agentic workflow platform — not procurement-specific — qualify as a project of 'similar nature'? (c) Does a single engagement combining multiple AI/ML modules (e.g., NLP + document processing + LLM + approval workflow) qualify even if the engagement's primary label was broader enterprise software development? (d) Will experience in enterprise workflow automation involving document ingestion, LLM-driven content generation, and multi-stage approval flows — delivered for a private sector (non-government) client — be treated as equivalent to governance or procurement experience? (e) Is the phrase 'preferably in procurement, governance, or enterprise workflows' mandatory or directional guidance only?	(a) It is clarified that a single reference project is not required to cover all listed technology areas. Demonstrated experience in any one or a combination of the specified domains (AI/ML-based systems, document processing platforms, workflow automation systems, and Generative AI / NLP / LLM-based solutions) shall be considered, subject to the project meeting the minimum value criteria of INR 25 Lakhs and relevance to the scope of work.  (b) Yes, enterprise Generative AI chatbot implementations, Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) deployments, or agentic workflow platforms may qualify as projects of similar nature, provided they demonstrate substantial use of AI/ML, NLP, or LLM capabilities and align with the functional intent of the RFP.  (c) Yes, a single engagement combining multiple AI/ML modules such as NLP, document processing, LLM integration, and workflow/approval automation shall be considered eligible, even if the project is broadly categorized under enterprise software development, provided the AI-driven components are clearly demonstrable.  (d) Yes, experience in enterprise workflow automation involving document ingestion, LLM-based content generation, and multi-stage approval workflows delivered for private sector clients shall also be considered equivalent, as long as the solution demonstrates relevant technical capability and successful implementation.
98	12-13	Sec 3, PQ Clause 3 — Relevant Technical Experience	Ongoing project — supplementary payment evidence	For ongoing projects, the RFP permits a CA Certificate with UDIN as payment proof. May the bidder also submit GST return filings (GSTR-1/3B) or bank credit statements as supplementary corroborating evidence of payments received, in addition to the CA Certificate, to establish that the INR 25 Lakh threshold has been met?	(a) The phrase "preferably in procurement, governance, or enterprise" is not applicable.  For ongoing projects, submission of a CA Certificate with UDIN certifying the project value and payments received shall be mandatory for establishing compliance with the INR 25 Lakhs threshold, as specified in the RFP.
99	13	Sec 3, PQ Clause 4 — Product / Solution Readiness	COTS definition — GenAI on foundation models; SKU/versioning vs. purpose-built deployable platform	The RFP mandates a 'productized and production-ready COTS solution'. Please clarify: (a) Does MPSEDC consider a GenAI solution built on top of open-weight foundation models — with custom orchestration, RAG pipelines, and agentic workflows — as a COTS solution, or is a pre-existing SKU with release versioning and published product documentation expected? (b) Will a purpose-built, configurable AI platform with modular deployment capability (covering document ingestion, bid preparation, evaluation criteria generation, and workflow automation) qualify as COTS, even if it does not carry a commercial brand name listed on a marketplace?	Pre-existing SKU with release versioning and published product documentation is not necessary
100	28	Sec 6.3(H) — ISO/IEC 27001 Certification	ISO 27001 — timing of certification and Annexure 3 checklist omission	The RFP references ISO/IEC 27001 compliance but it is not listed as a mandatory document in Annexure 3. Please clarify: (a) Must the bidder hold a valid ISO 27001 certificate at the time of bid submission, or can it be a committed deliverable prior to Go-Live? (b) If mandatory at bid submission, should the certificate be included with PQ documents even though it is not listed in Annexure 3? (c) Must the certification be company-wide, or does certification of the specific delivery team or data centre suffice?	Refer Corrigendum
101	62	Annexure 12.2 — Financial Bid Form	Quantity of 200 — annual volume, contract-period total, or notional L1 figure	The financial bid specifies an estimated quantity of 200 each for Bid Preparation and Bid Evaluation on a 'per RFP' basis. Please clarify: (a) Does 200 represent the expected annual volume, the full contract-period volume (including extensions), or a purely notional figure used for L1 evaluation only? (b) Given that billing is strictly on actuals per Clause 12.2(a), what is MPSEDC's realistic annual demand estimate, and will it be shared so bidders can price sustainably?	The figures are indicative in nature and have been estimated based on annual projections derived from historical trends

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
102	62	Annexure 12.2, Terms & Conditions Clause 5	No minimum commitment — platform fee component feasibility	The RFP confirms MPSEDC cannot guarantee procurement of the stated quantities and billing will be on actual usage. Given the significant upfront investment required (SDC deployment, on-prem LLM infrastructure, AI calibration, training, and documentation), will MPSEDC consider: (a) A minimum commitment or usage floor per quarter? (b) A fixed platform/retainer fee component in addition to per-RFP usage charges? In the absence of either, please clarify how MPSEDC proposes to protect the selected agency from a near-zero usage scenario.	No change, as per RFP
103	62	Annexure 12.2 — Financial Bid Form	Module independence — Bid Preparation vs. Bid Evaluation used separately	The financial bid has two separate line items: (1) AI-Assisted Bid/RFP Preparation and (2) End-to-End Bid Evaluation. Can a department use only the Bid Preparation module without Bid Evaluation, or vice versa? If so, how will per-RFP usage be counted — once per RFP regardless of modules used, or separately per module per RFP?	Usage shall be counted separately per BOQ line item per RFP
104	62	Annexure 12.2 — Financial Bid Form	Per-RFP financial bid — scope of End-to-End Bid Evaluation line item	For line item (2) 'End-to-End Bid Evaluation', does the per-RFP price include all evaluation stages — PQ, Technical, Commercial, and report generation — as a single bundled price? Or are any of these stages expected to be priced as separate line items? Precise scoping is necessary to avoid post-award pricing disputes.	The quoted price shall be inclusive of all evaluation stages—Pre-Qualification, Technical, and Commercial—as well as report generation, and shall be considered as a single consolidated (bundled) price.
105	64	Annexure 13, Clause (g)	Nominal quoting vs. not quoting — L1 strategy interpretation	Annexure 13 states that bidders who fail to quote any rate for any line item will be rejected. In a scenario where a bidder quotes one line item at a nominal rate (e.g., ₹1), would this constitute a valid L1 strategy or attract rejection or disqualification? Please clarify the interpretation of 'not quoting' versus 'nominal quoting'.	Bidders who fail to quote a rate for any BOQ line item shall be considered non-responsive and their bids shall be rejected. The L1 bidder shall be determined based on the aggregate (sum total) of the rates quoted for both line items.
106	9	Schedule of RFP, Clause 16 — Performance Security	PBG computation basis — notional grand total vs. actual consumption	The RFP specifies a Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) of 3% of the total contract value. Given billing is on actuals with no minimum commitment, please confirm: Is the 3% PBG computed on the notional Grand Total from Annexure 12.2 (Qty × Rate), or on actual cumulative consumption? This significantly affects the PBG amount the selected agency must furnish at contract signing.	A Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) equivalent to 3% of the Grand Total value, as quoted in the Financial Bid, needs to be submitted.
107	47–48	Sec 12.2(f) — Payment Terms	45-day payment window — trigger date: invoice submission, acceptance, or milestone	Clause 12.2(f) states payments shall be made within 45 days after submission of an invoice and MPSEDC's acceptance. Please confirm the trigger for the 45-day clock: (a) Does it start from the invoice submission date, (b) the invoice acceptance date by MPSEDC, or (c) the milestone completion sign-off date? The distinction is important for cash flow planning.	Payments shall generally be made within forty-five (45) days from the date of acceptance of the invoice by MPSEDC
108	46	Sec 11.14(c) — Limitation of Liability	Liability cap for consumption-based contract — Year 1 baseline	Section 11.14(c) caps aggregate liability at the 'annual bill value or average annual bill value'. For a fully consumption-based contract with no minimum guarantee: (a) During Year 1, before any billing history exists, what is the liability cap based on — the notional contract value from Annexure 12.2 or another reference? (b) In subsequent years, is the cap based on the immediately preceding year's actual billing?	a) For Year 1, the liability cap shall be based on the Grand Total value, as quoted in the Financial Bid. b) For subsequent years, the cap shall be based on the actual billing of the immediately preceding year; if a full year is not completed, it shall be calculated on a pro-rata (average) basis.
109	42	Sec 10.12 — Sub-Contracting	Sub-contracting definition — cloud infra, VPC LLM APIs, specialist vendors	Section 10.12 prohibits assignment or sub-letting of any substantial part of the contract. Please confirm whether the following arrangements constitute 'sub-contracting' under this clause: (a) Use of third-party cloud infrastructure (e.g., AWS, Azure, GCP in Indian regions) for hosting components within the SDC environment; (b) Use of commercial LLM APIs (e.g., Azure OpenAI deployed within a VPC with India data residency and PrivateLink) — noting this scenario is also covered from a technical permissibility angle in Q30 below; (c) Engagement of specialist vendors for VAPT, ISO 27001 audit, or training delivery.	Such type of service engagement shall not be construed as subletting
110	16	Sec 4.2(1) — Provision of Sample RFPs	Demo sample RFPs — advance sharing timeline, tender type mix, and demo mode	Please confirm the following regarding the 5 historical RFP cases to be provided for the technical demonstration: (a) Will they be shared with PQ-qualified bidders at least 5 working days before the demonstration date? (b) Will the 5 samples include a balanced mix of Works, Goods, and Services tender categories, or may they be concentrated in one type? (c) Will the demonstration be conducted online or at MPSEDC's Bhopal premises?	The sample RFP shall be made available to the PQ-qualified bidders on the day of demonstration.
111	16–17	Sec 4.2(3) — Output-Based Evaluation	Ground-truth set — shared alongside samples or withheld until after demo	For the output-based evaluation, will the complete ground-truth set — including final evaluation reports, L1 determination, issued corrigenda, PQ/technical scoring matrices, shortfall notices, and clarification letters — be shared alongside the 5 sample RFPs, or will actual outcomes be withheld from bidders until after the demonstration has been completed?	The outcomes of the Pre-Qualification and Technical Evaluation stages shall be made available to bidders through the MP Tenders portal prior to the opening of the Financial Proposals

