

| Response to Pre-Bid Queries/Suggestions/Clarifications of Rate Contract RFP for Selection of Email Solution Service Provider | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--|--------------|---|--|--|----------|---------------|--|
| Sl. No. | RFP Chapter No. | RFP Clause No. | RFP Page No. | Clause Details as per RFP | Query/Clarification/Suggestion | Remark By OEM/SI | Comments | Change in RFP | Response to be published |
| 1 | Chapter- 3 | 2. Qualification / Eligibility Criteria 2 -OEM Eligibility Point No 2 - Financial Turnover | 13 | Average Annual Turnover of the OEM for the last 3 financial years, i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 & 2024-25 should be at least Rs. 90.00 Crores. | Request to change OEM's Average Annual Turnover to minimum 300.00 Cr to ensure Enterprise Class Solution should be quoted and this request is as per earlier RFP reference. | It is as per earlier released RFP on this. | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 2 | Chapter- 3 | 3. Qualification / Eligibility Criteria 3 -OEM Eligibility Point No 4 -ISO Certifications | 13 | Email OEM must have all the following valid latest certifications (a) ISO 9001:2015 (Quality management) (b) ISO 27001:2013 (Information Security Management System) | Request to modify as - Email OEM must have all the following valid latest certifications or higher (a) ISO 9001:2015 (Quality management) (b) ISO 27001:2013 (Information Security Management System) (c) ISO 22301:2019 (Business Continuity Management System) (d) ISO 27701:2019 (Privacy Information Management System) | Business Continuity and Privacy Information certificate are equally important for OEM to participate in such a large bid. | | No | As per RFP |
| 3 | Chapter- 3 | 3. Qualification / Eligibility Criteria 3 -OEM Eligibility Point No 5 -Product | 13 | Copy of Self certificate and a certificate from the statutory auditor or the cost auditor of the company (in case of companies) giving the percentage of local content. | Request to modify as - Copy of Self certificate OR a certificate from the statutory auditor or the cost auditor of the company (in case of companies) giving the percentage of local content. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 4 | Chapter- 3 | 3. Qualification / Eligibility Criteria 3 -OEM Eligibility Point (b) | 13 | Where the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) of the offered Mail Messaging Software participates directly as the Bidder, and does not bid through any SI, Dealer, Distributor, or Partner, the Bidder shall be required to comply only with the eligibility criteria specified for the OEM, and the Bidder eligibility criteria applicable to SI/partners shall not apply. | Where the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) of the offered Mail Messaging Software participates directly as the Bidder, and does not bid through any SI, Dealer, Distributor, or Partner, the Bidder shall be required to comply with the eligibility criteria specified for the OEM as well as of SI/partners both. | If OEM is participating as SI then they should comply for both the criteria to ensure SIs capability for executing such a large project. | | No | As per RFP |
| 5 | Chapter- 4 | 4. Scope of Work, Deliverables & Timelines 3. Key Responsibilities of OEM/SI Point no. 3 | 14 | Migration of approximately 62000 mail boxes of various domains/systems Approx mail size 150 TB | Kindly confirm the exact data components to be migrated, for example: - User accounts - Mailboxes / application data - Calenders/Task - Metadata, logs, archives, historical records, etc. | It is important to understand the migration efforts and migration tool requirement wrt migration of Data. | | No | Whatever is stored mailbox and exportable from microsoft exchange should be imported into proposed email platform. |
| 6 | Chapter- 4 | 4. Scope of Work, Deliverables & Timelines B -Deployment of Resources Point No 1 - Installation & Commissioning | 15 | As per requirements for timely implementation, a Separate project implementation team will be deployed by OEM OR OEM manpower on the payroll of SI | Request to change - As per requirements for timely implementation, a Separate project implementation team will be deployed by OEM OR OEM certified manpower on the payroll of SI | It should be OEM Certified Man Power on the payroll of SI | | Yes | As per revised RFP |
| 7 | Chapter- 4 | 4. Scope of Work, Deliverables & Timelines D -Operation & Maintenance b-1. Support Engineer -Key Responsibilities | 16 | d) Investigate spam, phishing, and blacklisting issues | What is the e-mail security tool currently in use and who will be maintaining it? | | | No | The Current MX Gateway/Antispam used is Cisco IronPort, However Email Solution Must support integration with any MX Gateway/Antispam provided by RISL/DOIT&C |
| 8 | Chapter- 4 | 4. Scope of Work, Deliverables & Timelines D -Operation & Maintenance b-2. Sr Domain Expert - Key Responsibilities | 17 | i) Security & Compliance Management Implement and enforce email security policies, TLS encryption, and DLP (Data Loss Prevention). | Pl. advsie which is the DLP software currently in use ? | | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------|---|----|---|--|---|-----|---|
| 9 | Chapter- 4 | | 17 | j) Manage anti-spam and anti-phishing technologies (Microsoft Defender, Proofpoint, IronPort,) etc. | Pl confirm - What are specific tools currently being used and whether support on those tools will be available for configuration ? | | No | Microsoft Defender, Proofpoint, IronPort, etc. |
| 10 | Chapter- 4 | | 17 | n) Integrate email solutions with SIEM tools for proactive threat detection. | Pl. share the details of the cuurently used Siem tool at DoIT/RISL. | | No | Currently Logrhythm LR Siem is being used by RSDC |
| 11 | Chapter- 6 | 6. General terms & Conditions of Tender & Contract Point No 33 (a) - Warranty | 43 | The bidder must supply all items with comprehensive on-site OEM warranty valid for a period as mentioned in Annexure-1 of this RFP after the goods, or any portion thereof as the case may be, have been delivered to, installed and accepted at the final destination(s) indicated in the bidding document. | Request to modify as - The bidder must supply all items with comprehensive OEM warranty valid for a period as mentioned in Annexure-1 of this RFP after the goods, or any portion thereof as the case may be, have been delivered to, installed and accepted at the final destination(s) indicated in the bidding document. | Pl. remove on-ste as it is applicable only for Infra OEM's and not for Software OEMs as per Industry Standards | No | As per RFP |
| 12 | | Annexure-1: Bill of Material (BoM) Point No. c | 50 | For Items mentioned under Annexure-1: BOM shall be provided with Onsite Comprehensive OEM warranty and premium support (24x7) from the date of commissioning for 3 years.The quantity mentioned in the BoQ is tentative and to evaluate the L1 bidder only. Procuring Entity can place order in any combination of the quantity of mailboxes and servers. | Request to modify as - For Items mentioned under Annexure-1: BOM shall be provided with Comprehensive OEM warranty and premium support (24x7) from the date of commissioning for 3 years.The quantity mentioned in the BoQ is tentative and to evaluate the L1 bidder only. Procuring Entity can place order in any combination of the quantity of mailboxes and servers. | Pl. remove on-ste as it is applicable only for Infra OEM's and not for Software OEMs as per Industry Standards | No | As per RFP |
| 13 | | Annexure-2: Technical Specifications - 1 | 51 | Email software must support Email address creation on all kind of domain ASCII or non- ASCII (IDN) domains, Should support large indexed mailboxes & have advanced search features | Email software must support Email address creation on all kind of domain ASCII or non-ASCII (IDN) domains, Should support large indexed mailboxes & have advanced search features | IDN is a Single vendor Specific feature (On-prem vendors). Request to remove. | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 14 | | Technical Specifications 5 | 51 | Should have rich, interactive, web-based interface for end user functions (access through HTTPS) and mobile access through ActiveSync/SyncML/IMAP | Should have rich, interactive, web-based interface for end user functions (access through HTTPS) and mobile access through ActiveSync/SyncML/ IMAP . | IMAP is a basic authentication protocol and does not support features like Calendar, GAL, RemoteWipe etc on the Mobile devices | No | As per RFP |
| 15 | | Technical Specifications 19 | 51 | The solution should support PKI based encryption (Digital signature and Encryption of Mail) on Web, Mobile mail clients and Outlook Clients; it should also support data encryption in transit using TLS | The solution should support PKI based encryption with S/MIME (Digital signature and Encryption of Mail) on Web, Native Client, and Outlook Clients; it should also support data encryption in transit using TLS. | TLS is an encryption of mail on Transit and does not encrypt the data at rest. While S/MIME encrypts mail using digital signatures. | No | As per RFP |
| 16 | | Technical Specifications 22 | 52 | Email software should support S/MIME or SSL/TLS for email encryption on the web client. | Email software should support S/MIME or SSL/TLS for email encryption on the web client. | TLS is an encryption of mail on Transit and does not encrypt the data at rest. While S/MIME encrypts mail using digital signatures. | No | As per RFP |
| 17 | | Technical Specifications 27 | 52 | Should have the feature of creating filters/rules, security feature in user's login to define allowed Country(s) from which account can be accessible. | Should have the feature of creating filters/rules, security feature in user's login to define allowed Country(s) from which aeccount can be accessible. | Single vendor Specific, request to remove | No | As per RFP |
