

Clarifications to Queries Received (Email and Pre-Bid Meeting held on 24 August 2026) – RFP No. 6/ISA-MDTF/2026-ISA

Date: 25.09.2026

Subject: RFP for Appointment of a System Integrator (SI) for AI-Enabled Interoperable Utility Intelligence Platform for Network Planning, Grid Analytics and DER Integration

Clause Reference (Page)	Content of RFP	Query	Answers/Suggestions	ISA RESPONSE
	1.Subcontractor credentials in evaluation	Section 4.2 awards marks under "Relevant Project Experience", "Demonstrated Experience in Multi-Software Integration" and "Availability of COTS Software Solution" to the "Sole Bidder / Lead Bidder / any Consortium Member". Where a party participates as a subcontractor rather than a consortium member, will that party's credentials, references and work orders be counted toward these criteria, and may its personnel be included in the Key Personnel count?		As per the RFP, the credentials may be of the Sole Bidder, Lead Bidder, or any Consortium Member, as applicable.

	2. Quality certification held across the bidding team	Under "Quality Certification", the criterion refers to the Sole/Lead Bidder holding ISO 9001, with additional marks for further certifications such as ISO 27001 and ISO 20000. Where the Lead Bidder holds ISO 9001 and a consortium member or subcontractor holds ISO 27001, will the additional certification be recognised for scoring purposes?		All certifications under "Quality Certification" refer to the Sole/Lead Bidder.
	3. Contracting entity on award	In the event of award to a bidder incorporated outside India, will the contract be executed with the bidder's home-country entity, or is registration of an Indian entity, branch office or project office required at the time of contract signature?		As per RFP the lead/sole bidder shall have the rights

	4. On-site deployment expectation	The Terms of Reference require the SI to deploy qualified manpower at corporate and field levels. Does ISA or APEPDCL specify a minimum headcount, role mix or deployment location for the implementation and Facility Management phases, beyond what is set out in the Facility Management and SLA sections? Is deployment expected at the Visakhapatnam corporate office only, or at each of the 7 circle offices?		As per the RFP, the Bidder shall ensure timely fulfilment of the specified deliverables and SLA requirements. The Bidder shall determine the appropriate resource deployment and approach to meet the stipulated timelines.

Solution Requirements, 'GenAI Subscription Flexibility & Interoperability' (p.55)	• Two options offered: DISCOM's own GenAI subscription via API key, in lieu of the SI's subscription • Or: an optional connector to DISCOM's own GenAI application	We appreciate the flexibility already built into this requirement; our submission is only to widen it a little further. • Both options as drafted still depend on an external, recurring GenAI subscription - the SI's or the DISCOM's own. • Neither, as we read it, gives the DISCOM the choice of a fully self-hosted, subscription-free deployment within its own environment. • We would therefore like to propose, for APEPDCL's consideration, a third option - Open-Source LLM Deployment - under which APEPDCL provides the required GPU/server infrastructure and the SI deploys an open-source LLM on it, with the model instance remaining entirely within the DISCOM's environment. This removes the need for an external recurring GenAI subscription. Trade-offs we would like to flag openly • The deployed model remains relatively static unless separately updated; adopting newer open-source releases requires additional effort. • Periodic maintenance, upgrades, compatibility testing and optimisation would be needed and will be scoped		Suitable deployment options may be considered during solution architecture planning, subject to project requirements and feasibility.

		and priced separately. • Output quality and capability may not match proprietary, managed commercial GenAI models. • In short: managed-subscription capability versus self-hosted infrastructure ownership and control, with added maintenance responsibility. Requested Amendment • Add a third option - Open-Source LLM Deployment on APEPDCL-provided infrastructure - to the GenAI Subscription Flexibility & Interoperability requirement. • Subject to the trade-offs noted alongside.		

Exit Management and Handover, Clause (a) (p.113) read with IP and Rights, Sub-clause (i) 'Ownership of Insights' (p.93) and Deliverables - 'Scalable AI/ML Model' (p.93)	• SI must “hand over complete, editable documentation, source code, AI/ML models, schemas and APIs” on exit • Separately, “all processed data, derived insights and trained ML models” are vested as APEPDCL's exclusive property • Four provisions each separately require the SI's source code and/or platform architecture to pass to APEPDCL or a third party: - To APEPDCL and ISA on exit - To any third-party successor for re-platforming - As a standard deployment deliverable - APEPDCL is separately granted perpetual, exclusive rights to the “Baseline Release” plus all future enhancements	We fully appreciate the intent behind this clause. We would like to set out our position candidly and with apologies in advance, as we know it limits what we can commit to here. • As drafted, the provision brings together two categories that enterprise software contracts normally keep distinct. We would respectfully suggest the following distinction: - Category 1 - DISCOM data and DISCOM-specific results. All data supplied by, or generated from, APEPDCL's own systems - meter readings, billing data, feeder and transformer data, GIS and network topology data, SCADA and sensor data - together with the DISCOM-specific outputs the platform generates from it: aggregated data outputs associated with DISCOM assets or datasets, feeder-level AT&C loss figures, transformer health scores, reports and dashboard outputs. APEPDCL's data remains APEPDCL's property, the results are licensed to APEPDCL, and both are handed over in full on exit. - Category 2 - the SI's platform intelligence and underlying IP. Algorithms, scoring methodology, anomaly-detection models, benchmark methodologies, feature engineering,	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

		statistical models, AI models, generic insights, system-generated patterns and anonymised intelligence - together with the platform architecture, data schemas, storage design, database structures, processing pipelines, indexing logic, process-flow diagrams, internal workflow documentation, report templates, source code and builds that embody them. As per company policy, these should remain the SI's IP and cannot be handed over. This extends to APEPDCL-specific customisations and enhancements. A customised build remains part of the SI's platform and, regrettably, cannot be transferred on exit or vested as APEPDCL's property. • This is a SaaS / managed-service procurement rather than a bespoke software-development contract. The COTS applications offered represent development investment several multiples of the subscription price proposed to ISA/APEPDCL. This heavy commercial subsidisation is premised on continued protection of our underlying proprietary IP. • Section 4.3 of the Evaluation Criteria itself awards marks for bidders with a ready-built, proven COTS platform - by definition pre-existing IP developed	perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

		independently of this contract. Requiring that platform's source code, process flows, internal workflows and algorithms to be surrendered (to APEPDCL, to ISA, or to a competing successor) does not sit well with the basis on which the platform is being evaluated and procured. • The principle we would ask APEPDCL to adopt is the one used across enterprise contracts: the customer owns the facts and the results; the vendor owns the technology used to turn those facts into results. Receiving the results does not transfer ownership of the IP embodied in producing them. • To make sure this is not felt as a gap, we will provide APEPDCL complete documentation and manuals to independently access, navigate and export its own data, so that any transition is smooth and unhindered. Standard Industry Practices • This customer-data / results / derived-intelligence / underlying-IP distinction is standard in enterprise SaaS contracting. Customers are given ownership of Customer Data and all results derived from it, while expressly reserving to the vendor its software, algorithms, logic, models, architecture,		

		report templates, visualisations and dashboards - and confirms that outputs containing vendor IP do not transfer ownership of that IP. • A utility subscribing to Google Workspace, AWS, etc receives full access to contracted functionality and can export all of its own data and configurations at any time, but never receives the underlying source code - including for tenant-specific configuration built for it. • Subscriptions provide capability and data portability, not code ownership. Requested Amendments • We respectfully request that Clause (a) and Sub-clause (i) be amended to record this distinction between Category 1 and Category 2. • APEPDCL retains all right, title and interest in Category 1 - DISCOM data and the DISCOM-specific results generated for it - transferred in full, in usable and documented form, on exit. • The SI retains all right, title and interest in Category 2 - algorithms, scoring methodology, anomaly-detection models, benchmark methodologies, feature engineering, statistical models, AI models and model architecture, generic insights, system-		

		generated patterns, anonymised intelligence, schemas, storage and platform architecture, process documentation, builds and source code - which are excluded from vesting and from handover. • Confirm that APEPDCL's access to and use of the results does not transfer ownership of the SI's underlying IP embodied in them. • Confirm that the perpetual rights granted to APEPDCL under Clause (b)(ii) extend to use of the platform and to APEPDCL's data and outputs, not to ownership or transfer of the build itself.		

Exit Management and Handover, Clause (b)(i) 'ISA's Rights' (p.113-114)	ISA is granted “perpetual, global, royalty-free and sub-licensable” rights to the “Baseline Release”	We raise this only so that the drafting can be tightened and we are confident the reading below is not the intent. - Read literally, a sub-licensable, global right would allow ISA to redistribute our platform, free of charge, to any of its 120-plus member and signatory countries - effectively our entire addressable market - in exchange for a single ISA-funded subscription year. - The company-policy position at the query above applies here as well, and to sub-licensing as much as to transfer: Category 2 items - platform IP, source code, architecture and builds, including customised builds - cannot be transferred or sub-licensed to any party. Only Category 1 may be shared. - We are not aware of any standard SaaS enterprise subscription that grants a third party an unlimited, worldwide right to sub-license or redistribute the vendor's software free of cost to other customers, as a term of one client's subscription. Requested Amendment - Confirm that ISA's rights are limited to its own internal use - monitoring, evaluation, reporting and case studies. - Route any broader replication	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

		through a separate commercial arrangement, which we would be very glad to discuss.	perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Section 5 – Roles and Responsibilities: Allocation of IT Infrastructure and Server/Cloud Resources; Annexure 2 – Server Capacity Sizing (Pg. 111–112 & 139)	The RFP requires provision of necessary server sizing and capacity, cloud storage or on-premise and networking resources for hosting and running the proposed system. Annexure 2 also mandates bidders to provide detailed server sizing, including Application Servers, DB Servers, storage and GPU requirements.	Kindly clarify whether the servers, storage, GPU/compute infrastructure, networking, cloud resources and Disaster Recovery infrastructure required for hosting and operating the proposed solution will be provided/procured by APEPDCL, or whether the same are required to be supplied/procured by the SI and included in the Financial Proposal.		As per RFP under "responsibilities of Discom"
Section 5 – Integration with DISCOM Data Systems & Roles and Responsibilities (Pg. 75–78 & 110–111)	The SI is required to undertake bidirectional integration with various existing systems including GIS, SCADA, RMS, AMI/MDMS, OMS/DMS, ERP/CIS, Billing and other IT/OT platforms. The RFP further states that the DISCOM shall facilitate integration by providing relevant APIs, interface specifications, database schemas, data dictionaries, sample datasets and technical documentation wherever available.	Kindly confirm whether APEPDCL will provide all required APIs, interface specifications, database schemas, data dictionaries, sample datasets, test environments, access credentials and necessary coordination with existing OEM/application vendors. Further, kindly clarify who shall bear any third-party OEM, API, connector, customization or licensing charges required for such integrations.		APEPDCL will support and facilitate access to available information and coordination with relevant stakeholders. The SI shall make the necessary arrangements and deliver the solution and integrations as per the RFP. If any additional tools are required for integrations it is in the bidders scope

BDS No. 8 – Liquidated Damages & Facility Management Phase SLA (Pg. 20–21 & 116–121)	BDS No. 8 specifies Liquidated Damages at 5% of the total contract sum per week, subject to a maximum of 20% of the total contract sum. Separately, the Facility Management SLA provides individual performance penalties and states that the total cumulative SLA penalty shall be capped at 18% of the quarterly invoice amount.	Kindly clarify whether Liquidated Damages under BDS No. 8 and penalties under the Facility Management SLA are mutually exclusive for the same event/default, or whether both may be imposed cumulatively for the same breach.		Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

Section 5 – Intellectual Property (IP) and Rights / Exit Management and	The RFP provides that processed Utility data, derived insights and trained ML models resulting from Utility data shall remain the property of the Utility. It also provides perpetual rights relating to the Baseline	Kindly clarify and confirm that all pre-existing/proprietary COTS software, source code, algorithms, libraries, frameworks, AI models and other background Intellectual Property owned by the	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

				perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Handover (Pg. 93 & 113–114)	Release and requires third-party software, subscriptions and certificates to be registered in APEPDCL's name, with licenses/credentials handed over upon exit.	SI and/or Consortium Members prior to this assignment shall continue to remain the property of the respective owner, while ISA/APEPDCL shall receive the necessary usage/perpetual licence rights for the solution, as applicable.	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

				perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.c

BDS No. 19 – Maximum Expected Duration of Contract / Section 5 – Project Management (Pg. 22 & 96)	The BDS specifies that project deliverables shall be completed within nine (9) months from commencement of the contract. The implementation schedule also envisages Production Go-Live and Final Acceptance at T0 + 9 months, followed by Facility Management Services post Go-Live.	Considering the extensive scope involving assessment of existing IT/OT architecture, integration with multiple systems, AI/ML and Agentic AI modules, network modelling, GIS, load-flow analysis, cybersecurity, testing, UAT, training, commissioning and stabilization, we request ISA/APEPDCL to kindly consider extending the implementation period from nine (9) months to twelve (12) months to allow adequate time for integration, testing, validation and successful Go-Live.	As per RFP "Note" on page no 108

Section 4.2 – Minimum Eligibility Criteria: Relevant Project Experience (Pg. 24)	The RFP requires the Sole Bidder/Lead Bidder/any Consortium Member to have successfully implemented eligible projects involving AI-enabled Digital Utility Platforms, Digital Twin solutions, network analysis, AI/ML, IT/OT system integration and related technologies within the last three (3) years, executed or under execution from the date of issuance of the RFP.	Considering that large-scale power utility digital transformation, Digital Twin, AI/ML and IT/OT integration projects generally have longer implementation and operational cycles, we request ISA/APEPDCL to kindly consider projects executed/completed during the last five (5) to seven (7) years instead of restricting the qualifying experience to the last three (3) years. This will enable wider participation of experienced firms having proven utility-sector implementation experience.		As per RFP
Submission Date	The current deadline for submission of proposals is 13 September 2026.	Considering the extensive scope of work and the time required for preparation of a comprehensive technical and financial proposal, we kindly request ISA/APEPDCL to consider extending the proposal submission deadline by at least two (2) weeks.		As per RFP and issued Corrigendum

Section 30.1 (Evaluation of Technical and Financial Proposals) read with the technical evaluation criterion "Proposed Solution Demonstration"	ISA may invite technically responsive bidders for a presentation related to their technical proposals; conditions to be provided where required.	Bidders would be grateful if ISA could confirm the mode of the solution demonstration (online or in person) and, if in person, the location and indicative date, to enable appropriate planning.		The solution demonstration shall be conducted in person at Delh/Vizagi. The date and venue shall be communicated to shortlisted bidders with 7– 10 days' notice.
Scope of Work / Operations & Maintenance — "24x7 Support Hub (L1, L2, L3)"; Training Locations (Corporate Office and Site Offices)	The SI shall provide 24x7 support and conduct training and change- management activities at Utility premises; deployment model is not prescribed.	Please confirm whether ISA/APEPDCL requires a minimum on-site resource presence at APEPDCL premises during the implementation and post–Go-Live subscription phases, or whether the on-site/remote delivery split may be proposed at the bidder's discretion within the stated SLAs.		As per the RFP, the Bidder shall ensure timely fulfilment of the specified deliverables and SLA requirements. The Bidder shall determine the appropriate resource deployment and approach to meet the stipulated timelines.
Note 2 (Familiarization Visit)	Prospective bidders may, with prior approval from ISA/APEPDCL, visit the APEPDCL Corporate Office, Visakhapatnam, to familiarize themselves with the existing IT/OT infrastructure.	Please confirm the procedure and cut- off date for requesting the familiarization visit, and whether the relevant IT/OT infrastructure details can additionally be shared through a documented briefing for planning purposes.		As per rfp

Section 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria	JV/Consortium is allowed under the contract.	Can consortium members jointly satisfy eligibility requirements, or must the lead bidder independently meet all criteria?		As per the RFP, credentials may be considered as applicable.
Section 4.2 Relevant Project Experience	Experience in utility, AI and digital platform projects.	Will international utility-sector project experience be considered for qualification?		Yes
Section 4.2 Relevant Project Experience	Projects executed or under execution within last three years are eligible.	Can ongoing projects with substantial completion be considered for qualification?		Yes and as per rfp
Section 4.2 Relevant Project Experience	Eligible projects include utility digitalization and AI implementations.	Please clarify if completion certificates are acceptable where signed contracts/work orders are unavailable for pilot projects.		Yes as per RFP
Form G / Commercial Proposal	Pricing to include implementation and subscription components.	Should cloud infrastructure costs be included for the entire contract duration?		No as per RFP
Payment Terms & Conditions	Contract pricing and milestone-based payments.	How will tax variations during contract execution be treated?		As per RFP
Payment Terms & Conditions	The contract includes subscription and service components.	Please clarify whether future subscription extension pricing should be included in the financial proposal.		As per RFP note in pg no 134

Section 5 Introduction / Project Area / Annexure Capacity Sizing	Platform sizing depends on utility asset and data volumes.	Please provide estimated data volumes, number of feeders, substations, consumers, DER assets, and historical data size.		As per RFP pg no 32
Section 5 System Architecture / Deployment	On-premise, cloud or hybrid deployment may be adopted.	Is deployment expected on-premises, cloud, or hybrid infrastructure?		As per RFP Annexure 2
Section 5 User Management & Security (DR Requirements)	DR setup shall be implemented with agreed RTO/RPO.	Please confirm RTO and RPO requirements.		Maximum RTO is 1 Hr and Maximum RPO 15 minutes
Performance Requirements / Platform Scalability	Solution must support enterprise-scale users.	What is the expected user load and concurrent user volume?		Baseline user base across the existing DISCOMs shall be considered as approximately 10,000 users, with concurrent users assumed at 30% of the total user base. However, the SI shall ensure that the system capacity, scalability and performance remain compliant with the prescribed SLA requirements throughout the Contract Period, irrespective of any increase in the total user base or concurrent users beyond the aforesaid baseline.

AI Agent Builder & Advanced AI Capabilities	AI models and GenAI capabilities are required.	Are custom AI/ML models mandatory, or can commercial AI platforms be leveraged?		Bidders to consider all propose available solutions, with the final approach to be finalized during the architecture and design phase, in line with the RFP requirements.
AI-Driven Analytics	AI-driven forecasting and recommendations are required.	Please clarify whether bidders may leverage foundation models/LLMs provided by hyperscalers or must develop proprietary models.		Bidders to consider all propose available solutions, with the final approach to be finalized during the architecture and design phase, in line with the RFP requirements.
AI Agent Builder / GenAI Subscription Flexibility	Utility may provide its own GenAI subscriptions.	Please clarify responsibilities for GenAI licensing, token consumption and API subscription costs.		Existing subscriptions, if any, may be considered, subject to applicability and availability.
AI-Driven Analytics / Data Integration	AI training relies on historical datasets.	Will historical datasets be provided for model training and validation?		Yes as per RFP
AI Governance / Explainable AI Requirements	AI outputs must be explainable and auditable.	What explainability requirements are expected for AI recommendations?		As per rfp "Development of AI/ML Logic" pgno 97
Section 5 Integration with DISCOM Systems	Multiple enterprise systems shall be integrated.	Please provide a detailed list of systems to be integrated.		As per rfp pgno 75 to 78

Section 5 Data Integration	Existing systems such as GIS, SCADA, MDMS, ERP etc. will be integrated.	Will API documentation, interface specifications and sample datasets be provided before implementation?		Detailed integration requirements finalized during the architecture and design phase as per the RFP.
Section 5 Integration with DISCOM Systems	Large-scale bidirectional integrations are required.	Please clarify the availability and quality of APIs in legacy systems proposed for integration.		Detailed integration requirements finalized during the architecture and design phase as per the RFP.
Section 5 Integration Requirements	Real-time and near-real-time integrations are envisaged.	Are real-time integrations mandatory for all systems?		as per RFP
Network Protection & Security	Compliance with multiple cybersecurity requirements is required.	Which cybersecurity standards must be complied with (ISO 27001, IEC 62443, CERT-In, etc.)?		As per sub point no "vii" under the clause
User Management & Security	Encryption of data at rest and in transit is mandatory.	What encryption standards are required for data at rest and in transit?		Encryption requirements shall be finalized during the architecture and design phase, in line with the RFP and applicable standards.
Governance & Incident Management	Third-party VAPT is required before Go-Live.	Is third-party VAPT mandatory before production rollout?		as per rfp
Data Privacy & Security	Utility data governance requirements are specified.	Must all application and operational data remain within India?		Yes as per RFP
User Management & Security / SIEM Integration	Security event monitoring and SIEM integration are referenced.	Is SIEM/SOC integration mandatory?		As per RFP

Facility Management Services / SLA Support	Support model and incident management framework are defined.	Please provide severity classification definitions for incidents.		The framework shall be dynamic and self-learning. Incident categories and severity levels shall be proposed by the successful bidder and finalized jointly with APEPDCL and ISA during the architecture and design phase.
Facility Management Phase SLA Overview	Availability SLA requirements are defined.	What availability percentage is required during operations?		As per RFP "Service Delivery & Performance Monitoring"
Facility Management Phase SLA Overview	SLA penalties and credits apply during FMS phase.	Please clarify SLA penalty and service credit calculations.		As per RFP "Service Delivery & Performance Monitoring"
Facility Management Services	FMS support obligations are defined in the RFP.	Is dedicated onsite support mandatory during Facility Management Services?		As per the RFP, the Bidder shall maintain the required team composition and deploy resources, in line with the deliverables and SLA requirements.
Intellectual Property & Rights	Ownership provisions are defined for software and insights.	Who owns AI models, derived datasets, and generated insights after project completion?		As per RFP" Exit Management & pre bid Clarifications"
Data Migration & Deliverables	Historical datasets will be transformed and migrated.	What is the estimated historical data volume to be migrated?		As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP

Roles & Responsibilities	SI responsible for data validation and quality improvements.	Who is responsible for data cleansing and remediation?		As per the "Roles and Responsibilities & Deliverables" under the RFP
Payment Terms & Milestones	Milestone acceptance drives payment release.	Please provide detailed milestone-wise acceptance criteria.		As per RFP
Project Management / Implementation Framework	Nine-month implementation schedule is proposed.	Is phased rollout acceptable or is a single go-live expected?		As per RFP
	IT Systems Deployed	Please confirm which IT systems (e.g., ADMS, GIS, SCADA, ERP, CRM) are currently deployed across the seven circles.		As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP
	Centralized Control Room	Do you have a centralized power system control room for monitoring and managing the entire distribution network?		As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP
	Billing Module Status	Is the billing module an independent system or part of a larger ERP solution? Please clarify.		As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP
	Historical Data Availability	Will you provide historical consumer, billing, and asset data for the last three years for the seven circles?		As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP

	Asset Performance Data	For asset data, do you capture remote performance data for transformers, RMUs, auto-reclosers, and sectionalizers, including operation logs and failure counts?		As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP
	Numerical Relays & Fault Data	Do you have numerical relays in the field, and are you currently capturing fault data from these devices?		As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP
	System Integrator Role	The tender mentions a COTS solution. Are we expected to act as a system integrator, integrating data from various field systems into a common platform?		As per Section 5 of the RFP
RFP Notice:	Estimated Project Cost	Request ISA to kindly share the Estimated Project Cost.		Bidders are requested to submit their financial proposals as per the RFP requirements.