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
112	16	Sec 4.2(4) & (5) — Parameter-wise Qualification	Qualification threshold — quantitative accuracy metric or subjective committee judgment	The RFP states bidders are marked Qualified or Not Qualified per parameter based on 'degree of alignment, accuracy, and completeness'. Please clarify: (a) Is there a quantitative accuracy threshold (e.g., ≥80% match with ground truth outputs) that determines qualification? (b) Or is qualification entirely at the subjective discretion of the evaluation committee? Will MPSEDC publish the scoring rubric used to assess each of the 6 demonstration parameters before bid submission?	The evaluation shall be carried out by the designated Technical Evaluation Committee based on the desired output of the solution against each demonstration parameter.
113	17	Sec 4.2(6)(a) — Live Working Solution	Demo environment — bidder's own staging, cloud instance, or must be SDC pre-deployed	The RFP requires a live, working solution demonstration. Please clarify: (a) Must the demonstration solution be pre-deployed at the State Data Centre prior to the demo date, or can it be demonstrated on the bidder's own staging or cloud environment with equivalent security controls? (b) Would a hosted SaaS instance with India data residency and full isolation be acceptable as a demonstration environment?	(a) The bidder shall provide the demonstration through its own hosting environment. (B) Yes
114	16-17	Sec 4.2(4) & (5) — Overall Qualification	Re-demonstration opportunity if not qualified on one parameter	If a bidder is marked 'Not Qualified' on one or more demonstration parameters, will there be an opportunity for re-demonstration, supplementary clarification, or partial re-scoring before the bidder is declared overall 'Not Qualified'? Or is the first demonstration final and binding?	The outcome of the first demonstration shall be treated as final and binding. Bidders shall therefore ensure that all required functionalities and compliance points are adequately demonstrated during the scheduled demonstration session.
115	30-31	Sec 7.1 / SLA #1 — Project Delivery Timeline	30-day SLA clock — from Work Order issuance or infrastructure handover by MPSEDC	The RFP requires full production deployment within 30 days from Work Order, with a penalty of 0.5% per day of delay. Since deployment at the State Data Centre depends on infrastructure provisioning, network access, SDC coordination, and security clearances — which are outside the bidder's control — please confirm: (a) Will MPSEDC confirm that delays attributable to client-side infrastructure, access provisioning, or SDC dependencies are formally excluded from the penalty clock? (b) Alternatively, can the 30-day clock commence from the date of confirmed infrastructure handover by MPSEDC rather than from Work Order issuance?	It is clarified that the 30-day implementation timeline shall be applicable from the date of Work Order issuance or handover of required infrastructure/access by MPSEDC, whichever is later, to ensure readiness of the operational environment.  (a) Any delays arising due to dependencies on MPSEDC/SDC infrastructure provisioning, network access, security approvals, or other client-side enablers not attributable to the bidder shall be suitably reviewed and may be excluded from the penalty computation, subject to verification and confirmation by MPSEDC.  (b) Accordingly, the effective commencement of the implementation SLA clock shall be considered from the date of confirmed infrastructure readiness and handover by MPSEDC, where such dependencies exist, to ensure fair assessment of implementation timelines.
116	31	SLA #2 — Platform Availability (Uptime)	Uptime SLA — planned maintenance, maintenance windows, applicability during UAT	Please clarify the following regarding the 99.5% uptime SLA: (a) Is planned maintenance counted against the uptime SLA? If not, what is the permissible maintenance window duration and required advance notice period? (b) Does the uptime SLA apply during the calibration and UAT phases, or only from the Go-Live sign-off date?	Refer Corrigendum
117	32	Sec 7.3 — Other Terms (Penalty Cap)	Concurrent SLA penalties — per-SLA or mutually exclusive	Can a single incident trigger multiple SLA penalties concurrently (e.g., a security breach simultaneously triggering SLA #9 Security Compliance and SLA #10 Data Loss/Breach)? Please clarify whether penalty computation is applied independently per violated SLA or whether penalties are mutually exclusive for a single underlying incident.	It is clarified that SLA penalties shall generally be applied independently for each distinct SLA parameter violated, based on the nature and impact of the non-compliance.  However, in cases where multiple SLA breaches arise from a single underlying incident, the applicability of concurrent penalties shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by MPSEDC to ensure fairness and avoid unintended duplication of penalties for the same cause.  The final determination of whether penalties are to be applied cumulatively or treated as mutually exclusive shall rest with MPSEDC/competent authority based on the severity, impact, and scope of the incident.
118	47	Sec 12.1 — Period of Contract	Contract extension — automatic or re-negotiated; rates fixed or WPI/CPI escalation	The contract is for 1 year with a possible 2-year extension on 'same terms and conditions'. Please clarify: (a) Is the extension automatic upon satisfactory performance, or does it require fresh negotiation and re-issuance of a work order? (b) Does 'same terms and conditions' include pricing — i.e., will per-RFP rates remain fixed for all 3 years, or will MPSEDC apply a price escalation clause indexed to WPI/CPI or another benchmark?	(a) Extension of the work order shall be considered based on project requirements and satisfactory performance of the solution. Any such extension shall be issued through a separate work order.  (b) Any extension of the work order shall be on the same terms and conditions, without any price escalation.

Annexure 1

Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
119	9	Schedule of RFP / Sec 8.4 — Pre-Bid Meeting	Submission deadline extension — 17 calendar days between pre-bid meeting and closing	Only approximately 17 calendar days separate the pre-bid meeting (24 April 2026) from the bid submission deadline (11 May 2026). Given the material and technical nature of likely clarifications — including on-prem LLM architecture, infrastructure requirements, and AI calibration scope — will MPSEDC: (a) Issue formal responses to pre-bid queries as a corrigendum? (b) Consider extending the submission deadline to allow bidders sufficient time to incorporate clarifications into technically complex proposals?	(a) Yes, MPSEDC shall issue formal responses to all pre-bid queries through a duly issued corrigendum/addendum, wherever required, to ensure clarity and uniform understanding among all prospective bidders.  (b) The request for extension of the bid submission deadline has been examined. However, the current timeline has been defined considering the overall procurement schedule and project requirements. Accordingly, the request for extension is not considered at this stage.
120	22, 19	Sec 6.2(A)(6) / Sec 6.1 — e-Tendering Compatibility	e-Tendering integration — API availability, mptenders/GeP NIC, two-way vs. format-based	The RFP states the solution must be 'compatible with existing e-tendering systems' and references the mptenders.gov.in portal. Please clarify: (a) Does the MPSEDC e-tendering platform (mptenders.gov.in or GeP NIC) expose APIs (REST/SOAP/GraphQL) for two-way integration, or is output compatibility in standard formats (PDF/Word) sufficient? (b) If APIs are available, can MPSEDC share API documentation or a sandbox environment for integration design? (c) What specific data objects (tenders, bid submissions, evaluation outputs) need to be exchanged between the GenAI solution and the e-tendering portal?	Integration is not required with mptenders.gov.in or GeP NIC portal
121	25	Sec 6.2E — On-Premises Deployment	State Data Centre — OS, hypervisor, container platform, approved databases	To design a compatible deployment architecture, please share the following details about the State Data Centre environment: (a) Operating system and hypervisor platform in use (e.g., VMware, KVM, Hyper-V, or bare metal)? (b) Available container orchestration platform, if any (e.g., Kubernetes, Docker Swarm, OpenShift)? (c) Approved/preferred database systems (e.g., PostgreSQL, Oracle, MySQL, MSSQL)? (d) Network topology — is the deployed application reachable via internet, or intranet-only?	(a) & (b) State Data Centre will have the container orchestration platform on OpenShift.  (c) Bidder may select any database system mentioned in query.  (d) Applicable will be reachable via both internet or intranet.
122	25	Sec 6.2E — On-Premises Deployment : Infrastructure Responsibility	GPU, compute, storage, SSL, and LLM licensing — who provisions and who bears cost	The RFP mandates deployment at the State Data Centre. Please clarify the responsibility boundary in detail: (a) Will MPSEDC/SDC provide and bear the cost of all compute infrastructure — CPU servers, GPU nodes (for on-prem LLM inference), RAM, SSD/HDD storage, SSL certificates, and networking? (b) If GPU resources are available at SDC, please specify the tier (e.g., A100/H100, count, VRAM available), as this directly determines which LLM can be deployed. (c) Who bears the cost of any additional infrastructure the bidder requires beyond what SDC provides, including LLM model licensing if applicable?	(a) MPSEDC/SDC provide and bear the cost of all compute infrastructure — CPU servers, GPU nodes (for on-prem LLM inference), RAM, SSD/HDD storage, SSL certificates, and networking.  (b) H100SXM GPU or Higher GPU Count & VRAM will be provided by MPSEDC as per justified requirement of successful bidder.  (c) Bidder need to bear the cost of any additional infrastructure which is required by the bidder and the required LLM model licences.
123	25–26	Sec 6.2E — RBAC / IAM	Identity & Access Management — existing SSO/LDAP/AD integration or standalone	The RFP requires RBAC across 5 defined user roles. Please clarify: (a) Does MPSEDC have an existing IAM or SSO system at the SDC (e.g., LDAP, Active Directory, Keycloak, SAML-based federation) that the proposed solution must integrate with? (b) If yes, please share the IAM protocol and version. (c) If no existing IAM system, should the solution include a fully standalone user management and authentication module?	Solution should have fully standalone user management and authentication module
124	21	Sec 6.2A — Bid Preparation Module	Existing tender templates — digitization status, format, and count by category	The solution must use 'configurable, department-specific templates aligned with MPSEDC's standard bidding formats'. Please confirm: (a) Does MPSEDC have an existing digital library of standard RFP/NIT templates and clause sets, or will these need to be digitized from physical/legacy formats as part of the engagement scope? (b) In what format are templates stored (Word, PDF, structured XML)? (c) How many distinct template types/formats does MPSEDC use across Works, Goods, and Services categories?	(a) MPSEDC will share the standard RFP templates to the successful bidder.  (b) Word/PDF/Excel Formats  (c) MPSEDC uses 4-5 types of templates in each category.
125	25–26	Sec 6.2E — Deployment Sizing	Concurrent user load, total user base, monthly tender volumes, and bidder submissions per tender	To size the deployment and validate SLA commitments, please share: (a) Expected peak concurrent users? (b) Total platform users across all 5 roles? (c) Expected number of tenders processed per month? (d) Average number of bidder submissions per tender?	(a) Expected peak concurrent users = 05 (b) Total platform users across all 5 roles = 05 (c) Expected number of tenders processed per month? = 15-20 (d) Average number of bidder submissions per tender = 03-05 Approx
126	10	Sec 2.1 — State AI Mission	State AI Mission integration — platform interoperability requirements	This RFP is part of the broader State AI Mission. Will the deployed solution be required to integrate with or feed data into other State AI Mission initiatives? Are there platform-level interoperability requirements — such as a common identity framework, SSO federation, data exchange standards, or API gateway — that are not explicitly listed in Section 6 of the RFP but will be expected post-deployment?	No