| 18 | | Technical Specifications 31 | 52 | Should support "Automatic Email Categorization" or "Smart Mail Classification." The webmail system should automatically analyze incoming emails and classify them into meaningful categories i.e. OTP, GOV, Bank, Social, Travel etc. | Should support "Automatic Email Categorization" or "Smart Mail Classification." The webmail system should automatically analyze incoming emails and classify them into meaningful categories i.e. OTP, GOV, Bank, Soecial, Travel etc. | Single vendor Specific, request to remove | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------------|----|--|---|--|--|----|------------|
| 19 | | Technical Specifications 33 | 52 | The user should be able to get a tour/guide when logging in the webmail for the first time. The solution should support creation of Email Shortcuts for faster accessibility. Users can mark important mails as shortcuts and access them instantly, without moving them from their original folders. | The user should be able to get a tour/guide when logging in the webmail for the first time. The solution should support Shortcuts for faster accessibility. Users can mark important mails as shortcuts and access them instantly, without moving them from their original folders. | Pleac change as requested (bold) & request to remove the Text marked in Red. | | No | As per RFP |
| 20 | | Technical Specifications 39 | 52 | The webmail client should alert users when they mention an attachment in the email body but forget to attach a file. Users can configure the keywords that trigger this alert. OR Microsoft Outlook client, which if integrates with Exchange Server and provides attachment reminder alerts based on user-defined keywords in case of exchange. | The webmail client should alert users when they mention an attachment in the email body but forget to attach a file. Users can configure the keywords that trigger this alert. OR Microsoft Outlook client, which if integrates with Exchange Server and provides attachment reminder alerts based on user defined keywords in case of exchange. | The functionality can be defined for the native client (Web and Native Offline) for the OEM and not from a different vendor | | No | As per RFP |
| 21 | | Technical Specifications 40 | 52 | The email system should allow custom fonts in the webmail UI i.e Users should be able to utilize the range of fonts on the users Desktop for their emails. The solution shall support Email Recall for messages sent within the same domain or organization. If an internal email is sent accidentally, the sender can recall. | The email system should allow custom fonts in the webmail UI i.e Users should be able to utilize the range of fonts on the users Desktop for their emails. The solution shall support Email Recall / Resending for messages sent within the same domain or organization. If an internal email is sent accidentally, the sender can recall. | Request to remove | | No | As per RFP |
| 22 | | Technical Specifications 41 | 52 | The Solution must support Email Security Gateway integration for added security in emails. The solution should also provide Rights Management controls for internal communication; Senders can define specific permissions on emails sent within the organization to protect sensitive information. | The Solution must support Email Security Gateway integration for added security in emails. The solution should also provide integration with Rights Management Software (if available) controls for internal communication; Senders can define specific permissions on emails sent within the organization to protect sensitive information. | Rights management is an external capability than the email software and thus if department has a Rights management tool the email software should be able to integrate the same. | | No | As per RFP |
| 23 | | Technical Specifications 43 | 53 | The solution must support multiple desktop clients, including but not limited to Windows & Mac i.e. Microsoft Outlook, Mozilla, Thunderbird or OEM Native client. | The solution must support multiple desktop clients, including but not limited to Windows & Mac i.e. Microsoft Outlook, Mozilla, Thunderbird And OEM Native client (from the messaging software OEM). | While the messaging software should support third party Email Client, it is mandatory for the messaging software OEM to provide a Native Desktop Client for integrated & uniform interface for both Online and Offline mail Access | | No | As per RFP |
| 24 | | Technical Specifications 45 | 53 | The solution must support client's offline capability to access emails offline. | The Native Client of the supplend messaging software must support offline capability to access emails offline. | While the messaging software should support third party Email Client, it is mandatory for the messaging software OEM to provide a Native Desktop Client for integrated & uniform interface for both Online and Offline mail Access | | No | As per RFP |
| 25 | | Technical Specifications 46 | 53 | The solution must provide full IMAP, POP, and SMTP support. The user should be able to take offline backup of all emails from the server and archive them on the local PC/Laptop. | The native Desktop/offline client work on secure protocols & not IMAP/POP3 | IMAP & POP3 are basic authentication protocols and are not secure. | | No | As per RFP |
| 26 | | Technical Specifications 47 | 53 | The solution should create the same folder structure as on the server while Configuring on any client. | The Native Desktop Client should create the same folder structure as on the server while Configuring on any client & also when creating a local copy of the mailbox when archiving mails from the server to the local PC for space reduction | Functionality for the Native Desktop Client | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------------|----|--|--|--|--|-----|--------------------|
| 27 | | Technical Specifications 48 | 53 | Users should be able to restore deleted emails even from the trash until trash is not made empty by user from the client however Users should be able to restore deleted emails on web even from the trash which were deleted from the client. | Users should be able to restore deleted emails even from the trash from the Native Desktop & the Web Client. | Functionality to allow the users to recover mails from the Trash, helps to reduce Backup/restore tickets and also provides users to information that was deleted accidentally making users more productive. | | No | As per RFP |
| 28 | | Technical Specifications 49 | 53 | Email software should support S/MIME or PGP Mime for email encryption on the email clients along with RISL/DOIT&C Branded Mobile Email App for all users. | Email software should support S/MIME or PGP Mime for email encryption on the email clients (Web, Native Desktop, third party clients) along with RISL/DOIT&C Branded Mobile Email App for all users. | Email Encryption via S/MIME or PGP should not be done using Mobile App for security reasons as it is not recommended to store your digital certificates on mobile devices | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 29 | | Technical Specifications 50 | 53 | The email solution should support EAI and allow email address creation and communication from all valid domain names including IDN user ID. | The email solution should support EAI and allow email address creation and communication from all valid domain names including IDN user ID. | Single vendor Specific | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 30 | | Technical Specifications 51 | 53 | The email solution should support EAI address as both primary or aliases. | The email solution should support EAI address as both primary or aliases. | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 31 | | Technical Specifications 52 | 53 | The Email Solution must fully support Email Address Internationalization (EAI) as per global RFC standards. Provide Domain wise customized Login Page with a provision in atleast Hindi & English language. | The Email Solution must fully support Email Address Internationalization (EAI) as per global RFC standards. Provide Domain wise customized Login Page with a provision in atleast Hindi & English language. | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 32 | | Technical Specifications 53 | 53 | The solution must be UA-ready as per the Universal Acceptance Steering Group (UASG) ICANN guidelines. | The solution must be UA-ready as per the Universal Acceptance Steering Group (UASG) ICANN guidelines. | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 33 | | Technical Specifications 61 | 53 | Users should be able to Synchronize emails on mobile devices through ActiveSync or IMAP only (for iOS, Android). | Users should be able to Synchronize emails on mobile devices through ActiveSync or IMAP only (for iOS, Android). | IMAP is a basic authentication protocol and does not support features like Calendar, GAL, RemoteWipe etc on the Mobile devices | | No | As per RFP |
| 34 | | Technical Specifications 63 | 53 | Only corporate allowed devices should be allowed to Sync emails on the mobile device (A/B/Q) The mail solution must provide users capability to create different password for Sync emails on the mobile device. | Only corporate allowed devices should be allowed to Sync emails on the mobile device (A/B/Q) The mail solution must provide users capability to create different password for Sync emails on the mobile device. | Changing a user password does not provide device restrictions & different passwords for different apps is not a feasible solution for the user. Also you can not restrict devices using different passwords. | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|------------------------------|-----|---|--|--|--|-----|--------------------|
