**UIDAI- RFP FOR SELECTION OF SOFTWARE SOLUTION PROVIDERS FOR STATE RESIDENT DATA HUB (SRDH)**

***Pre-bid Queries and Clarifications***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | **Vol.** | **Section No.** | **Para No.** | **Page No.** | **Name of the Bidder** | **Statement of Clarifications/Deviations** | **Remarks/Bidder Question** | **Clarification issued by UIDAI** |
| 1. | II | 1.5 | 14 | 8 | Geodesic |  | What is the "UIDAI Vault Service"? | Vault is a secure server where the Aadhaar Enrolment Data(enrolment packets, KYR+ database files) generated during enrolments needs to be stored to enhance data security. XML files may also be sent to the vault after record insertion in SRDH.  Creation of vault is not in the scope of this RFP. |
| 2. | -- | General | -- | -- | Geodesic |  | Would the SRDHs of the different states be talking to each other? Consider the scenario; Person A has a RSBY number from state X, a Ration Card number from State Y. Depending in which state the individual did an Aadhaar Enrolment, the KYR data for Person A would reach the SRDH of State X or Y. For a consolidated view, should the SRDH framework allow for -Cross links between the SRDHs of the different states? Allow for migration of a resident data from one SRDH to another? Allow for querying of SRDH by other SRDHs? | No. As of now there is no plan to connect SRDHs of different states. |
| 3. | -- | General | -- | -- | Geodesic |  | Can we have a complete list of state departments and their databases that need to get hooked up with the SRDH? | No. Provision should be provided so that any suggested database can be connected to SRDH through the adapters and queries through the query builder |
| 4. | II | 1.5 | 16 | 9 | Geodesic | We should be able to connect to department databases for unified resident view. Some departments might not have this capability. | Would the Scope of Work also include enabling such departments to be connectible from SRDH? | See ans # 3 |
| 5. | -- | General | -- | -- | Geodesic |  | Is the SRDH conceptually trying to segregate individuals into SRDHs? That is a resident can be associated with just single SRDH. | No |
| 6. | II | 1.5 | 10 | 8 | Geodesic | Scalable RDBMS popularly used in the industry. | Can we have this list of scalable RDBMS? | Latest supported version of MySQL, Oracle, MS SQL Server and DB2 support required. Default database can any of the four. |
| 7. | I | Section 3, Part I | 3.8 | 12 | CMC Limited | The Bidders shall submit/ indicate a copy of the Letter of empanelment/registration no issued by UIDAI duly indicating the tier. | Since It is a Limited RFP sent to only tier-I empanelled vendors. Do we still need to submit letter of empanelment? | Not Required |
| 8. | I | Section 3, Part I | 3.12 | 13 | CMC Limited | Earnest Money Deposit EMD of Rs. 2,50,000 in the form of DD drawn in favour of “PAO, UIDAI, New Delhi” payable at New Delhi, must be submitted along with Bid. | Can Bidders provide EMD in form of BG? Kindly confirm? If yes kindly provide the format for the same? | No. The Clause remains unchanged. |
| 9. | I | Section 3, Part II | 8.2 | 23 | CMC Limited | Expected date for commencement of services- Date: 1/11/2011 | We request that UIDAI should provide at least 3-4 weeks prior notice for mobilisation/placing the manpower for the project | Please refer clause 8.1 and 8.2 of Sec 3, Part I of Vol I  Date: 1/11/2011 is only an expected date. |
| 10. | I | Section 5 | Fin -2 | 41 | CMC Limited | Form FIN-2 Summary of Costs - 3. Total Cost of Warranty for 6 months after deployment of Application. | Please clarify what type of warranty support is envisaged? Does bidder has to place manpower at site (Resident Software Professional)? Or it has to be on call or off site? | Warranty support will involve defect fixing and it will be on call basis, for SLA and penalty of warranty period, please refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 11. | I | Section 5 | FIN-5 | 44 | CMC Limited | Form FIN-5 Bill of Material[1] Cost [1] | We need clarity? What is this bill of material cost which need to fill? [1] BOM will include the AMC or any O&M Charges as applicable | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 12. | III | Section 1.1 | 3 | 5 | CMC Limited | Note: If the Software Solution Provider consists of more than one entity, all these entities should appear as signatories, e.g., in the following manner: | The Note suggests there could be more than one entity Please Clarify? Can the work be sub-contracting with UIDAI permission, if required | No. Sub-contracting is not allowed. Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 13. | III | Section 1.2 | 2.3 | 10 | CMC Limited | Commencement of Services - The Software Solution provider shall begin carrying out the Services not later than 10 days after the Effective Date specified in SC | We request that the minimum 3-4 weeks should be given for starting the job | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 14. | III | Section 1.2 | 6.3 | 24 | CMC Limited | Terms of Payment | The payment terms mentioned here are applicable for the project? Or the one mentioned at Page 33, 34? Please clarify | Both terms of payment apply |
| 15. | III | Section 1.2 | 9.2,9.3 | 27 | CMC Limited | Liquidated damages and penalties | Kindly clarify that overall penalty on all the counts in the contract would not exceed 10% of contract value and upper cap on all the count shall not exceed 10% of contract amount | Yes |
| 16. | III | General | - | - | CMC Limited |  | We request that the following clause be included in agreement  No amendment to this agreement is valid unless signed by a person duly authorized by the parties | Please refer Para 2.6 of Section 1.2 of Vol III |
| 17. | II | 1.3 | 8 | 6 | Mahindra Satyam |  | Process of data transfer from UIDAI to SRDH?  a.   Portal?  b.   Through portal application how will SRDH get the data in scheduled interval of time?  c.   What is the format of data will be transferred? XML file / Flat file etc..?  d.   Any API will be exposed from the portal application? | a. No  b. Not Applicable  c. Encrypted XML file with EID, UID, KYR and encoded photograph.  d. Not Applicable  State will make the EID-UID file available on the file system. Download from portal is the responsibility of the state. |
| 18. | II | 1.5 | 22 | 9 | Mahindra Satyam |  | For the pilot phase which will be implemented in 3 states only, how will the 30 Cr records be stored and managed? Will it be available in all the 3 states separately or kept in one DC or each state record is stored independently and updated accordingly? | Each state will have its own SRDH. 30 Cr is the envisaged maximum. |
| 19. | II | 1.5 | 22 | 9 | Mahindra Satyam |  | SRDH framework will be deployed at every state and the database at each state level will have details of that state resident only. Hardware and Data centre setup is needed for each State /UTs. Is our understanding is correct? What are the probable states for the pilot project? | Pilot States to be decided later.  Pilot infrastructure will be provided by the states, details will be known after pilot states are identified. |
| 20. | II | 1.3 | 8 | 6 | Mahindra Satyam |  | Will the Data transmitted by UIDAI to SRDH contain KYR+ data also? If not will this be transmitted in a separate XML for extraction and processing è Should SRDH have a frame work to extract this data? | KYR+ data will not be stored in SRDH. |
| 21. | II | 1.5 | 14 | 8 | Mahindra Satyam |  | State / UT’s may store the data (raw data also?) in central Vault. Is it the same Enrolment packets or any other data State/ UT’s can store in the central vault? Provide details of what all are stored in the central vault? | See ans # 1 |
| 22. | II | 1.5 | 19 | 9 | Mahindra Satyam |  | SRDH framework should include AUA server design and development? | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 23. | II | 1.3 | 8 | 6 | Mahindra Satyam |  | What kind of interface is used to send EID-UID xml files to SRDH? | Provision for record creation/updation in SRDH will be through:  (a) encrypted EID UID file  (b) Single record insert/ update through GUI form, after authentication.  (c) Batch insert/ update from a non-encrypted EID-UID file after authentication. |
| 24. | II | 1.5 | 11 | 8 | Mahindra Satyam |  | Is SRDH framework should allow modification (Update functionality?) for the KYR data through GUI? Or it should allow to modify KYR+ data only? To do modification whether biometric authentication is mandatory? Should Authentication tool be built or will it be provided by a 3rd party? If SRDH has to do modifications – suppose a resident comes for an Add /Modify/Delete/Deactivate etc, then how will this data be sync with UIDAI? Or SRDH only sent update request to UIDAI for modifications then in turn UIDAI will send the updated data back to the SRDH? | See ans # 23  Authentication APIs is available on UIDAI website (<http://uidai.gov.in/>), |