Annexure 1

Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
127	27	Sec 6.3(C) — Restriction on External APIs	On-premise LLMs — open-source self-hosted vs. VPC-isolated managed services	The RFP prohibits use of third-party APIs unless in a 'dedicated, isolated, government-approved environment'. Please confirm the permissibility of the following deployment models: (a) Self-hosted open-weight models (e.g., LLaMA 3, Mistral, Qwen, Falcon) fully installed and executed on-premise at the SDC with zero external calls — explicitly permitted? (b) Azure OpenAI deployed within a Virtual Private Cloud with India data residency and PrivateLink — technically permissible under Sec 6.3(C)? [Note: the sub-contracting implications of this same scenario are also raised in Q14 above.] (c) AWS Bedrock in the Mumbai region with VPC PrivateLink — permissible? The answer directly determines the solution architecture.	(a) Yes permitted. (b) Yes permitted. (c) Yes
128	27	Sec 6.3(B) — Restriction on AI Model Usage	On-prem fine-tuning of open-weight models on MPSEDC data — permitted	Clause 6.3(B) prohibits using project data to train, re-train, or fine-tune external or third-party AI/ML models. Please confirm that on-premises fine-tuning of open-weight models using MPSEDC's procurement data — with all model artifacts (weights, checkpoints, adapters) remaining exclusively at the SDC and never shared with any external party — is explicitly permitted under this clause.	Yes
129	27	Sec 6.3(C) — On-Premise Compliance	On-premise vector databases and embedding models — data residency compliance	Will the use of on-premise vector databases (e.g., Qdrant, Weaviate, Milvus, Chroma) and locally hosted embedding models — for document retrieval, semantic search, and RAG pipelines — be considered fully compliant with the data residency and external API restriction clauses, given all processing and storage remains within the SDC environment?	Yes
130	19–20	Sec 6.1 Scope Sr.2 / Sec 6.2B	OCR accuracy — measurement level (character/word/field) and document sample definition	The RFP mandates minimum 95% OCR accuracy. Please clarify: (a) Is the 95% threshold measured at character level, word level, or field-extraction level? (b) On what document sample will accuracy be evaluated — clean digital PDFs, scanned tenders with stamps and handwriting, or a defined mixed sample? (c) Could MPSEDC share 2–3 representative sample scanned tender documents prior to bid submission to enable accurate benchmarking and compliance commitment?	(a) & (b) Refer Corrigendum  (c) Tender section of MPSEDC's portal can be referred for published RFP through following link <a href="http://www.mpsedc.mp.gov.in">www.mpsedc.mp.gov.in</a>
131	19	Sec 6.2B — Document Ingestion	Historical document volume for bulk ingestion — count, format, and digital availability	The system requires a parsed and indexed tender repository. Please clarify: (a) How many historical tender documents does MPSEDC intend to ingest at go-live? (b) Is bulk ingestion a one-time activity or ongoing/incremental? (c) Are all historical documents available in digital format, or are some physical/archived requiring scanning as part of the scope?	(a) Available historical documents shall be shared with the successful bidder, as per the requirements of the proposed solution  (b) Bulk ingestion, as a one-time activity, shall be required for Go-Live; however, incremental ingestion shall also be required for continuous output enhancement  (c) The proposed historical documents to be provided shall be in digital format
132	19–20	Sec 6.2B — Document Characteristics	Typical document characteristics — page count, scan DPI, and Hindi/English language mix	To design an accurate and performant ingestion pipeline, please share: (a) What is the typical page count range of MPSEDC tender documents (NIT + RFP + annexures)? (b) What is the predominant scan resolution (DPI) of scanned tender documents? (c) Are tender documents primarily in English, Hindi, or bilingual? Does the OCR demonstration need to cover Hindi language support?	(a) 150-200 Pages  (b) All RFPs are in digital format (Not Scanned Pages)  (c) Primarily in English Language, OCR demonstration in Hindi would be required
133	19	Sec 6.2B — Corrigendum Handling	Corrigendum versioning — reference to original tender, max count, replace vs. supplement	Please confirm: (a) Are corrigenda in MPSEDC's e-tendering system stored with a reference back to the original tender document ID? (b) What is the typical maximum number of corrigenda issued per tender? (c) Do MPSEDC corrigenda replace sections of the original document or are they always supplementary addenda appended to the base document?	(a) Yes  (b) There is no specific count for corrigendum  (c) Both are applicable.
134	23–24	Sec 6.2C — Evaluation Criteria Generation	Scoring framework — standardized across tender types or independently defined per tender	Please clarify: (a) Does MPSEDC follow a standardized scoring framework across all tender types, or does each tender have an independently defined scoring model? (b) Are minimum qualifying scores (e.g., ≥70 marks to pass technical evaluation) standardized, or set per tender? (c) Is a sample completed scoring framework available that can serve as a calibration reference for the AI agents?	(a) Each tender have an independently defined scoring model  (b) Set per tender  (c) MPSEDC's historical RFPs/Evaluation shall be shared with successful bidders
135	24–25	Sec 6.2D — Technical Evaluation	Evaluator assignment — individual or panel; averaged or override; blind or collaborative	Please clarify: (a) Are tenders evaluated by a single evaluator or a panel? (b) If panel-based, are scores averaged or does a lead evaluator have override authority? (c) Does MPSEDC require blind evaluation (evaluators cannot see each other's scores until all have submitted), or is collaborative visible scoring acceptable?	(a) Evaluations shall be carried out by the panel. (b) The panel shall award the final score as a consolidated exercise. (c) No.