Section 4. Evaluation Criteria Relevant Project Experience	The Sole Bidder/Lead Bidder/any Consortium Member should have successfully implemented Eligible Projects involving AI-enabled Digital Utility Platforms, Digital Twin solutions, network analysis, predictive models using AI/ML, utility IT/OT system integration, Large Language Model (LLM)-based applications, Agentic AI, AI copilots, multi-agent AI systems, utility-scale AI/ML solutions, interoperable utility data platforms for any Power Distribution/Generation/Transmission Company, Renewable Energy Utility, or other Critical Infrastructure Sector within the last three (3) years executed or under execution from the date of issuance of this RFP:	We understand that AMISP projects with end to end AMI installation including HES integration, MDM integration with utility IT/OT system and analytics of consumer data, applications on cloud, etc. in power sector will be considered against the required criteria. Kindly confirm our understanding is correct.		Yes

Section 4. Evaluation Criteria 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria (Pre-Requisite)	Availability of COTS Software Solution Sole/ Lead Bidder/ any other Consortium Member • No demonstrated COTS-based AI-enabled solution for the Power Sector – 0 • Demonstrated COTS software solution with AI-enabled web-based applications for the Power Sector – 5 • Demonstrated COTS software solution with operational AI-enabled web applications for digitised and geotagged power utility asset management, monitoring, analytics, forecasting, or decision support dashboards in the Power Sector – 10	As outlined in the Eligibility Criteria, it is understood that ISA desires a COTS solution for the proposed project. However, given the functionality specified, it is unlikely that a single COTS solution been implemented across the power sector with the complete scope of features outlined in this RFP. In view of the above, we request ISA to kindly consider the following: 1. Allow bidders to propose a bespoke/customized solution; and 2. Incorporate a corresponding minimum marking criterion for bespoke solutions within the Eligibility/Technical Evaluation Criteria.	Solutions shall be considered eligible only where the proposed solution has been proven through deployment and is operational in a working environment, as per the RFP.

Section 3. Bid Data Sheet	Liquidated Damages b. Where there is non-satisfactory performance of the contract in line with the contract terms, the contractor shall be liable to pay ISA the liquidated damages of a weekly charge of 5% (five percent) of the total contract sum, for each week of the weekly occurrence, up to a maximum amount of 20% (twenty percent) of the contract sum; which surcharge is deductible from the vendor's outstanding invoices.	The RFP stipulates Liquidated Damages of 5% in the event the Contractor fails to deliver the specified deliverables within the stipulated timelines, or in cases of non-satisfactory performance not in conformity with the contract terms. The LD of 5% appears considerably high considering similar tenders issued by utilities in the power sector typically prescribe LD at the rate of 0.5% per week of delay or non-satisfactory performance, subject to a reasonable overall cap. In light of the above, we request ISA to kindly review and reconsider the LD provision and align it with prevailing industry benchmarks.	Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

Form G: Financial Proposal Form	The Bidder shall quote a single, all-inclusive annual subscription fee, which shall remain fixed and applicable throughout the entire five (5) year subscription period. The subscription shall initially be contracted for a period of one (1) year from the date of Go-Live. The subscription cost for the initial one (1) year period shall be borne entirely by ISA, and APEPDCL shall not have any payment or financial obligation towards the subscription during this period. APEPDCL shall, however, reserve the right, at its sole discretion, to continue the subscription for a further period of four (4) years, subject to the satisfactory performance of the Agency during the initial one (1) year period, availability of budgetary provisions, and the continued requirement of APEPDCL. During the extended four (4) year period, the annual subscription fee shall remain the same as the rate quoted by the successful Bidder and shall be borne by APEPDCL.	kindly confirm our understanding that the payment towards (a) Implementation of the solution, and (b) the subscription fee for the initial one (1) year period (from the date of Go-Live), shall be borne entirely by ISA.	Yes as per the RFP

Section 3. Bid Data Sheet	Max. File Size per transmission: 5 MB	We kindly request you to allow a maximum file size of 50 MB to maintain the proposal's original quality and integrity.	Kindly allow 50 MB file	As per RFP
RFP Notice	Last date for receipt of documents as per RFP 13.09.2026	Due to the holiday period, we kindly request a three-week extension, extending the submission deadline to 04.10.2026.	Kindly allow three-week extension of the submission deadline.	As per RFP and issued Corrigendum
Section 5 – Introduction / Project Area	APEPDCL has existing comprehensive GIS mapping from feeder to consumer level and the SI shall integrate with the existing GIS to enable updated as-built network visibility.	The RFP refers to existing GIS but does not specify its present data quality, completeness, accuracy or technology/platform.	Please confirm the existing GIS platform/OEM, database technology, GIS data model/schema, spatial reference system, data formats, current data quality and percentage completeness for the 7 Circles. Please also provide a representative sample GIS dataset for estimation.	As per RFP

Section 5 – Project Area / Asset Baseline	The project area covers 7 Circles/Districts and provides baseline quantities for substations, feeders, DTs, LT feeders, consumer meters and rooftop SPG.	The stated quantities may vary at the time of actual execution. This can materially affect GIS validation, migration and network modelling effort.	Please confirm whether the quoted scope shall be based on the baseline quantities given in the RFP or actual quantities at project commencement. Any quantity variation beyond the baseline should be treated through a defined change/variation mechanism.	as per the rfp "Scalability for Network expansion" and other subsequent clauses
b.2.2.1 – Static Asset Data	Static asset registries, GIS layers, feeder configurations and transformer records are to be provided for one-time digitization and periodic updates.	The RFP uses the term “one-time digitization” although existing GIS is stated to be comprehensive. The extent of digitization/rectification is therefore unclear.	Please clarify whether the SI is required to perform complete physical/GPS survey and re-digitization of all assets in the 7 Circles, or only cleansing, validation and updating of the existing GIS/network data.	as per the rfp "Intelligent Network Analytics & Decision Support" and other subsequent clauses

b.3.1–b.3.2 – On-Ground Coordination	SI shall engage linemen, field engineers and operational staff for on-site asset verification and real-time data collection, and field teams shall validate/update grid information.	The extent, locations and number of field surveys/field resources are not quantified.	Please specify the expected number of assets/feeders/km/locations to be physically verified, expected survey coverage, field manpower to be provided by APEPDCL, and whether SI is responsible for complete survey execution or only targeted validation.	Clause are prevelant to Discoms roles and responsibilities
Section 5 – Project Area / GIS Scope	The asset baseline includes approximately 7,517–12,137 km of 11 kV feeders across individual Circles, DTs, LT feeders, consumer meters and rooftop SPG.	The overall network volume is substantial and has direct impact on survey, GIS processing, QA/QC and topology creation effort.	Please confirm the exact in-scope network hierarchy and asset classes for GIS validation/digitization, including poles, conductors, switches, reclosers, capacitor banks, service lines, meters, DTs and consumer connectivity.	as per the rfp "Intelligent Network Analytics & Decision Support" and other subsequent clauses

Asset Management and Data Repository – Page 71	The system shall store asset ID, geospatial coordinates, technical specifications, tender details and maintenance logs and shall present one-time digitized data and historical records.	Asset attribute requirements are extensive, but the mandatory attribute dictionary is not provided.	Please provide the approved asset-wise attribute schema/data dictionary, mandatory fields, domain values, asset IDs/coding convention and validation rules to be used for GIS asset data and network modelling.	As per RFP
Asset Management and Data Repository – Page 71–72	The solution shall display consumer-to-transformer connections with editing capabilities, including geospatial validation.	Consumer-to-DT connectivity is critical for network analysis and loss/forecasting calculations.	Please confirm the source and availability of consumer-to-DT/feeder connectivity data, its accuracy, and whether SI is expected to physically validate and correct consumer connectivity for all consumers or only identified exceptions.	As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP
Existing Enterprise GIS Integration – Page 78	Generated analytical layers such as loss heatmaps, DER constraints and asset health profiles shall be exported back into the existing GIS schema.	The effort depends on the existing GIS schema, publication mechanism and ownership/access permissions.	Please provide the target GIS schema and clarify whether the SI may create new spatial layers/tables for analytical outputs. Please	Target GIS schema shall be finalized during implementation. New spatial layers/tables may be created with DISCOM approval.

			also confirm who will approve and publish changes to the enterprise GIS master database.	Changes to the master GIS database shall require approval of the designated DISCOM authority. If any additional tools are required then SI shall provide the same
b.2.2.6 – Data Availability	DISCOM shall specify availability, format, frequency, quality and historical retention period of datasets and provide APIs, schemas, dictionaries and technical documentation wherever available.	Data availability and quality directly affect network validation and AI/network analysis.	Please provide the latest data inventory covering GIS, asset register, feeder connectivity, SCADA/RMS, billing, AMI/MDMS, DER and historical datasets, including format, update frequency, retention period and known data-quality limitations.	As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP

Additional Features for Compliance – Page 72	The platform shall update actual networks based on job-order processes and identify/code network components as existing, new, proposed, etc.	This implies continuous GIS/network change management beyond the initial implementation.	Please clarify whether SI is responsible for configuring the complete job-order-based GIS update workflow, including field capture, approval, versioning, audit trail and synchronization to network analysis/SLD, and how many job orders/updates per month should be assumed for sizing.	The platform shall support job-order-based network updates, asset status tagging (existing/new/proposed), and synchronization with GIS and network analysis/SLD, as specified in the RFP. Any GIS incremental changes at field shall be scope of the discom
Scalability and Future Network Expansion – Page 103	The platform shall accommodate new substations, feeders, DTs, consumer connections, smart meters, RTS, BESS, EV charging and other DERs and synchronize topology changes.	The ongoing volume of new assets and network changes is not quantified.	Please provide an indicative annual/monthly volume of new/modified/retired assets and network topology changes to be supported during the FMS period, for sizing the continuous asset lifecycle and topology update service.	as per the rfp "Scalability for Network expansion" and other subsequent clauses

Deliverables / M4 – Page 107	M4 includes GIS Visualization, Asset & Consumer Data Management, Network Analysis, Load Flow Analysis and Digital SLD modules at T0+6 months.	GIS data validation, topology readiness and field updates are dependencies for these modules.	Please confirm the expected GIS/network data readiness milestone before M4 and whether APEPDCL will provide all required GIS and asset data before T0. Any delay in data/API/access/field availability should result in corresponding schedule relief.	As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP
Responsibilities of DISCOM – b.1 to b.4 / Page 111–112	APEPDCL shall provide GIS/asset data, integration access, field coordination and infrastructure/server/cloud resources.	Execution depends on timely provision of data, access, permissions, bandwidth and field support.	Please confirm the committed timelines/SLA for APEPDCL data handover, API access, field team availability, site access, security permissions, server/cloud provisioning and UAT approvals. Please also confirm that delays caused by these dependencies will not be treated as SI delays.	As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP

Data Security / Field Data	The platform shall handle critical grid infrastructure, consumer data and field-collected information under the RFP cybersecurity requirements.	Field collection may involve GPS coordinates, photographs, consumer information and sensitive network infrastructure data.	Please clarify the permitted field data collection/storage mechanism, device security requirements, restrictions on photographs/GPS data, data hosting location, encryption requirements and whether SI may temporarily process field data in its secure environment before transfer to APEPDCL.	As per RFP
Drone / Survey Requirement – implied through field data and GIS scope	The RFP requires on-ground verification and mobile/field application integration, but does not explicitly prescribe a complete drone survey methodology or drone-based survey coverage.	Drone survey can materially improve asset identification but requires aviation/security permissions and has different cost implications from conventional GPS field survey.	Please clarify whether drone/UAV survey is mandatory, optional, or not required for the GIS asset validation scope. If mandatory, please specify survey corridors/coverage, required sensors, accuracy, permissions and expected deliverables.	Drone/UAV survey are not in the scope of SI however system efficiency and relenat are to be covered as per rfp

Scope Boundary – GIS Data Provided by Utility / Project Deliverables	The RFP indicates that SI's AI/ML and network-analysis scope is based on GIS data provided by the Utility, while other clauses require validation, updates and continuous topology changes.	There is a potential overlap between “data provided by Utility” and SI responsibility for correcting/updating network data.	Please clearly define the boundary between APEPDCL's responsibility for providing the master GIS/network data and SI's responsibility for data cleansing, field verification, geo-tagging, digitization, topology correction and creation of updated as-built network data.	The SI shall use the provided data to develop AI-enabled intelligence layers for validation, identification of discrepancies and recommending necessary corrections, as specified in the RFP
FMS – Continuous Asset Lifecycle & Network Topology Updates	FMS includes dynamic asset ingestion for new/augmented DTs, feeders, rooftop solar and smart meters and continuous topology/SLD updates.	The FMS commercial line item does not define transaction/asset quantities or service volumes.	Please define the annual/monthly number of asset updates, network modifications, field validations and SLD changes included in FMS pricing. Additional volumes beyond the defined baseline may please be handled through a rate card/change mechanism.	as per the relevant scopes in the RFP
Section 3. Bid Data		Considering the extensive and technically		As per RFP and issued Corrigendum

Sheet	Deadline of Submission	complex scope of work kindly consider		
BDS No. - 14	September 13, 2026	extending the bid submission deadline by		
Ref. to Section.2 -	(11:59 PM IST)	2 weeks to enable bidders to adequately		
23		assess the requirements and submit a		
		comprehensive proposal.		
Section 4. Evaluation Criteria 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria (Pre-Requisite)	Quality Certification: 2 . Valid ISO 9001 certification, along with additional relevant ISO certifications (e.g., ISO 27001 for information security, ISO 20000 for IT service management) - 15	We are currently undergoing the ISO 27001 certification process and expecting it to be completed in few months. Kindly consider our duly signed undertaking/declaration pertaining to this, in lieu of the ISO 27001 certificate at the time of bid submission for eligibility.		As per the RFP
General Query	General Query	Please provide the expected historical data period, data volume and frequency for which SCADA, RMS, AMI, billing and other source systems data to be maintained in the portal .		As per the "Roles and Responsibilities" under the RFP

General Query	The scope requires AI/ML-based forecasting, anomaly detection and predictive maintenance.	Please clarify if there are any specific expectations of third-party AI/ML/LLM platforms and their APIs to use such as ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, etc.		All hosting shall be undertaken on APEPDCL's on-premises infrastructure. Bidders shall accordingly make their technical and commercial assumptions based on the relevant requirements, scope and architecture provisions of the RFP, subject to APEPDCL's approval of the proposed architecture.
		1. Roles b.4 (p.111) says the DISCOM provisions servers, storage, cloud and networking. However, Annexure 2 (p.139) requires the bidder to size Application/DB servers, SAN/NAS storage and NVIDIA A100 GPUs, and also makes non-submission a ground for rejection. So, is it that all hardware, GPU, cloud, OS/DB/virtualisation licences, DC/DR and bandwidth are on the Utility's account and that is Annexure 2 a sizing statement only? Kindly confirm.		Bidders shall provide the server specifications required for the deliverables mentioned in the RFP.

		2. Footnote 6 (p.112) limits the SI to AI/ML analysis “based on the GIS data provided by the Utility”, but Roles a.1.4 (p.109) makes the SI responsible for data collection, and the Network Analysis tables (p.38–45) repeatedly cite “Data from One-time Digitization” — conductor impedance/km, line lengths, transformer impedance and vector group, CT ratios, relay and recloser settings, sequence impedances. Whether that dataset already exists for all 7 circles? Kindly confirm no physical survey or geo-tagging is in the SI's scope.		Gis data sets available SI needs to process it as per RFP. No filed survey required

		3. Clause at p.97 bars “black-box AI logic”; p.103 requires delivery of “customized source code along with perpetual licenses”; p.113 gives ISA a perpetual, global, royalty-free, sub-licensable licence to the Baseline Release. Yet Section 4.2 (p.25) awards marks for a COTS product. Does the SI hand over base product source code, and may ISA redeploy the platform free of charge at other utilities or in other member countries?		As per RFP and issued Corrigendum
		4. Form G (p.134–135): Year 1 subscription is borne by ISA; Years 2–5 are at APEPDCL's “sole discretion” and subject to budget, at the same fixed rate with no escalation. Ask (a) whether L1 is determined on Professional Fees + 1 year or + 5-year levelized subscription, (b) whether any indexation is permitted from Year 3		As per RFP

		5. BDS 8 (p.20) sets LD at 5% of the total contract sum per week, capped at 20%. Industry norm is 0.5% per week of the delayed milestone value, so this is roughly ten times the market rate on ten times the base. It also sits alongside a separate SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice (p.121). LD may be rebased to the delayed milestone, capped at 5%, applied only for delays attributable to the SI, and confirm LD and SLA penalties are not levied for the same event.		Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.
		6. AIOps (p.92) refers to monitoring “LLM API availability, token consumption”, while Annexure 2 requires a GPU pool. Whether the LLM is to be self-hosted on-premise or whether commercial LLM APIs are permitted; whether grid and consumer data may leave the DC boundary under CEA/CERT-In and APEPDCL policy; and how variable inference/token cost is treated when the subscription fee is fixed for five years.		Si to suggest the solutions as per the deliverables and other relevant sections under the RFP

		7. The project area (p.32) covers roughly 5.07 million consumer meters, 276,000 DTs, 54,800 km of 11kV and 36,700 km of LT line. Whether load flow is required to 11kV, to DT, or down to individual LT consumer. Separately, the training numbers at p.84 are quoted “per Discom” — whether the scope is APEPDCL alone or replication across several DISCOMs.		APEPDCL
		8. The RFP mandates 24x7 support (p.103), a centralised L1/L2/L3 help desk (p.89), 24x7 security monitoring “through a SOC (or equivalent managed service)” (p.101) and CERT-In empanelled VAPT before Go-Live and every six months (p.101) — with no manpower table. Indicative onsite resources, roles, shifts and locations; whether the SOC is SI-provided or the Utility's existing one; and who pays the CERT-In auditor.		SI as per RFP

Section 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria – Financial Capacity of the SI	26	We would like to request the Authority to consider revising the minimum average annual turnover requirement to INR 200 Crore, considering that the project involves critical multi-system integration and high operational complexity. This revision will enable participation of system integrators with adequate financial strength, thereby ensuring smoother execution and minimizing integration and delivery risks.		As per RFP
Section 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria	24-25	We understand that as consortium is allowed, project credentials of the consortium member and member firms will also be acceptable for the evaluation. Kindly confirm.		As per RFP
Section 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria – Availability of COTS Software Solution	25	We understand that COTS GIS product provided by leading GIS OEM. we would like to request that, for COTS-based solutions, credentials and certifications issued by the respective OEMs and member firms be considered for eligibility and evaluation of Lead bidder in addition to bidder credentials.		As per RFP

Section 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria – Key Personnel	25	We would like ISA to consider revising this clause and propose the following team structure for the key personnel evaluation, as the project involves multiple integration it is necessary to have experts with competent skills:----- S. No. Team Member Minimum Resources 1 Project Manager -1 2 Solution Architect -1 3 Power Distribution Engineer / SME- 1 4 Data Scientist - 1 5 Data Analyst-1 6 UI/UX Engineer- 1 7 Network and Support Engineer- 1 8 GeoAI Expert- 1 9 GIS Expert- 2 10. GIS integration Expert- 1 11. GIS Developer- 1 12. GIS Mobile App Developer -1		Key personnel shall meet the composition and qualification criteria specified in the RFP. The term “No. of Full-Time Professionals” shall be read as “No. of Professionals.”

Section 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria – Quality Certification	26	We would like to request you to kindly consider CMMI Level 5 Certificates for this criteria. Considering this certification helps ensure lower project risk, higher quality outcomes, and consistent performance for complex projects.		As per RFP
Section 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria – Relevant Project Experience	24	We would like to request you to kindly consider project experience within the last five (5) years from the date of issuance of this EOI to ensure experienced and wider participation.		As per RFP
Section 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria – Key Personnel	25	We would like to request you to kindly consider number of full time professionals as: <150 (5 marks), ≥150 and ≤300 (10 marks), >300 (15 marks) to ensure participation from credible organisations and solution provider with enough manpower to support such a complex and large project.		As per RFP

Section 4.3 Technical Evaluation Criteria	27	We would like to request you to kindly consider the experience in power grid digitization projects in terms of number cities/ circles/ substations etc. instead of the number of assets.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Introduction	31-32	We kindly request you to please specify the area coverage corresponding to the mentioned circles.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Map Visualization	45-50	What are the preferred data formats and data standards (e.g., GeoJSON, Shapefiles, OGC Compliant data) for GIS layers and asset data submission? Kindly clarify.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Existing Enterprise GIS Platform Integration & Data Sharing	77	We understand base GIS layers (e.g., administrative boundaries, land use) will be given by department. Kindly clarify.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Existing Enterprise GIS Platform Integration & Data Sharing	77	Is there any existing GIS infrastructure, legacy system as well as spatial database in place at the DISCOMs that the proposed solution must integrate with? Kindly clarify.		As per RFP

Section 5 – AI Driven Analytics / Dashboard	35-36	What is the estimated user count on the different DISCOM platforms and what is the concurrent user count? Kindly provide details.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Integration with DISCOM Data Systems	75-77	What APIs or data exchange protocols are available for integrating GIS with SCADA, RMS, and other DISCOM systems? Kindly clarify.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Map Visualization	46	Will real-time sensor data (e.g., voltage, fault detection) be accessible for overlay on GIS maps? Kindly provide more details.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Digital Single-Line Diagrams	69-70	What are the expectations for AI generated digital Single Line Diagrams? Kindly clarify.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Platform & Software Standards	98-100	Are there any specific tools or platforms (Open Source vs Proprietary) preferred for implementation? Kindly clarify.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Existing Enterprise GIS Platform Integration & Data Sharing	77	Will preference be given to Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) GIS solutions, or is a custom-built GIS web application mandatory? Kindly clarify.		As per RFP

Section 5 – AI Driven Analytics / Dashboard	35-36	What level of customization is expected in terms of dashboards, symbology, and spatial queries? Kindly suggest.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Map Visualization – Land Base Representation	48	Kindly clarify the following mentioned points: Does the DISCOM have any existing satellite dataset available? If yes, then kindly provide the spatial resolution, radiometric resolution and temporal resolution of the data. If the data is not available we understand that the DISCOM will procure the required dataset. Kindly confirm.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Security & Infrastructure	100	Will the GIS data be hosted on-premise or in the cloud? Are there any restrictions or preferences? Kindly suggest. It is assumed that DISCOM will procure all the necessary hardware based on architecture suggested by the SI. Kindly confirm.		As per RFP
Section 5 – User Management & Security	78-83	What cybersecurity standards must be adhered to for GIS data storage and access and what will be SI's responsibility regarding cybersecurity? Kindly clarify.		As per RFP

Section 5 – Alerts & Notifications	72-74	How should GIS be leveraged to generate alerts (e.g., fault detection, voltage violations)? What is the expected latency and delivery method? Kindly suggest.		As per RFP
Section 5 – Alerts & Notifications	72-74	Will alerts be role-based and integrated with mobile/web applications? Kindly suggest.		As per RFP
Project Management / Platform Standards / Form G	96-100, 134-135	Are there any licensing constraints or compliance requirements (e.g., ISO standards, Indian geospatial data policies) that bidders must consider? Kindly suggest. As different COTS Product have different licensing policy and this can impact the cost estimation we request ISA to provide the BOQ for the licensees.		As per RFP

Section 4.2 - Relevant Project Experience: Look-back Period	24	The RFP restricts eligible project experience to assignments executed or under execution during the last three years. Utility digitization, GIS, network-analysis and IT/OT integration projects typically have long procurement and execution cycles. We request that the experience look-back period be extended to the last 7 years from the date of RFP issuance. Kindly consider the ongoing project as well.	As per RFP

Section 4.2 - Quality and Information-Security Certifications	26	Considering that the platform will process operational technology data, consumer information, critical grid models and AI-generated recommendations, we request that valid ISO 27001 certification be made mandatory for the Lead Bidder and/or platform OEM, in addition to ISO 9001. ISO 20000-1 or an equivalent IT-service-management certification may be required for the entity responsible for Facility Management Services. The RFP should also clarify whether certifications held by a consortium member or authorized OEM are acceptable for evaluation.	As per RFP

Section 4.3 - Network Scale / Energy Under Management	29	The experience criterion is measured only through annual energy input or peak demand. Client certificates and work orders for technology projects do not always state MU or MW values. We request that equivalent scale indicators also be accepted, including number of consumers, feeders, substations, distribution transformers, smart meters, assets, geographical circles or transaction/data volumes managed. Cumulative scale across multiple eligible projects may also be permitted, supported by client confirmation or publicly verifiable utility statistics.		As per RFP

BDS and Project Management - Implementation Timeline	22, 96-108	The RFP envisages completion of the complete platform, enterprise integrations, data transformation, network modelling, advanced AI modules, testing, training and Go-Live across seven circles within nine months. We request a phased implementation period of 12 months, comprising discovery/design, pilot implementation, stabilization and circle-wise rollout. At a minimum, milestone timelines should commence only after availability of approved data, APIs, infrastructure and access credentials. Delays attributable to the Authority, DISCOM, third-party OEMs or unavailable source-system interfaces should result in corresponding extension of time without LD.	As per RFP

BDS Clause 42 - Liquidated Damages	20-21	The proposed LD of 5% of the total contract sum for each week of occurrence, up to 20% of the contract sum, is disproportionate and may apply even where only one milestone is delayed. We request revision to 0.5% per week of the value of the delayed milestone, capped at 5% of that milestone and 10% of the implementation contract value in aggregate. A reasonable cure period should be provided, and delays arising from data, infrastructure, approvals, third-party systems, change requests or force-majeure events should be excluded. LD and SLA penalties should not be levied twice for the same event.	Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

System Architecture and Web/Mobile Application Scope	33-35	The indicative architecture states that the existing DISCOM GIS/mobile application may continue as the field-execution interface, while the detailed scope requires the SI to design, develop and maintain Android and iOS applications. Please clarify whether the requirement is to build a completely new mobile application, develop modules within the existing application, or integrate the proposed platform with the existing mobile application. The existing application technology stack, source-code/API availability, OEM support arrangement, device/MDM policy, expected user count and supported OS versions should be provided.	As per RFP

Integration with DISCOM Systems and DISCOM Responsibilities - Data Inventory	75-78, 110-111	To enable accurate architecture, effort and infrastructure sizing, we request issuance of a detailed source-system and data inventory before bid submission. The inventory should cover GIS, SCADA, RMS, MDMS/AMI, Billing/CIS, OMS/DMS/ADMS, ERP, FMS, Asset Management and other systems, including OEM/version, hosting location, API/database		As per RFP
		access, protocols, authentication, data dictionary, sample payloads, frequency, historical retention, volume, quality, current integrations, cybersecurity zones and responsible owners. If this cannot be issued before bidding, the RFP should provide for a discovery phase and mutually agreed integration/data baseline before detailed design.		