| 35 | | Technical Specifications 73 | 54 | The mail messaging software should have a feature of Application Programming Interface (API). The mail messaging software should have multi factors: Authentication web Login and TOTP generation through RISL/DOIT&C Branded Mobile App for all users. | The mail messaging software should have a feature of Application Programming Interface (API). The mail messaging software should have multi factors: Authentication web Login and TOTP generation through RISL/DOIT&C Branded Mobile App for all users. | Native Mobile App for TOTP should be made Optional | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 36 | | Technical Specifications 83 | 54 | The mail messaging software should support Delegated Admin. The mail system administrator should be able to create, delete user accounts and manage control the mail archival /journal solution. The mailing solution must also provide RISL/DOIT&C Branded Admin Mobile App. | The mail messaging software should support Delegated Admin. The mail system administrator should be able to create, delete user accounts and manage control the mail archival /journal solution. The mailing solution must also provide RISL/DOIT&C Branded Admin Mobile App. | Mobile App for Administration should be made Optional | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 37 | | Technical Specifications 90 | 55 | The email software should have the provision to restrict basic authentication protocols (POP3/IMAP) and should only allow secure access using TFA on Webmail, capability to create separate passwords for Desktop & mobile client | The email software should have the provision to restrict basic authentication protocols (POP3/IMAP) and should only allow secure access using TFA on Webmail, capability to create separate passwords for Desktop & mobile client | 1. It is practically not feasible to have 2 different passwords for a user. 2. POP3/IMAP are insecure protocols and thus it is recommended not to use on Desktop Clients (Native and third party like Outlook). | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 38 | | Technical Specifications 110 | 56 | The Proposed solution should have a user friendly administration Graphical user interface using which all features and capabilities should be centrally administered. Mobile App support is also required | The Proposed solution should have a user friendly administration Graphical user interface using which all features and capabilities should be centrally administered. Mobile App support is also required. | Mobile App for Administration should be made Optional | | No | As per RFP |
| 39 | | Technical Specifications 116 | 56 | The proposed solution should have capability for migrating existing user mail store data / archive data to new format without any data loss. | The proposed solution should have capability for migrating existing user mail store data / archive data to new format without any data loss. Including Emails, Calendar, Contacts, User filters etc. | To ensure all the data is migrated from the legacy environment to the new platform | | No | As per RFP |
| 40 | | Technical Specifications 121 | 56 | The email software should support web-based Office productivity suite integrated into the platform. | The email software should provide native support web-based Office productivity suite integrated into the platform. | This will ensure that the users get a uniform productivity suite & the department is not required to purchase any additional tool for office productivity | | No | As per RFP |
| 41 | | Technical Specifications 122 | 56 | The webmail interface should provide a feature to create/upload Document/ Spreadsheets/ Presentation in the webmail interface and the solution should have the required components to deliver this feature | The webmail interface should provide a feature to create, upload Document, Spreadsheets, Presentation in the webmail & the native Desktop interface and the solution should have the required components to deliver this feature | This will ensure that the users get a uniform productivity suite and also are able to work on it when working on Web or the Native Desktop Client | | No | As per RFP |
| 42 | | Technical Specifications 123 | 56 | Users should be able to share the documents internally. | Users should be able to share the documents internally & Externally | This is to ensure that the users if sharing large files outside the domain do not use public platforms and the data is always shared through official channels | | No | As per RFP |
| 43 | | Additional Queries | N/A | Section in the RFP | Additional Specifications (Functional Specifications) | Reason for Change | | | |
| 44 | | | | Web Mail Client | The mail messaging software should be feature-rich and bandwidth efficient such that users working on slow Connectivity / Low Bandwidth are also able to access Email facility smoothly. | The officials of Rajasthan Govt will be located in remote areas and it is important that the email software is able to provide services in a low network area | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------------------------------|--|---|--|----|---|
| 45 | | | | | The proposed solution shall integrate with necessary email security systems to warn users when accessing any suspicious URLs. OR the proposed solution shall necessarily email security systems to warn users when accessing any suspicious URLs | This is an important security feature to ensure users do not click on malicious URLs | | No | As per RFP, Already Mention in RFP on Point 17 page 51 |
| 46 | | | | | The webmail client should support URL defanging along with Email Security Gateway integration for added security in emails, i.e. converting clickable links to safe non-clickable formats. | This is an important security feature to ensure users do not click on malicious URLs | | No | As per RFP, Already Mention in RFP on Point 17 page 51 |
| 47 | | | | Desktop & Mobile Client | Desktop & Mobile Client | The requirement should be for a Native Desktop Client from the messaging software OEM to provide an integrated platform for both Online and Offline mail Access | | No | As per RFP |
| 48 | | | | | The offline client should be available to Windows & Mac OS. | The native Desktop Client should be available for Mac & Windows OS | | No | As per RFP |
| 49 | | | | | The offline client should have a provision of Auto-Archive emails for clearing the quota on the server and making a copy of email on the local PC/Laptop. | This is important as the users will have to create local archives when they are reaching the allotted Quota for mailboxes. | | No | As per RFP |
| 50 | | | | Support for MS-Outlook Client | Support for MS-Outlook Client | Section to be Added to ensure users who are currently using MS-Outlook and want to continue to use it do not have to change the end Client | | No | As per RFP, Already mentioned in RFP on Points 43 page 53 |
| 51 | | | | | The email software should support MAPI (MS-Outlook on Windows) and EWS (Outlook on Mac for the required users) and should also support OEM provided Native Client from the same Messaging Solution Provider. | These are Security features to ensure the Outlook Client works on a secure (MAPI) Protocol and is able to synchronise the users Mail, Calendar, Contacts, Sharing, Delegation, Free/Busy etc seamlessly ir-respective of the server side mailing platform | | No | As per RFP |
| 52 | | | | | Users should be able to get free/busy information while sending out calendars | | | No | As per RFP, Already mentioned in RFP on Points 53 page 53 |
| 53 | | | | | Users should be able delegate mailbox/calendars to the peers without sharing their password | | | No | As per RFP, Already mentioned in RFP on Points 13 page 51 |
| 54 | | | | | The Outlook client should be able to sync email, calendars, contacts etc from the server | | | No | As per RFP |
| 55 | | | | Document Sharing & Collaboration | The document repository should be able to auto maintain the version control of the documents | Enterprise Document Collaboration and File Secure Sharing. This ensures that users who are working collaboratively on a document can refer to all the previous versions of the document | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|----|------------|
| 56 | chapter 7 | 1. Payment Terms and Schedule | 47 | Payable Amount: 70% WO amount Remaining 30% will be equally divided and paid at the end of each support year. | Request for Changes: 85% WO amount Remaining 15% will be equally divided and paid at the end of each support year. | Request for Changes | | No | As per RFP |
| 57 | Additional Point for Consideration | Additional Point for Consideration | Additional Point for Consideration | Additional Point for Consideration | Request for Consideration: The bidder must possess, at the time of bidding, a valid CMMI Level 5 for Services Certifications. | Justification: Inclusion of CMMI Level 5 (Service domain) ensures the bidder demonstrates the highest level of process maturity, continuous improvement, and predictable service delivery. CMMI represents globally recognized best practices and is widely adopted across the worldwide IT industry and organizations. Adding this requirement will ensure participation of highly capable System Integrators, reduce execution risks, and enhance overall project quality and reliability. | | No | As per RFP |