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
136	24	Sec 6.2D — PQ Evaluation	PQ document types — fixed checklist or per-category; machine-readable or unstructured PDFs	To configure PQ validation logic accurately: (a) Does MPSEDC currently use a fixed PQ document checklist, or does it vary by tender category? (b) What are the most common document types submitted by bidders at PQ stage? (c) Are any bidder documents submitted in a structured machine-readable format (e.g., digitally signed PDF, XML), or are all submissions unstructured scanned PDFs?	(a) The same may vary depending upon the category of the tender. (b) Eligibility documents in PDF format are submitted by the bidders during the PQ stage. (c) Unstructured scanned PDF documents.
137	20	Sec 6.2A — Bid Preparation	Evaluation criteria — always pre-defined in RFP or sometimes determined post-submission	Please confirm: (a) Are evaluation criteria and scoring weightages always published as part of the original tender document? (b) Are there scenarios where MPSEDC defines evaluation criteria after bid submission (e.g., for highly technical or specialized procurement)? If yes, how should the AI system handle such cases?	(a) Yes (b) No
138	24	Sec 6.2D — Commercial Evaluation	BoQ structure — standardized machine-readable template or free-form per tender	The commercial evaluation module must parse BoQs and normalize price data. Please clarify: (a) Are MPSEDC BoQs always structured in a standardized machine-readable format (e.g., Excel template with fixed columns), or is structure free-form and variable per tender? (b) Do bidders submit BoQs via the e-tendering portal in a predefined template, or as independently formatted documents?	(a) In excel template, however the columns and rows are not fixed) (b) Bidders submit BoQs via the e-tendering portal in a predefined template specified for the RFP
139	20	Sec 6.1 Scope Sr.3 — AI Evaluation Criteria Generation	Single-bidder evaluation — workflow difference and per-RFP billing applicability	The RFP mentions capability to handle RFPs with a 'single bidder evaluation pool'. Please clarify: (a) Is single-bidder evaluation a common scenario at MPSEDC, and does the evaluation workflow differ materially from multi-bidder evaluation? (b) Does a single-bidder RFP still count as one RFP for billing purposes under Annexure 12.2?	(a) Single-bidder evaluations are not common; however, the evaluation workflow remains similar to that followed for multi-bidder evaluations (b) Yes
140	31	SLA #5 — AI Output Quality	AI output acceptance rate — who defines 'major rework', measurement methodology, before/after HITL edits	The SLA mandates ≥90% AI output acceptance rate without major rework. Please clarify: (a) Who defines 'major rework' — the Evaluation Committee unilaterally, or a jointly agreed rubric? (b) What is the measurement methodology (sample size per measurement period, frequency of review, scoring criteria)? (c) Is acceptance measured on the raw AI output before any human-in-the-loop edits, or after evaluator review and correction? This is a critical distinction: since Section 6.3(F) makes human review mandatory for every AI output, measuring acceptance after edits would render the SLA near-impossible to breach, while measuring on raw output creates a different risk profile entirely.	(a) Evaluation Committee (b) Query is not clear (c) Yes, before human in the loop
141	24–25	Sec 6.2D — Approval Gates	Approval hierarchy — levels required; DSC vs. system-based; delegation support	Please clarify the approval workflow requirements: (a) How many levels of approval are typically required before progressing from one evaluation stage to the next (e.g., Evaluator → Procurement Manager → Competent Authority)? (b) Does MPSEDC require evaluation reports and award recommendations to carry Class II/III Digital Signatures (DSC), or are system-based approvals (username + OTP/password confirmation) sufficient for legal validity? (c) Should the system support delegation of approval authority for cases where a designated approver is unavailable?	(a) 3 Levels (b) System based OTP/Password (c) No
142	25	Sec 6.2E — RBAC	RBAC granularity — multi-role users, tender-level permissions, time-bound role assignments	To configure RBAC correctly: (a) Can a single user hold multiple roles simultaneously (e.g., a Procurement Manager who is also an Evaluator for specific tenders)? (b) Should RBAC be enforced at the tender level — i.e., a user may be an Evaluator for Tender A but read-only for Tender B? (c) Should the system support time-bound role assignments (e.g., a temporary evaluator appointed specifically for one tender)?	(a) Yes (b) Yes (c) Yes
143	28	Sec 6.3(D) — Data Classification	Data classification assignment — AI-inferred or manually designated; MPSEDC policy document	The solution must support data classification (Confidential / Restricted / Public). Please clarify: (a) Will data classification be manually designated by procurement officers, or should the AI platform automatically infer classification based on document content? (b) Will MPSEDC publish a formal data classification policy for the system to be calibrated against?	(a) Yes, data classification be manually designated by procurement officers (b) No
144	28	Sec 6.3(H) — VAPT	VAPT — standard, CERT-In empanelment, cost responsibility, and periodic frequency	The RFP mandates VAPT prior to go-live and periodically thereafter. Please specify: (a) What VAPT standard is required (OWASP Top 10, CERT-In guidelines, NIST, or a specific GOMP framework)? (b) Must VAPT be conducted by a CERT-In empanelled agency, or can the bidder use its internal security team? (c) Who bears the cost of pre-go-live and periodic VAPT? (d) What is the expected frequency of periodic VAPT (quarterly, semi-annually, or annually)?	(a) As per CERT-IN guidelines. (b) Through a CERT-In empanelled agency (c) Bidder needs to bear all such cost. (d) Annually OR Whenever major updates gone live.

Annexure 1

**Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation**

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
145	27	Sec 6.3(A) — Data Residency	Data residency — DR/backup replication to secondary government site within India	For business continuity, will MPSEDC permit: (a) Encrypted backup replication to a secondary government data centre within India (e.g., NIC DC or another GoMP SDC)? (b) Backup storage on an air-gapped system within the same SDC campus? Please clarify what DR and backup configurations are permissible within the data residency constraints.	(a) Yes (b) Need to comply with SDC DR policy which will be shared with the successful bidder.
146	28	Sec 6.3(F) — Human-in-the-Loop	AI output explainability — depth of justification required per output	The RFP mandates AI outputs be 'explainable with appropriate justification mechanisms'. Please clarify: (a) Is a plain-language summary of the AI recommendation sufficient? (b) Does MPSEDC require full traceability back to specific clauses in the ingested source document? (c) Must explanations be generated for every AI output, or only for outputs flagged for human review?	(a) Yes (b) Yes (c) Yes for every AI output
147	29	Sec 6.3(I) — Fairness, Bias & Ethical Compliance	Bias audit — responsible party, methodology, frequency, and bidder grievance process	Please clarify: (a) Who is responsible for conducting the bias and fairness audit — the bidder, MPSEDC's internal team, or an independent third party? (b) What methodology is expected (statistical fairness testing, expert review, adversarial probing)? (c) What is the expected frequency of bias audits? (d) In the event a bidder formally challenges an AI-generated evaluation score on grounds of bias, what is the expected grievance and recourse process?	The detailed mechanism and governance framework for bias and fairness audits, including responsibility, methodology, audit frequency, and grievance redressal process, shall be finalized during the implementation stage in consultation with the successful bidder.  However, the proposed solution should support industry-standard practices for fairness assessment, explainability, auditability, and human oversight in AI-assisted evaluations.
148	27–28	Sec 6.3(G) — Data Retention & Secure Deletion	GoMP retention policy reference; third-party witness for secure deletion certification	Please share: (a) The specific GoMP record retention policy document or circular applicable to procurement records, so the solution's data retention module can be configured to enforce correct retention periods. (b) On contract expiry or termination, does MPSEDC require a third-party witness or independent auditor for the secure deletion process, or is a self-certified destruction report from the agency acceptable?	(a) The applicable record retention requirements and related policy provisions shall be shared with the successful bidder during the implementation phase, as required for solution configuration.  (b) The detailed process and compliance requirements for data deletion, including any requirement for third-party verification or certification, shall be finalized at the time of implementation and agreement execution.
149	46–47	Sec 11.15 — Exit Management	AI model IP on exit — model weights, fine-tuned adapters, and proprietary base model licensing	Section 11.15 requires all project assets — including AI models — to be handed over to MPSEDC on contract completion or termination. Please clarify: (a) Does ownership transfer include model weights and fine-tuned adapters trained on MPSEDC data? (b) What is the expected treatment of proprietary pre-trained base models provided under the bidder's license — does MPSEDC expect perpetual use rights to these base models post-contract? (c) What happens to licensed third-party model weights that the bidder cannot legally transfer?	(a) Yes, the ownership transfer is expected to include model weights, fine-tuned adapters, and other AI artefacts developed or trained using MPSEDC data.  (b) The treatment and usage rights of proprietary pre-trained base models provided under the bidder's license shall be governed as per the applicable licensing terms and conditions proposed by the bidder and accepted by MPSEDC.  (c) In case of any third-party licensed or non-transferable model weights/components, the bidder shall clearly specify such limitations, dependencies, and applicable licensing conditions in its proposal.
150	31	Sec 7.2 — SLA Penalties	Response time SLA — 'standard user operations' definition; threshold for AI processing tasks	The SLA mandates ≤3 seconds for 'standard user operations'. Please define this scope: (a) Does it include AI-driven compute-intensive operations (criteria generation, technical scoring, BoQ parsing, report generation), or only UI navigation and data retrieval? (b) What is the acceptable response time for AI processing operations — e.g., generating evaluation criteria for a 100-page RFP document?	(a) Refer Corrigendum  (b) It should be completed within 24 Hrs
151	31	Sec 7.2 — SLA Penalties Sr.6–8	Incident classification — who determines critical/major/minor; clock start point	Please clarify: (a) Who has authority to classify an incident as critical (4-hour), major (8-hour), or minor (24-hour) — MPSEDC, the bidder, or a jointly agreed classification matrix? (b) Will a pre-agreed incident classification framework be included in the Work Order, or should the bidder propose one in the technical bid? (c) Does the resolution clock start from the time of issue occurrence or from the time MPSEDC formally raises a ticket in the ticketing system?	(a) The incident classification and prioritization shall be determined by MPSEDC in consultation with the successful bidder, based on the nature, severity, and business impact of the issue.  (b) The detailed incident classification framework and escalation matrix may be finalized during the implementation stage and incorporated in the Work Order/Agreement. However, bidders may propose an indicative incident management framework as part of their technical proposal.  (c) The SLA resolution timeline shall generally be considered from the time of formal logging/registration of the issue in the designated ticketing or incident management system.