Integration Scope - Third-Party Dependencies and Costs	75-78, 110- 111	Please confirm that APEPDCL/ISA will facilitate cooperation from incumbent OEMs and third-party system owners and will provide API licenses, database access, interface specifications, test environments, VPN/network access and planned downtime windows without charge to the SI. The SI should not be responsible for delays, defects or SLA failures caused by third-party non-cooperation, source-system unavailability or poor source-data quality. Any third-party OEM modification, connector license or proprietary API charge should be borne directly by the Authority or reimbursed as an approved pass-through cost.		as per RFP

Annexure 2 - GPU Specification	139	Annexure 2 specifically lists NVIDIA A100 (40/80 GB), which may restrict competition and may not be optimal for every proposed architecture. We request amendment to "NVIDIA A100 40/80 GB or equivalent/higher performance accelerator" and permission for bidders to propose alternate GPU, inference accelerator, CPU-based, private-cloud or approved managed-AI architectures. Compliance should be assessed against the agreed security, data-residency, scalability, latency and functional requirements rather than a specific make/model.		As per detailing in Annexure 2 of the RFP
		1. Kindly provide the complete inventory of existing IT and OT applications currently deployed across APEPDCL.		as per RFP
		2. Please identify the current System of Record (SoR) for:		
		Asset Management		
		GIS		
		Billing		
		Consumer Information		

	Metering	
	Outage Management	
	Maintenance Management	
	DER Management	
	3. Please provide details of the following systems:	
	Vendor/OEM	
	Product Version	
	Deployment Model	
	Support Status	
	For:	
	GIS	
	SCADA	
	RMS	
	MDMS	
	AMI	
	OMS	
	ADMS/DMS	
	SAP/ERP	
	Billing	
	Asset Management	
	3. Which applications are:	
	Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS)	
	Customized COTS	
	In-house developed	

		4. Are there any ongoing or planned modernization initiatives that may impact this project during implementation?		
	Existing GIS Landscape	1. Please provide details of the existing GIS platform.		As per RFP
		2. Is the GIS currently maintained as:		
		Spatial GIS only		
		Electrically connected network model		
		3. Is Substation → Feeder → DT → Consumer connectivity available and validated?		
		4. Please indicate the approximate GIS asset coverage percentages for each Circles/District of APEPDCL:		
		Substations		
		Feeders		
		DTs		
		Consumers		
		Smart Meters		
		Rooftop Solar Assets		
		DER Assets		

		5. Has any GIS accuracy validation exercise been performed in the last 24 months?		
		6. Please share GIS positional accuracy standards currently followed.		
	Section B: Data Landscape	1. Kindly provide a detailed list of all data sources expected to be integrated under this project.		As per RFP
	B1. Enterprise Data Sources	2. Please confirm availability of data from:		
		GIS		
		SCADA		
		RMS		
		Protection Relays		
		AMI		
		MDMS		
		Billing		
		Consumer Systems		
		OMS		
		ERP		
		Asset Management		
		Weather Sources		
		Rooftop Solar		
		EV Charging Systems		
		BESS		

		DER Systems		
	Historical Data Availability	1. Please provide historical data availability for:		As per RFP
		SCADA		
		RMS		
		MDMS		
		AMI		
		Billing		
		Outages		
		Asset Failures		
		Maintenance		
		Consumer Consumption		
		2. What is the retention period currently maintained for each data source?		As per RFP
		3. What is the expected historical data volume to be migrated or integrated?		As per RFP
	Data Quality Assessment	1. Has any formal Data Quality Assessment been conducted?		As per RFP
		2. Please provide current data quality metrics, if available.		As per RFP
		3. Are there known issues related to:		As per RFP
		· Missing records		As per RFP
		· Duplicate assets		As per RFP

		· Duplicate consumers	As per RFP
		· Missing GIS coordinates	As per RFP
		· Incorrect connectivity	As per RFP
		· Incomplete technical asset information	As per RFP
		3. What percentage of GIS records are currently validated?	As per RFP
		4. Please clarify whether historical data cleansing is part of the SI scope or will be completed by DISCOM before implementation.	As per RFP
	Data Governance	1. Is there a formal Data Governance framework in place?	As per RFP
		2. Are Data Owners and Data Stewards identified?	As per RFP
		3. Please define ownership for:	As per RFP
		· GIS Data	As per RFP
		· Consumer Data	As per RFP
		· Meter Data	As per RFP
		· Asset Data	As per RFP
		· Operational Data	As per RFP
		· Analytical Outputs	As per RFP
	Section C: Integration Landscape	1. Please share the list of applications that currently expose APIs.	As per RFP

	Integration Readiness	2. Please indicate API technology and standards available:		As per RFP
		· REST		
		· SOAP		
		· GraphQL		
		· Message Queues		
		· Kafka		
		· MQTT		
		· Database Views		
		3. Is an Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) or Integration Platform currently available?		As per RFP
		4. Is an API Gateway platform available?		As per RFP
		5. Are API specifications available for integration with all identified systems?		As per RFP
	Third-Party Integration Dependencies	1. Are there licensing constraints or third-party approvals required for integration with existing applications?		As per RFP and all integration shall follow IES Specifications: https://ies.recindia.org.in/docs
		2. Will OEM coordination and access facilitation be provided by APEPDCL?		As per RFP
		3. Are there any systems where direct integration is not permitted?		As per RFP

	Section D: Electrical Network Model Readiness	1. Does APEPDCL currently maintain a connected electrical network model?		As per RFP
		2. Has feeder-to-consumer traceability been verified and approved?		As per RFP
		3. What percentage of feeders have verified electrical connectivity?		As per RFP
		4. Are conductor parameters available for all feeders?		As per RFP
		5. Are line impedance values available digitally?		As per RFP
		6. Are transformer technical specifications available digitally?		As per RFP
		7. Are protection relay settings maintained electronically?		As per RFP
		8. Are short-circuit studies currently available?		As per RFP
		9. Which power system analysis tools are currently used for network planning studies?		As per RFP
	Section E: SCADA, RMS and Operational Data	1. Please provide details of the existing SCADA platform.		As per RFP
		2. Number of SCADA-integrated substations.		As per RFP
		3. Total SCADA telemetry points available.		As per RFP
		4. Data refresh frequency.		As per RFP

		5. Typical end-to-end data latency.		As per RFP
		6. Please confirm availability of:		As per RFP
		· Voltage		As per RFP
		· Current		As per RFP
		· Power Factor		As per RFP
		· Breaker Status		As per RFP
		· Relay Status		As per RFP
		· Transformer Loading		As per RFP
		7. What percentage of assets are covered through RMS systems?		As per RFP
	Section F: AMI and Smart Meter Ecosystem	1. Current smart meter count.		As per RFP
		2. Planned smart meter rollout over the next five years.		As per RFP
		3. Current MDMS platform details.		As per RFP
		4. Smart meter interval granularity:		As per RFP
		· 15-minute		
		· 30-minute		
		· Hourly		
		5. Average daily smart meter data volume.		As per RFP
		6. Availability of:		As per RFP
		· Tamper Events		
		· Last Gasp		
		· First Breath		

		· Power Quality Events		
		7. Data retention period for AMI interval data.		
				As per RFP
	Section G: AI, Analytics and GenAI Readiness	1. Please provide details of any existing AI, ML, or Advanced Analytics initiatives.		As per RFP
		2. Are any AI models currently operational within APEPDCL?		As per RFP
		3. Is there an enterprise-approved GenAI platform available?		As per RFP
		4. Are platforms such as Azure OpenAI, OpenAI, Gemini, Claude, etc. approved for utility use?		As per RFP
		5. Does APEPDCL intend to provide its own GenAI subscription as referenced in the RFP?		As per RFP
		6. What AI governance policies currently exist?		As per RFP
		7. Are externally hosted LLMs permitted for utility data processing?		As per RFP
		8. Are there restrictions on model training using utility datasets?		As per RFP
	Section H: Infrastructure and Hosting	1. Please clarify the preferred deployment model:		On premise

		· On-Premises		
		· Private Cloud		
		· Public Cloud		
		· Hybrid		
		2. Is a production Data Lake already operational?		As per RFP
		3. If yes, please provide:		
		· Platform Details		
		· Technology Stack		
		· Current Storage Volume		
		· Expected Growth		
		4. Is GPU infrastructure currently available?		As per RFP
		5. Will server infrastructure be provided by APEPDCL?		As per rfp
		6. Please provide expected user counts for:		baseline user base across the existing DISCOMs shall be considered as approximately 10,000 users, with concurrent users assumed at 30% of the total user base. However, the SI shall ensure that the system capacity, scalability and performance remain compliant with the prescribed SLA requirements throughout the Contract Period, irrespective of any increase in the total user base or
		7. Executives		
		· Engineers		
		· Operators		
		· Supervisors		
		· Field Personnel		
	Section I: Security and Compliance	1. Please provide details of the enterprise Identity Management platform in use.		

				concurrent users beyond the aforesaid baseline.
		2. Is Single Sign-On currently implemented?		As per RFP
		3. Please provide details of:		
		· Active Directory		
		· Microsoft Entra ID		
		· LDAP		
		4. Is SIEM platform available?		
		5. Is SOC monitoring available?		
		6. Are there any data residency restrictions applicable to this project?		As per RFP
		7. Are there any security certifications mandatory beyond those listed in the RFP?		
	Section J: Business Objectives and Current Challenges	1. Please identify the top business drivers for this initiative.		
		2. What are the key pain points in the current operational environment?		
		3. What are the primary challenges in:		
		· Asset Visibility		
		· Grid Planning		
		· Network Analysis		

		· AT&C Loss Reduction		
		· DER Integration		
		· GIS Accuracy		
		· Data Integration		
		4. Which business processes currently rely heavily on manual intervention?		
		5. Which reports require significant manual compilation effort?		
		6. What are the primary reasons for delays in decision-making today?		
	Section K: Success Criteria and Expected Outcomes	1. Please define the measurable success criteria for the program.		As per RFP
		2. What improvements are expected in:		
		· AT&C Loss Reduction		
		· Reliability Metrics		
		· Outage Management		
		· Demand Forecast Accuracy		
		· Asset Utilization		
		· Renewable Energy Integration		
		3. Which functional modules are considered mandatory for Phase 1 Go-Live?		

		4. Are there any modules that can be delivered in subsequent phases?		
		5. What are the key acceptance criteria for:		
		· AI Models		
		· Network Analysis		
		· Load Flow Studies		
		· Digital Twin Capabilities`		
		· Agentic AI Functions		
		· Natural Language Querying		
	Section L: Commercial and Scope Clarifications	1. Please confirm whether data cleansing and topology correction activities are included within SI scope.		As per RFP
		2. Please clarify responsibility for data correction approval and validation.		
		3. Please confirm availability of integration support from incumbent application vendors.		
		4. Please clarify ownership and licensing of third-party connectors developed during the project.		
		5. Please clarify expected volume of change requests during implementation.		

		6. Please confirm whether future circle expansion will be covered under the current contract or treated separately.		
		7. Please provide the expected production and DR infrastructure sizing baseline from APEPDCL, if available.		
		8. Please clarify expected annual transaction volumes and API transaction rates.		
	Questions for Specific Reference			As per RFP
	Capitalizing on APEPDCL's existing digital infrastructure, which includes comprehensive GIS mapping from feeder to consumer level integrated with ERP systems, the selected System Integrator (SI) shall be responsible for developing a thorough understanding of the DISCOM's IT architecture as well as the underlying electrical infrastructure.	Please provide what level of documentation is available with APEPDCL around its digital infrastructure. Can this be made available under NDA so that we get a view of readiness?		
	Further, the SI shall design, develop, and operationalize the core AI platform for grid simulation, network analysis, and other functionalities covered under the RFP, while	1. Please provide details around existing GIS platform – name, version, number of users (by types) and primary use cases for usage.		As per RFP

	ensuring seamless integration with the existing GIS platform to enable updated as-built network visibility, intelligent analytics, and automated operational alerts.	2. Please provide details around licencing – type of licences, total number required for each role, validity, due for renewal		
		3. What current applications are integrated with GIS platform?		
		4. Who is providing maintenance and support for the GIS platform – internal teams or a 3 rd party provider?		
	Finally, SI shall provide continuous analytical support throughout the contract period, dynamically adapting the platform to process data from current integrations as well as any new, diverse data sources that may emerge over the course	Please provide details around planned initiatives that can influence new diverse data sources and integrations		As per RFP

	However, the final architecture, deployment topology, unified portal design, integration methodology, interoperability framework, communication protocols, cybersecurity controls, infrastructure sizing, application layering and technology stack shall be comprehensively assessed, designed and proposed by the selected System Integrator (SI) during the implementation phase, based on detailed assessment of the DISCOM's existing IT/OT systems, operational workflows, scalability requirements and field -level deployment considerations and as per the scope, functional requirements and implementation objectives defined under this RFP.	We will need to understand how our platform needs to fit in at the very beginning so that we can determine what changes need to be done to make it fit for purpose in this context which will influence our pricing. Please suggest a mechanism for us to get this understanding.		As per RFP bidder may contact with APEPDCL to understand the IT/OT at aee_it5@apeasternpower.com
	The applications shall comply with all applicable technical, functional, integration, performance, cybersecurity, and security requirements specified elsewhere in this RFP.	Not all capabilities are equal on mobile and web applications. Kindly provide a listing of what can be done on web vs. mobile with your priorities		As per RFP

	i. Display AI -calculated key performance indicators (KPIs): total assets digitized, validation completion rate, outage incidents, billing compliance and load distribution.	1. WRT total assets digitized and validation completion rate – we assume these are to be covered as part of digitization process and should be kept out of scope for this RFP unless it is a display only metric.		As per RFP
		2. what is the current level of digitisation existing as a %?		

	Map Visualization An AI -enhanced Geographic Information System (GIS) -based tool meticulously crafted to spatially visualize digitized grid asset data, sensor inputs and analytical insights, empowering DISCOM officials to monitor, analyze and strategically plan grid operations within a comprehensive geographic framework. This module seamlessly integrates multi-layered data sources—ranging from latest Sensor feeds to historical records — employing advanced visualization techniques and AI -driven insights to deliver a dynamic, interactive platform. It supports operational oversight, rapid fault detection and infrastructure optimization, enabling precise decision-making for grid management, renewable energy integration and loss reduction initiatives.	Does the existing GIS platform already support you or anticipate this as a new		As per RFP
	Agent Creation - The platform shall enable authorized users to create multiple AI agents without software development.	1. Is this a must-have requirement in the platform?		As per RFP
		2. What does the level of your BU Team have the expertise in the AI System and Agents as of now?		

		3. Please enlist what type of business and technical requirements that you want to achieve through this future AI Agents to be developed?		
		4. Please enlist the inventory of your existing AI Agents / tools and what is the scope of each existing AI agents?		
	Hardware Supply	1. Will the Computing Systems hardware Supply and costing be part of this Response?		As per rfp relevant sections and annexure 2
		2. Or recommending the hardware specifications alone will suffice?		
		3. Please clarify whether the required infrastructure—including application servers, database servers, GPU infrastructure, storage, networking, load balancers, backup infrastructure and security infrastructure—will be provided by the Utility, or whether the SI is expected to supply/provision these components.		As per rfp relevant sections and annexure 2

	vii. Security & Governance	1. Will you please share the full details of what is your present Security & Governance procedures that are being adopted now.		
		2. What is your present Security Compliances status and share the security standards being adopted now.		As per RFP
	Network Analysis Model Assessment	The RFP requires load-flow analysis including voltage profiles, power flow, losses and network analysis. Please confirm whether the Utility will provide a validated electrical network model along with required electrical parameters, or whether the SI is expected to develop, validate and maintain the complete electrical network model as part of the project		As per RFP
	GIS Electrical Network Model	Please confirm whether the existing electrical network GIS is based on Esri Utility Network, Geometric Network, ArcFM or any other network model		yes, As per RFP

	Users	Please provide the expected number of users, concurrent users, substations, feeders, distribution transformers, consumers, meters and other network assets that the proposed solution is required to support. This information is required for application, database, infrastructure and performance sizing		Baseline user base across the existing DISCOMs shall be considered as approximately 10,000 users, with concurrent users assumed at 30% of the total user base. However, the SI shall ensure that the system capacity, scalability and performance remain compliant with the prescribed SLA requirements throughout the Contract Period, irrespective of any increase in the total user base or concurrent users beyond the aforesaid baseline.
	AI	Please confirm whether the Utility has any preferred or approved LLM/Generative AI platform, model or cloud service provider. If not, may the SI propose an appropriate LLM platform based on security, performance, data residency and commercial considerations?		As per Rfp
Sec 4.2 – Availability of COTS Software Solution	25	Is the COTS software solution a must or the SI can design, develop and operationalize a custom solution for APEPDCL?		As per Rfp

Sec 4.3(1) & Sec 5	27, 38-41	Real-time data ingestion, synchronization and load-flow using SCADA/RMS/AMI interval data. Please indicate the current SCADA/RMS coverage (the asset table notes limited APTRANSCO SCADA feeders and partial smart-meter penetration). Where high-frequency telemetry is unavailable, please confirm the platform may operate on historical/estimated data without SLA penalty for data gaps outside SI control.		As per Rfp
AI Copilot & Agentic AI	27-28	Please define the minimum acceptance criteria for AI Copilot, Agentic AI and Multi-Agent AI capabilities, including expected performance benchmarks.		As per Rfp
Sec 4.3(4) – Proposed Solution Demonstration	29	Live demonstration = 30 marks; SI must score minimum 10 or is technically disqualified; ~60 mins. If there is no COTS product, can th SI demonstrate the POCs or any previous related work		As per Rfp

Introduction	31	Kindly confirm whether the existing GIS platform currently in use by APEPDCL is GE Smallworld, ESRI, open-source GIS, or any other platform. Please provide product/version details.		As per Rfp
Introduction	31	Please provide details whether GIS is only desktop based or Web GIS is also in place in the enterprise. Please provide user counts for Desktop GIS and WebGIS		As per Rfp
Introduction	31	Please provide names of other systems like ERP, ADMS, Customer Call center etc. with which currently GIS is integrated		As per Rfp
Introduction & System Architecture	31	Please let us know whether GIS data is up to date as per current field data of assets and Electric network and consumers data		As per Rfp
Introduction & System Architecture	31	Please let us know whether GIS is running on-prem infrastructure or GIS is there on cloud. In hat case , please mention cloud details in that case		yes, As per Rfp
Introduction & System Architecture	31	Please let us know whether any Mobile GIS is currently getting used. If so please provide details of Mobile GIS application like COTS/ bespoke, Mobiel Dservices getting used		As per Rfp

Introduction & System Architecture	31	Please provide GIS data model/data dictionary of network assets which are part of existing GIS		As per Rfp
Introduction	31	Please provide information whether the GIS application of utility is under maintenance by GIS OEM like ESRI, GEV etc.		As per Rfp
Introduction	31	Please provide information whether existing GIS data quality improvement and Electric network validation in GIS is part of the scope		As per Rfp
Introduction	31	Please provide software Bill of Quantity (BOQ) of existing GIS application		As per Rfp
Introduction & System Architecture	31-34	Please share the detailed inventory of existing IT/OT systems proposed for integration (GIS, SCADA, MDMS, AMI, Billing, OMS, ERP, Asset Management, RMS, Consumer Indexing, etc.) along with OEM/product details and supported protocols for data integration.		As per Rfp

Sec 5 – Introduction / Deliverables	31, 93, 95	SI responsible for ETL of existing 'unformatted GIS data' into a connected, routable electrical network model (e.g., Utility Network); one-time digitization data referenced throughout. Please confirm the current state, format, completeness and connectivity level of APEPDCL's GIS data (Substation–Feeder–DT–Consumer–DER). We understand that the One-Time-Digitization of assets/inventory is already completed in existing GIS implementation and SI will use this data. Please confirm if our understanding is correct.		As per Rfp

System Architecture	33-34	Kindly provide the number of concurrent users targeted for this Platform.	Baseline user base across the existing DISCOMs shall be considered as approximately 10,000 users, with concurrent users assumed at 30% of the total user base. However, the SI shall ensure that the system capacity, scalability and performance remain compliant with the prescribed SLA requirements throughout the Contract Period, irrespective of any increase in the total user base or concurrent users beyond the aforesaid baseline.