| 25. | II | 1.5 | 19 | 9 | Mahindra Satyam |  | Will SRDH be used for authentication requests (like AUA) from other state department applications, within the state? | Only with in state. |
| 26. | II | 1.5 | 7 | 8 | Mahindra Satyam |  | The RFP states that “Reconciliation mechanism should be built such that only new records are populated, and user gets information on the new records inserted, and existing records rejected”.  What is the “Reconciliation” being performed? Give more details of the process of “Reconciliation”? Is it new records will be directly inserted in the SRDH? Then on what basis the existing records and new records can be reconciled? | Existing records to be modified after latest data from UIDAI is made available to SRDH, or there is a manual activity for data modification, post authentication. |
| 27. | II | 1.5 | 10 | 8 | Mahindra Satyam |  | Is it in the production system each state will have their own Database server, is it not same across all the States / UTs? | Every state will have its own SRDH and necessary infrastructure |
| 28. | II | 1.5 | 11 | 8 | Mahindra Satyam |  | a.   “Add/Modify/Delete/ Deactivate/ Reactivate …” individual records – will this be done by Portal application or are the Backend Wrapper services sufficient? If a new record needs to be added, should the system have facility to capture Face Image also?  b.   What is the functionality of ADD at SRDH? If we are creating new record, how will the Aadhaar number be created? | a. Portal application will call backend services. SRDH should allow upload of photograph in the case of a new record  b. Add functionality will work only if a record in CIDR exists (with authentication) |
| 29. | II | 1.5 | 16 | 9 | Mahindra Satyam |  | Should the interface needed to build between SRDH and state department be available with this short pilot project? Then what are the technologies being used by the different state depts for the SRDH to interface with and communicate?  a.   What is the type of data that is required to be pulled from each State depts to be displayed in SRDH from resident data view? And have each of the dept exposed their services for SRDH to access and retrieve data? Will the State depts. build a web service for us to call and consume the data and display the output in the SRDH for the resident?  b.   Does UIDAI expect us to write different adaptors for different depts. of different states? This will be cumbersome as each state will have its own DB design? Of so please provide us the details of this design for estimation? | Building of interface between SRDH and state applications/ databases is out of SSP's scope. Instead SSP should provide database adapters for connection  a. Not in scope. Query builder provides the basic functionality for users who have detailed knowledge of state application database. Saved queries can then become standard reports  b. Use standard adapters |
| 30. | II | General | - | - | Mahindra Satyam |  | If suppose one Resident data is available / Registered in one state? Then if the Resident moves to another State permanently how that state will get the data? Whether to pull the data again from the UIDAI? Or transfer the data from previous state to this state? If fresh entry is made means the old record in another state needs to be deactivated? | There is no inter-state communication in scope  Resident will request for manual addition in the new state |
| 31. | II | 1.5 | 21 | 9 | Mahindra Satyam |  | Is it necessary for the user to enter the details in the local language or only display of the details should be in local language? If the resident moves states, will this data need to be converted into the new state local language? | Manual entry of data will be in English only and will be transliterated to local language. Data coming from UIDAI (encrypted EID-UID XML) will be in local language also. Support should be there for local language display. |
| 32. | II | General | - | - | Mahindra Satyam |  | Is the data centre setup for SRDH is in the scope of SSP? | See ans # 27 |
| 33 | II | General | - | - | Mahindra Satyam |  | Who will establish the network connectivity between SRDH and other state level applications? | See ans # 27 |
| 34 | II | General | - | - | Mahindra Satyam |  | For how many users vendor needs to provide training? | Less than 25 |
| 35 | II | 1.5 | 13 | 8 | Mahindra Satyam |  | Apart from the 11 metrics reports, what are all the other report requirements? Who are all the Users for the reports and how many concurrent Users will be? Apart from these reports any other Dashboard requirements are there? | Apart from standard reports, SRDH users should be able to create custom reports using the query builder. |
| 36 | II | 1.5 | 21 | 9 | Mahindra Satyam |  | Are the reports required in local language? | Yes |
| 37 | II | General | - | - | Mahindra Satyam |  | What are all the performance metrics expectations? | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 38 | II | General | - | - | Mahindra Satyam |  | What is the expected volume of transactions for pilot phase and for production? | Will be finalized during requirements phase |
| 39 | I | General | - | 2 | Persistent | |  | | --- | | Earnest money deposit, Rs 2,50,000 | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | We have given the Bank guarantee for RS 10. Lakhs to UIDAI. Can we get exemption in this? | | |  | | | No |
| 40 | I | 2 | 2.1 | 5 | Persistent | |  | | --- | | This support includes, but is not limited to, Requirements Analysis, Design Review, architecture Review, etc. | | |  | | --- | | Who will give us the signed requirement document | | FRS will be prepared by the Consultants. SRS will be prepared by the SSP. FRS will be ready when SSP comes on board |
| 41 | I | 3.4 | Section 3 Part II | 20 | Persistent | |  | | --- | | Curriculum vitae (CV) for Proposed Professional Staff | | |  | | --- | | Do you want the sample CV s with number of persons available or named CV | | Named CVs are required |
| 42 | II | 1.5 | 10,16 | 8 | Persistent | |  | | --- | | “Supported databases should include but not limited to latest releases of MySQL, Oracle, Sybase, MS Access and DB2. | | |  | | --- | | We want accurate list of databases and their versions so as to bring uniformity in bid pricing. Every database support means additional development as well as testing efforts. | | See ans # 6 |
| 43 | II | 1.5 | 6 | 8 | Persistent | |  | | --- | | “Provide high level of data security in line with the security guidelines issued by UIDAI to all stakeholders in the ecosystem that includes Registrars, Enrolment Agencies, and Authentication User Agencies. “ | | Please specify the guidelines by actual reference of the document. Since security model in turn depends on Access model, the Role Based Model should be spelt out in terms of user hierarchy levels, actual roles, and the type of actions and so on. | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011  Role based access model to be defined during design. |
| 44 | II | 1.5 | 17 | 9 | Persistent | “Ability to seed Aadhaar numbers into department databases, by creating a web utility which allows capture of Aadhaar Number, KYR(configurable), key identifier such as Ration Card, Job Card etc. (name and data type configurable), and upon authentication, saves records in a pre-defined CSV file. The CSV file may be used thereafter by States to enrich department databases, as required.” | Whether the web utility is needed for in-house government officials, or for deployment in field and exposed to citizens as part of live verification and updates. If it is in-house, the scope would be limited to role based access only. If it is citizen oriented, then we would have to include field based Aadhaar authentication also in scope. | Web utility will be used by state personnel only. Residents themselves would not use the utility, but their information would be captured by Application Users. Authentication will be required, nevertheless. |
| 45 | II | 1.5 | 18 | 9 | Persistent | “SRDH should support Aadhaar Authentication (both demographic and biometric) by consuming Aadhaar Authentication API (API details available on UIDAI website). Authentication feature should be used before adding a new record, or before updating existing record.)” | If we assume that this will be used by government officials (i.e. in the office, not citizen centric), AND we do role based access, it means users should authenticate only once per session (typically few times in a day; sessions can last few hours). If the records changes need to happen occasionally, then it makes sense to authenticate for the purpose against Aadhaar particularly when using biometrics) | ‘In-office' and 'citizen-centric' are not contradictory. Citizen centric usage is valid 'in-office'. |