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
152	30-31	Sec 7.1 / 7.2	Post go-live support — window (8x5/24x7), on-site vs. remote, patches and enhancements scope	For post-go-live support planning: (a) What is MPSEDC's expected support window — 8x5 (business hours), 12x6, or 24x7? (b) Will a dedicated on-site support resource be required at MPSEDC's Bhopal premises, or is remote support sufficient? (c) Are software updates, security patches, LLM model updates, and minor feature enhancements included within the contract scope, or will they be billed as change requests?	(a) The support coverage requirements, including support window timings, shall be finalized during the implementation and contract finalization stage based on operational requirements of MPSEDC.  (b) The requirement of onsite and/or remote support shall be determined based on project needs and may be finalized during implementation. However, the bidder should ensure timely support and issue resolution as per the prescribed SLA requirements.  (c) Software updates, security patches, LLM/model updates, bug fixes, performance optimizations, and minor feature enhancements required during the contract period shall be treated as part of the overall scope of work, and no additional payment shall be made for the same.
153	26	Sec 6.2(F) — Training, Documentation & Handover	Training user counts per role, number of locations, and train-the-trainer option	To plan training delivery accurately: (a) What are the approximate user counts across each role category (Procurement Officers, Evaluators, Approvers, System Administrators, Read-only Auditors)? (b) Across how many office locations is training expected? (c) Is a train-the-trainer model acceptable in lieu of direct training for all users?	(a) The indicative number of users for training purposes is expected to be approximately five (5) users across the defined role categories.  (b) The training locations and deployment coverage shall be finalized during project execution in consultation with the successful bidder.  (c) Yes, a train-the-trainer approach may be considered acceptable, subject to approval by MPSEDC and ensuring adequate knowledge transfer, training effectiveness, and availability of required training materials/documentation.
154	33	Sec 8.1 — Earnest Money Deposit (EMD)	EMD refund timeline by rejection stage — PQ, Technical Demo, Financial Evaluation	Section 8.1 states unsuccessful bidders' EMD will be released within 30 working days of issuing a work order or signing the agreement with the successful agency. Please clarify the refund timeline for bidders eliminated at each stage: (a) Rejected at PQ stage; (b) Rejected at Technical Demonstration stage; (c) Technically qualified but not selected after Financial Evaluation. Does this mean all unsuccessful bidders must wait until the successful bidder is fully onboarded and the agreement is signed?	EMD shall be released at each stage of evaluation to bidders who are disqualified, in accordance with the refund timelines prescribed under the MP e-Tendering Portal.  However, for bidders disqualified at the Financial Evaluation stage, the EMD shall be released within a maximum period of 30 working days from the date of issuance of the Work Order or execution of the Agreement with the successful bidder.
155	Pg. 8	Sec. 1 — Schedule of RFP	Post-submission timelines	Please share expected timelines for: (a) completion of PQ/Technical evaluation; (b) opening of financial bids; and (c) issuance of Work Order / Lol to successful bidder.	(a) Yes, MPSEDC shall issue formal responses to all pre-bid queries through a duly notified corrigendum/addendum, wherever required, to ensure clarity and uniform understanding among all bidders.  (b) Any request for extension of the bid submission deadline shall be duly examined by MPSEDC based on the nature and extent of clarifications issued. If considered necessary to ensure fair competition and adequate time for incorporation of changes in technically complex proposals, the submission timeline may be suitably extended through a formal corrigendum.
156	Pg. 16	Sec. 4.2 — Technical Demo Methodology	Sample RFPs for Technical Demonstration	By when will the sample RFPs be shared with PQ-qualified bidders? Will bidders get a defined preparation window before the live demo? Will sample RFPs be in Hindi, English, or both?	The sample RFP shall be made available to the PQ-qualified bidders on the scheduled date of the demonstration. The sample RFP shall be provided in the English language.
157	Pg. 15-16	Sec. 4.1 & 4.2 — Technical Demo Evaluation	Scoring — Qualified / Not Qualified benchmarks	What specific benchmarks determine Qualified vs Not Qualified for each of the 6 demo parameters? Is partial/conditional qualification possible? Will evaluation criteria be disclosed to bidders in advance?	The evaluation shall be carried out by the designated Technical Evaluation Committee based on the desired output of the solution against each demonstration parameter.
158	Pg. 25-26	Sec. 6.2(E) — On-Premises Deployment	SDC Infrastructure Specifications	To enable accurate scoping and pricing: (a) what GPU hardware is available at SDC (model, VRAM)? (b) Is the bidder expected to procure GPU hardware, or utilise existing SDC infrastructure?	(a) GPU - H100SXM or Higher CPU, RAM & Storage would be as per the justified requirement of successful bidder.  (b) No, infrastructure will be provided by MPSEDC
159	Pg. 27	Sec. 6.3(C) — External API Restriction	LLM Deployment — On-Prem vs. Approved Cloud	Is the requirement strictly an on-premises open-source LLM with zero external API calls? Or is a cloud-hosted LLM permissible if deployed within an isolated environment?	Refer Corrigendum

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
160	Pg. 19-27	Sec. 6 – Scope of Work (General)	Hindi Language Support	Are Hindi-language tender documents in scope for OCR processing? Should AI-generated outputs (reports, evaluations) be in Hindi, English, or both? Is a Hindi UI required?	(a) Yes, Hindi-language tender documents shall also be within the scope of OCR processing.  (b) AI-generated outputs, reports, evaluations, and related documents shall primarily be in English; however, the solution should also support Hindi language content and occasional bilingual output requirements, wherever applicable.  (c) A fully Hindi-based UI is not mandatory; however, the solution should support Hindi language rendering/input and basic multilingual usability features.
161	Pg. 30-32	Sec. 7.1, 7.2 & 11.9 – SLA / Force Majeure	30-Day Go-Live – SDC Dependency & Penalties	Will delays caused by SDC infrastructure readiness or government access approvals be treated as Force Majeure (no penalty)? Will a formal SDC readiness confirmation trigger the 30-day deployment clock?	It is clarified that delays arising due to SDC infrastructure readiness, network provisioning, security clearances, or other government-side dependencies not attributable to the selected agency shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and may be considered for appropriate extension or exclusion from penalty computation, subject to verification and approval by MPSEDC/competent authority.  Further, the 30-day deployment timeline shall commence from the date of formal confirmation of infrastructure readiness and handover by MPSEDC, where such dependencies exist, to ensure fair and realistic implementation conditions.  Treatment of such delays under Force Majeure or otherwise shall be determined based on the nature of the dependency and supporting documentation, as per applicable RFP provisions.
162	12	3.3	The Bidder must have successfully completed at least one (1) project of similar nature with a minimum contract value of INR 25 Lakhs during the last five (5) years as on the bid submission date.	It is requested that the clause be modified for Technology Implementation projects as the qualifying experience of this value. Accordingly, the clause may be revised as - <i>The Bidder must have successfully completed at least one Technology Implementation project with a minimum contract value of INR 25 Lakhs during the last five (5) years as on the bid submission date.</i>	No change, as per RFP
163	16	4.2 (1)	Provision of Sample RFPs: The Purchaser shall provide five (5) previously completed tender/RFP cases.	What is the time gap between PQ and Technical evaluation?	An exact timeline cannot be confirmed at this stage. However, the sample RFP for the demonstration shall be made available to the PQ-qualified bidders on the scheduled date of the demonstration.
164	21	6.2.A (6)	Ensure compatibility with existing e-tendering systems.	Request more details on this clause	The solution shall support standard export formats and interoperability requirements; however, integration with existing e-tendering systems is not presently envisaged under the scope of this RFP
165	23	6.2.B (2)	The OCR engine shall achieve a minimum accuracy of 95% for standard MPSEDC tender document formats.	Does the 95% accuracy requirement apply to handwritten documents that are scanned?	Refer Corrigendum
166	23	6.2.B (1)	Support ingestion of: Scanned PDF documents (with OCR processing).	Does the solution need to support table extraction from scanned PDFs where there are non-standard items like cells are merged/multi-level headers/missing borders etc.	Yes, the proposed solution should support extraction and processing of tables from scanned PDF documents, including complex and non-standard table structures such as merged cells, multi-level headers, and irregular or missing borders.
167	24	6.2.C (2)	Calibration shall include: Iterative validation using at least one sample RFP per tender type.	It is mentioned on Page 31 - clause 7.2 - completion of full production deployment within 30 days from Work Order. Production deployment is subject to successful UAT which requires iterative validation as mentioned 6.2.C (2), hence, it is requested that timelines for Go-Live to incorporate such iterations.	It is clarified that the requirement of completing full production deployment within 30 days from issuance of Work Order is indicative of the overall implementation timeline, and shall include activities such as configuration, integration, testing, UAT, and Go-Live readiness.  The iterative validation process as mentioned under Clause 6.2.C (2) is an integral part of UAT and is expected to be planned and executed within the overall project timeline to ensure timely completion.  However, it is also clarified that Go-Live timelines may be adjusted to accommodate reasonable iterative refinements arising during UAT, provided that the overall objective of timely production deployment is not compromised. Any such adjustments shall be mutually agreed and approved by MPSEDC based on project progress and readiness.