| 58 | Chapter 4 | A. Details of work Point no. 2 | 14 | Alternatively, the SI may provide new Email solution: SI/Bidder may provide new on-premise mailing solution for 80000 users. The SI/Bidder opting for this alternate shall have to migrate complete mails of users from present solution to this new solution. The deployed mailing solution should not be dependent on server-based licensing. The SI/Bidder shall deploy the mailing solution on a minimum of 16 servers (10 Client + 6 Mailbox) at the DC and 8 servers (5 Client + 3 Mailbox) at the DR. The procuring entity may increase or decrease the number of servers on which the mailing solution is deployed at the RSDC and DR sites, as per requirements. | a..Kindly specify if automated failover is mandatory or if a manual switchover is acceptable. b.The RFP mandates 99.9% uptime but does not mention RPO/RTO. Please confirm expected values. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 59 | Chapter 4 | 3. Key Responsibilities of OEM/SI Point no. (b) | 14 | Reviewing the existing mailing solution (Microsoft Exchange 2016), migrating it to the newly supplied mailing solution, and managing the existing system until the new solution is live. | a.Please confirm the average and maximum mailbox size of the 62,000 mailboxes. b.Are there shared mailboxes, public folders, or resource mailboxes that also need migration? Count? c.Should migration include calendar, contacts, mailbox rules, and PST files? d.Will RISL provide an Active Directory mapping/user list for mailbox migration, or should the bidder prepare this? e.Does RISL have any archival mailboxes (In-Place Archive or third-party archive solutions) whose data is also required to be migrated to the new Exchange environment? If yes, kindly provide details (volume, format, location). | | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|----|---|--|--|----|---|
| 60 | | | | Additional | <p>Kindly clarify the following with respect to the infrastructure and supporting components to be provisioned under this RFP:</p> <p>a. Will RISL provide the server hardware and storage for both DC and DR sites, or should the bidder provision these?</p> <p>b. Will RISL provide a Mail Gateway Security device (for spam and malware filtering), or is the bidder expected to supply and integrate it?</p> <p>c. Is a Server Load Balancer (for traffic distribution and redundancy) to be provided by RISL, or should the bidder include it in the proposed solution?</p> <p>d. Please confirm whether RISL will provide the hypervisor platform (e.g., VMware, Hyper-V, Nutanix AHV, etc.), or should the bidder propose and supply the same.</p> <p>e. Please confirm whether RISL will provide any replication tool (VM-level or storage-level) for mailbox and application replication between DC and DR, or if the bidder is expected to include and configure such a tool in the solution.</p> | | No | RISL will provide the infrastructure. |
| 61 | Chapter 7 | Payment | 47 | Additional Queries | We request department to allow us to submit warranty certificate on yearly basis. | | No | As per RFP |
| 62 | Chapter 7 | Payment Terms and Schedule | 47 | Timelines = T+120 days | As it required migration of all mailboxes we would require more time to do migration therefore we request you to please increase delivery time for T + 180 Days | | No | As per RFP |
| 63 | Chapter 7 | Budget | | Additional Queries | Department has decided 30 cr budget for this RFP, however we think that this budget is not sufficient for this solution, therefore request you to please increase budget by 20%-25% | | No | As per RFP |
| 64 | Chapter 7 | Penalty | 48 | Maximum applicable penalty shall be 50% of agreed value of item. | Request you to please change it to "Maximum applicable penalty shall be 5% of unit item of that payment cycle. | | No | As per RFP |
| 65 | Chapter 4 – Scope of Work, A. Details of Work | Section 4 – Scope of Work, A. Details of Work | 14 | The RFP provides two options to bidders: (i) ATS upgrade of existing Microsoft Exchange 2016 solution, and (ii) provision of a new on-premise email solution for 80,000 users with complete migration from existing solution. | It is understood that the existing Microsoft Exchange solution has already been licensed and deployed by the department earlier, and bidders opting for ATS upgrade would primarily quote for ATS and license enhancement, whereas bidders opting for a new email solution would need to quote for complete perpetual licenses along with full migration and deployment efforts. In this context, kindly clarify how commercial parity will be ensured between these two options during financial evaluation so that bids are compared on a fair and equitable basis. | | No | As per RFP, Commercial parity will be ensured through BoQ-based evaluation under the LCBS (L1) methodology as specified in the RFP, with bids compared on the total evaluated cost for the option chosen by the bidder. |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|-------------|--|---|--|--|----|--|
| 66 | Chapter 4 – Scope of Work, Option-1 & Option-2 | Section 4 – Scope of Work, Option-1 & Option-2 | 14 | Option-1 requires ATS upgrade of existing solution, whereas Option-2 requires fresh solution deployment along with migration of approximately 62,000 mailboxes (~150 TB data). | Kindly clarify whether the financial evaluation will be carried out on a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) basis for the contract period to ensure objective comparison between ATS-only upgrade bids and bids proposing a new solution with migration. | | | No | As per RFP, Financial evaluation will be carried out as per the LCBS (L1) methodology based on the BoQ defined in the RFP and not on a separate TCO basis. |
| 67 | Chapter 5 – ITB, Clause 12: Selection Method (LCBS) | Section 5 – ITB, Clause 12: Selection Method (LCBS) | 22 | Selection method is Least Cost Based Selection (L1). | In view of the availability of two technically permissible solution approaches with significantly different cost structures, kindly clarify whether separate financial comparison will be carried out for each option or whether a common normalization methodology will be applied before determining L1. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 68 | General | General | — | Both upgrade and new solution options are permitted under the RFP. | Kindly confirm whether bidders are free to choose and quote for either of the two options independently, and whether the final selection will consider long-term operational, technical, and commercial suitability of the proposed option for the department. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 69 | | D. Operations and Maintenance (Bidder's OEM Certified/ Trained Manpower): | 16 / D.a.i. | a. The bidder shall deploy onsite, the following minimum technical manpower: - i. Support engineer: 4 Nos.; 7 days a Week (Monday to Sunday). | The RFP specifies deployment of four (4) onsite support engineers with coverage required seven (7) days a week (Monday to Sunday). In this context, we seek the following clarifications: Weekly Off / Leave Compliance : Please clarify whether rotational weekly offs will be permitted for deployed engineers, in line with applicable labour laws and standard HR practices that mandate at least one weekly off after six consecutive working days. Absence and Replacement Mechanism : In the event of medical emergencies, personal leave, or any unforeseen absence of a deployed engineer, please clarify: Whether the bidder is required to provide replacement manpower to ensure uninterrupted services. If yes, the acceptable timeline within which such replacement manpower must be deployed (e.g., same day / next working day). Roster-Based Deployment Model : Please confirm whether a roster-based manpower deployment model ensuring continuous service coverage while complying with statutory labour norms will be acceptable to RISL. The above clarifications will help bidders ensure compliance with statutory requirements while maintaining uninterrupted service delivery as envisaged under the RFP. | | | No | As per RFP, Bidder must plan additional relivers and its cost |
| 70 | Chapter 7 | Service Level Standards/ Requirements/ Agreement | 48 / 2 | Maximum applicable penalty shall be 20% of agreed value of item | The RFP stipulates that the maximum applicable penalty shall be up to 20% of the agreed value of the item. In this regard, we respectfully request the Authority to consider revising the maximum penalty cap to 10% of the agreed value. A penalty cap of 20% is considerably high and may adversely impact commercial viability, risk assessment, and pricing decisions by bidders. Rationalizing the penalty cap to 10% would help balance risk allocation and enable more competitive pricing, while still ensuring adherence to service quality, performance standards, and contractual obligations. We request the Authority to kindly consider this revision in the interest of fostering healthy competition and achieving optimal value for the project. | | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|---|-------|---|--|--|--|----|------------|
| 71 | Chapter 7 | Measurement Parameter | 48 | Time taken for resolving the issue raised Within 0-1 hours of reporting the issue/ complaint - No penalty | The RFP specifies that issues/complaints must be resolved within 0–1 hour of reporting to avoid penalty. In this regard, we request RISL to kindly consider revising the resolution timeline to 0–3 hours, as a 0–1 hour resolution SLA is extremely stringent and may not be practical for all types of incidents, especially complex technical issues requiring root cause analysis or coordination with OEM support. A 0–3 hour resolution window will ensure realistic service commitments while maintaining high service quality and operational feasibility for bidders. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 72 | Chapter 7 | Measurement Parameter | 48 | After 6 hours of reporting the issue/ complaint - 1% of the quarterly payable amount towards | The RFP states that after 6 hours of reporting an issue/ complaint, a penalty of “1% of the quarterly payable amount towards” will be applicable. In this regard, kindly clarify the clause, as the statement appears incomplete and does not specify whether the penalty is limited towards cost which will be paid on account of Operation & Maintenance (O&M) | | | No | As per RFP |