| 46 | I | Section3, Part II | 3.3(a) | 20 | Mastek |  | * Our understanding that this is a fixed bid project with an upper cap of 1 year on the timeline (in terms of calendar months) * However the team composition has also be provided on page 23 of Vol 1 * What if the estimated effort by a vendor suggests that the required team size is more/less than the team suggested by UIDAI?   Our assumption is that the resource rates do not necessarily have to be same as the rates decided during empanelment? | UIDAI has suggested indicative roles and not team size. It has to be empanelled rates and roles. |
| 47 | I | Section3, Part II | 5.2 (Key Professional Staff) | 23 | Mastek |  | Are the resources required to be onsite? If yes, does ‘onsite’ imply Delhi or Bangalore? | Resources will be located at SSP's premises. Travel whenever required. |
| 48 | I | Section 5 | Form Fin 2 | 41 | Mastek |  | What is the location of project execution?  What nature of travel is envisaged? Which are the 3 states being considered for pilot rollout? | SSP's premises. Travel as and when required. States not decided yet |
| 49 | I | - | - | All Pages | Mind Tree | "Signature and Seal of Bidder" | In the footer, what is intended by "Signature and Seal of Bidder"? Are we expected to provide on all pages in addition to our response? Please clarify. | No, only Tech, Fin forms and relevant documents mentioned in the RFP are to be submitted with the signature and seal of bidder |
| 50 | I | 2 | 2.1 | 5 | Mind Tree | This support includes, but is not limited to, requirements Analysis, Design Review, Architecture Review, Release Roadmap Planning, Product Roll-out Strategy, Product deployment Strategy, User-Acceptance Testing(UAT) planning and execution, Institutional Framework Design, etc. | What is meant by Institutional Framework Design? How is it different from Application Framework Design? | Institutional framework design refers to process design within the user organization. However this is out of scope for SSP. |
| 51 | I | 2 | 2.1 B | 5 | Mind Tree | Providing Warranty for a period of six months after deployment | When does the 6-month warranty start? Assuming an agile methodology with multiple releases, and per industry norms, we understand that the warranty period shall start when the first release begins life in the production environment. Please confirm the understanding is correct. | Refer the project timelines |
| 52 | I | 2 | 2.1 C | 5 | Mind Tree | Provide Training to intended users of application | Please clarify and quantify the scope of training. E.g. how many users to be trained, how many hours of training to be performed, insights into possible locations where the training could be performed? | See ans # 34 for number of participants.  Please refer Form Fin2 of sec 5 of Vol 1 for the training effort  Usually one location per state for pilot deployment in scope, could be a couple in one of the states |
| 53 | I | Section 3 Part I | 5.1 | 15 | Mind Tree | The Evaluation Committee while evaluating the Technical Proposals shall have no access to the Financial Proposals …. | Given that the rates are as per RFE, using the effort estimate it is fairly easy to reasonably estimate the financials of the Development portion of the Financial Bid even before opening the Financial Proposal. Consequently, we would like to request change in the submission procedure for the Technical Proposal so it only focuses on the "Technical Evaluation" parameters. And consequently, we would like to request that only the technical evaluation parameters are considered without the people effort data being in the Technical Proposal. Hence, we request that the Form-TECH-6 be removed from the scope of the Technical Proposal. | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 54 | I | Section 3, part II | 5.2 (ii) | 23 | Mind Tree | Key professional staff qualifications and competence for the assignment … | We understand that we need to submit CV of only 5 people as per the 5 roles. Please confirm if the understanding is correct. | These are 5 roles and not number of people. CVs of all people proposed against these 5 roles should be submitted. |
| 55 | I | Section 4 | Form Tech 2B | 26 | Mind Tree | On Inputs and Facilities | We assume that our team will work out of our premises in Bangalore. Please clarify if our assumption is correct and also confirm the location from where the project is to be executed. | SSP is free to choose the development location |
| 56 | I | Section 4 | Form Tech 2B | 26 | Mind Tree | On Inputs and Facilities | Is there need to deploy people at different locations in the country? Please share details - number of people, skills and indicative duration. Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | Key resources will travel to UIDAI HQ during requirements, design and UAT phase. Also during deployment of pilots some travel will be required. SSP is expected to make reasonable assumptions based on the complexity of the application |
| 57 | 1 | Section 4 | Form Tech 4 | 29 | Mind Tree | FORM TECH-4 TEAM COMPOSITION AND TASK ASSIGNMENTS | How does this compare with the requirement per para 5.2 (ii). Do we repeat the details of the 5 people whose CV shall be submitted? Please clarify. | see ans # 54 |
| 58 | I | Section 4 | Form Tech 6 | 32 | Mind Tree | Form TECH-6 Staffing Schedule | Given that the rates are as per RFE, using the effort estimate it is fairly easy to reasonably estimate the financials of the Development portion of the Financial Bid even before opening the Financial Proposal. Consequently, we would like to request change in the submission procedure for the Technical Proposal so it only focuses on the "Technical Evaluation" parameters. And consequently, we would like to request that only the technical evaluation parameters are considered without the people effort data being in the Technical Proposal. Hence, we request that Form-TECH-6 be removed from the scope of the Technical Proposal. | see ans # 53 |
| 59 | I | Section 5 | Form Fin 2 | 41 | Mind Tree | This includes 30 man days of training resource, who may be utilized as required by the Purchaser | We assume that the 30 man days of the training resource is required on continuous basis and not spread over a few months. Please clarify if the assumption is correct. We need this input to plan for the resource availability for the project. | Will be as worked out in the project plan and adjusted to ground realities as the project progresses |
| 60 | I | Section 5 | Form Fin 3 | 42 | Mind Tree | Professional Staff and Support Staff should be indicated individually | Please clarify the meaning and distinction between "Professional Staff" and "Support Staff". | Refer section 5.2 of Vol I for definition of professional staff. Rest of the roles are support staff |
| 61 | I | Section 5 | Form Fin 3 | 42 | Mind Tree | Professional Staff and Support Staff should be indicated individually | Please clarify the intended meaning of "Professional Staff and Support Staff should be indicated individually". | See ans # 60 |
| 62 | II | 1.1 | - | 3 | Mind Tree |  | Is the page intentionally left blank? | Yes |
| 63 | II | 1.1 | - | 4 | Mind Tree | Consultant: Works under the direction of Purchaser to conduct as-is study, provide recommendations to come up with to-be requirements, prepare FRS (Functional Requirement Specification) … | Since the Consultant would build the FRS, is the FRS already prepared? When do you expect the FRS to be completed? | See ans # 40 |
| 64 | II | 1.4 | - | 7 | Mind Tree | SRDH Application Framework would also allow States/UTs to store data, which may not be required in immediate future, to a central vault provided by UIDAI …. | What is the meaning of "central vault"? The RFP is very thin on expectations around the requirements and scope for the "central vault". Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 1 |
| 65 | II | 1.5 | - | 7 to 10 | Mind Tree | Below are the attributes that are expected in the SRDH Application framework which will ensure that the end objectives are met. | The functional specifications are very generic, at a very high level and a mix of functional and non-functional requirements. The details are at a vision statement rather than functional specifications. It would help if UIDAI can share the FRS that has been prepared for the initiative to help size the application. There is lack of clarity on the (1) scope of work for the SRDH framework development and also (2) scope of work for the Pilot in the 3 cities -- to give a fixed price quote. We request UIDAI to consider revising this to T&M contract based on the quality of the Technical Proposal submitted, given the lack of clarity and many unknowns. This will give UIDAI the desired flexibility to ramp-up or -down the team as required. | No T&M. SSP is expected to take into account the fact that FRS-SRS will be done as part of engagement in consultation with SSP balancing the same with the fixed duration and financials |