Annexure 1

Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
168	26	6.2.E (6)	The Bidder shall demonstrate adherence to defined performance benchmarks, including: 1. Platform response time of ≤ 3 seconds for standard user interactions	It is requested that this clause be deleted, as this response time may not adequately account for variability arising from LLM-driven processing, which is inherently dependent on query and document complexity.	The clause stands as per the RFP. However, the stipulated response time requirement is primarily applicable to standard user interactions and routine system operations. AI/LLM-driven processing timelines may vary depending upon the complexity, size, and nature of the request or document being processed.
169	26	6.2.E (5)	The Platform shall implement comprehensive Role-Based Access Control (RBAC).	Request to provide the information as which Identity and Access Management (IAM) system or Active Directory is used at MPSEDC.	MPSEDC has an existing MPSSO-based Identity and Access Management (IAM) framework. The successful bidder may be required to ensure compatibility/integration support with the prevailing authentication and access management mechanisms, as applicable.
170	29	6.3.A (2)	No data shall be transmitted, processed... through any external or cloud-hosted Large Language Models (LLMs).	Are open-source models (e.g., Llama 3, Mistral) permitted if they are hosted locally within the SDC?	Yes
171	30	6.3.H (1)	Conduct of Vulnerability Assessment and Penetration Testing (VAPT) prior to Go-Live.	Will the VAPT be conducted by the bidder or a third-party auditor appointed by MPSEDC?.	VAPT shall be conducted by the bidder as per CERT-IN guidelines through a CERT-In empanelled agency
172	31	7.1 (Timeline)	Go-Live & Acceptance: By Day 30 from Work Order.	It is humbly submitted that the prescribed delivery timelines and associated SLA-linked penalties are strict w.r.to the technical scope, which includes production-grade deployment in a SDC, secure configuration (SSL, RBAC, IAM), OCR pipeline tuning, AI model calibration, workflow integration within a compressed thirty day period. Given the inherent dependencies on infrastructure readiness, data availability and quality, security approvals, integration with existing systems, and iterative validation cycles (which is subject to input document quality as well), the current timelines may not adequately account for industry-standard stabilization and testing phases. In view of the above, it is requested that - 1. Implementation timeline be extended to at least 4 months 2. A stabilization period post go-live be incorporated, during which SLA penalties are requested to be waived off 3. A clause be incorporated stating that any delays not attributable to the bidder including, but not limited to, delays arising from accelerated compute or hardware availability constraints or dependencies on inputs, approvals, or actions from MPSEDC to not impact the payment milestones or trigger the penalty imposition	It is clarified that the timeline of 30 days for Go-Live from the date of Work Order has been prescribed keeping in view the criticality of the project and the expectation of a time-bound implementation. The bidder is expected to plan and execute all activities, including configuration, integration, testing, AI/OCR calibration, and UAT within this overall implementation window through adequate resource planning and parallel execution wherever feasible.  The request for extension of the overall implementation timeline to 4 months is not agreed to, as it would dilute the intended objective of early operationalization of the system.  However, it is also clarified that:  Dependencies related to MPSEDC-side inputs, infrastructure readiness, access provisioning, approvals, or other external factors not attributable to the bidder shall be appropriately reviewed and may be considered for reasonable adjustment in timelines and/or exclusion from SLA penalties, subject to verification by MPSEDC.  The concept of a separate post Go-Live stabilization period with blanket waiver of SLA penalties is not envisaged; however, any initial stabilization issues immediately post Go-Live may be addressed as part of warranty/transition support and will be evaluated based on their nature and impact.
173	31	7.2 (SLA 5)	AI Output Quality (Criteria Generation / Evaluation) ≥ 90% acceptance rate without major rework.	Request to clarify as how the major rework is defined.	It is clarified that “major rework” refers to instances where the AI-generated output is not usable in its current form and requires substantial revision or regeneration due to significant issues such as incorrect logic, incomplete or missing critical information, misclassification affecting decision outcomes, or failure to meet defined business rules and validation parameters.  Minor corrections such as formatting changes, small factual edits, or limited refinements that do not alter the core output or decision logic shall not be considered as major rework.  The detailed classification and assessment criteria for determining “major rework” shall be finalized by MPSEDC/Technical Evaluation Committee during implementation and acceptance testing.

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
174	32	7.2 (SLA 10)	Data Loss / Data Breach: Zero tolerance. 10% of contract value per incident + legal action.	Request to cap liability for unintentional breaches if the bidder has followed all SDC security protocols.	<p>It is clarified that the provisions related to Data Loss / Data Breach with zero tolerance and associated penalties are defined to ensure strict adherence to security and data protection requirements of the project.</p> <p>However, in cases where the selected bidder can demonstrate that all prescribed SDC security protocols, standard security practices, and contractual obligations have been duly complied with, and the incident is determined to be unintentional and not arising due to bidder negligence or system misconfiguration, the liability and penalty, if any, shall be reviewed and decided by MPSEDC on a case-by-case basis based on root cause analysis and audit findings.</p> <p>Accordingly, any request for blanket capping of liability is not agreed to, and treatment of such incidents shall be governed strictly by forensic assessment and competent authority determination.</p>
175	24	6.2.3 (C)	The Platform shall incorporate a human-in-the-loop mechanism, enabling authorized users to review, modify, and override AI-generated criteria and scoring outputs at each stage of evaluation.	Request this clause to be modified to underscore the mandate for human-in-the-loop. Revised - <i>The Platform shall incorporate a mandatory human-in-the-loop mechanism at the stage of finalization of outputs, whereby authorized users shall review, validate, and approve all AI-generated criteria and scoring outputs prior to their adoption. Upon such approval, the responsibility for the finalized outputs shall rest with the Authority, and the SI to be not made liable for any direct or indirect damages arising from reliance on such approved outputs</i>	The clause stands as per the RFP. However, all AI-generated outputs shall remain subject to mandatory human review, validation, and approval by authorized personnel before finalization and adoption in the procurement process. Final procurement decisions shall be taken by the competent authority based on such review and approval process.
176	62	Annexure-12.2 – Financial Bid Form	Financial Proposal for the assignment proposed by MPSEDC	The estimated quantity of RFPs for preparation and evaluation have been stated as 200 each. For the evaluation process, we would like to know <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Average number of pages per RFP</li> <li>•Average number of bidders per RFP</li> <li>•Average number of pager per bidder response</li> </ul>	<p>Based on historical data, the following averages have been observed:</p> <p>Average number of pages per RFP: approximately 100–150  Average number of bidders per RFP: approximately 3–5  Average number of pages per bidder response: approximately 150–200</p> <p>The above figures are indicative in nature and may vary depending on the specific requirements of each RFP.</p>
177	23	6.2 > B > 1	The pipeline shall support ingestion of the following document formats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Scanned PDF documents (with OCR processing)</li> <li>o Native digital formats such as PDF and Word (.doc/.docx)</li> <li>o Multi-file tender packages, including primary documents and associated annexures</li> </ul>	Will the ingestion need to support xls,xlsx, and macros enabled xlsx also?	Yes, the proposed solution should support ingestion and processing of standard spreadsheet formats including .xls, .xlsx, and macro-enabled Excel files, wherever
178	23	6.2 > B > 2	The OCR engine shall achieve a minimum accuracy of 95% for standard MPSEDC tender document formats	What is the proposed mechanism to measure accuracy?	Refer Corrigendum
179	24	6.2 > C > 2	Mandatory Requirements - Alignment of AI interpretation logic with MPSEDC's established evaluation norms and practices	Will specific guidelines / procurement manual(s) be provided in advance?	Yes, the relevant procurement guidelines, manuals, policies, templates, and reference documents, as required for implementation and configuration of the solution, shall be shared with the successful bidder.
180	16	4.2 > 1	Provision of Sample RFPs: The Purchaser shall provide five (5) previously completed tender/RFP cases (including all relevant documents such as RFP, corrigenda, bids received, and final evaluation outputs) to all bidders who have qualified in the Pre-Qualification (PQ) stage and are eligible for the Technical Demonstration. These cases shall be provided uniformly to all such bidders to ensure a fair and level playing field.	For the demo for Bid Preparation process, will the RFPs be provided in advance (after PQ qualification) for the bidder to prepare a standard clause library?	The sample RFP shall be made available to the PQ-qualified bidders on the day of demonstration.
181	-	-	-	For the demo for Bid Preparation process, will a sample SOR be provided? If yes, will it be provided in advance?	The Scope of Work for the bid preparation demonstration parameter shall be made available to the PQ-qualified bidders on the scheduled date of the demonstration.
182	20	6.1 > 5	Technical Bid Evaluation > Scoring	For QCBS tenders, can we assume that the technical evaluation will have both subjective and objective scoring?  If yes, for subjective scoring, do we need to provide a screen for authorized evaluator(s) to manually input marks? (for example: understanding of scope, quality of presentation, etc.)	<p>Yes, for QCBS-based tenders, the technical evaluation may include both objective and subjective scoring parameters.</p> <p>Yes, the proposed solution should provide appropriate provisions/screens for authorized evaluators to manually enter, review, and validate marks/scores for subjective evaluation parameters, wherever applicable.</p>
183	25	6.2 > E	E. On-Premises Deployment Requirement	We would like to confirm whether MPSEDC will consider a Hybrid Cloud model where data is stored in the SDC but processed via a secure, private connection to a MeitY-empanelled CSP in India region?	Refer Corrigendum