| 73 | Chapter 7 | Measurement Parameter | 48 | After 12 hours of reporting the issue/ complaint - 2% of the quarterly payable amount towards | The RFP states that after 12 hours of reporting an issue/ complaint, a penalty of “2% of the quarterly payable amount towards” will be applicable. In this regard, kindly clarify the clause, as the statement appears incomplete and does not specify whether the penalty is limited towards cost which will be paid on account of Operation & Maintenance (O&M) | | | No | As per RFP |
| 74 | Chapter 7 | Measurement Parameter | 48 | After 24 hours of reporting the issue/ complaint - 3% of the quarterly payable amount towards per 12 hours | The RFP states that after 24 hours of reporting an issue/ complaint, a penalty of “3% of the quarterly payable amount towards” will be applicable. In this regard, kindly clarify the clause, as the statement appears incomplete and does not specify whether the penalty is limited towards cost which will be paid on account of Operation & Maintenance (O&M) | | | No | As per RFP |
| 75 | Chapter 4 | Section 4 – Scope of Work | 14 | The deployed mailing solution should not be dependent on server-based licensing, while a fixed minimum number of Client and Mailbox servers is prescribed. | Kindly clarify whether bidders proposing solutions with user-based or subscription-based licensing (not linked to server count) may deploy an optimized server architecture, provided functional and performance requirements are met. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 76 | Chapter 4 | Section 4 – Scope of Work | 14 | The solution is required for 80,000 users. | Kindly clarify whether the department anticipates user growth beyond 80,000 during the contract period, and if so, whether pricing for additional users will be governed under the same rate contract terms. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 77 | Chapter 4 | Section 4 – Migration Details | 14-15 | Approximate existing mail data size is 150 TB | Kindly clarify whether the indicated 150 TB mail data size is inclusive of DR replication data and archives, and whether bidders should consider projected data growth during the contract period while sizing the solution. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 78 | Chapter 4 | Section 4 – Scope of Work | 14-16 | Email solution deployment on DC & DR servers. | Kindly clarify whether the scope includes procurement, licensing, and support of operating systems and any third-party dependencies required for the email solution only and OS, DB, Infra etc. will be provided by the department. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 79 | Chapter 4 | Section 4 – Scope of Work, A. Details of Work | 14 | The RFP provides two options to bidders: (i) ATS upgrade of existing Microsoft Exchange 2016 solution, and (ii) provision of a new on-premise email solution for 80,000 users with complete migration from existing solution. | Kindly clarify the number of Microsoft Exchange user licenses (mailboxes) and server licenses currently held by the department. Additionally, please provide the detailed breakup of the incremental Microsoft user and server license requirements to reach the proposed capacity, and specify the licenses for which only Annual Technical Support (ATS) is required for both DC and DR locations. | | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|---|----|---|--|--|--|----|------------|
| 80 | Chapter 7 | I. For initial order (which includes setup/configuration and migration from the Old/existing system) | 47 | 70% WO amount Remaining 30% will be equally divided and paid at the end of each support year. | (i) 80% WO Amount after Delivery Challan for ordered items/licenses (ii) 10% After UAT Report (iii) 10% will be equally divided and paid at the end of each support year. This payment structure balances financial viability for the bidder and ensures the bidder can deliver, implement, and support the project efficiently throughout its lifecycle. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 81 | Chapter 7 | II. For subsequent license orders placed during the rate contract duration (new user onboarding licenses in the new system) | 47 | 70% WO amount Remaining 30% will be equally divided and paid at the end of each support year. | (i) 80% WO Amount after Delivery Challan for ordered items/licenses (ii) 10% After Installation (iii) 10% will be equally divided and paid at the end of each support year. This structure protects the bidder's cash flow, reduces project delivery risks, and ensures sustained support throughout the contract period. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 82 | Chapter 7 | I. For initial order (which includes setup/configuration and migration from the Old/existing system) | 47 | Timeline(T+120) | Timeline(T+150) This timeline ensures that the bidder can deliver the solution without compromising quality, while also mitigating risks associated with supply delays, installation complexities, or unforeseen operational challenges. It balances project feasibility for the bidder and assures the client of timely and successful delivery. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 83 | Chapter 7 | II. For subsequent license orders placed during the rate contract duration (new user onboarding licenses in the new system) | 47 | Timeline(T+15) | Timeline(T+60) This timeline ensures that the bidder can deliver the solution without compromising quality, while also mitigating risks associated with supply delays, installation complexities, or unforeseen operational challenges. It balances project feasibility for the bidder and assures the client of timely and successful delivery. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 84 | Chapter 7 | 2) Service Level Standards/ Requirements/ Agreement | 48 | Maximum applicable penalty shall be 20% of agreed value of item. | Maximum applicable penalty shall be 10% of agreed value of item. We requests a maximum penalty of 10% instead of 20% to ensure a fair and balanced risk allocation. While the bidder is fully committed to timely delivery, installation, and support, unforeseen factors such as OEM supply delays, logistics challenges, or operational dependencies can impact timelines. A 10% penalty is sufficient to incentivize performance without imposing disproportionate financial risk on the bidder, thereby ensuring project feasibility and enabling the bidder to maintain quality, compliance, and sustained support throughout the contract period. | | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|--|-----|--------------------|
| 85 | Chapter 5 | Right to vary quantity | 26 | i. 50% of the quantity of the individual items and 50% of the value of original contract in case of works; and ii. 50% of the value of goods or services of the original contract. | i. 25% of the quantity of the individual items and 25% of the value of original contract in case of works; and ii. 25% of the value of goods or services of the original contract. The bidder's cost structure and supply commitments are based on current market rates. Limiting variation to 25% ensures that the contract remains financially feasible for the bidder, avoiding potential losses due to extreme fluctuations. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 86 | chapter 3 | 8.Cetificates | 12 | The Bidder shall have following certificates: - A. ISO 9001:2015 (For quality Management) or higher B. ISO 27001:2013 or higher certificate. (For Information Security Management) certificate(s). C. CMMI Level -3 or higher certificaes | For wider participation we request you to kindly remove the requirement of CMMI Level 3. Also the solution has been developed by OEM and OEM will complete the migration of existing mailboxes to new solution. Hence, we request you to kindly amend this clause as: The Bidder shall have following certificates: - A. ISO 9001:2015 (For quality Management) or higher B. ISO 27001:2013 or higher certificate. (For Information Security Management) certificate(s). The OEM shall have following certificates 1. CMMI Level -3 or higher certificates | | | No | As per RFP |
| 87 | chapter 3 | 2 | 13 | Average Annual Turnover of the OEM for the last 3 financial years, i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 & 2024-25 should be at least Rs. 90.00 Crores. | Like you have mentioned for SI the same should be mentioned also for the OEM – “Average Annual Turnover of the OEM from IT/ITeS for three financial years should be atleast 250 Crores. Also it should be validated from a 3rd party auditor” | | | No | As per RFP |
| 88 | chapter 3 | | 13 | | Would recommend adding this clause – “The proposed solution shall have a clearly defined roadmap next 7 years and support for 10 years. Documentary proof to validate the same should be attached.” | | | No | As per RFP |
| 89 | A | Technical specification | 14 | The product should not be open source or available as open source and must comply with the Make in India – Class 1 category requirements. | While it is mentioned that the product should not be Open-Source, we also must consider the product offered may have Open-Source Components which may be obsolete and have deficiencies. The clause can be modified as – “The product supplied should be COTS only and will not be an amalgamation of Open-Source Components. No Solution with Open-Source as a primary base shall be acceptable. A written declaration shall be provided which mentions that Open-Source is not the core base of the solution provided.” | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 90 | 34 / 74 / 83 / 110 | Technical specification | 52 / 54 / 55 / 56 | As part of solution RISL/DOIT&C Branded Mobile App for all users is also must.. | OEM Vendor will provide Mobile App but as a part of delivering regular updates and upgrades as Mobile App is updated frequently from PlayStore or AppStore it is not possible to provide a Branded App. Also it violates Security policies of the App Store / Play Store. We would recommend altering this clause to say – “The Mobile App should be the from the same principal OEM and should be updated frequently to incorporate the latest features and functionality” . | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------|-------------------------|---------|--|---|--|--|-----|---|