System Architecture and Roles and Responsibilities of the DISCOM b.4 Allocation of IT Infrastructure and Server/Cloud Resources	33-34 and 111	Please confirm whether the DISCOM has any preference for the AI platform to be deployed on cloud, on-premise, or hybrid infrastructure. Also, RFP states that "Provision necessary server sizing & capacity, cloud storage or on premise and networking resources for hosting and running the new system efficiently." Kindly comment on probable time that the Discom would take in provisioning of the infra from the time of commencement of the project considering the 9 months implementation timeline.		As per Rfp
System Architecture & Scope of Work	33-34	It is mentoned that DISCOM existing Mobile Application may continue and Mobile application is also mentioned as one of the Deliverables . Please clarify if mobile app needs be be deliverd as part of scope or only web application is to be developed . If Mobile app needs to be delivered what will be the difference in existing mobile app and new mobile app in terms of role /operations.		As per RFP

Sec 5 – System Architecture	33-34	Please share the technology stack, data model/schema, API documentation and licensing of the existing APEPDCL GIS and mobile application, and confirm whether the SI is expected to integrate with it 'as-is' or to replace/rebuild any of its functionality.		As per RFP
Sec 5 – Deliverables / Hosting	34, 100, 111	Deployment may be on-premise, cloud or hybrid at Utility's option; APEPDCL to provision servers/cloud & DR at its Data Centre. Please confirm the hosting model (on-prem APEPDCL DC vs cloud) is to be FIXED before pricing, and that all compute/GPU/storage infrastructure (per Annexure 2 sizing) and the DR site are provided by APEPDCL at no cost to the SI, so bidders exclude hardware capex from the financial proposal.		As per Rfp

Scope of Work - Integration	34	We assume that APIs/interfaces of all incumbent systems will be made readily available by APEPDCL without additional cost to the SI and that the bidder will be indemnified from any delay caused due to delayed provision of such APIs/interfaces. Pls confirm.		As per Rfp
Scope of Work - Integration	34	We understand that APEPDCL will own any modifications/customizations required on existing systems side to enable integration with the existing systems, Please confirm.		As per Rfp
Scope of Work	34	Is forecasting to be done in the proposed system or forecasting shall be available and to be brought /ingested into this platform ?		As per Rfp
AI Analytics / Network Analysis	35-45	Kindly clarify whether the load flow analysis engine is expected to be developed by the SI or whether use of proven commercial network analysis software/COTS products is acceptable.		As per Rfp

Sec 5 Network Analysis	38	Data from One-time Digitization: Voltage profiles for every bus - Network topology data: Asset location, Bus specification (type of bus), Total number of buses - Line and cable data: impedance/km (resistance/km, inductance/km), conductor type, line length, line limit (thermal or power limit whichever is applicable) Could you please confirm that data from One-time Digitization - Is this data readily available or we need to perform survey for the given project area. If the data is available what is the level of accuracy and completeness.		As per Rfp
Sec 5 – AI Agent Builder / Advanced AI	52-55	Agentic AI, multi-agent orchestration, LLM copilots, RAG, autonomous long-running & scheduled task execution. Please confirm whether use of leading third-party foundation models (e.g., via secure API) is permitted for the agentic/LLM capabilities, or whether an on-premise/air-gapped open-source LLM is mandated for data-sovereignty. This drives both architecture and cost.		As per Rfp

Form G / GenAI Subscription	55, 134	Platform shall allow DISCOM to consume its own GenAI subscription (API key) in lieu of the SI's GenAI subscription. Please clarify how GenAI/LLM consumption costs are to be treated in the financial proposal – should the bidder assume SI-provided LLM for the full term, and if APEPDCL later provides its own API key, will there be a corresponding price adjustment/credit?		As per Rfp
Sec 5 – Integration with DISCOM Data Systems	75-77	Bidirectional integration with SCADA, GIS, MDMS/AMI, OMS, ERP/SAP, FMS, EPCCB(URMS), PM-KUSUM portals, Data Lake, and MoP/MNRE central servers. Please provide a definitive list of the in-scope source systems with their versions, current API availability/readiness, data latency and whether APEPDCL will provide production-ready APIs. Confirm that integration effort for systems without existing APIs (custom connector build) is a change-managed item.		As per Rfp

Training & Change Management	84-87	Kindly provide the expected number of users, user categories, training locations and training language requirements.		As per Rfp
Sec 5 – Facility Management (AIOps)	92-93	All platform releases, LLM connector updates, AI model improvements, security patches at no additional cost during the contract period. Please confirm that 'no additional cost' updates are limited to the platform/modules within the defined RFP scope, and that any NEW functional module or materially expanded scope will be handled as a chargeable Change Request (as stated in clause 11 of FMS), including third-party OEM/LLM licence cost increases.		As per Rfp

Sec 5 – Facility Mgmt / Evaluation Criteria	92, 103	< 1% error rate across all features' and '> 90% accuracy in analytics, simulations, chat responses and predictive tasks.' Request that AI accuracy SLAs be defined per use-case against jointly-agreed UAT benchmark datasets (consistent with SLA 1.5), and confirm the blanket '< 1% error rate' is an aspirational design goal, not a penalty-bearing SLA for probabilistic AI/LLM outputs.		As per Rfp
Sec 5 – Deliverables (Mobile App)	93-94, 137	AI-Native Web AND mobile application (Android/iOS) required; SI to develop and deploy mobile app. Please clarify whether a NEW mobile application is to be built by the SI, or whether AI insights/alerts are to be surfaced within APEPDCL's EXISTING field mobile app (as implied by the System Architecture section). The two readings have significantly different scope and cost.		As per Rfp

Exit Management / IP Rights	93, 113-114	Perpetual, royalty-free, sub-licensable rights jointly to ISA and APEPDCL; SI to hand over editable source code, AI/ML models, schemas, APIs at exit. Please confirm that pre-existing background IP, COTS/OEM product source code and third-party licensed components are excluded from the perpetual-rights handover, and that the licence covers project-specific developments and configurations only (otherwise COTS product bidders cannot participate).		As per Rfp
Project Management – Development of AI/ML Logic	97	All AI/ML models, prompts, workflows and algorithms to be fully documented and shared; no black-box AI without prior written approval. Please confirm that this disclosure obligation applies to the SI's project-specific configurations, prompts and trained models, and does NOT require disclosure of the underlying proprietary/third-party foundation model weights or pre-existing background IP of the SI/OEM.		As per Rfp

Sec 5 – Performance Requirements	104-105	Static page load < 50 ms; dynamic page < 1 sec; full map with all feature classes < 4 sec. Please confirm whether the < 50 ms static-page and < 4 sec full-map SLAs are measured at the server/TTFB level within the APEPDCL DC/LAN (excluding public-internet and client-device latency), as these thresholds are not achievable over uncontrolled WAN links.		As per Rfp
Form G / Table 1	134-135	ISA bears 100% of Year-1 subscription; APEPDCL may extend 4 years at the same annual rate; single fixed all-inclusive annual subscription fee for 5 years. Given the 5-year price lock, please confirm whether any price escalation/indexation (e.g., for LLM/GenAI token costs, third-party software renewals, or forex movement) is permitted, or whether bidders must absorb all such increases for the full term.		As per Rfp

Annexure 2 – Server Capacity Sizing	139-141	Bidders must mandatorily submit server sizing (vCPU/GPU, RAM, SSD) incl. NVIDIA A100 GPUs; non-submission renders bid non-responsive. Since GPU/compute sizing depends on data volumes and concurrent users not fully specified, please confirm whether APEPDCL will procure the sized infrastructure based on the SI's Annexure-2 assessment, and that sizing assumptions stated by the bidder will be accepted for responsiveness even if final infrastructure is tuned post-award.		As per Rfp
Vendor-Neutral Extensibility	100	The platform architecture shall support hybrid cloud, private cloud, public cloud and on-premises deployments without functional limitations. Does it mean fist preferenec is On-premsie implementation ?		As per Rfp

Integration with DISCOM Data Systems	75-78	Kindly provide source-wise data volumes, growth projections, retention requirements, and refresh frequencies for GIS, SCADA, RMS, AMI/MDMS, Billing, OMS, ERP, Asset Management, Solar/DER and Data Lake sources?		As per Rfp
Integration with DISCOM Data Systems	75-78	How many years of historical data are available for each source system?		As per Rfp
Data Management Standards	104	What are the expected data retention periods for raw, curated and analytics datasets? Is immutable/WARM storage required for audit and cybersecurity logs?		As per Rfp
DR requirements	80	Can the DR environment be hosted in AWS/Azure, or must it reside within APEPDCL-managed infrastructure?		As per Rfp
Integration with DISCOM Data Systems	75-78	Please provide system-wise frequency, latency and volume requirements for bidirectional data synchronization from the AI Platform back to GIS, SCADA, RMS, MDMS/AMI, OMS, Billing, ERP and other operational systems, including alerts, recommendations, workflow updates and analytical outputs		As per Rfp

Alerts and Notifications	73	Delivery of alerts and associated insights within 2 minutes of issue identification. What is the overall SLA for processing real time Data ?		As per Rfp
Asset Management and Data Repository	70	Store AI-validated asset details: Asset ID, geospatial coordinates, technical specifications, tender details and maintenance logs Can you explain more about AI validation here ?		As per Rfp
Data Lakes	77	Are there any preferred standards, data models, storage formats, metadata, catalog, lineage, or governance requirements applicable to the Data Lake implementation?		As per Rfp
Dashboard	54-44	The expected number of standard/pre-built dashboards to be delivered as part of the base scope.		As per Rfp

BDS Item 18-19 / Project Mgmt	22, 96	Contract commencement Nov 2026; project deliverables within 9 months; then 1-year subscription (+4 optional). Given the breadth of scope (11 modules, enterprise integration, one- time data transformation), please confirm whether the 9-month timeline is negotiable/phaseable through the mutually-agreed baseline schedule, and whether a pilot-circle-first rollout approach is acceptable.		As per Rfp
System Architecture & Scope of Work	33-34	System architecture shows Sensors (Field devcies) as one of the data source , can you pls elobrate what type of sensors or field devises data it is ? Which system is aggegating all these data ? Our understanding is data acquisition from each individual devices shall not be in scope of SI - please confirm		As per Rfp

System Architecture & Scope of Work	33-34	System architecture Solar DER (Rooftop Meters) as one of the data source , Which system is aggregating all these data ? Our understanding is data acquisition from each individual roof top meters shall not be in scope of SI - please confirm		As per Rfp
Sec 5 Network Analysis	38	Data from One-time Digitization: Voltage profiles for every bus - Network topology data: Asset location, Bus specification (type of bus), Total number of buses - Line and cable data: impedance/km (resistance/km, inductance/km), conductor type, line length, line limit (thermal or power limit whichever is applicable) Could you please confirm that data from One-time Digitization - Is this data readily available or we need to perform survey for the given project area. If the data is available what is the level of accuracy and completeness?		As per Rfp

Limitation of Liability		There was no explicit mention about the Limitation of Liability. Request to limit the total liability - Direct , indirect, consequential to the contract value.		As per Rfp
Project Management - Implementantation	96	The implementation timeline for the AI-powered grid digitization, network modeling, load flow analysis, grid simulation, and expansion planning solution should be extended to 15 months, given the project's complexity and the significant effort required to understand, structure, and migrate the existing data to the new platform.		As per Rfp
Last date for receipt of documents as per RFP	4	Request for extension of the last date for submission of the Bid responses upto 3rd Oct 2026.		As per Rfp & issued corrigendum
Liquidated Damages - Section 3 - Bid Data Sheet - (#8.b)		We request ISA to reduce the weekly liquidated damages to 0.5% of the value of the respective deliverable for each week of delay, subject to a maximum of 5% of that deliverable's value.		Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

Section 5 – System Architecture (Page No.33)	System Architecture	Are there no GIS systems to be provided, and only outputs need to be shared with the GIS system?		As per Rfp
AI-Driven Analytics, Part E (Map Visualization) §2, pt. 1 – Sensor Data Overlay (Page No.46)	Integrate latest Sensor data streams from SCADA systems, Remote Monitoring Systems (RMS), Load Flow Analysis (LFA) and IoT-enabled devices, visually representing critical metrics across the grid network.	The requirement references IoT-enabled devices for integrating latest sensor data streams. Please specify the list of devices and the methodology for integration.		As per Rfp
AI-Driven Analytics, Part E (Map Visualization) §9, pt. 1 – Spatial Queries (Page No.47)	Present an intelligent land base layer integrating topographic and administrative data, with clickable entities displaying geospatial attributes such as name and address	Where will the source administrative data (for land base/jurisdiction layers) come from?		As per Rfp
What-If Simulations, Section C (AI Agent Builder & Autonomous Task Execution) – Agent Creation, pt. 1	Agent Creation	Can the agents use LLM APIs, or will the LLM APIs be provided / privately hosted?		As per Rfp
Integration with DISCOM Data Systems (general)	The platform shall support secure, scalable, and bidirectional integration with the DISCOM's existing IT and OT systems through standard APIs and approved integration mechanisms	Are the data for all assets available in source systems? Is there no physical survey required?		As per Rfp

Integration with DISCOM Data Systems (general)	General	Please specify the number of integration points required.		As per Rfp
Integration with DISCOM Data Systems, Point E – PM-KUSUM Scheme Integration, pt. 1 (Page No. 77)	Considering all three point (i, ii, iii)	What is the source of this data?		As per Rfp
Integration with DISCOM Data Systems, Point G – Data Lake	The proposed solution should be capable to secure API-based integration, the bidder shall be capable of integrating with APEPDCL's proposed Data Lake through secure connectivity for datasets involving very large volumes.	Which is the proposed Data Lake?		As per Rfp

Integration with DISCOM Data Systems, Note pt. 1 (SI must integrate all new/existing systems)	Throughout the contract period, the System Integrator (SI) must integrate all new or existing systems necessary to achieve the project's scope and objectives. The SI is specifically responsible for bidirectional integration and data sharing with the central servers of MoP, MNRE, and their subsidiary bases on the directions given the APEPDCL. All data sharing must align with current and future policies, schemes or programs instituted by the GoI and GoAP.	What is the estimated number of integrations involved — kindly provide.		As per Rfp

Intellectual Property (IP) and Rights, pt. 2 – Right to Re-platform (Page No. 93)	Ownership of Insights: All processed data, derived insights, and trained ML models resulting from Utility data remain the exclusive property of the Utility	Considering ISA is preferring a COTS product, sharing source code for editing will be a challenge due to licensing factors.	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

				perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Platform & Software Standards (hosting)(Page No.98)	The proposed solution shall be delivered as an open, extensible, secure, vendor-neutral, and interoperable Digital Utility Platform that serves as the foundational layer for hosting, managing, and operating current and future utility applications.	What is the proposed hosting model — on-premise, private cloud, or SaaS?		on premise
Roles & Responsibilities, a.1.1 (Page No. 109)	Design, develop, configure, test, deploy and commission a fully functional AI-powered web and mobile-based Utility Platform comprising modules such as GIS-based Network Visualization, Digital Single-Line Diagrams (SLDs), Network Analysis, Load Forecasting, AI powered Natural Language Querying, AI Agent Builder, What-If Simulations, Asset & Consumer Data Management, Alerts & Notifications and other functionalities specified in this RFP.	Will the infrastructure be provided (by the Utility)?		As per Rfp
Roles & Responsibilities, a.1.2 (page No. 109)	Deploy the platform in an on-premise, cloud or hybrid environment, as specified by the Utility, ensuring scalability, high availability, interoperability, reliability and seamless user experience.	Please specify the hosting model for the proposed LLM — via APIs, or privately hosted.		As per Rfp

Licensing (general)	General	Does ISA intend to sub-license the solution to other utilities or companies?	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

				perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Facility Management Phase SLA Overview, (Page No.114)	SLA components	Considering the infrastructure is provided by the Utility, any downtime attributable to infrastructure should be excluded from penalties/SLA computation.		As per Rfp
Service Delivery & Performance Monitoring, Section C – Availability Management (Page No. 116)	FMP	Penalty should apply only to software-attributable issues, not infrastructure-level issues.		As per Rfp
Annexure 2 – Server Capacity Sizing, (Page No.122)	Server Capacity requirements	Please provide the estimated inbound/outbound integration data volume, number of queries per month, number of agents, etc., to enable accurate sizing.		As per RFP all intregation shall follow the IES specifications https://ies.recindia.org.in/docs
Introduction, p.31	...serving a diverse urban, rural, agricultural, and industrial consumer base with a projected electricity demand of ~30,159 MU, a total power purchase requirement of ~33,220 MU, and an estimated availability of ~34,622 MU.	For forecasting, is SLDC- or feeder-level SCADA data available along with historical data collected at regular intervals? Specifically, do we have a sufficiently long and reliable history of clean, consistent, and granular data to support accurate forecasting?		As per RFP

Introduction, p.31	Capitalizing on APEPDCL's existing digital infrastructure, which includes comprehensive GIS mapping from feeder to consumer level integrated with ERP systems...	APEPDCL is described as having 'comprehensive GIS mapping from feeder to consumer level integrated with ERP systems.' Please confirm the GIS platform (e.g., Esri, QGIS-based, other), is there complete topology is complete and current across all 7 circles.		As per RFP
Data Lakes requirement, p.77	The proposed solution should be capable to secure API-based integration, the bidder shall be capable of integrating with APEPDCL's proposed Data Lake through secure connectivity for datasets involving very large volumes.	Is there a APEPDCL/ISA enterprise Data Lake already provisioned (referenced under 'Data Lakes' requirement)? If so, please share its platform (e.g., Hadoop, Snowflake, Azure/AWS-native), current data volume, and expected connectivity mechanism for the proposed platform.		As per RFP
b.4.1, p.111	Provision necessary server sizing & capacity, cloud storage or on premise and networking resources for hosting and running the new system efficiently.	Clause b.4 states the DISCOM will 'provision necessary server sizing & capacity, cloud storage or on premise and networking resources.' Please confirm: will infrastructure procurement follow the		As per RFP
		SI's Annexure 2 sizing submission, and what is the expected lead time/process for provisioning post-approval? As this will impact the overall project timelines		

Annexure 2, p.139	GPU: NVIDIA A100 (40/80GB) — Annexure 2 server sizing template line item 5	Will GPU compute (e.g., NVIDIA A100 40/80GB, per Annexure 2 template) be provisioned by APEPDCL/ISA, or must the SI include GPU procurement/hosting in its cost proposal? If APEPDCL-provided, what GPU capacity is currently available or planned?		
Performance Requirements (d.i), p.104; Annexure 2 note, p.139	...the following performance metrics shall be met for all concurrent users" / Elsewhere: "bidders may make reasonable assumptions about the expected workload, including the number of concurrent users, role-based access patterns...	The Performance Requirements section specifies response-time SLAs (e.g., static page <50ms TTFB, dynamic pages <1s, map load <4s) 'for all concurrent users.' Please confirm the expected number of concurrent users (control room, field staff, planners, management) the platform must support at peak.		As per RFP
Training scope, p.84	Approximate number of trainees: 90-100 personnel per Discom." (elsewhere) "Approximate number of trainees: 750 personnel per Discom."	Please confirm the expected trainee counts per role/module — the RFP states different figures in different sections ('90-100 personnel' and '750 personnel' per DISCOM). Please clarify which figure applies to which training track/module.		As per RFP

b.6.1, p.111	Designate a single point of contact (SPOC) responsible for coordinating between DISCOM teams and the System Integrator.	Will a single Nodal Officer/SPOC be designated before contract signing, and can Esyasoft have a designated technical counterpart from each source-system team (GIS, SCADA, MDMS, Billing, etc.) during the discovery/integration phase?		As per RFP
b.5.1, p.111	Assist in pilot deployments, testing system performance in select zones before full-scale rollout.	Is a phased/pilot rollout across a subset of circles expected before full 7-circle deployment, as referenced under 'Support for Field Testing, Pilot		As per RFP
		Runs and Full-Scale Implementation'? If so, which circle(s) would be the pilot?		As per RFP
a.7, Scalability / Additional Circles, p.102	In the event of project scale-up or onboarding of a new agency for additional circles, the SI shall provide... / ...ensuring that the system can be extended to additional circles and/or integrated with solutions...	Clause a.7 references future scale-up to 'additional circles' or 'a new agency.' What is the realistic 3-5 year horizon for scope expansion beyond the current 7 circles, so the architecture can be designed for that scale from day one without re-architecture?		As per RFP

Financial Proposal / Form G, p.135-136; Payment Terms, p.105-108	The Bidder shall quote a single, all-inclusive annual subscription fee, which shall remain fixed and applicable throughout the entire five (5) year subscription period." / "The subscription shall initially be contracted for a period of one (1) year... APEPDCL shall... continue the subscription for a further four (4) years...	Milestones M1-M7 (development) are followed by M8 (FMS). Please confirm how the Annual Levelized Subscription Fee is to be priced for the full five-year subscription structure, including the initial one-year period and the optional subsequent four-year period, and whether the quoted annual fee must remain fixed throughout.		As per RFP
b.4.1-b.4.3, p.111	Provision necessary server sizing & capacity, cloud storage or on premise and networking resources for hosting and running the new system efficiently.	Please clarify the responsibility matrix between ISA, APEPDCL and the System Integrator for provisioning and bearing the cost of compute infrastructure, GPU, storage, database, networking, cloud/on-premise infrastructure, backup/DR and other infrastructure required for hosting and operating the proposed platform.		As per RFP

b.2.2.6, p.111; a.2.1, p.109	The DISCOM shall also specify the availability, format, frequency, quality, and historical retention period of each dataset... / "Integrate the platform with the Utility's existing IT and OT systems... to enable a unified operational data environment.	Please clarify the intended enterprise data architecture. Will APEPDCL/ISA provide a centralized Data Lake/Data Platform that acts as the common data layer for all functional modules and integrated IT/OT systems, or is the SI expected to establish and manage the common data/integration layer as part of the proposed solution?		As per RFP
Exit Management & Handover, p.113-114	The System Integrator (SI) must execute a zero-cost Exit Management Plan... The SI must hand over complete, editable documentation, source code, AI/ML models, schemas, and APIs to both APEPDCL and the ISA to enable independent operation.	Please clarify the complete application handover and IP requirements at contract expiry, termination or non-renewal. Specifically, please confirm whether the SI is required to hand over source code, application binaries, configurations, AI/ML models, schemas, APIs, deployment scripts, technical documentation, credentials and other technical artefacts required for independent operation by APEPDCL/ISA.		As per RFP

Exit Management & Handover, p.114	All third-party software, subscriptions, and certificates must be registered in APEPDCL's name. At exit, the SI must hand over all administrative rights, activation keys, credentials, and perpetual licenses so no component relies on the SI.	Please clarify whether all third-party software, COTS products, AI/LLM services, databases, middleware, GIS components and other licensed technologies used in the solution are required to be procured and registered in APEPDCL's name from project commencement, or whether the SI may initially procure them and subsequently transfer the applicable licenses/subscriptions during Exit Management.		As per RFP
Financial Proposal / Form G, p.135-136	The subscription cost for the initial one (1) year period shall be borne entirely by ISA, and APEPDCL shall not have any payment or financial obligation towards the subscription during this period." / "During the extended four (4) year period, the annual subscription fee... shall be borne by APEPDCL.	Please clarify the payment responsibility and contractual arrangement for the subscription/FMS period. Specifically, please confirm whether subscription/FMS payments during the contract period will be made by ISA or APEPDCL and whether payment responsibility changes after the initial subscription period.		As per RFP

Financial Proposal / Form G, p.135-136	The Bidder shall quote a single, all-inclusive annual subscription fee, which shall remain fixed and applicable throughout the entire five (5) year subscription period." / "The subscription shall initially be contracted for a period of one (1) year... with a further four (4) year subscription period...	Please confirm whether bidders are required to quote a single annual subscription fee applicable throughout the complete five-year subscription structure and whether the quoted rate will remain fixed for the subsequent subscription years. Please also confirm whether the complete subscription pricing is required to be submitted as part of the initial financial proposal.		As per RFP

Scope of Work cl.(a), p.35; System Architecture, pp.32-33; Alerts & Notifications, p.72	The System Integrator (SI) shall design, develop, deploy, test, commission, and maintain web-based and mobile-based (Android and iOS, wherever applicable) applications... / ...the existing DISCOM GIS/mobile application may continue to function as the field execution interface for linemen and field crews..." / "...field personnel and linemen receive... notifications through the existing mobile application platform already deployed by the DISCOM...	Clause (a) 'Web and Mobile Application Development' (p.35) requires the SI to develop web and mobile (Android/iOS, 'wherever applicable') applications, while the System Architecture (pp.32-33) and the Alerts & Notifications module (p.72) state that the existing DISCOM GIS/mobile application continues as the field execution interface receiving alerts. Please clarify: (a) is a new SI-built mobile application in scope, or is mobile scope limited to integration with the existing DISCOM app; and (b) if a new app is required, which of the 11 modules/functions must be available on mobile?		As per RFP
Intelligent Network Analytics & Decision Support h.i, p.62	This platform capability must be bidirectionally synchronized with the field-ready Mobile Application, enabling linemen to execute on-site verification, resolve inconsistencies, and capture real-time updates using DISCOM-provided field teams.	If feeder-to-consumer digitization is found incomplete or inaccurate in any of the 7 circles, is field survey/data capture in the SI's scope, or will DISCOM-provided field teams perform on-ground verification with the SI supplying the tooling and validation workflows only?		All surveys are part of Discom where as SI to perform/validate and other deliverables as per RFP

AI/ML transparency requirements, p.97	No proprietary or black-box AI logic that prevents understanding, validation, modification, or [reuse]... shall be used without prior written approval..." / documentation required for "approach, assumptions, datasets, feature selection, model outputs, and acceptance criteria."	The RFP states no proprietary or 'black-box' AI logic may be used without prior written approval (p.97). Does this restriction extend to established third-party/COTS power-system engines (load flow, short circuit, optimization) whose solver internals are proprietary but whose methodology, inputs and outputs are fully documented and industry-standard? If approval is required, can it be granted at proposal stage?		as per RFP
Chat-based NLQ, pp.64 & 68; Agentic AI / GenAI flexibility, p.55	Uses a fine-tuned GPT model trained on DISCOM's historical and real-time data..." / GenAI Subscription Flexibility & RAG-grounded response requirements.	The NLQ module requires a 'fine-tuned GPT model trained on DISCOM's historical and real-time data' (pp.64, 68), while the Agentic AI requirements mandate RAG-grounded responses with citations (p.55). Please confirm whether literal LLM fine-		as per RFP
		tuning is mandatory, or whether a RAG/grounding architecture over an enterprise LLM (with DISCOM-specific terminology handling) is acceptable. If fine-tuning is required, please confirm where DISCOM data may be processed for training (in-country/on-prem constraints).		