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
184	30	7.1	7. Service Level Agreements (SLA) Deliverables and Penalties	Based on our experience on organizational nuances and customization requirement, we recommend the go-live to be at least 60 days from project. This period is will include model tweaking and UAT.	It is clarified that the prescribed timeline of 30 days from Work Order for Go-Live has been defined considering the criticality and time-bound nature of the project. The bidder is expected to plan execution in a manner that accommodates configuration, integration, testing, UAT, and AI/model calibration activities within the overall implementation schedule through appropriate parallelization and resource deployment.  Accordingly, the request to extend the Go-Live timeline to 60 days is not agreed to. However, MPSEDC may consider reasonable adjustments in timelines only in cases where delays arise due to dependencies attributable to MPSEDC, infrastructure readiness, or other external factors beyond the bidder's control, subject to review and approval.
185	12	3	The Bidder must have successfully completed at least one (1) project of similar nature with a minimum contract value of INR 25 Lakhs during the last five (5) years as on the bid submission date.	Considering the advanced and evolving nature of the technology stack, achieving prior experience of ₹25 lakhs specifically in this domain is relatively uncommon. We request that MSMEs and Startups with proven experience in AI-related projects relevant to this RFP be considered for exemption from this criterion, to encourage innovation and broader participation.	No change, as per RFP
186	30	7.1	End-to-end tender lifecycle executed successfully Performance benchmarks validated Go-live readiness and acceptance sign-off by MPSEDC By Day 30 from Work Order	<b>Extension of Project Timeline</b> We kindly request an extension of the project completion timeline. The current duration of 30 days appears insufficient given the complexity and scope of work involved in such advanced technology implementations. A revised timeline would help ensure quality delivery and proper execution.	It is clarified that the 30-day timeline from issuance of Work Order for end-to-end implementation, including tender lifecycle execution, performance benchmarking, Go-Live readiness, and acceptance sign-off, has been prescribed keeping in view the criticality and time-bound objectives of the project.  The bidder is expected to ensure adequate planning, resource deployment, and parallel execution of activities to meet the stipulated timeline, including configuration, integration, testing, calibration, and validation within the defined period.  Accordingly, the request for extension of the project completion timeline is not agreed to. However, any delays arising due to dependencies attributable to MPSEDC or other external factors beyond the bidder's control may be considered for appropriate review and relaxation on a case-by-case basis, subject to verification and approval by MPSEDC.
187	12	1	Consortiums or Joint Ventures are not allowed.	<b>Allow for Consortium Participation</b> As a 25-year-old IT solutions company working with Various Govt. Departments, we actively collaborate with innovative startups working in cutting-edge AI technologies. We request permission to form a consortium with such partners, enabling a combination of experience and innovation to deliver optimal outcomes for this project.	No change, as per RFP
188	17	Section 5.1, Page-17	Selection Method – L1 (Least Cost)	It is respectfully requested to consider changing the selection methodology from L1 to QCBS to appropriately evaluate the technical complexity, AI governance, security compliance, and long-term sustainability of the proposed solution, where technical quality is critical to successful implementation.	No change, as per RFP
189	30-31	Section 7.1 & 7.1 Deliverables, Pages - 30-31	Full production deployment within 30 days from Work Order	It is requested to extend the overall deployment timeline from 30 days to 45 days, to ensure secure on-premises deployment, comprehensive AI calibration, integration, testing, and compliance validation without compromising quality or governance requirements.	It is clarified that the stipulated timeline of 30 days from Work Order for full production deployment is defined considering the critical nature of the project and the expectation of a time-bound implementation.  The bidder is expected to plan and execute all activities, including secure on-premises deployment, integration, testing, AI/model calibration, workflow configuration, and compliance validation within the overall implementation schedule through adequate resource planning and parallel execution.  Accordingly, the request for extension of the deployment timeline to 45 days is not agreed to. However, any delays arising due to dependencies attributable to MPSEDC, such as infrastructure readiness, access provisioning, or other external approvals, may be considered for appropriate adjustment in timelines or exclusion from penalties, subject to review and approval by MPSEDC.

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
190	12	Section 3.2 – Financial Capacity (Turnover), Page -12	Minimum annual turnover of INR 50 Lakhs	It is requested to increase the minimum annual turnover requirement to INR 10 Crores, considering the criticality of the solution, long-term support expectations, data security obligations, and risk mitigation for a state-wide AI-enabled procurement platform.	No change, as per RFP
191	46273	Schedule of RFP, Page - 8-9	Last date for submission of proposals	It is requested to extend the bid submission deadline, to allow sufficient time for bidders to understand the detailed technical, security, and governance requirements, prepare robust proposals, and ensure a more competitive and well-evaluated procurement process.	The request for extension of the bid submission deadline is not considered. The timeline specified in the RFP remains unchanged.
192	19	Section 6.1, Page -19	Deployment of a ready (COTS) Generative AI solution; no fresh core development envisaged	Please clarify the permissible extent of customization/configuration, as several functional requirements appear development-intensive	The proposed solution is expected to be a ready and production-grade COTS platform. However, reasonable configuration, customization, workflow alignment, parameterization, prompt engineering, integration support, and feature-level enhancements required to meet the functional and operational requirements of MPSEDC shall be within the scope of the project. Major fresh development of an entirely new core platform is not envisaged under this RFP.
193	21-29	Section 6.2 & 6.3, Pages -21-29	AI-assisted pre-bid query management	Please clarify whether “automated” pre-bid queries imply autonomous response issuance or AI-assisted drafting with mandatory human approval	The term “automated” in the context of pre-bid query handling shall mean AI-assisted drafting and recommendation support for responses and corrigenda generation. However, all such outputs shall be subject to mandatory human review and approval prior to issuance.
194	22	Section 6.2(B), Page ~22	OCR accuracy minimum 95%	Please specify the methodology, sample size, and acceptance process for validating OCR accuracy	Refer Corrigendum
195	23	Section 6.2(C), Page 23	Calibration of AI agents using MPSEDC sample documents	Kindly clarify whether such calibration/update/training of the system is a one-time activity or can be periodically updated during the contract tenure	The initial calibration and training of AI agents using MPSEDC sample documents shall be carried out during implementation and Go-Live stages. However, periodic calibration, refinement, and updating of the system during the contract tenure may also be required to improve performance, accuracy, and alignment with evolving procurement requirements.
196	27	Section 6.3(C), Page 27	Restriction on use of external APIs	Kindly confirm whether all AI/ML components must be fully on-premises, including LLM inference and embeddings	Refer Corrigendum
197	28	Section 6.3(F), Page 28	Mandatory human-in-the-loop validation	Please clarify the authority hierarchy and approval responsibility for AI-assisted outputs	The authority hierarchy and approval workflow for AI-assisted outputs shall be configured as per MPSEDC’s defined procurement and evaluation process. All AI-assisted outputs shall remain subject to mandatory review, validation, and approval by authorized officials before finalization or adoption.
198	16	Section 4.2, Page -16	Technical demonstration using sample RFPs	Will the sample RFPs cover multiple tender categories (Works, Goods, Services) and complexity levels	The sample RFPs to be provided for the demonstration shall pertain only to the categories of Goods and Services for demonstration purpose RFPs related to Works category shall not be included.
199	12	Section 3, Page -12	Relevant technical experience	Kindly confirm whether private sector or PSU procurement automation projects are considered equivalent to government projects	Refer Corrigendum
200	30	Section 7.1, Page -30	Full production deployment within 30 days	Kindly confirm availability of required infra, SDC access, and required approvals, immediately upon issuance of Work Order	It is clarified that MPSEDC shall facilitate the necessary infrastructure readiness, SDC access, and required approvals in accordance with the project implementation plan to enable commencement of activities post issuance of Work Order.  However, exact availability timelines for all access permissions and infrastructure components may depend on internal processes and coordination requirements. The selected bidder is expected to coordinate closely with MPSEDC and respective stakeholders to ensure timely onboarding and execution within the stipulated deployment timeline.
201	31	Section 7.2, Page -31	AI output quality acceptance rate ≥90%	Please specify the objective criteria, review authority, and audit mechanism for measuring AI output acceptance	The AI output quality and acceptance rate shall be assessed through review and validation by the designated evaluation/review committee of MPSEDC based on accuracy, relevance, usability, compliance with procurement requirements, and extent of rework required. The detailed assessment methodology and audit/review mechanism shall be finalized during implementation and operationalization of the solution.