| 91 | 30 | Technical specification | 52 | Should support CalDV and CardDAV Import | As CalDAV and CardDAV need full access to the system. This is a security risk as you must expose your servers to provide this functionality to others. We have documented attacks or vulnerabilities in this area. We would request changing the clause to – “Should support VCF and iCAL for import and export of Calendar and Contacts” . | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 92 | 50 / 51 / 52 / 53 | Technical specification | 53 | Support for EAI & IDN | EAI – is not a widely used feature and is supported only by a few email solutions. It is also not a popular standard and does have limitations with Email Security Gateways and other corresponding systems. Request you to kindly remove this section. | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 93 | 68 | Technical specification | 54 | The proposed Messaging Solution should be Enterprise Grade with perpetual license(on-prime) and should not include any individual components running on Beta version. A hyperscale, multi-tenant email platform. | While we support a Hyper scalable Email Solution. We would recommend you amend the clause for “Multi-tenant Email Platform” as your deployment is going to On Premises and Single Tenant. Kindly modify this clause as “A Hyper scalable Email Platform which can be Single or Multi-Tenant” | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 94 | Pt 43 | Technical specification | 52 | The solution must support multiple desktop clients, including but not limited to Windows & Mac i.e. Microsoft Outlook, Mozilla, Thunderbird or OEM Native client. | While support for multiple desktop clients is fine why is Native Desktop Client from OEM not selected. This guarantees complete OEM ownership and control and guarantees security. Request you to modify the clause as “The Email software should support OEM provided Native Client (Windows and Mac) from the same Messaging Solution Provider. In addition to this it should support other Desktop clients including but not limited to Windows & Mac i.e. Microsoft Outlook, Mozilla, Thunderbird” | | | No | As per RFP |
| 95 | Annexure 2 | Technical specification | 51 | | AI today provides a great productivity benefit for all organizations and provides seamless GenAI capabilities in Mail. We would request the inclusion of this clause - “Proposed Email Solution should provide for Local Sovereign AI with features for Mail Reply / Summarization and other capabilities to be provided without Internet dependency and guaranteeing data sovereignty, privacy and security” . | | | No | As per RFP, Extension to add this feature may be made available in webmail as and when required |
| 96 | | Technical specification | Generic | | Request to please add this clause – “The Email Solution supplied should be free from all encumbrances of US Export Regulations and should not have any restrictions on usage of encryption / algorithms / standards or any other functionalities should not have any restrictions” . | | | No | As per RFP |
| 97 | 36 | Technical specification | 52 | The solution should support selecting multiple emails from different folders and combining them into one single email, including all attachments from the selected emails. | Not all clients offer this functionality. We provide capability on Client and not on Web Client. We request you to remove the clause as it is Vendor Specific. | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 98 | Annexure 2 | | 51 | | Request you to add the following clause as all Email Solutions are today being designed for productivity and should provide wider capabilities – “Ability to create custom online forms and workflows independent from files and integrated with email solution to allow better coordination and automate key processes.” | | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|----|--|---|--|--|----|-------------|
| 99 | Annexure 2 | OEM Eligibility Criteria | | | Request you to add the following clause as all Email Solutions are today being designed for productivity and should provide wider capabilities – “The solution should have the capability for business staff to create smart web forms without any coding. These forms should replace sending emails with attachments. It should have workflow functionality and ability to integrate data from other applications.” | | | No | As per RFP |
| 100 | Annexure 2 – Point 79 | Section 4 A | 54 | The mail messaging software should be configured in High Availability and 99.9% Uptime for services offered. | We would recommend to also add how 99.9% uptime will be achieved and if there is any dependency / pre-requisite requirement on RISL to procure a certain Virtualization Software / Storage from a single vendor across DC or DR and also the requirement which limits your choice to a single OS across DC or DR. We recommend adding this clause – “The mail messaging software should achieve High Availability and 99.9% uptimes without the need to procure specialized Virtualization Software / OS / Storage from a single vendor across DC and DR and should be compliant with Block Storage and should not be OS Dependent”. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 101 | B - Deployment of resources:- Support Engineer equivalent | 34 / 74 / 83 / 110 | 15 | 3+ years relevant work experience in technical administrative tasks to ensure stability and availability of email servers, troubleshooting, mail routing related issues. | 2+ years relevant work experience in technical administrative tasks to ensure stability and availability of email servers, troubleshooting, mail routing related issues. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 102 | chapter 7 | 30 | 47 | Completion of Supply & Installation Phase as mentioned in 4.(A). 70% WO amount Remaining 30% will be equally divided and paid at the end of each support year. | We request you to kindly change the payment terms as below. 4.(A). 75% WO amount should be given after installation and configuration of mail boxes, 10% should be released after successful migration Remaining 15% will be equally divided and paid in starting of OEM license support for 2nd and 3rd year . | | | No | As per RFP |
| 103 | | | | Average Annual Turnover of the OEM for the last 3 financial years, i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 & 2024-25 should be at least Rs. 90.00 Crores. | Like you have mentioned for SI the same should be mentioned also for the OEM – “Average Annual Turnover of the OEM from IT/ITeS for three financial years should be at least 90 Crores. The same must be certified by a Chartered Accountant (CA) and validated by a Third-Party Inspection Agency (TPIA) OR The OEM shall have an average annual turnover of at least ₹200 Crores from IT/ITeS for the last three financial years. The same must be certified by a Chartered Accountant (CA) and validated by a Third-Party Inspection Agency (TPIA) | | | No | As per RFP |
| 104 | | Additional Clause to added for RISL benefit and smooth transition - | | | The OEM offering the solution shall have a minimum of 1,500 dedicated developers and support personnel on its payroll. Further, all support services for the proposed solution shall be provided from India to ensure data sovereignty, operational continuity, and regulatory compliance. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 105 | | | | | Implementation of the proposed solution and services shall be executed only by OEM Professional Services (PS) personnel , and not by third-party or subcontracted resources. | | | No | As per RFP, |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------------|----|--|---|--|--|----|---|
| 106 | | | | | A minimum stabilization period of 120 days post go-live shall be provided, during which enhanced monitoring and priority support shall be extended to RISL to ensure operational stability by the OEM onsite resources . | | | No | As per RFP, |
| 107 | | 4, A | 14 | The licenses (Ent. Edition/ Highest Version) shall be perpetual and on-premise with software assurance. | Please note that latest Edition on Exchange Server is Subscription based, so kindly do allow the same | | | No | As per RFP, |
| 108 | | 4, A, 3, C | 14 | Installing the new mailing solution at RSDC P4 and creating a replica at the DR site in Jodhpur or as decided by RISL. | Kindly Confirm the Jodhpur DR Site have Active Directory? If yes, is it replicating with Data Center? Has fail-over ever been tested? | | | No | Currently AD server available at RSDC if any version upgradation or established in new AD required will be done by OEM/SI migration team. |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------------------------------|----|---|--|--|--|-----|--|
| 109 | | 4.C.c | 15 | Annual Technical Support for the items as mentioned in Annexure-1 with updates and comprehensive maintenance shall be required for three (3) years from the date golive after migration. | We suggest in case of Miucrosoft ATS, since Microsoft Exchnage is already running, would request Go-live to be same as Supply date of ATS. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 110 | | 4.B | 15 | Implementation and Commissioning - Duration | For the 4-month implementation timeline, does this include the entire migration of all 62,000 mailboxes, or can a phased go-live approach be proposed with full migration extending beyond 4 months? | | | No | As per RFP |