| 66 | II | 1.5 | 1 | 7 | Mind Tree | Web Application, which is compatible with latest browser versions of IE 7 and above, Mozilla Firefox and Google Chrome | Please mention target versions for Firefox and Chrome similar to IE | Latest versions as finalized during FRS-SRS |
| 67 | II | 1.5 | 7 | 8 | Mind Tree | Decrypt EID-UID mapping files with KYR information and photograph, and parse the same to populate SRDH | EID-UID mapping files does not contain photograph. Where is this data expected to come from? | This is a change taking place now, UIDAI will provide the same for SRDH. |
| 68 | II | 1.5 | 9 | 8 | Mind Tree | Access to data and services should only be role based | What is the required authorization mechanism for wrapper services? Role based access is normally used for human interface like portal. What is the granularity of roles? Please provide some envisaged roles. Is role based access control required for resident data sub-sets? If yes, to what level? | FRS will explain |
| 69 | II | 1.5 | 10 | 8 | Mind Tree | Supported databases should include but not limited to latest releases of MySQL, Oracle, Sybase, MS Access and DB2 | NFR requirements indicate volumes of 30 crores. MS Access does not support that volume and also does not have replication and other high availability features. Can MS Access be removed from this list? Should the solution be certified on all these databases? If yes, for what data volumes, what versions (be specific) of the database? What does such a certification involve and is acceptable to UIDAI as final report? | See ans # 6  Has to work on all specified DBs. |
| 70 | II | 1.5 | 11 | 8 | Mind Tree | Any organic (record-by-record basis) addition and updation should happen after Authentication with CIDR | What mode of authentication against CIDR is envisaged here - demographic or demographic and biometric? Is it exact match or fuzzy? | Both. Matching threshold should be configurable |
| 71 | II | 1.5 | 13 | 8 | Mind Tree | Necessary queries need to be built for reporting on 11 metrics as mentioned below, however this list may change as more clarity into the reporting requirement is obtained | Reporting requirements are too generic and therefore difficult to estimate effort for. Please be specific on number of reports and the metrics required. The metrics required affects data model and design and therefore the effort to build and test as well. | Assume simple reports |
| 72 | II | 1.5 | 16 | 9 | Mind Tree | It should be noted that SSP should only bundle these adapters that state teams will use to create unified views | Can you explain what you mean by adapters here? Are these just JDBC/ODBC drivers to the mentioned databases?  How will the unified display between SRDH and the department database be built? Who owns this? We assume it is out of scope for SSP. | This will be owned by SRDH users after department DB owners provide access to their database and data model required for querying.  Display is just the table of output from query initiated through query-builder which can be exported to PDF etc like any report. |
| 73 | II | 1.5 | 17 | 9 | Mind Tree | Ability to seed Aadhaar numbers into department databases, by creating a web utility which allows capture of Aadhaar Number, KYR(configurable) | We assume the KYR data set is limited to what is mentioned in this RFP only. Please confirm | Yes. KYR and Photograph. There may be additional KYR fields, but if there is an addition, it would be limited to approximately 5 fields. |
| 74 | II | 1.5 | 18 | 9 | Mind Tree | Authentication feature should be used before adding a new record, or before updating existing record | The requirement talks of using biometric authentication when doing organic adds. How is the resident biometric for authentication captured? Will the resident be called to do this authentication when his/her record is being added? Web-based interface to biometric devices is not feasible. Does it require a new standalone client to be built for this authentication? | Biometric Authentication needs to be supported so that Application Users may authenticate residents in presence of residents. |
| 75 | II | 1.5 | 22 | 9 | Mind Tree | Scalable enough to store and retrieve upto 30Crores records | There is no mention of response times, concurrency, throughput needs etc. So we assume the NFR is purely w.r.t. to the ability to store and read the stated volume of records. Also there is no mention on availability of system. We assume there are no specific requirements there. | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 76 | II | 1.5 | 23 | 10 | Mind Tree | Architecture should be modular and framework should be highly configurable so that state specific changes can be incorporated without undertaking major modifications and without impacting all users | This statement appears to imply a shared co-hosted setup across states. Is it correct? The term "highly configurable" is ambiguous. What aspects need to be configurable- data, business rules, flow, exception handling, pages, queries etc? Please be specific as it helps in sizing design, development and testing efforts. | No co-hosted setups. Each state is independent. Highly configurable refers to making changes to the way system behaves without touching the code. Ex addition of custom fields, connection to remote databases |
| 77 | II | 1.7 | 2 | 11 | Mind Tree | SSP is expected to make SRDH operational in the candidate states as part of this contract | Does this mean SSP is required to procure hardware for pilot i.e. production as well? If answer to above is yes, is SSP required to have separate state-wise deployments i.e. data centres - one for each state being piloted? Is SSP expected to run operations for this system during pilot? What level of L1 support is needed - 3 shifts covering 24 X 7? Is there a need for tech support - voice, contact etc for this system during pilot? Please clarify. | See ans # 19  SSP will fix defects during pilot phase. All support will be required only during the normal working hours. No voice support expected |
| 78 | II | 1.7 | 1 | 10 | Mind Tree | 1. Deliverables of SSP will include:  1.1 Functional Requirement Specification (FRS) | There is a conflict with reference to who is responsible for preparing the FRS. Para 1.1 (pg 4 of 18) refers Consultant as the responsible party whereas Para 1.7 specifies SSP as the responsible party. We assume that the Consultant will prepare the FRS and the SSP will prepare the SRS. Please clarify who is responsible for preparing FRS. | See ans # 40 |
| 79 | II | 1.7 (1) | 1.8 | 10 | Mind Tree | 1.8 User Acceptance Test Cases  1.9 User Acceptance Test Results | There is a conflict with reference to who is responsible for UAT. Para 2.1 (pg 5 of 45, Vol. I) refers UAT Planning and Execution as the responsibility of the Consultant whereas Para 1.7 specifies SSP as the responsible party for UAT Test Cases and Test Results. We assume that the Consultant should be responsible for the UAT execution completely -- both test cases and test results. It is fair industry practice that the SSP cannot also vouch for the UAT, and it should be an independent 3rd party performing UAT. Please clarify that our assumption is correct. | Nature of work is highly technical therefore it is suggested that the UAT test cases are prepared by the SSP. Consultants will provide necessary oversight. |
| 80 | II | 1.7 | 4 | 11 | Mind Tree | Before the start of code build, SSP will conduct Conference Room Pilot of the technical solution for select audience from UIDAI. Only upon approval of CRP that code- build will commence. | What is the scope of the "Conference Room Pilot"? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | It is expected that during CRP the SSP shows the wireframes of screens, process flows and architecture model. |
| 81 | II | 1.7 | 4 | 11 | Mind Tree | Before the start of code build, SSP will conduct Conference Room Pilot of the technical solution for select audience from UIDAI. Only upon approval of CRP that code- build will commence. | Where will the "Conference Room Pilot" be held? | At the UIDAI HQ in Delhi |
| 82 | II | 1.7 | 4 | 11 | Mind Tree | Before the start of code build, SSP will conduct Conference Room Pilot of the technical solution for select audience from UIDAI. Only upon approval of CRP that code- build will commence. | What level of support is expected during the "Conference Room Pilot" ? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 80 |
| 83 | II | 1.7 | 4 | 11 | Mind Tree | Before the start of code build, SSP will conduct Conference Room Pilot of the technical solution for select audience from UIDAI. Only upon approval of CRP that code- build will commence. | What are the conditions to determine the objective completion of the "Conference Room Pilot"? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 80 |