Exit Management & Handover, p.113; Form G / Payment Terms, pp.105-108, 135-136	The System Integrator (SI) must execute a zero-cost Exit Management Plan upon contract expiry, termination, or if APEPDCL does not continue the subscription beyond the first year.	The Exit Management clause (p.113) applies zero-cost handover even 'if APEPDCL does not continue the subscription beyond the first year', while the fee must remain fixed for the full five-year structure. Please confirm whether any minimum commitment or early-discontinuation compensation applies if the subscription is not extended beyond Year 1 — or whether bidders should structure full development-cost recovery within the Professional Fees (Table 1) alone.		as per RFP
BDS 42 / ITB 41, pp.18-20	...the contractor shall be liable to pay ISA the liquidated damages of a weekly charge of 5% (five percent) of the total contract sum, for each week of the weekly occurrence, up to a maximum amount of 20% (twenty percent) of the contract sum...	Liquidated Damages are set at 5% of the total contract sum per week, capped at 20% (BDS 42, p.20). Please confirm that LD applies only to delays/breaches attributable to the SI, and that extension of time without penalty will be granted for delays caused by DISCOM/ISA-side dependencies (data access, API/credential provisioning, infrastructure readiness, UAT and milestone approvals). We also request reconsideration of the weekly rate, which is exceptionally high relative to industry norms.		Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

Form G / Financial Proposal notes, p.135; BDS (security provisions), pp.20-21	The successful Bidder shall submit a Contract Performance Guarantee (CPG) to APEPDCL equivalent to ten percent (10%) of the total subscription value for the subsequent four (4) year period.	A Contract Performance Guarantee of 10% of the total subscription value for the 4-year extension period is required (p.135), while Bid Security and Performance Security for the base contract are NIL. Please confirm the CPG instrument (bank guarantee		As per RFP
		from a scheduled Indian bank?), beneficiary (APEPDCL), submission timing (with the extension LoA?), validity and claim period.		
GenAI Subscription Flexibility & Interoperability, p.55	The platform shall provide the DISCOM the option to consume its own GenAI subscription(s), by way of an API key, for use by the SI... in lieu of the SI's own GenAI subscription.	GenAI Subscription Flexibility (p.55) allows the DISCOM to bring its own GenAI API key 'in lieu of the SI's own GenAI subscription'. If the DISCOM does not exercise this option, please confirm that GenAI/LLM consumption costs are to be included within the fixed annual subscription fee, and provide an assumed usage volume (users, queries/day, token budget) so all bidders price this identically.		As per RFP

Integration scope, pp.74-78 & p.109-111	...providing the System Integrator with access to relevant APIs, interface specifications, database schemas... wherever available." (integration scope across OMS, GIS, EPCCB/URMS, Mobile applications, SAP/ERP)	For integration with existing enterprise systems (SAP/ERP, incumbent GIS, AMI head-end/MDMS, billing), who bears any third-party OEM charges required to open or use their interfaces — e.g., SAP interface/named-user licensing, GIS vendor API/SDK fees, head-end system integration fees? Will APEPDCL procure/authorize these under its existing OEM contracts?		As per RFP and all integration shall follow IES Specifications: https://ies.recindia.org.in/docs
FMS / Platform Upgrades notes, pp.92, 97	Any new functional module, business capability, workflow or feature that materially expands the scope of work beyond the requirements defined in this RFP shall be treated as a Change Request and shall be implemented only after written approval of the Utility under mutually agreed commercial terms.	New functionality beyond RFP scope is to be handled as a Change Request 'under mutually agreed commercial terms' (pp.92, 97). Will a man-day/blended rate card be quoted as part of the financial proposal to govern future CR pricing, or will each CR be negotiated independently?		As per RFP
Payment Milestones & notes, pp.105-108	All Milestones deliverables during both development and subscriptions period shall be duly approved by the DISCOM for payment acceptance" / "Subscription period shall	Milestone payments require DISCOM approval of deliverables and the subscription period commences 'post Go-Live acceptance from the DISCOM' (pp.105-108). Please define the objective		As per RFP

	commence post Go live acceptance from the Discom	acceptance criteria for each milestone (particularly M6 UAT and M7 Final Acceptance) and confirm maximum review/approval timelines binding on APEPDCL/ISA, with deemed-acceptance or timeline relief if approvals are delayed.		
FMS SLA tables, pp.116-121	SLA tables including AI Model Accuracy & Performance and Agentic AI Performance parameters with Warranty/Stabilization Period provisions.	For the AI Model Accuracy & Performance and Agentic AI SLAs (pp.116-121): who validates a 'failure', against what baseline/benchmark dataset is accuracy measured, and does the 6-month Warranty/Stabilization period (no penalties) run from overall platform Go-Live or per module/model as each goes live?		As per RFP
Exit Management & Handover, p.113	The SI must hand over complete, editable documentation, source code, AI/ML models, schemas, and APIs to both APEPDCL and the ISA to enable independent operation.	Do the source-code and documentation handover obligations under Exit Management apply identically to embedded third-party/COTS components (e.g., a licensed load-flow engine, GIS libraries) as to SI-developed custom code, or is source-code escrow (with APEPDCL as beneficiary, released on trigger events) an acceptable alternative for COTS components whose source the SI does not own? and if it is IP how can that be shared across		The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership

Relevant Project Experience	The Sole Bidder/Lead Bidder/any Consortium Member should have successfully implemented Eligible Projects involving Alenabled Digital Utility Platforms, Digital Twin solutions, network analysis, predictive models using AI/ML, utility IT/OT system integration, Large Language Model (LLM)-based applications, Agentic AI, AI copilots, multi-agent AI systems, utility-scale AI/ML solutions, interoperable utility data platforms for any Power Distribution/Generation/Transmission	The specified eligibility criterion requires experience across several advanced AI/ML modules, such as Digital Twin, LLM-based applications, Agentic AI, AI copilots, multi-agent systems and utility-scale platforms. AI/ML adoption in the Indian power utility sector is still at a nascent stage, and only a limited number of companies may have implemented this entire range of modules. The present requirement may therefore restrict wider participation, particularly from capable Indian MSMEs and specialized technology companies.		during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code,
	Company, Renewable Energy Utility, or other Critical Infrastructure Sector within the last three (3) years executed or under execution from the date of issuance of this RFP: • Aggregate project value across eligible engagements Each of the projects need to have signed contracts and work orders as on date of bid submission. In cases where a signed contract or work order is not available due to the pilot nature of the project, the bidder must submit a completion certificate along with evidence of the available funding. The implementation should	To encourage broader participation and ensure a competitive bid, we request you to relax and amend the criterion as follows: "The Sole Bidder/Lead Bidder/any Consortium Member should have successfully implemented or have under execution, during the last five years, at least one project involving AI/ML, data analytics, predictive analytics, business intelligence, asset analytics or other advanced analytics solutions in any Power Grid, Power Transmission, Power Distribution, Generation, Renewable Energy, Utility or Critical Infrastructure project.		

	have covered technical asset modeling and software integration of power grid systems.	The experience may cover one or more relevant analytics modules and need not necessarily include all the technologies/modules listed in the existing clause. MSME-registered companies with relevant technical experience in the above areas shall also be considered eligible.” Further, since USD–INR exchange rates are subject to fluctuation, we request that the project-value thresholds be specified in INR. Alternatively, the tender may prescribe a fixed exchange rate and reference date for conversion of foreign-currency contracts. The requested relaxation will facilitate participation by competent MSMEs and specialized AI/ML companies, improve competition and enable the Employer to receive technically innovative and commercially competitive offers		documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI’s Background IP or APEPDCL’s project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.
Availability of COTS Software Solution	Sole/ Lead Bidder/ any other Consortium Member • No demonstrated COTS-based AI-enabled solution for the Power Sector – 0 • Demonstrated COTS software solution with AI-enabled web-based applications for the Power Sector – 5 • Demonstrated COTS software solution with operational AI-enabled web	The present evaluation criterion restricts qualifying experience exclusively to COTS-based AI-enabled software solutions. It is submitted that power utilities differ significantly in terms of asset hierarchy, network topology, GIS and SCADA architecture, data formats, operational workflows, regulatory requirements, cybersecurity policies, and integration with existing		

	applications for digitised and geotagged power utility asset management, monitoring, analytics, forecasting, or decisionsupport dashboards in the Power Sector – 10	enterprise applications. Therefore, AI-enabled solutions for the power sector generally require substantial utility-specific configuration, customization, integration, and development. Restricting the criterion only to COTS solutions may exclude bidders having successfully implemented customized or purpose-built AI-enabled applications with equivalent or superior functionality and proven operational performance in the power sector. Further, classifying software as COTS or non-COTS does not, by itself, establish its technical capability, scalability, interoperability, or successful field performance. It is therefore requested that the evaluation be made technology-neutral and based on demonstrated functionality and operational experience, irrespective of whether the solution is COTS, configurable, customized, or purpose-built. Proposed Amended Clause: Sole Bidder/Lead Bidder/Any Other Consortium Member · No demonstrated AI-enabled software solution for the Power Sector – 0 Marks · Demonstrated COTS/configurable/customized/purpose-built software solution with AI-		

		enabled web-based applications for the Power Sector – 5 Marks	
		· Demonstrated operational COTS/configurable/customized/purpose-built software solution with AI-enabled web applications for digitised and geotagged power utility asset management, monitoring, analytics, forecasting, and/or decision-support dashboards in the Power Sector – 10 Marks This amendment will retain the intended technical qualification and scoring standards while encouraging wider competition and enabling the Utility to evaluate solutions based on proven capabilities and operational outcomes rather than the software's commercial classification	

4.3 Technical Evaluation Criteria	AI-enabled Utility Analytics, Integration and Grid Intelligence Capability: Demonstration of bidder's capability and prior experience in utility data integration, electrical network understanding for power utilities, as per RFP requirements. Utility Infrastructure Understanding and Integration Capability (max 20 points): • Demonstration of understanding of electrical network hierarchy including substations, feeders, DTs, switches, meters, Distributed Energy Resources (DERs) and associated electrical connectivity : 5 points • Demonstration of integration capability for data ingestion from existing DISCOM IT/OT systems (minimum two systems such as GIS, SCADA, MDMS, AMI, OMS, ERP, Billing, Outage Management, or Asset Management Systems) into the proposed platform: 5 Points - Demonstration of bidirectional integration	HES and MDMS are core utility IT/OT platforms that demonstrate large-scale real-time data ingestion, meter and network hierarchy management, integration with AMI, Billing, GIS, ERP and other utility systems, as well as operational analytics and bidirectional exchange of alerts and commands. Therefore, prior experience in implementing HES/MDMS/AMI solutions should be considered as relevant experience under "Utility Analytics, Integration and Grid Intelligence Capability." It is also observed that AMI, MDMS and Billing are included as eligible systems in certain integration criteria but excluded from similar criteria elsewhere. It is requested that these systems be considered consistently across all applicable evaluation parameters. Further, since the supporting documents are listed using "/", kindly confirm that any one of the following shall be sufficient to establish compliance:		

	capability by publishing AI insights, alerts, recommendations, or analytics back to existing DISCOM IT/OT systems (minimum two systems such as GIS, SCADA, MDMS, AMI, OMS, ERP, Billing, Outage Management, or Asset Management Systems): 5 Points • Demonstration of real-time data ingestion, synchronization and operational analytics capability for utility infrastructure : 5 points Supporting Documents Evidence of capability (Technical Presentation / Minimum Viable Product Demonstration / Work Orders / Completion Certificates / Client Certificates)	Technical Presentation, MVP/Demonstration, Work Order, Completion Certificate, or Client Certificate. Requested Amendment: Experience and demonstration of HES, MDMS, AMI and Billing-system integration may be accepted under the relevant scoring criteria, and capability may be demonstrated through any one of the specified supporting documents.		
Section 3 – Bid Data Sheet, Page 21; Section 4.1, Page 23	The BDS specifies Bid Security as NIL and Performance Security as NIL. The preliminary examination criteria also refer to bid security compliance.	We understand from the RFP that no Bid Security/EMD is required and that there is no Performance Security requirement for the initial contract. However, the RFP does not specifically mention any Tender Fee/RFP Fee. Please confirm that no EMD/Bid Security, Tender Fee, Tender Cost or any other fee is payable by the bidder for participation in this RFP. Further, please confirm that no Performance Security is required from the successful bidder for the initial contract period with ISA.		

Section 2, Clause 29 – Evaluation of Eligibility and Qualification, Page 15; Form D – Previous Relevant Experience, Page 126	Past experience of working with ISA and/or multilateral/international organizations will be an added advantage. However, Form D states that only assignments for which the Bidder was legally contracted/sub-contracted by the Client	Please clarify whether the experience of the Bidder's Parent Company/Affiliate Company in executing projects for ISA, multilateral agencies or international organizations can be considered for technical qualification/evaluation. If permissible, please clarify the required supporting documents and	
	or was a Consortium/JV partner can be claimed as bidder experience.	whether a formal undertaking/commitment from the Parent/Affiliate Company will be sufficient. Considering that AI/ML-based utility analytics is an emerging area in the Indian market, allowing relevant Parent/Affiliate credentials would enable bidders to leverage established expertise and advanced technologies for successful implementation of the proposed project.	
Section 3 – Bid Data Sheet, Clause 22; RFP Notice, Page 2	The proposal is to be submitted by email in PDF format. The BDS specifies a maximum file size of 5 MB per transmission. Technical and Financial Proposals may be submitted separately, and the Financial Proposal is to be password protected.	The RFP requires submission of comprehensive technical and financial proposals, including detailed technical architecture, methodology, project plan, integration approach, AI/ML approach, credentials, supporting documents and other annexures. Considering the extensive documentation required, it may not be feasible to compress the complete Technical Proposal into a 5 MB file. Please confirm whether the Bidder may	

		provide the Technical Proposal and/or Financial Proposal through a secure cloud/Google Drive link shared in the submission email, instead of attaching the complete documents to the email. Further, if submission through a Drive/cloud link is permitted, please confirm whether access should be provided only to the designated email ID (mdtf_procurement@isa.int) or to any additional email IDs.		
Form G – Financial Proposal	The RFP requires the bidder to quote for the complete project and five-year subscription. However, the RFP does not mention the total project budget.	Please confirm the total budget allocated for this project, including the implementation and subscription costs.		
Section 5 – Intellectual Property, Data Ownership	The RFP requires comprehensive documentation and provides the Utility with rights relating to exported schemas, code and	Since the proposed solution is COTS-based, the Bidder will not be able to provide the complete source code, proprietary product architecture,		

& Exit Management, Pages 93–94 and 113–114	model architectures. It also requires handover of source code, AI/ML models, schemas and APIs during exit. APEPDCL is to have perpetual rights over the baseline release and future developments, subject to the specified provisions.	underlying data models or other proprietary components of the COTS platform. However, the Bidder can provide the source code, configurations, APIs and technical documentation specifically developed/implemented for this project. Please confirm whether this approach will be acceptable, with the Bidder's pre-existing proprietary COTS components and intellectual property remaining with the Bidder.		
Section 3 – Bid Data Sheet / Proposal Submission	The RFP specifies submission of the Technical and Financial Proposals through email in PDF format.	Please confirm whether the Bidder is required to submit any hard copies/original documents of the Technical Proposal, Financial Proposal, supporting documents or any other submission at any stage of the bidding or contract process.		As per section 3 of the RFP

Section 3 – Bid Data Sheet, Sl. No. 20	The RFP states that ISA may award the contract to one or more Proposers and reserves the right to award the contract in whole or in part to more than one successful Proposer, based on the outcome of the evaluation and ISA's requirements. The RFP also specifies the contract type as a Services Contract.	Please clarify the basis on which the contract will be awarded in case more than one proposer is selected. Will the evaluation and financial assessment be carried out on a module-wise/work-package-wise basis, or will the complete project be evaluated and awarded to one or more bidders based on specific requirements? Please also clarify how the costing will be evaluated if the contract is awarded in part to different bidders and whether bidders are required to quote for the complete scope or individual modules/work packages.		As per RFP
Page 31 – Terms of Reference	“Subscription for the next 4 years on satisfactory performance and budgetary provisions of APEPDCL”	Kindly specify the measurable SLA/KPI criteria and evaluation methodology that will be used by APEPDCL to determine satisfactory performance for renewal of the subscription beyond the first year.		As per RFP

Pages 34–35 – Scope of Work → Web & Mobile Application; Page 72 – Alerts & Notifications	Page 34 states that AI-generated insights shall be communicated to the existing DISCOM GIS/mobile application. Page 35 requires the SI to “design, develop, deploy, test, commission, and maintain web-based and mobile-based (Android and iOS, wherever applicable) applications.” Page 72 further states that field personnel/linemen shall receive alerts through the existing mobile application platform already deployed by the DISCOM.	Kindly clarify whether the SI is required to develop a new mobile application under this RFP or integrate the proposed platform with the DISCOM's existing GIS/mobile application, or whether both are required.		As per RFP
Page 38 – Network Analysis → Additional Analysis Features for Compliance	“The proposed solution shall ingest and utilize feeder-wise, Distribution Transformer (DT)-wise, and consumer-wise Energy Audit data, billing data, and Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI)/Smart Meter interval data...” Further, AI/ML algorithms shall reconcile GIS connectivity, SCADA measurements, energy audit results, billing records and smart meter data.	Kindly provide the current availability, completeness and historical depth of data from GIS, SCADA/RMS, AMI/MDMS, Billing/CIS, Energy Audit and other existing DISCOM systems that will be made available to the SI for implementation of the proposed platform.		As per RFP

Page 55 – AI Agent Builder & Autonomous Task Execution → GenAI Subscription Flexibility & Interoperability	“The platform shall provide the DISCOM the option to consume its own GenAI subscription(s), by way of an API key, for use by the SI in delivering the AI Agent Builder and associated Advanced AI capabilities, in lieu of the SI's own GenAI subscription.”	Kindly clarify whether the GenAI subscription/API access will be provided by the DISCOM from the start of implementation or whether the SI should provision its own GenAI subscription as part of the proposed solution.		As per RFP
Page 55 – GenAI Subscription Flexibility & Interoperability	“The platform shall provide the DISCOM the option to consume its own GenAI subscription(s), by way of an API key... in lieu of the SI's own GenAI subscription.”	Kindly clarify whether APEPDCL intends to provide its own GenAI subscription/API access from the start of implementation?		As per RFP
Page 72 – Alerts & Notifications → Integration Requirements; Page 89 – FMS	The RFP requires “AI model retraining with historical/real-time data” and “continuous improvement of the complete AI platform throughout the contract period”	Specify the acceptance/revalidation process for retrained models.		As per RFP
Page 75 – Integration with DISCOM Data Systems	“All insights generated through the above dashboard shall be seamlessly integrated with all APEPDCL's systems (OMS, GIS, EPCCB (URMS), Mobile applications and SAP/ERP systems etc.)...”	Kindly provide the complete list of existing DISCOM IT/OT systems/applications that are required to be integrated under this RFP, along with the make/OEM.		As per RFP

Page 80 – User Management and Security → Disaster Recovery & Business Continuity	The SI shall design, implement, test and maintain a DR environment for all applications, portals, mobile applications, APIs, databases, middleware and supporting infrastructure. Critical services shall be restored within the “agreed RTO and RPO.”	Kindly specify the required Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO) for the proposed Production/DR environment.		Maximum RTO is 1 Hr and Maximum RPO 15 minutes
Page 92 – Facility Management Services → Evaluation Criteria	“Accuracy: Data and AI predictions with <1% error rate across all features.” Further, “AI Effectiveness: >90% accuracy in analytics, simulations, chat responses and predictive tasks.”	Kindly clarify the methodology, reference/ground-truth dataset and test cases that will be used for measurement and acceptance of the specified Data/AI prediction accuracy and AI effectiveness requirements.		As per RFP
Page 92 – Evaluation Criteria → Scalability	The platform is required to demonstrate performance under “full deployment load.”	Kindly define the expected full-deployment load in terms of concurrent users, API transactions, analytical jobs, AI/GenAI queries and concurrent simulations to be considered for performance benchmarking.		As per RFP

Page 92 – Platform Maintenance, Upgrades & Continuous Improvement	The Facility Management Services shall also include the ongoing maintenance and continuous improvement of the complete AI platform throughout the contract period. Without any additional cost to the Utility, the System Integrator shall provide: 1. All platform software releases, version upgrades and maintenance updates issued during the contract period. 2. AI model improvements, prompt orchestration enhancements, reasoning engine optimizations and performance improvements required to maintain or improve solution effectiveness. 3. Updates to Large Language Model (LLM) connectors, AI frameworks, orchestration engines, vector databases, Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) components, embedding models and supporting AI infrastructure as required for continued platform functionality. 4. API upgrades, SDK updates, middleware updates and connector enhancements necessary to maintain interoperability with integrated Utility systems and supported third-party platforms. 5. Updates to software libraries,	Kindly clarify the criteria for distinguishing an FMS enhancement/update from a materially new functionality to be handled as a Change Request, particularly for changes required due to future Utility systems, policies, schemes or business workflows.		As per RFP

	operating system dependencies, container platforms, databases and runtime components required for security, compatibility and vendor support. 6. Security updates, vulnerability remediation, cybersecurity hardening and critical bug fixes released by OEMs or open-source communities during the contract period. 7. Implementation of platform performance optimization updates including database tuning, AI inference optimization, application optimization, indexing improvements and resource utilization enhancements. 8. Compatibility updates required due to changes in supported browsers, operating systems, cloud infrastructure, virtualization platforms or Utility IT infrastructure. 9. Periodic health assessment of the deployed platform, including recommendations for preventive maintenance, capacity optimization and technology refresh wherever applicable. 10. The above activities shall be considered part of the Facility Management Services and no additional payment shall be admissible for implementation of			

	such updates during the contract period. 11. Any new functional module, business capability, workflow or feature that materially expands the scope of work beyond the requirements defined in this RFP shall be treated as a Change Request and shall be implemented only after written approval of the Utility under mutually agreed commercial terms.			