| 111 | | Annexure 1, Table A, S.No. 1 | 50 | Mail boxes with Ent. Edition Licenses | What does "Ent Edition Licenses" mean? Hope you mean Commercial, Professional Edition | | | No | "Ent. Edition Licenses" refers to the Enterprise Edition / highest available edition of the proposed email solution, offering full enterprise-grade features, scalability, and security. It is not intended to restrict the requirement to any specific commercial naming convention such as "Professional" or "Commercial." Bidders may propose the highest edition available in their product portfolio that meets all RFP requirements. It is also clarified that the proposed solution must not be open source or available as open source in any form, as specified in the RFP. |
| 112 | | BoQ-2 | 66 | No. of mail boxes Licenses (Ent. Edition) with 1 year of ATS - 40,000 | Why is this qty 40,000 while the intial quantity is 80,000? Shouldn't the quantities be the same? | | | Yes | As per the Revised RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|----|---|---|--|--|-----|--|
| 113 | | 3, 2, b | 13 | Where the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) of the offered Mail Messaging Software participates directly as the Bidder, and does not bid through any SI, Dealer, Distributor, or Partner, the Bidder shall be required to comply only with the eligibility criteria specified for the OEM, and the Bidder eligibility criteria applicable to SI/partners shall not apply. | Would Request you to kindly change this clause as "Where the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) of the offered Mail Messaging Software participates directly as the Bidder, and does not bid through any SI, Dealer, Distributor, or Partner, the Bidder shall be required to meet both the criteria mentioned for Bidder & OEM" | | | No | As Per RFP |
| 114 | | 4, A | 13 | The product should not be open source or available as open source and must comply with the Make in India – Class 1 category requirements. | Request you to kindly modify this Clause as " The product should not be open source or available as open source and must comply with the Make in India – Class 1 or 2 category requirements." | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 115 | | 4, A, 1 | 13 | The bidder has to upgrade the solution to the latest version of Microsoft Exchange(on-premise) and enhance the perpetual licenses to 80000 users | Request you to kindly modify this Clause as " The bidder has to upgrade the solution to the latest version of Microsoft Exchange(on-premise) for 80000 users." | | | No | As Per RFP |
| 116 | | 4, A, 1 | 13 | The latest upgraded version must comply with the Make in India – Class I category requirements. | The latest upgraded version must comply with the Make in India – Class I or II category requirements. | | | Yes | As Per Revised RFP |
| 117 | | Annexure 1 d | 50 | All hardware / software would be perpetual (on-premise) in nature. | All Hardware / Software would be Perpetual or Subscription (for full Agreement Period) | | | No | As Per RFP |
| 118 | | Annexure 1 b | 50 | All the supplied Hardware/ Software should be Interoperable, IPv6 ready and in compliance with the policies/ guidelines issued by DIT, GoI in this regard | Kindly Confirm does the Bidder need to provide the Hardware also for the mailling Solution | | | No | Infra will be provide by RSDC. In case any other tool required for installation and migration will be arranged by Bidder. |
| 119 | | N/A | | Additional | Kindly confirm if department has Active directory Implemented & bidder is required to provide the integration with the same | | | No | Currently AD server available at RSDC if any version upgradation or established in new AD required will be done by OEM/SI migration team. |
| 120 | | N/A | | Additional | Kindly confirm if department has the Anti Spam / Anti Virus Solution, if Yes confirm the details & till when it is valid, also Hope existing Scurity vendor will provide the integration with the Offered Mail Messaging Solution | | | No | The Current MX Gateway/Antispam used is Cisco IronPort, However Email Solution Must support integration with any MX Gateway/Antispam provided by RISL/DOIT&C |
| 121 | | N/A | | Additional | Kindly confirm on the Existing Mail Messaging License Inventory department has. | | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------------------------|----|--|---|--|--|-----|---|
| 122 | | Annexure 1 g | 50 | The bidder is required to submit the technical compliance statement for each item on the respective OEM's letter-head OR email from OEM. | As per our understanding from Prebid meeting , this clause is applicable only for bidders offering alternate solution | | | No | As per RFP |
| 123 | | 3, 2, 5 | 13 | Supplied product should have compliance make in India Class-I. | Kindly change the clause to " Supplied product should have compliance make in India Class-I or II" | | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 124 | | 3, 2, 4 | 13 | Email OEM must have all the following valid latest certifications | Request you to kindly add following certifications as well : ISO 20000-1:2011 - IT Service Management ISO 22301 - Business Continuity Management PCI DSS - Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard SOC I, II, III - Service Organization Control Reports | | | No | As per RFP |
| 125 | | N/A | | Additional | Kindly Confirm who will provide the Server Operating System (Like Windows Server, CAL, Linux)) | | | No | Operating system will be provided by RSDC |
| 126 | | N/A | | Additional | Confirm the Desktop Client used used by majority of the users & would it require the support with the existing Mail Client | | | No | As per RFP |
| 127 | | As per section 7.1 & 7.3 of the RFP | 47 | Completion of Supply & Installation Phase as mentioned in 4.(A) | We request your kind consideration that 100% payment be released upon delivery of the items/licenses, as the System Integrator (SI) is required to remit 100% payment to the OEM at the time of supply. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 128 | | Annexure 1 g | 50 | The bidder is required to submit the technical compliance statement for each item on the respective OEM's letter-head OR email from OEM. | As per our understanding from the Pre-Bid Meeting, it is noted that this clause is applicable only to bidders offering an alternative solution. Kindly confirm the same. | | | No | OEM/SI must submit their technical specification on their letterhead. In case of Microsoft, the OEM must submit the technical specifications of the latest released On-Premises Enterprise Edition of the mailing solution on official letterhead |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|----|--|--|--|-----|--------------------|
| 129 | Chapter 3. QUALIFICATION/ ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA | 4. Technical Capability | | <p>1) The Bidder must be authorised partner of OEM.</p> <p>2) The bidder must have successfully completed or partially completed one work order of providing mailing solution license (Installation/migration of e-mail solution or similar service) OR Installation/migration with Management/Support of e-mail solution or similar service of value not less than the amount Rs. 2.00 Cr in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>3) The bidder must have successfully completed or partially completed one work order of providing mailing solution license minimum 10000 mailboxes in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>4) The bidder must have successfully completed or partially completed two work order work order of providing mailing solution license Installation/migration of e-mail solution or similar service) of value not less than the amount Rs. 1.00 Crore with 7000 mailboxes each in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards.</p> <p>5) The submitted Work Order(s) pertaining to the Email Software Product shall be from projects of similar nature and scope, successfully implemented in State Government Departments, Central Government Departments, Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs), Financial Institution, BFSI, Public Sector Banks.</p> | <p>Request you to modify the criteria as given below:</p> <p>1) The Bidder must be authorised partner of OEM.</p> <p>2) The bidder must have successfully completed or partially completed one work order of providing mailing solution license (Installation/migration/support of e-mail solution or similar service) OR Installation/migration with Management/Support of e-mail solution OR similar service of value not less than the amount Rs. 2.00 Cr in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>3) The bidder must have successfully completed or partially completed one work order of providing mailing solution license / supporting minimum 10000 mailboxes in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>4) The bidder must have successfully completed or partially completed two work order work order of providing mailing solution license Installation/migration of e-mail solution or similar service) of value not less than the amount Rs. 1.00 Crore with 7000 mailboxes each in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards.</p> <p>5) The submitted Work Order(s) pertaining to the Email Software Product shall be from projects of similar nature and scope, successfully implemented in State Government Departments, Central Government Departments, Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs), Financial Institution, BFSI, Public</p> | | No | As per RFP |