| 84 | II | 1.7 | 4 | 11 | Mind Tree | Before the start of code build, SSP will conduct Conference Room Pilot of the technical solution for select audience from UIDAI. Only upon approval of CRP that code- build will commence. | What is the intent of having the "Conference Room Pilot" before the start of the code build? Please clarity the objectives. | To validate design and solution fit |
| 85 | II | 1.8 | (ii) a | 11 | Mind Tree | Prepare SRS (Software Requirement Specifications). These technical design documents will be based on FRS | Who are the stakeholders for providing the business requirements? | Consultants and UIDAI |
| 86 | II | 1.8 | (ii) a | 11 | Mind Tree | Prepare SRS (Software Requirement Specifications). These technical design documents will be based on FRS (Functional Requirement Specifications) | From which location is Requirements expected to be driven? | UIDAI HQ and States |
| 87 | II | 1.8 | (ii) a | 11 | Mind Tree | Prepare SRS (Software Requirement Specifications). These technical design documents will be based on FRS (Functional Requirement Specifications) | Are they expected to be at one location or spread across the 3 states? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | At the development location |
| 88 | II | 1.8 | (ii) a | 11 | Mind Tree | a. Prepare SRS (Software Requirement Specifications). These technical design documents will be based on FRS (Functional Requirement Specifications) | We assume that the SME/s have clarity on business requirements and shall be able to provide inputs, review and approve the same for baseline within 5 days of submission. Please confirm if our understanding is correct. | No timelines for approval have been defined yet |
| 89 | II | 1.8 | (ii) b | 11 | Mind Tree | b. UI Prototype c. Application Framework development | From which location is the Design expected to be driven? | Development location |
| 90 | II | 1.8 | (ii)b | 11 | Mind Tree | b. UI Prototype c. Application Framework development | Can we assume that the design reviews can be held remotely or are the team expected to be co-located with the SME/s? | Both. Some of the key resources may have to travel. Even consultants will visit the development locations for discussions and reviews |
| 91 | II | 1.8 | (ii)b | 11 | Mind Tree | b. UI Prototype c. Application Framework development | We assume that the SME/s shall review and approve the design approach for baseline within 5 days of submission. Please confirm if our understanding is correct. | No timelines for approval have been defined yet |
| 92 | II | 1.8 | (ii) f | 11 | Mind Tree | Performance measurement and tuning | What is the end report needed from this exercise?  Given the NFR of 30 crores, is it sufficient for the system to be able to store 30 crore records and provide ability to read from it at whatever throughput, response time and concurrency that the system is built for? It is assumed that UIDAI will provide the necessary infrastructure - servers, storage, data centre required for conducting this performance measurement exercise. Please confirm. | Preliminary testing can be conducted on the development and QA environment however the final performance testing will happen only on the pre-production environment provide by the states. Not 'whatever throughput' but as agreed upon during FRS-SRS |
| 93 | II | 1.8 | (ii) i | 11 | Mind Tree | Transition of SRDH to state by the end of warranty support | What are responsibilities during transition? We assume this involves only knowledge transfer on application and relevant documentation. Also, we expect KT to be capped at 10 person days of effort, time. | Yes |
| 94 | II | 1.8 | (ii) i | 11 | Mind Tree | Transition of SRDH to state by the end of warranty support | Since there are 3 states, what happens if there are external dependencies and challenges which have an adverse implication on the bidder ability to transition out in a reasonably planned time. We assume that UIDAI shall treat that as a change request and compensate for delays. | Will be looked into on a case-by-case basis. |
| 95 | II | 1.8 | (ii) | 11 | Mind Tree | The list of activities above is illustrative and SSP is expected to own the complete lifecycle management of the Application Framework. | While different paragraphs in the RFP describe the scope of work, the phrase "the list of activities above is illustrative" adds ambiguity to the actual scope of work / activities / and deliverables. We assume that anything not covered in the RFP and not in our proposal shall be considered as out of scope. Please confirm that our understanding is correct. | Response should include all the lifecycle activities that SSP will perform. |
| 96 | II | 1.8 | (ii) e | 11 | Mind Tree | e. Application Framework Deployment and Pilot in three states | Please clarify what the Consultant is expected to perform as part of the Rollout Strategy (Vol I, Para 2.1, pg 5 of 45). What is the SSP expected to do for the Pilot in the three states? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. This would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline to determine completion and graceful exit. | Deployment and Defect fix is expected from SSP |
| 97 | II | 1.8 | (ii) f | 11 | Mind Tree | f. Performance measurement and tuning | Apart from the need to support upto 30 Cr records, there is no mention in the RFP about performance and scalability needs. We assume there are no other needs or inputs for performance measurement and tuning. Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. This would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline to determine completion and graceful exit. | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 98 | II | 1.8 | (ii) i | 11 | Mind Tree | i. Transition of SRDH to state by the end of warranty support | How long is the transition at each of the 3 states envisaged? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 93 |
| 99 | II | 1.8 | (ii) i | 11 | Mind Tree | i. Transition of SRDH to state by the end of warranty support | What are the conditions to determine completion of the transition? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | Sign off from the UIDAI team |
| 100 | II | 1.8 | (ii) i | 11 | Mind Tree | i. Transition of SRDH to state by the end of warranty support | We assume that the transition will complete before the end of the six month warranty support. Please validate that the assumption is correct. | Yes |
| 101 | II | 1.9 | - | 12 | Mind Tree | Assistance during Pilot | What is the scope of the Pilot? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | Similar to UAT plus testing ability of query-builder to query across pre-selected state department databases |
| 102 | II | 1.9 | - | 12 | Mind Tree | Assistance during Pilot | What are the 3 states being considered for the pilot? Clarity on would help make relevant assumptions needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 19 |
| 103 | II | 1.9 | - | 12 | Mind Tree | Assistance during Pilot | How many cities will the initiative be piloted in? Clarity on would help make relevant assumptions needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 19 |
| 104 | II | 1.9 | -- | 12 | Mind Tree | Assistance during Pilot | What level of support is expected during the Pilot? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 98 |
| 105 | II | 1.9 | - | 12 | Mind Tree | Assistance during Pilot | What is the readiness criteria for starting the Pilot? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | Completion of UAT |
| 106 | II | 1.9 | - | 12 | Mind Tree | Assistance during Pilot | What are the conditions to determine the objective completion of the Pilot? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. This would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline to determine completion and graceful exit. | See ans # 101 |
| 107 | II | 1.9 | - | 12 | Mind Tree | Assistance during Pilot | How long is the Pilot envisaged? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | Refer project timelines |
| 108 | II | 1.9 | - | 12 | Mind Tree | Assistance during Pilot | What will be the exit criteria for the Pilot. Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 101 |
| 109 | II | 1.11 | - | 12 | Mind Tree | 1.11 Change Management Process | The content under the header "Change Management Process" seems to be misplaced. Can you please describe the actual "Change Management Process" and also appropriate use of the User Manuals. | Change management here refers to training of users on SRDH. Do not confuse with Change Request process |
| 110 | II | 1.12 | (vii) | 12 | Mind Tree | (vii) 100% test coverage is expected | 100% test coverage is expected. We would like to clarify the "100%" refers to what level of detail? | Will be finalized in FRS-SRS as “x% of Line of Code” |