Page 109 – Roles and Responsibilities / Provision of Grid Asset Data, GIS Layers and Power Flow Records	"Grant comprehensive access to existing asset registries, GIS maps, feeder configurations and power distribution records to enable system integration. Share historical and real-time data from SCADA, RMS, billing systems and energy meters to facilitate data validation and analytics-driven insights."	Kindly confirm the responsibility for identification, correction and validation of incomplete, inaccurate or unavailable source data/GIS/network records. Further, please clarify whether delays arising due to non-availability or quality issues in APEPDCL-provided data shall result in corresponding extension of the affected project timelines.		As per RFP

Pages 109–110 – Roles and Responsibilities / Integration Support for Seamless Data Exchange	"The DISCOM shall facilitate integration with existing third-party applications, OEM systems, and enterprise platforms by providing the System Integrator with access to relevant APIs, interface specifications, database schemas, data dictionaries, communication protocols, authentication mechanisms, sample datasets, and technical documentation, wherever available. The DISCOM shall also specify the availability, format, frequency, quality, and historical retention period of each dataset (e.g., number of years/months of historical data available) to enable the SI to design, configure, and implement the required integration, AI/ML models"	Kindly confirm that APEPDCL shall facilitate the required API access, credentials, interface documentation, security approvals and coordination with existing application/OEM vendors for integration under the project. Further, please clarify who shall bear any charges levied by incumbent OEMs/vendors for API enablement, interface modifications or additional licenses required for such integration.		As per RFP
Pages 109–112 – Roles and Responsibilities / Appointment of a Nodal Officer for Project Coordination	"Ensure timely decision-making, approvals and issue resolution to streamline project execution".	Kindly specify the expected turnaround time for review and approval of design documents, integration requirements, data validation, UAT observations, deliverables and milestone sign-offs.		As per RFP

Pages 109–112 – Roles and Responsibilities / Integration Support for Seamless Data Exchange	"The DISCOM shall facilitate integration with existing third-party applications, OEM systems, and enterprise platforms by providing the System Integrator with access to relevant APIs, interface specifications, database schemas, data dictionaries, communication protocols, authentication mechanisms, sample datasets, and technical documentation, wherever available. The DISCOM shall also specify the availability, format, frequency, quality, and historical retention period of each dataset (e.g., number of years/months of historical data available) to enable the SI to design, configure, and implement the required integration, AI/ML models".	Confirmation required on delays attributable to APEPDCL, ISA, incumbent OEMs or other third-party dependencies—including delay in data/API access, infrastructure provisioning, field support or approvals—shall result in corresponding schedule relief to the SI and shall not attract LD/SLA penalties for the affected period.		As per RFP

Pages 109–112 – Roles and Responsibilities / Ensuring Adoption and Effective Utilization of the New System	"Drive organizational change management, ensuring that personnel across departments effectively adopt the new AI-driven platform. Establish KPIs for system utilization, monitoring its impact on operational efficiency, revenue protection and loss reduction. Promote a data-driven decision-making culture, leveraging insights from the system to enhance grid management strategies".	Kindly clarify whether user-adoption/utilization KPIs, wherever applicable, shall be considered a joint APEPDCL–SI responsibility, since achievement of such KPIs is dependent upon nomination of users, management participation, user availability, training attendance and actual operational usage by APEPDCL personnel.		As per RFP
Page 110 – Roles and Responsibilities / Allocation of IT Infrastructure and Server/Cloud Resources	"Provision necessary server sizing & capacity, cloud storage or on premise and networking resources for hosting and running the new system efficiently. Ensure sufficient bandwidth and network access for seamless data transmission from remote field locations to the central repository"	Kindly confirm the deployment model and timeline for provisioning complete resources.		As per RFP

Page 110 – Roles and Responsibilities / Allocation of IT Infrastructure and Server/Cloud Resources	"Provision for the expansion of server infrastructure to ensure sufficient capacity for the smooth execution of algorithms & required platform operations".	Kindly confirm the approval process and lead time for provisioning incremental resources during the contract period, based on the SI's periodic sizing recommendations.		As per RFP
Form G: Financial Proposal Form Page 134 of 141	NA	The RFP specifies the detailed scope of work and requires bidders to submit the overall financial proposal along with detailed cost break-up. However, the indicative project budget / estimated contract value is not specified. Kindly provide the indicative project budget / estimated contract value earmarked for this project to enable bidders to undertake appropriate commercial planning and submit a competitive financial proposal. Further, please clarify whether the estimated value, if provided, covers the complete implementation/development scope along with the first-year post-Go-Live subscription/FMS only, or also includes the subscription for the subsequent four years.		As per RFP

Section 3. Bid Data Sheet Page 22 of 141	One or more Proposers. ISA reserves the right to award the Contract, in whole or in part, to more than one successful Proposer based on the outcome of the evaluation and ISA's requirements.	Kindly clarify whether the complete scope of work is intended to be awarded to a single System Integrator (SI) or distributed among multiple agencies. In case the scope is proposed to be split, we request APEPDCL to provide the detailed scope allocation, commercial responsibility, lead integrator role, interface ownership, acceptance responsibility, and mechanism for managing inter-agency dependencies.		As per RFP
Section 5. Terms of Reference Page 31 of 141	However, it should be noted that the underlying data may vary at the time of actual execution	We request authority to provide a final baseline dataset/inventory for each data source, asset category, historical period, data frequency, data quality and integration availability. Further, kindly confirm the permitted variance from the stated baseline that will be treated as included scope and the commercial/ change-control mechanism for material variance.		As per RFP

Section 5. Terms of Reference Page 34 of 141	However, the final architecture, deployment topology, unified portal design, integration methodology, interoperability framework, communication protocols, cybersecurity controls, infrastructure sizing, application layering and technology stack shall be comprehensively assessed, designed and proposed by the selected System Integrator (SI) during the implementation phase, based on detailed assessment of the DISCOM's existing IT/OT systems, operational workflows, scalability requirements and field-level deployment considerations and as per the scope, functional requirements and implementation objectives defined under this RFP.	Kindly confirm the approved deployment preference - on-premises, private cloud, public cloud or hybrid - along with the hosting location, data-residency requirement, cloud account ownership and approval process. The deployment model fundamentally affects solution architecture, cyber controls, infrastructure cost, recurring cloud cost, DR design and delivery timeline.		On premises; if the bidder is proposing hybrid then the cloud related charges shall be borne by bidders

Section 5. Terms of Reference Page 35 of 141	The System Integrator (SI) shall design, develop, deploy, test, commission, and maintain web-based and mobile-based (Android and iOS, wherever applicable) applications as part of the AI-powered platform for delivering the functionalities and services specified under this RFP. The applications shall comply with all applicable technical, functional, integration, performance, cybersecurity, and security requirements specified elsewhere in this RFP.	Kindly clarify whether both native Android and iOS mobile applications are mandatory, the required mobile use cases, number of users, device compatibility matrix, MDM/security requirements, app-store publishing responsibility and whether an existing DISCOM GIS/mobile application is to be integrated rather than replaced. “Wherever applicable” is undefined. Native mobile application development, device management and app-store compliance have material cost and schedule implications.		Apps and web applications shall be developed as per the RFP, including bi-directional communication capabilities

Section 5. Terms of Reference Page 35 of 141	c. Scalability for Network expansion: The System Integrator (SI) shall ensure that the proposed platform is inherently scalable and capable of supporting continuous expansion of the distribution network throughout the contract period. The solution shall automatically accommodate newly added substations, feeders, Distribution Transformers (DTs), poles, switches, consumer connections, smart meters (AMI), rooftop solar (SRT), Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS), EV charging infrastructure, etc, and other Distributed Energy Resources (DERs) without requiring software redesign, database restructuring, or interruption of services. All AI models, electrical connectivity, Digital Twin, load flow analysis, dashboards, analytics, and reports shall dynamically incorporate newly connected assets and maintain data integrity and network topology.	Kindly define the quantitative expansion envelope included during the contract period, including maximum additional assets, consumers, smart meters, DERs, integrations, data throughput and concurrent users and additions beyond this approved envelope may kindly be treated as a Change Request.		As per RFP

e. Preliminary Validated Dataset with Confidence Scores Page 95 of 141	Data Migration and Network Transformation: The SI shall be perform comprehensive extraction, transformation, and loading (ETL) of the Utility's existing, unformatted GIS data into the required target network data model (e.g., Utility Network or equivalent). This scope includes full responsibility for schema mapping, initial topology creation, and converting raw point/line data into a fully structured, connected, and routable electrical network format prior to executing any analysis or SLD generation.	Kindly provide the available GIS data model, sample datasets, topology/connectivity status, data dictionary, positional-accuracy standard and expected data-quality benchmark. Kindly also confirm whether any physical field survey, consumer-to-DT verification, asset tagging, GIS correction or field validation is within SI scope.		As per the RFP and subsequent notes under the prevailing sections.
g. Supervised-Approved Dataset with Action Log Page 95 of 141	i. Final Dataset: A dataset with all discrepancies resolved and validated will be delivered.	Kindly define the acceptance criteria for the "Final Dataset," including permissible residual discrepancy, accuracy threshold by asset class, DISCOM validation timeline, responsibility for unavailable/incorrect source data and deemed-acceptance provisions.		As per RFP

d. AI-Enabled Data Integration and System Interoperability Page 94 of 141	vii. Third-Party Integration & Connector Framework: The System Integrator shall design, develop, configure, test, deploy and maintain API-based connectors, plugins, adapters and middleware required for integration with Utility systems and approved third-party applications. The solution shall support secure standards-based integration (including REST APIs, webhooks, message queues and other industry-standard protocols), along with connector configuration, authentication, documentation, testing and ongoing support throughout the Contract Period.	Kindly provide a mandatory interface inventory identifying systems to be integrated at Go-Live, API availability, protocols, read/write interfaces, data volumes, frequency, third-party OEMs, licensing/API charges, sample data and interface readiness dates. The scope refers to GIS, SCADA, RMS, MDMS, AMI, billing, OMS, DMS/ADMS, ERP/CIS and other applications, but no confirmed integration inventory or interface specifications are provided.		As per the RFP and subsequent notes under the prevailing sections.

b.3. On-Ground Coordination with Field Teams for Data Validation Page 111 of 141	b.4.1. Provision necessary server sizing & capacity, cloud storage or on premise and networking resources for hosting and running the new system efficiently.	Kindly confirm the exact responsibility split for supply, procurement, commissioning, operation, replacement and lifecycle support of servers, GPU, SAN/NAS, backup, DR, network, OS, database, security tools and cloud resources. Kindly confirm whether the bidder is only required to propose sizing or also include the associated infrastructure cost in the financial quote. While DISCOM is stated to provide infrastructure, the financial proposal is all-inclusive and Annexure 2 requires detailed sizing. This creates ambiguity over cost and operational ownership.		As per roles and responsibilities under the RFP
Annexure: 2 Server CAPACITY SIZING Page 139 of 141	GPU: NVIDIA A100 (40/80GB)	Kindly clarify whether NVIDIA A100 GPU is mandatory, whether equivalent/current-generation GPUs will be accepted, and whether GPU hardware will be provided by DISCOM or included by the bidder.		As per the RFP and subsequent notes under the prevailing sections.

Page 104 of 141	a. Static Page Load Time (Web Portal) i. Avg. load time: < 50 ms	Kindly define the test methodology, network boundary, test location, browser/device profile, concurrent user count, payload size, cache condition, map/data volume, percentile metric and exclusions for all performance parameters. Kindly revise the <50 ms static-page criterion to a practical application performance benchmark.		As per the RFP and subsequent notes under the prevailing sections.
Section 5 - Evaluation Criteria Page 92 of 141	1. Accuracy: Data and AI predictions with <1% error rate across all features .	Kindly specify use-case-wise AI acceptance criteria, benchmark dataset, test sample size, error metric, confidence threshold, retraining frequency, treatment of missing/erroneous source data and approval process.		As per RFP
Section 5 viii. AI Operations (AIOps) Page 93 of 141	2. Monitoring of LLM API availability, token consumption and inference failures.	Kindly confirm the approved LLM/GenAI models, deployment model, external API permissibility, data localization, data retention, token volume assumptions, model/API subscription ownership and treatment of third-party LLM outages or price changes.		As per RFP

Section 5 - Data Privacy and Privacy by Design Page 102 of 141	• Auditability: Annual third-party data privacy audits must be conducted to ensure the DT platform complies with the IT Act and prevailing data protection regulations	Kindly specify the applicable data-protection framework, audit agency qualification, audit scope, number of audits, responsibility for audit cost and acceptance criteria. Kindly clarify whether personal consumer data will be shared and the approved anonymization/pseudonymization standard.		As per RFP
Integration with DISCOM Data Systems Page 75 of 141	All insights generated through the above dashboard shall be seamlessly integrated with all APEPDCL's systems (OMS, GIS, EPCCB (URMS) , Mobile applications and SAP/ERP systems e.t.c.) to facilitate timely field-level action. The field execution status and closure details shall, in turn, be integrated back into the now proposed application to enable continuous learning, regeneration of insights, and optimization of the tool.	Kindly provide the complete list of existing DISCOM IT/OT systems/applications that are required to be integrated under this RFP, along with the make/OEM.		As per RFP

Section 3 (BDS) / Item 8 (Ref. ITB Cl. 41-42) - Liquidated Damages Page 20	“Where the contractor fails to fulfill the performance of the deliverables in accordance with the specified timelines in the approved strategy document or Where there is non-satisfactory performance of the contract in line with the contract terms, the contractor shall be liable to pay ISA the liquidated damages of a weekly charge of 5% (five percent) of the total contract sum, for each week of the weekly occurrence, up to a maximum amount of 20% (twenty percent) of the contract sum; which surcharge is deductible from the vendor’s outstanding invoices.”	The weekly LD rate of 5% of the total contract sum (up to a 20% cap) is excessive and is not linked to the value of the delayed milestone/deliverable. It is respectfully requested that the LD rate be reduced and computed on the value of the delayed milestone only, and that the overall cap on Liquidated Damages be reduced and read together with SLA Penalties and other liabilities under a combined aggregate cap of 10% of the Contract Value. Amendment Clause: “Where the contractor fails to fulfill the performance of the deliverables in accordance with the specified timelines in the approved strategy document or Where there is non-satisfactory performance of the contract in line with the contract terms, the contractor shall be liable to pay ISA the liquidated damages. the aggregate ceiling for all Liquidated Damages, SLA recoveries, service credits and penalties shall be ten percent (10%) of the Contract Value. No recovery shall be duplicated for the same event. No Liquidated Damages shall apply to delay caused by Employer dependencies, approvals, access, data, third-party systems, force majeure or matters outside the Contractor's reasonable control. All		Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

		Liquidated Damages shall count toward the combined aggregate ten percent (10%) cap." of a weekly charge of 5% (five percent) of the total contract sum0.5% (zero point five percent) of the value of the delayed Milestone/Deliverable, for each week of the weekly occurrence, up to a maximum amount of 20% (twenty percent) of the contract sum10% (ten percent) of the Contract Value, which cap shall apply in aggregate and be inclusive of all SLA Penalties and other liabilities of the Contractor under the Contract; which surcharge is deductible from the vendor's outstanding invoices."		

Section 3 (BDS) / Item 8 - Liquidated Damages (Proviso) Page 21	“Provided that ISA may the event of the contractor’s default or failure to meet a timeline issue a Notice of Breach as a warning of first instance; and in the second instance terminate the contract; and the invoice due shall be calculated on a pro-rata basis following the provision of this section.”	The clause does not provide for payment to the Contractor for Services rendered and costs incurred up to the date the notice of termination is issued, irrespective of the reason for termination. It is respectfully requested that ISA/the Utility be required to pay the Contractor for all such costs, including committed future costs already incurred solely for the project, up to the date of intimation of termination. Amendment Clause: “Provided that ISA may the event of the contractor’s default or failure to meet a timeline issue a Notice of Breach as a warning of first instance; and in the second instance terminate the contract; terminate the Contract by issuing not less than thirty (30) days’ prior written notice to the Contractor, during which period the Contractor shall be entitled to cure the default and the invoice due shall be calculated on a pro-rata basis following the provision of this section. Provided further that, irrespective of the reason for termination of the Contract, ISA/the Utility shall pay the Contractor for all Services satisfactorily rendered and for all costs and expenses reasonably and demonstrably incurred by the		As per RFP

		Contractor up to the date of intimation/issuance of the notice of termination, including any committed and non-cancellable future costs already incurred solely for the purposes of this project.”		

Section 5 (ToR) / Facility Mgmt Phase SLA Overview - Remarks (Pt.1) Page 121	“The total cumulative penalty imposed for applicable SLA breaches shall be limited to a maximum cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice amount”	An 18% quarterly cap on SLA penalties, uncapped in relation to the overall Contract Value and un-netted against Liquidated Damages, can result in disproportionate cumulative exposure across the Contract Period. It is respectfully requested that SLA Penalties be reduced and capped in aggregate, together with Liquidated Damages and all other liabilities, at 10% of the total Contract Value. Amendment Clause: “The total cumulative penalty imposed for applicable SLA breaches shall be limited to a maximum cap of ~~18% of the quarterly invoice amount~~ 5% of the ~~quarterly invoice amount~~, subject further to an aggregate cap of 10% (ten percent) of the total Contract Value (inclusive of Liquidated Damages and all other liabilities of the Contractor) across the Contract Period”		Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

Section 5 (ToR) / Statutory Compliance for All Personnel Page 93	“The bidder agrees to operate strictly on a principal-to-principal basis for the purpose of this engagement. All responsibilities, obligations, and liabilities—whether statutory, contractual, financial, or otherwise—shall rest exclusively with the bidder. Under no circumstances shall the authority/client be held liable for any act, omission, default, or non-compliance on the part of the bidder or its personnel, subcontractors, agents, or representatives.”	This clause imposes unlimited and uncapped liability on the bidder with no overall limitation of liability. It is respectfully requested that the Contractor's aggregate liability under the Contract (including Liquidated Damages and SLA Penalties) be capped at 10% of the total Contract Value, save for a customary carve-out for gross negligence, wilful misconduct, breach of confidentiality, IPR infringement, or statutory non-compliance. Amendment Clause: “The bidder agrees to operate strictly on a principal-to-principal basis for the purpose of this engagement. All responsibilities, obligations, and liabilities—whether statutory, contractual, financial, or otherwise—shall rest exclusively with the bidder. Under no circumstances shall the authority/client be held liable for any act, omission, default, or non-compliance on the part of the bidder or its personnel, subcontractors, agents, or representatives. Notwithstanding anything contained herein, save and except in respect of claims arising from gross negligence, wilful misconduct, breach of confidentiality, infringement of intellectual property rights or statutory		As per RFP

		non-compliance, the aggregate liability of the Bidder/System Integrator arising out of or in connection with the Contract, including under Liquidated Damages and SLA Penalties, shall not exceed 10% (ten percent) of the total Contract Value with no duplicate recovery for the same event. The foregoing cap shall apply notwithstanding any other provision that purports to impose greater non-indemnity liability. Neither Party shall be liable for indirect, incidental, consequential, special or punitive damages. Notwithstanding anything contained herein, any direct indemnity claim against the Bidder/System Integrator arising out of or in connection with the Contract shall in no event exceed 100% (hundred percent) of the total Contract Value."		

Section 5 (ToR) / Intellectual Property (IP) and Rights Page 93	“i. Ownership of Insights: All processed data, derived insights, and trained ML models resulting from Utility data remain the exclusive property of the Utility. ii. Right to Re-Platform: Subject to the procedures outlined in the Exit Management clause, the Utility maintains a perpetual, royalty-free right to modify, enhance, and share all exported schemas, code, and model architectures with any third-party successor for the purpose of re-platforming the Digital Twin services”	This clause vests ownership of all derived insights and trained ML models in the Utility without distinguishing the SI's pre-existing/proprietary IP (tools, frameworks, generic/reusable AI models, libraries) from project-specific deliverables. It is respectfully requested that a carve-out be added confirming that the SI's pre-existing IP remains its own property, with a license granted to the Utility for use within the scope of this project. Amendment Clause: “i. Ownership of Insights: All processed data, derived insights, and trained ML models resulting from Utility data remain the exclusive property of the Utility, provided that all pre-existing intellectual property, proprietary tools, frameworks, algorithms and generic/reusable components of the System Integrator that are not specific to the Utility's data shall remain the sole property of the System Integrator, and the Utility shall be granted a non-exclusive, non-transferable, royalty-free license to use the same solely for the purposes of this Contract. ii. Right to Re-Platform: Subject to the procedures outlined in the Exit Management clause, the Utility maintains a perpetual, royalty-free	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

		right to modify, enhance, and share all exported schemas, code, and model architectures with any third-party successor for the purpose of re-platforming the Digital Twin services”	perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL’s name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI’s Background IP or APEPDCL’s project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Section 5 (ToR) / Exit Management and Handover, Cl.(a) Page 113	“Exit Management & Handover: The System Integrator (SI) must execute a zero-cost Exit Management Plan upon contract expiry, termination, or if APEPDCL does not continue the subscription beyond the first year. The SI must hand over complete, editable documentation, source code, AI/ML models, schemas, and APIs to both APEPDCL and the ISA to enable independent operation.”	(i) Mandating a 'zero-cost' Exit Management Plan regardless of the reason for exit is commercially onerous; (ii) the trigger conditions should be clarified to expressly cover termination for any reason whatsoever; and (iii) the clause should expressly require a smooth, time-bound transition through structured knowledge transfer, not merely document/code/model handover. It is respectfully requested that the clause be revised accordingly. Amendment Clause: “Exit Management & Handover: The System Integrator (SI) must execute a ~~zero-cost~~ mutually agreed and, save for handover of the standard project deliverables and documentation, reasonable cost-reimbursement based Exit Management Plan upon contract expiry, termination for any reason whatsoever, or if APEPDCL does not continue the subscription beyond the first year. The SI must hand over complete, editable documentation, source code, AI/ML models, schemas, and APIs to both APEPDCL and the ISA to enable independent operation. The SI shall further ensure a smooth and time-bound transition through structured knowledge transfer —	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

		including training of designated personnel and a reasonable hand-holding/shadow-support period — and the Utility/ISA shall pay the SI for all costs reasonably and demonstrably incurred towards the Exit Management Plan up to the effective date of exit.”	perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL’s name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI’s Background IP or APEPDCL’s project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Section 2 (ITB) / Clause 26.1 - Confidentiality Page 14	“Information relating to the examination, evaluation, and comparison of Proposals, and the recommendation of contract award, shall not be disclosed to Bidders or any other persons not officially concerned with such process, even after publication of the contract award.”	This clause only protects the confidentiality of ISA's evaluation process; it does not impose a mutual, bilateral confidentiality obligation covering technical, commercial and other proprietary information exchanged between the parties during performance of the Contract (including sensitive Utility/consumer data). It is respectfully requested that a reciprocal confidentiality obligation be added. Amendment Clause: “Information relating to the examination, evaluation, and comparison of Proposals, and the recommendation of contract award, shall not be disclosed to Bidders or any other persons not officially concerned with such process, even after publication of the contract award. Both Parties further agree to keep confidential all technical, commercial and other proprietary information exchanged in the course of this engagement, and neither Party shall disclose such information to any third party without the prior written consent of the other Party, except as required by applicable law.”		As per RFP

Section 2 (ITB) / Clause 43.1 (Other Provisions) r/w Clause 6.1 Page 18	“ISA may withdraw the RFP at any time by providing written notice to the bidder in any case in which the mandate of ISA applicable to the performance of the Contract or the funding of ISA applicable to the RFP is curtailed or terminated, whether in whole or in part.”	ISA reserves an unrestricted right to withdraw the RFP at any time, while Clause 6.1 places the entire cost of proposal preparation on the Bidder with no exception. It is respectfully requested that, if the RFP is withdrawn after the Deadline for Submission of Proposals and a Bidder has already been shortlisted/technically qualified, ISA reimburse such Bidder's reasonable, documented proposal preparation costs. Amendment Clause: “ISA may withdraw the RFP at any time by providing written notice to the bidder in any case in which the mandate of ISA applicable to the performance of the Contract or the funding of ISA applicable to the RFP is curtailed or terminated, whether in whole or in part. Provided that, where the RFP is withdrawn after the Deadline for Submission of Proposals and a Bidder has been shortlisted/found technically qualified as of the date of withdrawal, ISA shall reimburse such Bidder's reasonable and documented costs incurred towards preparation and submission of its Proposal, upon production of supporting documentation.”		As per RFP

Section 2 (ITB) / Clause 42.1 - Payment Provisions Page 18	“Payment will be made only upon ISA's acceptance of the work performed. The terms of payment shall be within thirty (30) days, after receipt of invoice and certification of acceptance of work issued by the proper authority in ISA with direct supervision of the Contractor. Payment will be affected by bank transfer in the currency of contract.”	The clause does not provide any remedy where payment is delayed beyond the stipulated 30-day period for reasons not attributable to the Contractor. It is respectfully requested that interest on delayed payments be included. Amendment Clause: “Payment will be made only upon ISA's acceptance of the work performed. The terms of payment shall be within thirty (30) days, after receipt of invoice and certification of acceptance of work issued by the proper authority in ISA with direct supervision of the Contractor. Payment will be affected by bank transfer in the currency of contract. Upon termination for any reason whatsoever, the Employer shall, within thirty (30) days of termination or submission of the supporting statement, whichever is later, pay the Contractor for: (i) work performed and work in progress up to the termination date; (ii) usable deliverables and approved materials; (iii) non-cancellable commitments and future costs already incurred or committed solely for the Project before receipt of the termination notice; and (iv) reasonable demobilisation, exit and transition costs. Only amounts		As per RFP

		undisputed or finally determined to be due from the Contractor may be deducted, subject to the applicable liability cap. In the event payment is delayed beyond the stipulated thirty (30) day period for reasons not attributable to the Contractor, ISA shall pay interest on the delayed amount at the rate of 1% (one percent) per month, calculated from the date immediately following expiry of the said thirty (30) day period until the date of actual payment."		