## Annexure 1

## Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
202	31-32	Section 7.2, Pages - 31-32	Security breach penalties	Kindly clarify liability treatment in case of breaches attributable to SDC infrastructure or external dependencies	It is clarified that data security and protection obligations under the contract shall remain binding on the selected agency for the scope of its solution and managed services components.  However, in cases where a data breach or security incident is demonstrably attributable to State Data Centre (SDC) infrastructure, network, or other external dependencies beyond the control of the selected agency, such incidents shall be jointly reviewed by MPSEDC/competent authority and the agency to determine the root cause and responsibility.  In such scenarios, liability and penalty provisions shall be applied only to the extent of proven fault or negligence of the selected agency, and shall not be automatically imposed for factors outside its reasonable control, subject to forensic analysis and official determination by MPSEDC or designated authority.
203	47	Section 12.1, Page - 47	Contract period and extensions	Please clarify whether AI recalibration, rule updates, and enhancement support are included during extension years	Yes, AI recalibration, rule updates, performance tuning, model refinements, and enhancement support required for smooth functioning of the solution during the contract period, including extension period(s), shall be considered within the scope of support and maintenance services.
204	46	Section 11.15, Page 46	Exit management	Kindly clarify the extent of handover of AI configurations, rules, and trained artifacts to MPSEDC at exit	(a) Yes, the ownership transfer is expected to include model weights, fine-tuned adapters, and other AI artefacts developed or trained using MPSEDC data.  (b) The treatment and usage rights of proprietary pre-trained base models provided under the bidder's license shall be governed as per the applicable licensing terms and conditions proposed by the bidder and accepted by MPSEDC.  (c) In case of any third-party licensed or non-transferable model weights/components, the bidder shall clearly specify such limitations, dependencies, and applicable licensing conditions in its proposal.
205	12	Section 3.2, Page -12	Minimum annual turnover of INR 50 Lakhs	Please clarify whether turnover from AI-related services only will be considered or overall company turnover	Total turnover shall be considered; related or segment-specific turnover is not a requirement under the RFP
206	12	Section 3.3, Page -12	Definition of "similar nature" project	Kindly clarify whether enterprise procurement automation or AI-based document processing projects outside government procurement are acceptable	Refer Corrigendum
207	13	Section 3.4, Page -13	Product / solution readiness undertaking	Kindly clarify whether a configurable platform with existing deployments is mandatory, or a near-production solution is acceptable	The proposed solution is expected to be a ready and production-grade COTS platform. However, reasonable configuration, customization, workflow alignment, parameterization, prompt engineering, integration support, and feature-level enhancements required to meet the functional and operational requirements of MPSEDC shall be within the scope of the project. Major fresh development of an entirely new core platform is not envisaged under this RFP.
208	14	Section 3, Page -14	Verification of eligibility documents	Please confirm whether MPSEDC may seek clarifications/additional documents post bid submission for PQ compliance	Yes, MPSEDC may seek clarifications and/or additional supporting documents from bidders post bid submission, wherever required, for the purpose of evaluation and establishing Pre-Qualification (PQ) compliance, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the RFP.
209	15	Section 4.1, Page -15	AI-enabled bid preparation and evaluation lifecycle demonstration	Kindly confirm whether partial automation with human-assisted workflows is acceptable	Yes, partial automation with human-assisted workflows is acceptable, subject to the condition that the proposed solution meets all functional, performance, security, and SLA requirements specified in the RFP. However, the bidder shall ensure that the level of human intervention does not compromise efficiency, scalability, auditability, or compliance requirements of the system.
210	16	Section 4.2, Page -16	Use of sample RFPs provided by MPSEDC	Will bidders be given sufficient time to ingest and configure the provided sample RFPs before demonstration	Yes. Bidders shall be provided adequate time during the demonstration process to ingest and configure the provided sample RFPs for the purpose of demonstration.

Annexure 1

**Pre-bid Queries/Response - RFP for Selection of Agency for Deployment of Generative AI-Enabled Procurement Solution for Bid Preparation and Evaluation**

S#	RFP Page No.	RFP Clause No.	Clause Details	Query/Suggestion/ Clarification	MPSEDC Response
211	15	Section 4.1, Page -15	Automated PQ and technical evaluation capability	Kindly clarify the expected minimum percentage alignment between AI-generated PQ/technical evaluation results and historical evaluation outcomes used for validation during the technical demonstration (e.g., 80%, 90%, or higher).	The alignment between AI-generated PQ/technical evaluation outputs and historical evaluation outcomes will be assessed during the technical demonstration for indicative validation purposes only. The solution is expected to demonstrate a high degree of accuracy and consistency (preferably ≥90%) with reference/historical evaluation results; however, this is not intended to be a rigid or sole acceptance threshold.  The final acceptable benchmark and evaluation methodology, including any minimum alignment percentage, shall be finalized by the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC). Final evaluation will be based on overall system performance, robustness, explainability, and adherence to RFP requirements rather than a single fixed percentage criterion.
212	-	Section 4.2	During the Technical Demonstration stage, is exact historical replication of evaluation outputs mandatory, or will logical equivalence based on the defined evaluation criteria be considered an acceptable standard of qualification?	Justification: The RFP states that bidder outputs will be compared against "actual outcomes/results" of the sample RFPs. However, where historical evaluations involved committee deliberations, expert judgment, or discretionary decisions, AI-generated outputs may produce logically sound results that differ in form from the historical record. A definition of the acceptable standard of comparison — whether exact replication or equivalence within defined parameters — is essential for bidders to <u>appropriately calibrate and demonstrate their solution.</u>	The evaluation shall be carried out by the designated Technical Evaluation Committee based on the desired output of the solution against each demonstration parameter.
213	-	Section 4.2	Will bidders be provided a defined configuration and calibration window after receiving the five sample RFP cases, and prior to the live Technical Demonstration? Additionally, will the original scoring matrices and evaluation weightages of the sample RFPs be shared as part of that package?	Justification: The RFP requires bidders to demonstrate a "live, working solution" against five historical RFP cases covering the complete evaluation lifecycle. Accurate calibration of AI agents to MPSEDC specific procurement norms — as mandated under Section 6.2(C) — requires prior exposure to the scoring rubrics and weightage frameworks actually used in those cases. Without a defined calibration window and access to original scoring matrices, bidders cannot meaningfully align their solution outputs to the expected historical outcomes. Clarity on both the time allotted for calibration and the data to be shared is critical for fair and outcome-based evaluation.	On the scheduled day of the demonstration, PQ-qualified bidders shall be provided with a sample RFP and adequate time to ingest and configure it within their respective solutions. Thereafter, the designated Technical Evaluation Committee will evaluate the solution based on its outputs against the defined demonstration parameters.  It is further clarified that the objective of the demonstration is to assess the capability of the proposed solution. MPSEDC-specific configurations may be undertaken subsequently during the implementation phase within the stipulated 30-day timeline.
214	-	Section 6.3(A) Section 6.3©	Is the deployment of open-source Large Language Models (e.g., LLaMA, Mistral, or equivalent) fully within the State Data Centre explicitly permitted, provided there are no external API calls, cloud dependencies, or data transmission outside the designated SDC infrastructure?	Justification: The RFP prohibits use of third-party or public AI APIs (Section 6.3C) and mandates all data processing within the SDC. However, it does not explicitly address whether deploying a locally hosted, open-source LLM — with no external dependencies — is a permitted architecture. Given that modern Generative AI solutions rely on LLMs for core capabilities such as document understanding, criteria generation, and evaluation assistance, clarity on the permissibility of self-hosted open-source models is fundamental to the solution design and deployment <u>architecture.</u>	Yes, the local deployment of open-source LLMs is permitted, subject to compliance with the functional, technical, security, and performance requirements specified in the RFP.
215	-	Section 6.2(E)	Since MPSEDC has confirmed GPU provisioning at the State Data Centre, kindly provide the detailed GPU specifications — including model/generation (e.g., NVIDIA A100, H100, or RTX series), total VRAM per GPU, number of GPU nodes, NVLink/NVMe interconnect availability, and associated CPU, RAM, and NVMe SSD storage — as these parameters are directly determinant of the AI model architecture, inference throughput, and concurrent user capacity that the solution can be designed and <u>committed to deliver</u>	Justification: The performance SLAs committed in the RFP — including ≤3 second response times, 99.5% uptime, and 95% OCR accuracy — are directly dependent on the underlying GPU compute capacity. LLM inference for document-length procurement inputs is computationally intensive; a solution sized for 8GB VRAM GPUs will differ materially in architecture, throughput, and concurrent user handling from one designed for 40–80GB VRAM enterprise GPUs. Without these specifications, any committed SLA figures would be architectural assumptions rather than validated commitments. This is the single most capacity-defining <u>parameter in the entire RFP.</u>	Refer Corrigendum
216	-	Section 6.2(E)	Given that the solution mandates on-premises deployment within the State Data Centre with a ≤3 second response time SLA and 99.5% uptime commitment, kindly confirm whether the GPU resources provisioned at the SDC for this project will be dedicated exclusively to this solution, or whether they will be shared across other SDC workloads — as shared GPU environments introduce inference latency spikes and resource contention that can directly and materially impact the committed SLA parameters under sustained concurrent usage.	Justification: Government State Data Centres typically operate GPU resources in a shared pool across multiple hosted applications and workloads. LLM inference for document-length procurement inputs is highly GPU-bound and sensitive to resource contention. Under concurrent usage scenarios — such as multiple evaluators simultaneously processing large tender submissions — shared GPU allocation can cause inference queuing delays that breach the ≤3 second response time SLA and threaten the 99.5% uptime commitment. A written confirmation of dedicated GPU allocation is essential for the bidder to <u>architect the solution with guaranteed, contractually defensible performance commitments rather than best-effort estimates.</u>	Refer Corrigendum