| 111 | II | 1.12 | (viii) | 12 | Mind Tree | (viii) Before moving to next phase of SDLC, SSP is expected to fix all high and medium severity defects | The expectations are unclear. Why should SSP be expected to fix all high and medium severity defects before moving to the next phase of the SDLC. Do you expect a water-fall model here vs. agile mode of delivery and releases? Can you please clarify the intent behind this requirement? | High and medium defects are showstoppers therefore they should be fixed before UAT. |
| 112 | II | 1.13 | - | 13 | Mind Tree | 1.13 Setting up and Maintenance of Development and QA Environments | We assume that we shall deliver the project from our facilities in Bangalore. We also assume that the SSP is responsible for procuring hardware and setting up the environment for DEV and QA only. We assume that UIDAI will procure and setup the environment for UAT, Benchmarking, Production and Pilot. Please confirm our understanding is correct. | See ans # 47 and 48.  UIDAI will provide UAT environment, pilot environment shall be provided by the states, SSP will be responsible for Dev and QA environment, |
| 113 | II | 1.14 | (v) | 13 | Mind Tree | (v) All defects and change requests have been incorporated in the base lined version of the code | We assume that Change Requests shall be approved first, and only then time-line shall be committed and then requirements implemented. Please clarify that our assumption is correct. | Yes |
| 114 | II | 1.15 | - | 11 | Mind Tree | 1.15 Performance Tuning and Benchmarking | We assume that UIDAI shall provide the Benchmarking environment and seed data to perform the benchmarking exercise and performance tuning. Please confirm that our understanding is correct. | Yes |
| 115 | II | 1.15 | (iv) | 13 | Mind Tree | (iv) Any change to code or design arising out of performance tuning exercise will not be termed change request even if UIDAI had signed off a deliverable in the past owing to lack of foresight and knowledge/ experience around performance tuning. | As a service provider, we exercise all caution to ensure that decisions are made jointly and prudently. We request UIDAI to amend the clause so that it is not 1-sided and is more balanced. E.g. we request UIDAI to reconsider an amendment that allows to be taken up through the Change Management process. | UIDAI may not be able to advise the SSP best practices from performance tuning perspective therefore UIDAI cannot treat the design changes to improve performance as change requests. |
| 116 | II | 1.17 | - | 14 | Mind Tree | 1.17 Release Management | Given the agile methodology and possibility of multiple releases via well-defined release calendars, we assume that the UAT would be performed in iterative fashion so as to get comfort on the quality of the system before rolling into production. Please confirm if our understanding is correct. | Official UAT is done once as in RFP milestone calendar. We will however help in testing every iterative build. |
| 117 | II | 1.17 | - | 14 | Mind Tree | 1.17 Release Management | Given the use of agile methodology with multiple releases, and per industry norms, we understand that the warranty period shall start when the first release begins life in the production environment. Please confirm the understanding is correct. | Warranty will kick in only after Pilots are complete. |
| 118 | II | 1.18 | - | 14 | Mind Tree | 1.18 Rollout Plan | We would like some insights into the thought process on the Pilot and Rollout strategy? Does UIDAI visualize a serial approach or a parallel approach? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | SSP can recommend given the timelines. |
| 119 | II | 1.19 | - | 14 | Mind Tree | UIDAI may engage a 3rd party audit agency to study the Application framework, server infrastructure deployment and specifically the access controls. | We assume that the "Security Audit" shall be performed during the appropriate SDLC phase itself (e.g. along with UAT) so as to reach closure before the end of the warranty period. Please confirm that our understanding is correct. | During System test or UAT |
| 120 | II | 1.20 | (i) | 14 | Mind Tree | (i) Design, Develop, Test, Deploy and Roll out the SRDH solution in 3 states | What is the scope of the Pilot rollout? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | Deployment and defect fix support during pilot |
| 121 | II | 1.20 | (i) | 14 | Mind Tree | (i) Design, Develop, Test, Deploy and Roll out the SRDH solution in 3 states | What are the 3 states being considered for the pilot rollout? Clarity on would help make relevant assumptions needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 19 |
| 122 | II | 1.20 | (i) | 14 | Mind Tree | (i) Design, Develop, Test, Deploy and Roll out the SRDH solution in 3 states | What level of support is expected during the Pilot rollout? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 120 |
| 123 | II | 1.20 | (i) | 14 | Mind Tree | (i) Design, Develop, Test, Deploy and Roll out the SRDH solution in 3 states | What are the conditions to determine the objective completion of the Pilot rollout? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. This would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline to determine completion and graceful exit. | No open defect |
| 124 | II | 1.20 | (i) | 14 | Mind Tree | (i) Design, Develop, Test, Deploy and Roll out the SRDH solution in 3 states | What will be the exit criteria for the Pilot rollout? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 123 |
| 125 | II | 1.20 | (ii) | 14 | Mind Tree | (ii) Provide personnel adequately qualified to perform the requisite tasks. In case performance related issues are observed that | The phrase ends abruptly as "…are observed that". Please clarify the sentence. | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 126 | II | 1.20 | (iii) | 14 | Mind Tree | (iii) Procure all necessary hardware and software to design, build, test and deploy SRDH | Please share details of the current IT infrastructure, landscape and platform at the 3 target states. What is their roadmap ahead? This is needed to understand current state and readiness. | See ans # 19 |
| 127 | II | 1.20 | (iii) | 14 | Mind Tree | (iii) Procure all necessary hardware and software to design, build, test and deploy SRDH | We assume that we shall deliver the project from our facilities in Bangalore. We also assume that the SSP is responsible for procuring hardware and setting up the environment for DEV and QA only. We assume that UIDAI will procure and setup the environment for UAT, Benchmarking, Production and Pilot. Please confirm our understanding is correct. | See ans # 47 and 48. UIDAI will provide UAT environment, pilot environment shall be provided by the states, SSP will be responsible for Dev and QA environment, |
| 128 | II | 1.20 | - | 15 | Mind Tree | Responsibility of Purchaser  (iii) Review deliverables of SSP within agreed timelines | Please define "within agreed timelines" as in "Review deliverables of SSP within agreed timelines". | As in RFP. |
| 129 | II | 1.20 | - | 15 | Mind Tree | Responsibility of Purchaser | We would like UIDAI to define expectations for (1) timely review and approvals , e.g. within 2 days of submission, so that comments can be incorporated (2) resolution of bottlenecks and escalation in a timely manner, e.g. 5 days after being brought to attention. These will help the project and ensure that progress is made at the pace at which it is expected. | See ans # 128 |
| 130 | II | 1.21 | - | 15 | Mind Tree | 1.21 Service Level Agreements and Penalties | We request UIDAI to share some SLA and commitments that they would like to provide the SSP so we can standardize assumption and plan for the same. | See ans # 128 |
| 131 | II | 1.21 | 4 | 16 | Mind Tree | Closure of all High and Medium severity defects by end of UAT | Typically, fix of defects takes a certain amount of time post the UAT, and this depends on the size of the application. Hence, we request an amendment so that this is not tied to the end of UAT but to a mutually agreeable period post the UAT (e.g. 2 weeks). The period can be mutually agreed once we have an assessment of the size of the application and other relevant metrics such as # of test cases, # of open defects, severity of open defects. | Will be worked out during project as necessary. The idea of iterative agile builds is to eliminate any showstoppers before UAT |
| 132 | II | 1.22 | 4 | 17 |  | 4 - Code Build and Unit Test | Why is the "Conference Room Pilot" kept before the "Code Build and Unit Test" phase? Please clarity the objectives. | See ans # 80-84 |
| 133 | II | 1.22 | 4 | 17 | Mind Tree | 4 - Code Build and Unit Test | What is the scope of the "Conference Room Pilot"? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 80-84 |
| 134 | II | 1.22 | 4 | 17 | Mind Tree | 4 - Code Build and Unit Test | Where will the "Conference Room Pilot" be held? | See ans # 80-84 |