NIL	NIL	Kindly add a Dispute Settlement Mechanism Clause for the project. Kindly restore a balanced arbitration clause under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, with a neutral tribunal, seat and continued performance/payment of undisputed amounts pending resolution. "Any dispute not resolved through amicable settlement or conciliation within thirty (30) days shall be finally resolved by arbitration under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The tribunal shall comprise a sole mutually appointed arbitrator for claims up to INR 10 crore and three arbitrators for higher-value claims, with each Party appointing one arbitrator and the two appointees appointing the presiding arbitrator. The seat and venue shall be Visakhapatnam, proceedings shall be in English, and performance and payment of undisputed amounts shall continue pending resolution."	As per RFP

4.3 Technical Evaluation Criteria clause No. 3 page 29	Experience in implementing network intelligence, demand forecasting, or load analysis applications, evaluated by the total annual energy input or peak demand capacity successfully modeled or any other quantifiable uses cases: Total Energy Volume Under Management: — Score ≥ 2,000 MU (Million Units) per annum OR ≥ 500 MW Peak Demand — 5 ≥ 5,000 MU per annum OR ≥ 1,200 MW Peak Demand — 10 ≥ 10,000 MU per annum OR ≥ 2,500 MW Peak Demand — 15 Supporting document: Work Order / Completion Certificate / Client Certificate	This being a specific requirement, it is not possible to have the cited criteria proved through Work Order / Completion Certificate / Client Certificate, hence we request authority to accept Snapshot of system confirming the total energy value under management and amend the criteria as follows: Experience in implementing network intelligence, demand forecasting, or load analysis applications, evaluated by the total annual energy input or peak demand capacity successfully modeled or any other quantifiable uses cases: Total Energy Volume Under Management: — Score ≥ 2,000 MU (Million Units) per annum OR ≥ 500 MW Peak Demand — 5 ≥ 5,000 MU per annum OR ≥ 1,200 MW Peak Demand — 10 ≥ 10,000 MU per annum OR ≥ 2,500 MW Peak Demand — 15 Supporting document: Work Order / Completion Certificate / Client Certificate/<u>Snapshot of system confirming the total energy value under management</u>		As per RFP

4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria (Pre-Requisite) Availability of COTS Software Solution, page 25	Sole/ Lead Bidder/ any other Consortium Member • No demonstrated COTS-based AI-enabled solution for the Power Sector – 0 • Demonstrated COTS software solution with AI-enabled web-based applications for the Power Sector – 5 • Demonstrated COTS software solution with operational AI-enabled web applications for digitised and geotagged power utility asset management, monitoring, analytics, forecasting, or decision-support dashboards in the Power Sector – 10	Mandating “AI-enabled” as a prerequisite unnecessarily restricts competition, as the core requirement should assess proven COTS capabilities for power utility asset management, monitoring, analytics, forecasting and decision support, irrespective of the underlying technology. AI is an enabling technology rather than a functional outcome; removing this restriction will encourage wider participation of mature, proven solutions while retaining the required functional and operational capabilities. Hence we request authority to amend the criteria as below: Sole/ Lead Bidder/ any other Consortium Member • No demonstrated COTS-based ~~AI-enabled~~ solution for the Power Sector – 0 • Demonstrated COTS software solution with ~~AI-enabled~~ web-based applications for the Power Sector – 5 • Demonstrated COTS software solution with operational ~~AI-enabled~~ web applications for digitised and geotagged power utility asset management, monitoring, analytics, forecasting, or decision-support dashboards in the Power Sector – 10		As per RFP

Page 2-3, 12-13 RFP Notice; ITB 19.2, 21.1	Pre-Bid Meeting held on 24.08.2026; amendments to be notified on ISA website; minutes of the Bidder's conference to be sent to participants.	Request that (a) the Minutes of the Pre-Bid Meeting dated 24.08.2026 and (b) a consolidated corrigendum containing ISA's responses to all pre-bid queries be published on the ISA website / circulated to all prospective bidders, and that a minimum of 14 days be allowed between issue of the corrigendum and the bid due date so that clarifications can be incorporated into the proposals.		As per RFP & corrigendum
Page 21, BDS 14	Deadline of Submission: September 13, 2026 (11:59 PM IST).	Annexure 2 (Server Capacity Sizing) is a mandatory submission, and an incomplete or non-compliant submission renders the bid non- responsive. Sizing cannot be completed until ISA/APEPDCL provide the baseline parameters (number of named and concurrent users by role, historical data volumes and retention, inventory of systems to be integrated). Request clarification for better server sizing and an extension of the bid due date by at least three (3) weeks from the date of issue of the corrigendum.		As per RFP

Page 3, 21 RFP Notice (c); BDS 14, 15	Last date for receipt of documents as per RFP: 13.09.2026, to be submitted to mdtf_procurement@isa.int. Allowable manner of submitting proposals: submission by email.	Confirm that submission is exclusively by e-mail and that no physical/hard copies are required. If hard copies are required, confirm (a) the delivery address, (b) the number of copies, (c) whether the same date and time (13.09.2026, 11:59 PM IST) applies to physical receipt, and (d) whether the date of dispatch or the date of receipt governs.		As per RFP

BDS 16	Format: PDF files only. Max. File Size per transmission: 5 MB. File names max 60 characters, Latin characters only.	A responsive Technical Proposal (company profile, CVs, ISO certificates, work orders, client certificates, audited accounts, Power of Attorney, forms) will substantially exceed 5 MB. Confirm (a) whether the proposal may be split across multiple e-mails clearly marked 'Part 1 of N', and that all parts received before the deadline will be treated as one proposal; (b) whether a password-protected ZIP or a secure download link (SFTP / OneDrive / Google Drive) is acceptable; and (c) whether Annexure 1 and Annexure 2 may be submitted in Excel format in addition to PDF.	As per RFP

Page 13, 122, 134, 139 ITB 10.2, 22.4; Section 6 Checklist; Form G; Annexure 2	Section 6 lists both Annexure 1 (Cost break-up) and Annexure 2 (Server Capacity requirements) as 'Must be submitted in a separate sealed envelope/password protected email'. ITB 10.2 provides that a Technical Proposal containing material financial information may be declared non-responsive.	Annexure 2 (Server Capacity Sizing) contains no pricing and is a technical responsiveness requirement, yet Section 6 places it in the financial envelope. Confirm definitively whether Annexure 2 is to be submitted with the Technical Proposal or the Financial Proposal. Bidders need certainty here, as placing it incorrectly could be construed either as financial information in the Technical Proposal or as an incomplete Technical Proposal.		As per RFP its applicable for annexure 1
Page 13 ITB 22.4(b), (c)	Financial Proposal shall be encrypted with password and clearly labelled; password to be provided only upon ISA's request.	Confirm the acceptable encryption method (PDF user password, password-protected ZIP, or other), and that the password will be requested only from bidders found technically responsive. Confirm the e-mail address and mode by which the password is to be furnished.		As per RFP

Page 20,23 BDS 6; Section 4.1 Preliminary Examination Criteria	BDS 6 states Bid Security: NIL. Section 4.1 lists 'Bid Security submitted as per RFP requirements with compliant validity period' as a Yes/No preliminary examination criterion.	Confirm that no Bid Security / Proposal Security is required for this RFP and that the corresponding Preliminary Examination criterion in Section 4.1 is not applicable and will not be a ground for rejection. Request that Section 4.1 be corrected by corrigendum.		As per RFP BID security is exempted for the developomnet and 1st year subscription period
Page 21, 135 BDS 9; Note to Form G	BDS 9 states Performance Security: NIL. The note to Form G requires the successful Bidder to submit a Contract Performance Guarantee (CPG) to APEPDCL equivalent to 10% of the total subscription value for the subsequent four (4) year period.			As per RFP, the PBG to be submitted for the balace 4 years period where APEPDCL makes the payments

Page 20-22 BDS 2, BDS 3, BDS 20	BDS 2: partial bids Not Allowed. BDS 3: alternative proposals shall not be considered. BDS 20: ISA will award the contract to 'One or more Proposers... in whole or in part, to more than one successful Proposer'.	These provisions are inconsistent. Clarify (a) the basis on which the scope may be split among multiple bidders post-award; (b) whether such a split would be by functional module, by circle, or otherwise; and (c) how the lump-sum development price and the levelized annual subscription price would be adjusted, since the pricing of an integrated single-platform solution is not divisible on a pro-rata basis. Request confirmation that in the event of a partial award the bidder will have the right to re-quote or to decline.		As per RFP
Page 18 ITB 37.1	ISA reserves the right to vary the quantity of services and/or goods by up to 25% of the total offer without any change in unit price or other terms.	For a lump-sum software development and subscription engagement there are no unit prices in the conventional sense. Confirm (a) the basis on which a variation of up to 25% would be valued, and (b) that any such variation will be priced by reference to the Annexure 1 cost break-up line items or an agreed man-day rate card.		As per RFP ISA reserves to vary the quantity by 25% as the same unit price i.e. for the quantity variations cost shall be varies as per the unit cost quoted

Page 10, 21 ITB 13.1; BDS 10	Currency of Proposal: US Dollars / Indian Rupees. For companies registered in India payment will be made in INR, with the exchange rate locked as per the UN Operational Rates of Exchange on the date of bid submission.	Confirm (a) that an Indian bidder may quote the entire proposal in INR; (b) the currency in which financial proposals will be compared, and the exchange rate and reference date used for conversion under ITB 13.1; and (c) that a bidder quoting in INR will not be disadvantaged in the FP Rating computation relative to a bidder quoting in USD.		As per RFP
Page 7, 13 ITB 2.4, 22.3	Bidders must adhere to the ISA Supplier Code of Conduct (ISA_Supplier_Code_of_Conducts.pdf). ITB 22.3: the mere act of submission of a Proposal implies that the Bidder fully accepts the ISA General Contract Terms and Conditions (ISA_GTBs.pdf).	The ISA General Terms and Conditions of Contract and the Supplier Code of Conduct are referenced but do not form part of the RFP document set circulated. As bidders are deemed to accept the GTC in full by the act of submission, request that both documents be issued as part of the RFP / corrigendum so that the terms can be reviewed before submission. Even Redirection of PDF to website is not resolving to accurate page and resulting only to Home page of ISA		Relevant Links are in Section 2 of the RFP

Page 23, 124 Section 4.1; Form B	Preliminary Examination requires Power of Attorney. Form B requires Power of Attorney to be attached.	Confirm whether a notarised Power of Attorney on stamp paper is required, or whether a certified copy of a Board Resolution authorising the signatory is sufficient. Confirm that a scanned copy is acceptable for e-mail submission, with the original to be produced on request.		As per RFP
Page 124 Form B	Form B asks whether the Bidder is a UNGM registered vendor and whether the Bidder is an ISA vendor.	Confirm whether prior UNGM registration or ISA vendor registration is a pre-requisite for submission or for evaluation/award. If registration is required, confirm the process and the typical lead time so that it can be completed before the bid due date.		UNGM registration or ISA vendor registration is not a pre-requisite

Page 20-22 Section 3 (Bid Data Sheet), 'Ref. to Section 2' column	Several BDS rows cite ITB clause numbers that do not correspond to the subject matter (e.g. BDS 5 Proposal Validity cites clause 10 instead of 16; BDS 6 Bid Security cites 14 instead of 12; BDS 7 Advance Payment cites 41 instead of 40; BDS 8 Liquidated Damages cites 42 instead of 41; BDS 10 Currency cites 18 instead of 13; BDS 11 and 12 cite 31 instead of 18; BDS 17 cites 27 instead of 30).	As the Bid Data Sheet prevails over the Instructions to Bidders in the event of conflict, request that these cross-references be corrected by corrigendum to avoid ambiguity in interpretation.		As per RFP

Page 24, 26 Section 4.2 - Relevant Project Experience; and Note 1 & 2 under Section 4.2	The criterion recognises projects involving 'AI-enabled Digital Utility Platforms, Digital Twin solutions, network analysis, predictive models using AI/ML, utility IT/OT system integration, Large Language Model (LLM)-based applications, Agentic AI, AI copilots, multi-agent AI systems, utility-scale AI/ML solutions, interoperable utility data platforms'. Note 1 then defines 'Eligible Projects' as 'any project consisting of Geospatial and Technical data capture of power grid assets and a GIS-based web application to track digitised power grid assets', and the criterion further requires that 'the implementation should have covered technical asset modeling and software integration of power grid systems'.	The restrictive definition in Note 1 is materially narrower than, and inconsistent with, the list of qualifying engagements in the criterion itself. Confirm that the broad list in the criterion column prevails, and that projects in AI/ML analytics, Meter Data Management (MDM/AMI), LLM and Agentic AI applications, and interoperable utility data platforms qualify as Eligible Projects without a GIS/geospatial data-capture component. Request that Note 1 be deleted or aligned with the criterion by corrigendum. As presently drafted, the note would exclude precisely the AI-native capabilities that this RFP is procuring.	Eligible Projects, as referred in Technical Requirement, shall "also" mean any project consisting of Geospatial and Technical data capture of power grid assets and a "AI" GIS-based web application to track digitised power grid assets

Page 26 Section 4.2 - Note: 'Startups shall be governed in accordance with the applicable rules and guidelines issued under GFR and DPIIT, Government of India'	A note appears at the foot of Section 4.2 referring to GFR and DPIIT guidelines for startups, without specifying its operative effect.	Request explicit clarification of the operative effect of this note for a DPIIT-recognised startup. Specifically, confirm whether, in line with Rule 173(i) of the General Financial Rules 2017 and the relaxations notified by DPIIT / Ministry of Finance for Startups and Micro & Small Enterprises, a DPIIT-recognised startup is exempted from the requirements of (a) prior turnover, (b) prior experience, and (c) years of operation; and if so, how the marks attaching to those criteria (Years of Operation 15 + Relevant Project Experience 20 + Financial Capacity 15 = 50 of 100) are to be treated in computing the minimum 70-point pre-qualification score - for example by excluding those criteria and pro-rating the score over the remaining criteria.	For Start-ups, the value of financial backing received from a Venture Capitalist, Bank or recognised financial institution, duly certified by the statutory auditor/Chartered Accountant, shall be considered equivalent to the corresponding turnover for the purpose of awarding marks under this criterion.

Page 24-26, 98-99 Section 4.2 scoring table and Note 3; Platform & Software Standards	Section 4.2 Note 3 requires a minimum of 70 of 100 points in the Pre-Qualification evaluation. The scoring bands award 10 (not 15) marks for up to 5 years of operation, 7 (not 20) marks for aggregate project value up to USD 100,000, and 5 (not 15) marks for turnover below USD 100,000. Separately, the RFP expressly contemplates a platform ecosystem in which applications are developed by 'external vendors, technology partners, startups, research institutions' (p.98) and by 'OEMs, startups, academia' (p.99).	On the present construct, an Indian DPIIT-recognised startup incorporated within the last five years, even scoring full marks on Multi-Software Integration (10), COTS Software Solution (10), Key Personnel (15) and Quality Certification (15), can attain a maximum of 72 of 100 points, and only 62 points if any single sub-criterion falls one band short. The 70-point threshold is therefore effectively unattainable for early-stage indigenous product companies, which is inconsistent with the RFP's own stated intent to enable startups. Request that ISA either (a) reduce the pre-qualification qualifying threshold to 60 points; or (b) exempt DPIIT-recognised startups from the Years of Operation and Financial Capacity criteria and re-normalise the score over the remaining criteria; or (c) expressly permit cumulative qualification across consortium members for all criteria (see next query).		As per RFP

Page 10-11, 24-26 ITB 14; Section 4.2	Consortium provisions permit a JV/Consortium/Association with a designated Lead Entity, jointly and severally liable.	For criteria open to 'any Consortium Member', confirm (a) whether aggregate project values are summed across all members; (b) whether the number of full-time professionals is summed across members; (c) where more than one member qualifies, whether the highest score or the sum is taken; (d) the maximum permitted number of consortium members; and (e) whether a minimum share of scope or responsibility is prescribed for the Lead Bidder.		Wherever the RFP specifies Sole/Lead/Consortium, evaluation shall be jointly undertaken accordingly as per RFP
Page 24 Section 4.2 - Legal Status ('Sub-contracting is allowed')	Sub-contracting is expressly allowed, but the qualification criteria refer only to the Sole Bidder, Lead Bidder and Consortium Members.	Confirm whether the credentials of a declared sub-contractor or technology partner (relevant project experience, COTS product, multi-software integration track record, energy volume under management, key personnel) may be relied upon for pre-qualification and technical evaluation; and if so, what documentation is required (back-to-back agreement, MoU, or letter of commitment) and whether the sub-contractor must be named at bid stage.		As per RFP

Page 26, 127 Section 4.2 - Financial Capacity of the SI; Form D - Financial Standing	Section 4.2 requires 'a minimum annual turnover & Working capital in last two Financial Years' evidenced by audited financial statements and a statutory auditor/CA certificate for the 'average annual turnover for last two audited financial years'. Form D requires Annual Turnover for the last 3 years and balance sheet / income statement information for the last 3 years, and states that historic financial statements must correspond to accounting periods already completed and audited, with no statements for partial periods accepted.	Clarify (a) whether two or three financial years apply; (b) whether the assessment is on 'minimum annual turnover' in each year or on the 'average annual turnover' over the period (the criterion uses both formulations); and (c) how a bidder incorporated recently, having fewer than two/three completed audited financial years, is to be assessed. Request confirmation that for such bidders the audited accounts for the completed year(s) available, together with CA-certified provisional figures for the current period, will be accepted, and/or that the DPIIT startup exemption from turnover criteria will apply.		As per RFP

Page 26 Section 4.2 - Financial Capacity of the SI	The criterion refers to 'a minimum annual turnover & Working capital in last two Financial Years', but the scoring table prescribes thresholds only for Turnover (USD).	No working capital threshold, definition or scoring basis is stated. Confirm (a) the working capital requirement, if any; (b) how it is to be computed (net working capital as current assets less current liabilities, as certified by the statutory auditor); (c) whether unutilised bank credit limits, paid-up capital, cash reserves or committed investor funding may be counted towards working capital; and (d) how it is scored, since no marks are allocated to it in the table.		The marking is based on turnover; however, bidders shall submit the documents related to Working Capital & turnover as specified in the RFP
Page 24, 26 Section 4.2 - Relevant Project Experience; Financial Capacity of the SI	Thresholds for aggregate project value (USD 100,000 / USD 500,000) and turnover (USD 100,000 / USD 500,000) are expressed in US Dollars, whereas Indian bidders' work orders and audited accounts are denominated in INR.	Confirm the exchange rate and reference date to be applied for converting INR values to USD - for example the UN Operational Rate of Exchange as on the bid submission date, the RBI reference rate on the date of each work order, or the closing rate for each financial year. This determines which scoring band a bidder falls into and therefore has a direct bearing on the pre-qualification score.		As per RFP

Page 24 Section 4.2 - Relevant Project Experience	'Eligible Projects... within the last three (3) years executed or under execution from the date of issuance of this RFP: Aggregate project value across eligible engagements'.	Confirm that (a) the full contract / Purchase Order / Work Order value of a project under execution is counted, and not merely the value executed to date; (b) values are aggregated across multiple engagements; (c) engagements funded by Government of India programmes or grants (including Ministry of Power funded pilots), multilateral development banks, or international organisations are counted, consistent with the express provision that 'Work orders from international non-governmental non-profit organizations shall be considered valid for financial assessment'; (d) values are exclusive of taxes; and (e) the full value of a multi-year subscription, licence or AMC engagement is counted.	As per RFP

Page 24 Section 4.2 - Relevant Project Experience (proviso)	'In cases where a signed contract or work order is not available due to the pilot nature of the project, the bidder must submit a completion certificate along with evidence of the available funding.'	Clarify (a) what constitutes acceptable 'evidence of the available funding' - a sanction letter from the funding agency, a Purchase Order issued by the funding agency, an MoU, or a letter from the utility; (b) whether an ongoing (not yet completed) funded pilot supported by a utility letter of engagement qualifies, given that a completion certificate cannot be issued for an ongoing pilot; and (c) the value to be attributed to such a pilot for the purpose of the aggregate project value computation.		As per RFP
Page 24, 126 Section 4.2 - Relevant Project Experience; Form D - Previous Relevant Experience	Section 4.2 recognises projects 'executed or under execution'. Form D states 'Please list only previous similar assignments successfully completed in the last 3 years.'	These provisions are inconsistent. Confirm that assignments currently under execution may be listed in Form D and will be counted for both pre-qualification and technical evaluation, and request that Form D be amended accordingly.		The precedence rules shall be as per section Sections 2 and 3 of the RFP.

Page 127 Form D - Previous Relevant Experience	'Attached are the Statements of Satisfactory Performance from the Top 3 (three) Clients or more.'	Confirm whether Statements of Satisfactory Performance from three clients are mandatory. Where a bidder has fewer than three eligible clients, confirm that statements from the available clients will be accepted without prejudice to responsiveness or scoring.		As per RFP
Page 25 Section 4.2 - Key Personnel	'Professionals with qualifications in computer science, Solution Architect, AI/ML Expert, Electrical, GIS Expert, Cybersecurity, Data Architect or related fields, and experience in building software applications, project management and other relevant areas.' Marks by number of full-time professionals (<5 = 5; 5-10 = 10; >10 = 15). Supporting document: CVs of Key Personnel.	Clarify (a) whether the count is of the proposed project team or of the bidding entity's total relevant full-time headcount; (b) whether each listed discipline must be individually represented (i.e. whether a dedicated GIS Expert and a dedicated Cybersecurity Expert are mandatory) or whether the list is indicative; (c) whether one individual may be counted against more than one role; (d) whether personnel on the payroll of a consortium member or declared sub-contractor may be counted; (e) whether CVs are required for every counted professional or only for named key personnel; and (f) the minimum qualification and years of experience expected per role.		Personnel shall meet the composition and qualification criteria specified in the RFP. "No. of Full-Time Professionals" shall be read as "No. of Professionals."