| 130 | | 3. QUALIFICATION/ ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 1) In Case Bidder is System Integrator (SI), Dealers & Distributors 2. Financial: Turnover from IT/ ITeS | 11 | <p>Average Annual Turnover of the bidder from IT/ITeS for three financial years, i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 & 2024-25 should be at least Rs. 50.00 Crores.</p> | <p>As per the tender document, the Average Annual Turnover of the bidder from IT/ITeS for the last three financial years (FY 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25) is stipulated to be at least INR 50.00 Crores. It is respectfully submitted that the prescribed turnover requirement appears to be on the higher side and may limit competition by restricting participation to a very limited number of bidders.</p> <p>In this context, reference is invited to the provisions of the Rajasthan Transparency in Public Procurement (RTPP) Act, 2012, which emphasize fair competition, transparency, and adoption of non-restrictive and proportionate qualification criteria in public procurement. The Act encourages formulation of eligibility conditions that are commensurate with the scope, scale, and complexity of the work, so as to ensure wider participation and value for money.</p> <p>Considering the nature and scope of the IT/ITeS services envisaged under the tender and prevailing industry practices for similar projects, it is requested to kindly review and revise the minimum average annual turnover requirement from INR 50.00 Crores to INR 15.00 Crores, which would promote healthy competition while remaining aligned with the objectives and principles of the RTPP Act.</p> | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|--|--|-----|--------------------|
| 131 | 3. QUALIFICATION/ ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 1) In Case Bidder is System Integrator (SI), Dealers & Distributors 4. Technical Capability | 11 | 1) The Bidder must be authorised partner of OEM. 2) The bidder must have successfully completed or partially completed one work order of providing mailing solution license (Installation/migration of e-mail solution or similar service) Or Installation/migration with Management/Support of e-mail solution or similar service of value not less than the amount Rs. 2.00 Cr in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards. OR 3) The bidder must have successfully completed or partially completed one work order of providing mailing solution license minimum 10000 mailboxes in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards. OR 4) The bidder must have successfully completed or partially completed two work order work order of providing mailing solution license Installation/migration of e-mail solution or similar service) of value not less than the amount Rs. 1.00 Crore with 7000 mailboxes each in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards. 5) The submitted Work Order(s) pertaining to the Email Software Product shall be from projects of similar nature and scope, successfully implemented in State Government Departments, Central Government Departments, Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs), Financial Institution, BFSI, Public Sector Banks, proivate organisations. | You are requested to kindly modify the clause as below: 1) The Bidder must be authorised partner of OEM. 2) The bidder must have Ongoing or successfully completed or partially completed one work order of providing mailing solution license (Installation/migration of e-mail solution or similar service) Or Installation/migration with Management/Support of e-mail solution or similar service of value not less than the amount Rs. 2.00 Cr in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards. OR 3) The bidder must have Ongoing or successfully completed or partially completed one work order of providing mailing solution license minimum 10000 mailboxes in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards. OR 4) The bidder must have Ongoing or successfully completed or partially completed two work order work order of providing mailing solution license Installation/migration of e-mail solution or similar service) of value not less than the amount Rs. 1.00 Crore with 7000 mailboxes each in India during the period from 01/04/2021 onwards. 5) The submitted Work Order(s) pertaining to the Email Software Product shall be from projects of similar nature and scope, successfully implemented in State Government Departments, Central Government Departments, Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs), Financial Institution, BFSI, Public Sector Banks, proivate organisations. | | No | As per RFP |
| 132 | 3. QUALIFICATION/ ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 1) The OEM of the Mail Messaging software shall possess the following minimum qualification/ eligibility criteria 2. Financial: Turnover | 13 | Average Annual Turnover of the OEM for the last 3 financial years, i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 & 2024-25 should be at least Rs. 90.00 Crores. | It is respectfully noted that the current bid conditions prescribe a higher financial eligibility requirement in cases where the System Integrator (SI) and OEM are the same legal entity, while other bidder configurations are evaluated under different criteria, despite there being no corresponding change in the Scope of Work, Deliverables, or Operational Responsibilities. This distinction may unintentionally result in differential treatment among bidders and may not be fully aligned with the principles of fairness, equal opportunity, and proportionality under the RTPP Act and Rules. In this regard, it is humbly requested that the financial eligibility conditions be reviewed and, if deemed appropriate, rationalized to ensure uniform and equitable evaluation of all eligible bidders in accordance with established public procurement norms. | | Yes | As per Revised RFP |
| 133 | 3. QUALIFICATION/ ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 1) The OEM of the Mail Messaging software shall possess the following minimum qualification/ eligibility criteria 3. Experience - Mailboxes & Organizations | 13 | Email software OEM should have experience of providing mailboxes to at least 5,00,000 users during last 3 years. | The Email Software Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) shall have demonstrated experience in designing, deploying, and providing an enterprise-grade email messaging solution catering to a minimum of 1,00,000 users during the preceding three (3) years. The deployment shall be a single deployment and should include core functionalities such as mail routing, storage management, security controls, user authentication, and system administration, supported by verifiable documentary evidence such as completion certificates, client references, or self-certified deployment details. | | No | As per RFP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|----|--|---|--|--|----|---|
| 134 | | 4. SCOPE OF WORK, DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINES 2. Alternatively, the SI may provide new Email solution: | 14 | The deployed mailing solution should not be dependent on server-based licensing. The SI/Bidder shall deploy the mailing solution on a minimum of 16 servers (10 Client + 6 Mailbox) at the DC and 8 servers (5 Client + 3 Mailbox) at the DR. The procuring entity may increase or decrease the number of servers on which the mailing solution is deployed at the RSDC and DR sites, as per requirements. | As per the tender clause, the mailing solution is required to be deployed on a fixed minimum number of servers with defined client and mailbox roles at DC and DR sites. It is submitted that such role-wise, fixed server specifications appear to be aligned with a particular deployment model. Several enterprise mailing solutions are architected to allow infrastructure sizing and server roles to be determined based on actual user load, performance, high availability, and disaster recovery requirements, with the System Integrator/Bidder proposing the suitable architecture and corresponding Bill of Materials (BoM), without any dependency on server-based licensing. In this regard, it is requested to kindly consider allowing bidders to propose a vendor-neutral, requirement-based architecture, wherein the number of servers and their roles are derived through sizing and design justification rather than being prescribed upfront. | | | No | As per RFP |
| 135 | | ANNEXURE-2: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS (to be submitted on OEM Letterhead) Web Mail Client 35 | 52 | The Webmail client should support Dark Mode and multilingual. | Kindly provide clarification on the languages supported by the web client. Additionally, we request confirmation on whether the mobile application is also required to support multiple languages, as this requirement is not explicitly mentioned in the tender specifications. This information will help bidders align the proposed solution accordingly. | | | No | The webmail client should support English, Hindi primarily. |
| 136 | | General | - | General | It is observed that the tender document does not explicitly provide any exemption or relaxation for Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) / MSMEs with respect to Tender Fee, minimum turnover requirement, and prior experience criteria. The Government of India, through the Public Procurement Policy for Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) Order, 2012 issued by the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, along with subsequent amendments and office orders, has mandated facilitation of MSE participation in public procurement, including exemption from payment of Tender Fee, consideration for relaxation in qualification criteria such as turnover and experience, wherever feasible. Further, the Government of India's flagship initiatives such as Atmanirbhar Bharat, Make in India, and Vocal for Local emphasize strengthening domestic capabilities and encouraging indigenous MSMEs to participate in government tenders and projects. These initiatives aim to ensure inclusive growth, promote innovation, and reduce dependency on imports by enabling capable MSMEs to compete on a level playing field. In view of the above policy framework and the Government of India's stated mission to promote MSME participation in public procurement, it is requested to kindly clarify whether eligible MSE/MSME bidders, registered under Udyam or | | | No | As per RFP |