| 135 | II | 1.22 | 4 | 17 | Mind Tree | 4 - Code Build and Unit Test | What level of support is expected during the "Conference Room Pilot”? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 80-84 |
| 136 | II | 1.22 | 4 | 17 | Mind Tree | 4 - Code Build and Unit Test | What are the conditions to determine the objective completion of the "Conference Room Pilot"? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 80-84 |
| 147 | II | 1.22 | 8 | 17 | Mind Tree | 8 - Pilot in 3 states | What is the scope of the Pilot? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. There is no basis for us to determine if it can be accomplished in 4 weeks or what it would actually take. | See ans # 120-124 |
| 148 | II | 1.22 | 8 | 17 | Mind Tree | 8 - Pilot in 3 states | What are the 3 states being considered for the pilot? Clarity on would help make relevant assumptions needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 120-124 |
| 149 | II | 1.22 | 8 | 17 | Mind Tree | 8 - Pilot in 3 states | How many cities will the initiative be piloted in? Clarity on would help make relevant assumptions needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 120-124 |
| 150 | II | 1.22 | 8 | 17 | Mind Tree | 8 - Pilot in 3 states | What level of support is expected during the Pilot? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 120-124 |
| 151 | II | 1.22 | 8 | 17 | Mind Tree | 8 - Pilot in 3 states | What is the readiness criteria for starting the Pilot? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 120-124 |
| 152 | II | 1.22 | 8 | 17 | Mind Tree | 8 - Pilot in 3 states | What are the conditions to determine the objective completion of the Pilot? Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. This would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline to determine completion and graceful exit. | See ans # 120-124 |
| 153 | II | 1.22 | 8 | 17 | Mind Tree | 8 - Pilot in 3 states | What will be the exit criteria for the Pilot. Clarity on would help set expectations and ensure that there is a clear guideline at the time of response submission. The RFP does not describe the expectations, which is needed for us to estimate the effort and plan for the same. | See ans # 120-124 |
| 154 | III | - | - | All Pages | Mind Tree |  | In the footer, what is intended by "Signature and Seal of Bidder"? Are we expected to provide on all pages in addition to our response? Please clarify. | See ans # 49 |
| 155 | II | 1.7 | 2 | 11 | Patni |  | Could you please provide the names of the states at which it will be deployed? | See ans # 19 |
| 156 | II | 1.7 | 2 | 11 | Patni |  | Would it be possible to share the information about existing infrastructure /environment details for the pilot states? Please mention if any amount of existing hardware/data centre infrastructure could be reused. | See ans # 19 |
| 157 | II | 1.13 | - | 13 | Patni |  | ***'SSP will procure and operationalize necessary hardware and software at the Software Development site'*** - We assume Software Development Site would mean as the following: (i) Mutually agreed UIDAI site (1 no.) for Conference Room Pilot (ii) For Development & QA environment, we assume it would be @ Data Centre of the state(s) under Pilot Scope. Please confirm, or let us know if SSP needs to host Dev/QA environment in their premises  (iii) For Production environment, we assume it would be @ Data Centre of the state(s) under Pilot Scope. Please confirm | (i). UIDAI HQ  (ii). SSP will establish the development and QA environments.  (iii). Production environment will be set up by the respective states |
| 158 | II | General | - | - | Patni |  | What is the mechanism which will be used for sending the test data to the SSP? Will it be sent through FTP or through e-mail or will it be mailed in some media like CD, DVD? | Could be any of the mentioned options |
| 159 | II | General | - | - | Patni |  | Can we assume, there is no data flow (except authentication requests) from SRDH to CIDR/Central UIDAI Repository? Please confirm. | No data flows back to CIDR |
| 160 | II | General | - | - | Patni |  | In case of change of existing records @ Central UIDAI Repository, how will the same change envisaged to be applied to SRDH? | See ans # 23 |
| 161 | II | 1.5 | 11 | 8 | Patni |  | Will the KYR and KYR+ fields stored in SRDH be presented for modification to appropriately authenticated power users? | See ans # 20 |
| 162 | II | 1.5 | 11 | 8 | Patni |  | If answer to previous Question is 'Yes', how the change should be written back into CIDR/Central UIDAI Repository. Or let us know if that is not a desired functionality | See ans # 159 |
| 163 | II | 1.5 | 16 | 9 | Patni |  | ***'Ability to connect to department databases for providing unified resident view. E.g. In the resident view apart from KYR fields it should be possible to display PDS and MNREGA related information...... It should be noted that SSP should only bundle these adapters that state teams will use to create unified views. Connections to target databases and creation of unified views is not in scope of SRDH.'*** Our understanding is following, please confirm which ones are right. Please help us correct the wrong ones: -Physical movement of SRDH data into state application databases and the vice versa is not in scope of project (apart from enabling seeding the databases with UID) - However a platform needs to be presented to create a logical unified resident view - The platform would create unified view at reporting/ query level and not at physical /data level | - SRDH data can be used to update the state databases by means of a interface exposed by SRDH  - Query builder development is in scope |
| 164 | II | 1.5 | 17 | 9 | Patni |  | We assume actual seeding of Aadhaar number/UID into state application databases is not in scope. Also, providing a (probabilistic) data match score of Aadhaar record/individual residents against Resident Records in state Application database [e.g. Sachin Tendulkar with UID 0001 in SRDH matches 90% with S Tendulkar in Land Records Database, 55% with Sachin T in Land Records Database] is also not in scope. Please confirm. | Actual Seeding is not in scope of SRDH development. |
| 165 | II | 1.5 | 18 | 9 | Patni |  | ***SRDH should support Aadhaar Authentication (both demographic and biometric) by consuming Aadhaar Authentication API (API details available on UIDAI website)*** SRDH is not to store Biometric Records as per 1.5.3. In absence of the same, how will the biometric authentication against Aadhaar Authentication API is envisaged? Is it, for every login attempt by an Administrator, biometric data is to be captured when they log in (maybe through fingerprint reader) and verified against Aadhaar Authentication API in real-time? | 1. Authentication will happen only through CIDR  2. Login will not require biometric authentication |
| 166 | II | 1.5 | 18 | 9 | Patni |  | If answer to previous question is "Yes", will the procurement, setup and installation of biometric data reader (hardware/software) and transmitter be also in scope of project? | Not in scope |
| 167 | II | General | - | - | Patni |  | Can you please provide a breakup of total users from 3 states combined: A) **Report/Query users** (only viewing and querying data/reports from SRDH): B) **Administrator Users** (monitor Data Loads, Add/delete/Modify/Deactivate/Reactivate Records):  C) **Data Trustees**, if needed (Approve/Reject Modification, Deletion, Changes): D) **Power Users/Analysts** (Create new reports/queries out of SRDH/unified view etc.): | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 168 | II | General | - | - | Patni |  | Can you please provide % concurrence for users: A) Report/Query users: B) Administrator Users:  C) Data Trustees, if needed: D) Power Users/Analysts: | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 for overall concurrent users. |
| 169 | II | 1.6 & 7 | - | 10 | Patni |  | In the earlier document shared/workshop held in the month of July, one of the requirement was to enrich the SRDH database with the other state level data sources. In perspective of those discussions and 1.6 Data Flow Diagram in current Volume II document, please confirm: (A)Enriching state level databases with Aadhaar data is in scope? (B) Enriching SRDH data from state level databases is in scope? (C) In the workshop, one of the suggestions was kind of a configurator to enable bi-directional data enrichment? Is the same still in scope? | (A). Yes. See and # 163  (B). No  (C). No  Enrichment will happen in two ways: one possibly by means of using encrypted EID-UID file or a manual update or a batch update. Manual and batch updates will be done only after appropriate authentication |
| 170 | II | - | - | - | Patni |  | How many users are expected to be trained on the application for each state for the pilot implementations? | Less than 25 |
| 171 | II | 1.5 | 13 | 8 | Patni |  | Reporting Requirements would be 11 Metrics as per Vol II Scope of Work: 1.5.13. Can we assume at most 15 pre-defined reports to be built on the 11 Metrics, or are there any other pre-defined reporting requirements? | Up to 15 predefined reports. However it is necessary that the query builder enables SRDH users to create custom reports |
| 172 | II | General | - | - | Patni |  | Apart from unified resident view, is there a need for ad-hoc reporting interface for SRDH data only? (Referring to discussion in July workshop on possibility to use and query SRDH data to prepare, save and distribute lists for maybe state-run welfare schemes like 'Sarva Siksha Abhijaan'. Is that requirement no more in scope? | Apart from standard reports, SRDH users should be able to create custom reports using the query builder |
| 173 | II | General | - | - | Patni |  | We understand that the audit log for all the activities should be maintained in the SRDH database. What is the expected duration for which log needs to be maintained? What will be the frequency for archiving this log? | It can be discussed during the design and build. |
| 174 | II | General | - | - | Patni |  | Apart from photograph, Is there any need for storing any scanned documents /binary images in the SRDH database in future? | No |
| 175 | II | General | - | - | Patni |  | For estimation purposes, can we estimate that each resident record should not be more than 500 bytes without photograph, | Up to 25 KB without photograph |
| 176 | II | General | - | - | Patni |  | For estimation purposes, can we estimate that photograph for each record should not be more than 2MB? If not, please provide a working number for estimation. | Up to 400 kb in stored format (in source XML, where the photograph is encoded). Actual photograph size is 50 -100 kb. |
| 177 | I | Section 5 | Form Fin 1 | 39 | CMC | Form FIN-1 Financial Proposal Submission Form - 10. In case we are engaged by the UIDAI as Software Solution Provider Agency, we shall provide any assistance/cooperation required by UIDAI, UIDAI appointed auditing agencies/ UIDAI officials for performing their auditing and inspection functions | We request that UIDAI to confirm that the auditing and inspection functions shall be restricted to this project only. If UIDAI notifies Contractor of any deficiencies, then Contractor shall, within thirty (30) days of receipt of such notice, correct the deficiencies. There shall be no other consequences. The cost of the audit shall be borne by UIDAI ? Please confirm. | OK |
| 178 | II | 1.15 | iv | 13 | CMC | Any change to code or design arising out of performance tuning exercise will not be termed change request | We request this clause to reconsidered as any changes would require additional effort to be put in by SSP ? Hence he should by suitably compensated ? | See ans # 115 |
| 179 | 11 | 1.20 | - | 14 | CMC | Responsibilities of each Party - (i)(ii) Provide personnel adequately qualified to perform the requisite tasks. In case performance related issues are observed that ? | The said sentence is incomplete ? Please let us know what is intended here by UIDAI ? | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 180 | III | 1.2 | 2.4 | 10 | CMC | Expiration of contract "Unless terminated earlier pursuant to Clause GC 2.3" | (This doesn’t not seem to be correct. Please clarify which clause does it refer to " We feel it should be this Contract shall expire at the end of such time period after the Effective Date as specified in the SC. | The Clause remains unchanged. |
| 181 | III | 1.2 | 2.10 | 16 | CMC | 2.10 Extension of Contract - The contract shall be extended for a period as required by the Purchaser based on mutual agreement. The rates used for the calculation of the ‘Total Cost of Services’ as given in Appendix D shall be effective for such extension. | We request that the rates shall be mutually discussed and arrived at in case of extension of contract) | The Clause remains unchanged. |
| 182 | III | 1.2 | 3.13 | 20 | CMC | Assignment - The Software Solution Provider shall not assign, in whole or in part, their obligations under this Contract | We request that clause be modified as under -Assignment - The Software Solution Provider shall not assign, in whole or in part, their obligations under this Contract without obtaining prior written consent of the Purchaser. | The Clause remains unchanged. |
| 183 | III | 1.2 | 6.1 | 23 | CMC | 6.1 Total Cost of Services - Notwithstanding Clause GC 6.1(b) hereof, if pursuant to of the Clause GC and GC 5.2 hereof, the Parties shall agree that additional payments shall be made to the Software Solution Provider in order to cover any necessary additional expenditures not envisaged in the cost estimates referred to in Clause GC 6.1(a) above, the ceiling or ceilings, as the case may be, set forth in Clause GC 6.1(b) above shall be increased by the amount or amounts, as the case may be, of any such additional payments. | We request this clause need to be modified as given below :6.1 Total Cost of Services - Notwithstanding Clause GC 6.1(b) hereof, if pursuant to of the Clause GC 4.2 and GC 5.2 hereof, the Parties shall agree that additional payments shall be made to the Software Solution Provider in order to cover any necessary additional expenditures not envisaged in the cost estimates referred to in Clause GC 6.1(a) above, the ceiling or ceilings, as the case may be, set forth in Clause GC 6.1(b) above shall be increased by the amount or amounts, as the case may be, of any such additional payments. | The Clause remains unchanged. |
| 184 | III | 1.2 | 6.3 | 24 | CMC | 6.3 Terms of Payment - ) Once a milestone is completed, the Software Solution Provider shall submit the requisite deliverables as specified in this Contract. The Purchaser shall release the requisite payment upon acceptance of the deliverables. However, if the Employer fails to intimate acceptance of the deliverables or its objections thereto, within 30 days of receipt of it, the Employer shall release 75% of the payment for the respective deliverable without further delay (maximum 30 days) and the Software Solution Provider shall produce a Bank Guarantee for the same. | We request that the following may kindly be added in clause - that if the employer fails to provide acceptance within 30 days, the deliverables shall be deemed accepted for all purposes including release of full 100% payment to software solution provider without furnishing any bank guarantee | The Clause remains unchanged. |
| 185 | III | 1.2 | 8.2 | 27 | CMC | 8.2 - Arbitration- the Presiding arbitrator shall be appointed by the authority specified in SC 8.2 (a). | (No authority is mentioned in SC 8.2 (a), We request that in such case, the presiding arbitrator shall be appointed by the court of competent jurisdiction) | To be decided before execution of the contract |
| 186 | III | 1.2 | 8.2 | 27 | CMC | Arbitration proceedings shall be held in India at the place indicated in SC 8.2 (b) , | We request that arbitration proceedings shall take place at Delhi) as No place is mentioned in SC 8.2 (b) | To be decided before execution of the contract |
| 187 | III | 1.2 | 11.1 | 30 | CMC | Limitation of Liability | We request the following line may kindly be added to Limitation of liability clause, in case of gross negligence or willful misconduct. and point (c) Software Solution Provider failure to perform its contractual responsibilities, to perform the services, or to meet agreed service levels shall be excused if and to the extent Vendor’s non-performance is caused by Customer’s mission to act, delay, wrongful action, failure to provide inputs, or failure to perform its obligations under this Agreement." | The Clause remains unchanged. |
| 188 | - | - | General | - | Mahindra-Satyam |  | We understand that UIDAI wants to provide query building (ad hoc report) capability to users? How many users within UIDAI would be using ad hoc reporting capabilities? | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 189 | - | - | General | - | Mahindra-Satyam |  | If there is a current reporting tool in UIDAI for reporting but does not offer ad hoc report build capability then is UIDAI open to change/migrate to new reporting tools? | Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |
| 190 | - | - | General | - | Mahindra-Satyam |  | What are the report performance expectations? | Will be worked out during requirements phase. |
| 191 | - | - | General | - | Mahindra-Satyam |  | For how many users vendor needs to provide training? | See ans # 34 |
| 192 | - | - | General | - | Mahindra-Satyam |  | What is the approximate expected daily data volume for loading? | Will be worked out during requirements phase. |
| 193 | II | 1.5 | 13 | 8 | Mahindra-Satyam |  | Who are the primary users of 11 metrics reports? How many total and concurrent users are expected to use these reports? | State personnel are the users. Refer corrigendum dated 29.9.2011 |