Page 24 Section 4.2 - Years of Operation	'The Sole/Lead Bidder must demonstrate prior experience in the technology or power sector. Points will be awarded based on the number of completed years of relevant operation as of the bid submission date.' Supporting documents: Certificate of Incorporation, Company Profile.	Confirm (a) that 'completed years of relevant operation' is reckoned from the date of incorporation of the Sole/Lead Bidder to the bid submission date; (b) whether the technology or power sector experience of the promoters/founders/team members, or of a predecessor, parent or group entity, may be considered in demonstrating 'prior experience in the technology or power sector'; and (c) that there is no minimum years-of-operation threshold and that a bidder with fewer than 5 completed years is eligible with 10 marks.		As per RFP
Page 22, 26, 29 BDS 17; Section 4.2 Note 3; Section 4.3 Note 4	Section 4.2 is titled 'Minimum Eligibility Criteria (Pre-Requisite)' with a total of 100 points and requires 'a minimum score of seventy (70) points in the Pre-Qualification (PQ) evaluation'. Section 4.3 Technical Evaluation Criteria also totals 100 marks and requires a minimum of 70 marks. BDS 17 states the minimum technical score required to pass is 70%.	Confirm that (a) the 100-point assessment under Section 4.2 is a separate qualifying gate; (b) the Section 4.2 score does not carry into, or form any part of, the 100-mark Technical Evaluation under Section 4.3; (c) the 70% minimum technical score in BDS 17 refers to Section 4.3 only; and (d) only the Section 4.3 score is used in the TP Rating for the combined 70:30 scoring.		As per RFP

Page 7-8 ITB 4.1, 4.2	Bidders associated with the preparation of the design, specifications, Terms of Reference or cost estimation for this procurement, or involved in the preparation/design of the programme/project, shall be considered to have a conflict of interest.	Confirm that (a) participation in ISA's earlier Expression of Interest No. 2/ISA-MDTF/2025-ISA under the DUET initiative, or responses to other ISA market consultations, does not by itself constitute a conflict of interest; and (b) a bidder may submit proposals for more than one DISCOM RFP issued by ISA under the MDTF/DUET initiative. Also confirm the position where a bidder or its personnel participate in Government of India standards or policy forums in the power sector in an individual or nominated capacity.	As per RFP

Page 24-26 Section 4.2 (as issued)	The RFP as issued contains no requirement for a CMMI appraisal (although raised in Pre-Bid Meeting by one of interested party to fix CMMI Level 5 as qualification requirement), no minimum turnover floor, no minimum years of operation, and no requirement for a prior DISCOM-wide production deployment.	We understand that the introduction of a CMMI Level 3/5 appraisal requirement was canvassed. Request confirmation that no additional qualification requirement (CMMI appraisal, minimum turnover floor, minimum years of operation, mandatory prior enterprise-wide DISCOM deployment, or similar) will be introduced by corrigendum. Such requirements are not necessary for the stated scope, are not aligned with the Government of India's Make in India and Startup India procurement policy, and would exclude the indigenous product companies and startups that this RFP expressly seeks to enable (pages 98 and 99). Should any such criterion nonetheless be introduced, request that (a) adequate additional time be allowed, and (b) DPIIT/GFR startup relaxations be applied.	As per RFP

Page 27-28 Section 4.3, Criteria 1 and 2 - Supporting Documents	Supporting documents include 'Technical Presentation / Minimum Viable Product Demonstration / Work Orders / Completion Certificates / Client Certificates'.	Confirm that functional capability demonstrated through a Minimum Viable Product using synthetic, anonymised or representative datasets - including on the bidder's own environment or on anonymised data from another utility engagement - will be awarded full marks, and that a live production deployment on APEPDCL data or on a named utility's production data is not a pre-condition. Bidders are bound by confidentiality obligations to existing utility clients and cannot demonstrate live production data.		As per RFP

Page 28 Section 4.3, Criterion 4 - Proposed Solution Demonstration (30 marks)	'The SI shall present and live demonstrate the proposed solution... Approx. Time - 60 mins.' The SI must score a minimum of 10 marks in this criterion, failing which it is liable for rejection.	Confirm (a) the indicative date and the mode (in-person at ISA Secretariat, Gurugram / APEPDCL Corporate Office, Visakhapatnam, or virtual); (b) whether the ~60 minutes is inclusive of question and answer time; (c) whether internet connectivity, screen-sharing and display facilities will be provided; (d) the composition of the evaluation committee; (e) whether the detailed marking rubric for the 20-mark live demonstration will be shared in advance; (f) the permitted number of bidder representatives; and (g) the notice period that will be given before the demonstration.		Presentation shall be in person in Delhi/Vizag, date and time, venue shall be intimated in advance 7 to 10 days, Rest as per RFP
Page 28-29 Section 4.3, Criterion 4 and Note 4	Criterion 4 prescribes a minimum of 10 marks. Note 4 prescribes a minimum of 70 marks in the Technical Evaluation.	Confirm that (a) the minimum of 10 marks applies only to Criterion 4; (b) there is no separate minimum for Criteria 1, 2 or 3; and (c) the 70-mark minimum applies to the aggregate of Criteria 1 to 4 out of 100.		As per RFP

Page 27-28 Section 4.3, Criteria 1, 2 and 3	Criteria 1, 2 and 3 refer to 'bidder's capability and prior experience' and to 'Work Order / Completion Certificate / Client Certificate' without specifying whose credentials may be relied upon in a consortium.	Confirm that, consistent with Section 4.2, the credentials, work orders, client certificates and live demonstration of a consortium member or declared sub- contractor may be relied upon for Criteria 1, 2 and 3, and that a single consolidated demonstration by the consortium is acceptable.		As per RFP

Page 28,32 Section 4.3, Criterion 3 - Total Energy Volume Under Management (15 marks); TOR Project Area table	Marks are awarded on 'the total annual energy input or peak demand capacity successfully modeled or any other quantifiable use cases': $\geq 2,000$ MU or ≥ 500 MW = 5; $\geq 5,000$ MU or $\geq 1,200$ MW = 10; $\geq 10,000$ MU or $\geq 2,500$ MW = 15. The RFP's own circle-wise table shows Total Energy Under Management (Input) across the 7 APEPDCL circles totalling approximately 18,374 MU.	Clarify (a) whether 'Total Energy Volume Under Management' means the total annual energy input or peak demand of the utility or network for which the bidder's platform, models or applications are deployed (irrespective of whether the deployment covers the whole utility or a defined sub-network), or only the energy attributable to the specific assets within the bidder's scope; (b) whether deployments at generation, transmission, load despatch or state-level entities qualify; (c) whether volumes may be aggregated across multiple client utilities; (d) whether pilot and under-execution engagements qualify; and (e) the acceptable documentary basis (client certificate stating MU/MW, published tariff order, or utility annual report). Given that the top band ($\geq 10,000$ MU / $\geq 2,500$ MW) approximates the scale of more than half of APEPDCL itself, request that aggregation across engagements be expressly permitted, or that the bands be revised downwards.	As per RFP

Page 27-28 Section 4.3, Criteria 1 and 2 - sub-criteria wording	Criterion 1 (20 points) comprises four capability bullets; the third (bidirectional integration, 5 points) is not consistently formatted as a bullet. Criterion 2 (35 points) comprises Map Visualization (5), Load Flow Analysis & Digital SLD (10), Agentic AI Solutions (10) and Natural Language based Querying (10). Each block is worded 'X points if all below sub-features are demonstrated'.	Confirm (a) the sub-allocation under Criterion 1 is $5+5+5+5 = 20$; (b) the sub-allocation under Criterion 2 totals 35; and (c) whether partial marks are awarded where some but not all sub-features within a block are demonstrated, or whether the allocation is strictly all-or-nothing. If all-or-nothing, request that partial/pro-rata marking be introduced, as a single unavailable sub-feature would otherwise forfeit the entire block.		As per RFP
Page 31-32 TOR Introduction; Project Area table	The Introduction states APEPDCL has 'a projected electricity demand of ~30,159 MU, a total power purchase requirement of ~33,220 MU, and an estimated availability of ~34,622 MU'. The circle-wise table on page 32 shows Total Energy Under Management (Input) summing to approximately 18,374 MU across the 7 circles.	Confirm which figure is to be used for solution scoping, AI/ML model design and infrastructure sizing, and confirm whether all seven circles listed in the table constitute the full project scope.		As per RFP

Page 32 TOR Project Area table and note	'All technical specifications for the underlying assets and infrastructure to be modeled within these regions are detailed in the below table, serving as the baseline. However, it should be noted that the underlying data may vary at the time of actual execution.'	Confirm (a) the tolerance band within which variation from the baseline asset counts is at the SI's cost; and (b) that growth beyond that band (for example a material increase in smart meter, DER or EV charging counts during the contract period) will be treated as a Change Request under the provision at page 92, or addressed under the 25% variation clause, rather than absorbed within the quoted price.		As per RFP the variations in the quantity shall be on quoted unit rate basis
Page 35, 93-94 Scope of Work; Deliverables (c)	The SI shall develop 'web-based and mobile-based (Android and iOS, wherever applicable) applications'. Deliverables include 'AI-Native Web Application & mobile for Grid Intelligence and Operational Optimization'. The System Architecture section states the existing DISCOM GIS/mobile application 'may continue to function as the field execution interface for linemen and field crews'.	Confirm (a) that the mobile application is for DISCOM officials and field staff only and that no consumer-facing application is in scope; (b) whether a new mobile application is to be developed or the existing DISCOM GIS/mobile application is to be extended; (c) whether both Android and iOS are mandatory, or Android only for field use; (d) who is responsible for publishing to the Google Play Store / Apple App Store and under whose developer account; and (e) the expected number of mobile users.		Deliverables to be as per RFP

Page 33-34 System Architecture; '*Discom GIS App is the same app as in DATA Sources'	The architecture envisages near real-time communication of alerts, analytics and operational insights from the AI-native platform to the existing DISCOM GIS/mobile application for field-level action.	Request details of the existing DISCOM GIS platform and mobile application: OEM/product name and version, hosting, whether documented APIs exist for inbound alert ingestion, who owns and maintains it, whether the current vendor is under contract, and whether that vendor's cooperation for bidirectional integration will be procured by APEPDCL. The SI's ability to deliver Milestone M3 depends on this.	Deliverables to be as per RFP

Page 69-70 Digital Single-Line Diagrams	The SI must demonstrate a module for generating and editing digital single-line diagrams representing the electrical network topology, with drag-and-drop editing, real-time validation against grid rules and versioning.	Confirm whether the Digital SLD module is required for (a) planning, simulation, load flow and network analysis and near real-time monitoring only; or (b) also for supervisory control actions (circuit breaker open/close, isolator operation, tap changing). If control is within scope, confirm the interface to SCADA/RTU, the applicable cyber-security clearances and OT segregation requirements, the approvals required from APTRANSCO/SLDC, and by whom those approvals will be obtained. Also confirm the required data refresh frequency for near real-time monitoring.		As per RFP

Page 32, 75-77 Project Area table (33 kV Feeders on APTRANSCO SCADA); Integration with Discom Data Systems	The table separately identifies '33 kV Feeders (APTRANSCO SCADA)' totalling 424 feeders across the 7 circles. The scope requires integration with SCADA for real-time data ingestion and bidirectional publication of AI insights.	Clarify (a) the integration mechanism to be provided for SCADA - OPC-UA server, IEC 60870-5-104, ICCP/TASE.2, historian database access, or REST API; (b) that the 33 kV feeder SCADA is owned and operated by APTRANSCO and that APEPDCL/ISA will obtain APTRANSCO's written consent and provide the interface, credentials and data; (c) the number of tags/points and the polling interval available; (d) whether an OT DMZ, unidirectional gateway or data diode is required and who provides it; and (e) that any delay in obtaining APTRANSCO consent will extend the M3 milestone without liquidated damages.		As per RFP

Page 32, 75-77 Project Area table (smart meter penetration); Integration with Discom Data Systems	The table shows smart meters on approximately 30,368 of 275,999 DTs and on approximately 669,277 of 5,073,512 consumer meters, i.e. only a minority of assets are smart-metered.	Confirm the data acquisition path for feeders, DTs and consumers that are not smart-metered - whether via DCU/FRTU/RMS, periodic file upload from the billing/CIS system, or manual entry - and the frequency and format available. Confirm that (a) the SI is not responsible for data unavailability arising from the absence of field instrumentation; and (b) analytics KPIs and SLAs will be assessed only in respect of assets for which data is actually available.		As per RFP

Page 75-78 Integration with Discoms Data Systems; Roles and Responsibilities b.2.2.6	The SI is to integrate with GIS, SCADA, RMS, MDMS, AMI, Billing Systems, OMS, DMS/ADMS, Asset Management Systems 'and other approved enterprise applications'. Milestone M3 (15% of development price) is contingent on 'Integration with Utility IT/OT systems including SCADA, GIS, MDMS, Billing, RMS and other approved systems' by T0+4 months.	Request an inventory of the DISCOM's existing systems within scope, stating for each: OEM/product name, version, deployment model (on-premises/cloud), whether documented APIs or integration interfaces exist, data dictionary and schema availability, and current support/AMC status. Also confirm the number of integrations to be delivered within the 9-month implementation, and that any system without an available API will be treated as out of scope or as a Change Request. Effort, schedule and price cannot be reliably assessed without this inventory.		As per RFP

Page32, 75-77 Project Area table; Integration with Discoms Data Systems	The scope contemplates integration with MDMS/AMI for interval consumption data, tamper alerts, last gasp/first breath outage alerts and load profiling.	Confirm whether APEPDCL has an operational Head End System (HES) and Meter Data Management System (MDMS) for its smart meter population; if so, the OEM/product and version; and whether interval data will be made available to the SI through the MDMS/HES API, or whether the SI is expected to acquire data directly from meters/DCUs. Confirm the interval granularity available (15-minute/30-minute/daily) and the historical depth.		As per RFP
Page 111 Roles and Responsibilities b.4 - Allocation of IT Infrastructure and Server/Cloud Resources	The DISCOM shall 'Provision necessary server sizing & capacity, cloud storage or on premise and networking resources', ensure sufficient bandwidth, and 'Provision for the expansion of server infrastructure'.	Not specified anywhere in the RFP, yet required for the mandatory Annexure 2 sizing: request the expected number of named users and the peak number of concurrent users, broken down by role and level (corporate office, circle, division, sub-division, section/field), and the expected number of mobile/field users. Without this, sizing submissions will not be comparable across bidders.		As per relevant notes under the RFP

Page 139-141 Annexure 2 - Server Capacity Sizing	'Submission of the server sizing details in the prescribed format is mandatory. Failure to furnish the required information, or submission of incomplete or non-compliant details, shall render the bid non-responsive and liable for rejection.'	Request, per data source (GIS, SCADA/RMS, MDMS/AMI, Billing/CIS, ERP, OMS, DER), (a) the number of years of historical data to be migrated; (b) the current data volume in GB/TB and approximate record counts; (c) the interval granularity and expected daily ingestion volume; and (d) the required online retention and archival retention periods, including for smart meter interval data. Alternatively, confirm that sizing based on the bidder's clearly stated and justified assumptions will be accepted and will not be a ground for rejection.		As per relevant notes under the RFP

Page 41 What-If Simulations - DRE integration / renewable yield estimation	The scope includes wind farm annual yield and loss estimation and solar farm yield estimation.	Wind yield and loss estimation requires met-mast time series, wind resource data and turbine power curves; solar yield estimation requires string and inverter engineering design. Such computations are ordinarily performed in specialised tools at the pre-feasibility stage. Confirm whether the platform is required to (a) compute these from first principles, or (b) ingest and analyse the outputs of established pre-feasibility studies. If (a), confirm that APEPDCL will provide met- mast data, wind resource assessments, turbine and inverter specifications and plant design data for the DER assets concerned.		As per RFP

Page 36 AI-Driven Analytics - Consumption and Supply Summary	The scope includes blended cost of supply, year-on-year consumption and cost variation, BESS savings and DSM savings computations.	Confirm that APEPDCL will provide the power purchase cost data, PPA-wise and source-wise variable and fixed cost data, approved tariff schedules, ARR/True-up filings, year-on-year consumption and cost data, and BESS and DSM programme design parameters required to compute blended cost of supply and the associated savings. Confirm the periodicity at which such data will be refreshed.		As per RFP
Page 62-63 What-If Simulations - Grid planning / cost estimation	The scope refers to civil works cost estimates and the preparation of material and cost estimates.	Confirm (a) whether a cost estimation / BOQ engine is required within the platform, or whether the requirement is limited to consuming estimates prepared in the DISCOM's existing ERP or estimation system; (b) if a cost engine is required, the applicable Schedule of Rates (APEPDCL/APSSR) and who maintains and updates it; and (c) whether integration with the DISCOM's ERP for material master and rate data is expected.		As per RFP

Page 87-89, 112 Change Management; Roles and Responsibilities b.7	The SI is to deliver a structured Change Management approach 'covering HR readiness, operational adjustments, communication strategies' and an HR Plan. Roles and Responsibilities b.7 places organisational change management on the DISCOM.	Confirm that the SI's obligation is limited to preparing the change management strategy, communication material, stakeholder engagement plans, training and adoption support and adoption metrics, and does not extend to (a) supplying or configuring an HRMS or ITSM product, (b) organisational restructuring or manpower planning, or (c) acting as HR consultant to the DISCOM. Confirm that the DISCOM owns and executes organisational change, consistent with b.7.1.		As per RFP

Page 90-91, 101, 137 Facility Management Service (iii) Support for Third-Party Audits; Governance & Incident Management (iv), (v); Annexure 1B item 6	The SI must facilitate third-party audits mandated by the Utility, including facilitation of interviews, system access, walkthroughs and verification of controls. An independent VAPT and secure source code review by a CERT-In empanelled auditor is a mandatory pre-condition for Go-Live, and must be repeated at least once every six months and after any major change, throughout the contract period. Annexure 1B item 6 lists 'CERT-In Audits: Bi-annual (every 6 months) mandatory VAPT and source code security audits' as a subscription cost line.	Confirm (a) whether the CERT-In empanelled auditor is appointed and paid for by ISA/APEPDCL, with the SI's obligation limited to facilitation and remediation, or whether the SI must engage and pay the auditor; (b) if the latter, the expected number of audit cycles over the 5-year subscription period and the scope of each (application, APIs, infrastructure, mobile app, integrations, AI/LLM components, source code review), so that the cost can be quantified; and (c) that closure timelines for audit findings will account for dependencies on DISCOM-controlled infrastructure and third-party systems.		As per RFP

Page 31, 109 TOR Introduction; Roles and Responsibilities a.1	'The SI shall deploy qualified manpower at both corporate and field levels to ensure successful project implementation.'	Neither the minimum on-site manpower nor a corresponding line item in Annexure 1 is specified. Confirm (a) the minimum on-site manpower expected during implementation and during the Facility Management phase, by role, location and duration; (b) whether deployment is required at the APEPDCL Corporate Office, at circle offices, or both; (c) whether office space, workstations and connectivity will be provided by APEPDCL; and (d) whether such manpower is to be priced within the lump-sum Professional Fees and the annual subscription fee, and if so under which Annexure 1 line item.		As per RFP
Page 72-74 Alerts and Notifications - 'Delivery: Dashboard alert integrated with roster management'	The Alerts and Notifications section refers to alert delivery integrated with roster management. ISA's earlier EOI No. 2/ISA-MDTF/2025-ISA included 'Roster Management' in its title; this RFP's Scope of Work table does not list a roster management module.	Confirm whether a roster / workforce scheduling module is within the SI's scope, or whether roster data will be consumed from the DISCOM's existing systems (ERP/HRMS or the existing GIS mobile application) via API for the purpose of alert routing only.		As per RFP

Page 83-86 Training and Knowledge Base	'The training will be provided in both English and the local language, with a focus on field staff who predominantly use the local language.' The platform is to serve control room operators, engineers, supervisors and field personnel.	Confirm whether the application user interface, reports, alerts/notifications and the chat-based natural language querying module are required to support the local language (Telugu) in addition to English, or whether the local language requirement applies to training delivery and training material only. Multilingual support in the NLQ/LLM layer materially affects design, model selection and cost.		As per RFP

Page 83-85 Training and Knowledge Base (a)(i), (ii)	Professional Training for the core implementation team: approximately 90-100 personnel per Discom. End-User Training: approximately 750 personnel per Discom. Training 'preferably conducted by the OEM partner or OEM-certified training partner'. Higher management training at the Utility's Corporate Office.	Confirm (a) that the figures of 90-100 and 750 relate to APEPDCL alone; (b) the number of training locations and batches across the 7 circles; (c) whether venues, hardware, projection and connectivity will be provided by APEPDCL; (d) whether travel, accommodation and per diem of trainers are within the SI's scope; (e) the number of refresher cycles expected over the contract period; and (f) that a bidder that is itself the OEM of the proposed platform satisfies the 'OEM partner or OEM-certified training partner' requirement.		As per RFP
Page 104, 103, 128 Maintenance Support and Service Levels (c)(iii)(3), (d)(i)(1)(c), (v)(2); Form E Section 1.3	The RFP refers in several places to the 'ISA Business Application' response time, to conducting UAT with 'ISA stakeholders', to compliance with 'ISA's retention policies', and Form E Section 1.3 refers to 'similar engagements for fund-raising done in the region/country'.	Confirm that these are template references carried over from ISA's standard RFP format and that the deliverable under this RFP is the APEPDCL utility intelligence platform only. If a separate 'ISA Business Application' is within scope, request that it be specified. Confirm also that Form E Section 1.3 (fund-raising experience) is not applicable and will not be scored.		As per RFP

Page 111, 137, 139-141 Roles and Responsibilities b.4; Annexure 1B item 1; Annexure 2	Roles and Responsibilities b.4 places the provision of server sizing and capacity, cloud storage or on-premises infrastructure, networking, bandwidth and future server expansion on the DISCOM. Annexure 2 requires the bidder to size application servers, DB servers, primary and archive SSD storage, GPUs (NVIDIA A100 40/80GB) and associated compute. Annexure 1B item 1 refers to Disaster Recovery with real-time data replication and failover drills at the APEPDCL Data Centre.	Confirm expressly that all compute, GPU, storage, network, data centre, disaster recovery site, hypervisor/virtualisation, operating system and database platform costs and bandwidth are provided and borne by APEPDCL/ISA and are excluded from the bidder's financial proposal, and that Annexure 2 is required for sizing and specification purposes only. This is the single largest cost variable in the engagement and bids will not be comparable unless the position is stated unambiguously.		As per RFP bidder needs to provide the sizing only

Page 100, 102, 111 Security & Infrastructure (a); Platform & Software Standards (g)(iii); Roles and Responsibilities b.4.1	Security & Infrastructure is drafted on the premise 'Where the AI Digital Platform is hosted in the Utility's On-Premises Data Centre'. The platform architecture must support hybrid cloud, private cloud, public cloud and on-premises deployments without functional limitations. Roles and Responsibilities b.4.1 refers to 'cloud storage or on premise'.	Confirm the intended deployment model for this engagement: on-premises at the APEPDCL data centre, a MeitY-empanelled / Government Community Cloud, or hybrid. Confirm (a) any data residency or localisation requirement; (b) whether the APEPDCL data centre presently has GPU capacity available, and if not, who procures it; (c) the available floor space, power and cooling headroom; and (d) whether a separate DR data centre exists, its location, connectivity and the applicable RPO/RTO. Architecture, sizing, security controls and price all depend on this answer.		As per RFP
Page 139 Annexure 2 - item 5 'GPU: NVIDIA A100 (40/80GB)'	The sizing format names a specific GPU model.	Confirm whether the NVIDIA A100 is mandated, or whether equivalent or newer GPUs (for example L40S, H100) or managed cloud GPU services may be proposed. Confirm also whether a design using managed/hosted LLM inference services without dedicated on-premises GPUs is acceptable.		As per RFP and its relevant notes & instructions

Page 63-68, 92, 137 Chat-based Natural Language querying module; Facility Management Service (vii)(3) and (viii)(2); Annexure 1B item 2	The scope requires LLM-powered AI copilots, Retrieval-Augmented Generation, vector databases, embedding models and Agentic AI. AI Operations expressly includes 'Monitoring of LLM API availability, token consumption and inference failures'. FMS requires updates to LLM connectors, AI frameworks, orchestration engines, vector databases, RAG components and embedding models at no additional payment.	Confirm who bears the cost of (a) commercial Large Language Model API tokens or licences, (b) embedding and vector search services, and (c) any third-party AI/ML services, over the full 5-year subscription period. If these are within the SI's scope, request indicative volumes (expected number of users, queries per user per day, average context size, and peak concurrency) so that consumption can be estimated and priced. Alternatively, confirm that a self-hosted open-weight model deployed on DISCOM-provided GPU infrastructure is acceptable, in which case the GPU capacity must be confirmed as DISCOM-provided. As drafted this is an open-ended and unquantifiable cost.		AS per RFP

Page 96, 113, 111 Project Management (a)(iv); Exit Management (d); Roles and Responsibilities b.4	Project Management (a)(iv) requires that 'All software licenses for the GIS, Network Analysis, and Load Forecasting system shall be procured and supplied' and that the quoted price cover licence and subscription procurement, updates and renewals, change requests and periodic mobile updates for the entire contract lifecycle. Exit Management (d) requires all third-party software, subscriptions and certificates to be registered in APEPDCL's name. The Introduction records that APEPDCL already has 'comprehensive GIS mapping from feeder to consumer level integrated with ERP systems'.	Clarify (a) whether APEPDCL's existing GIS platform licences (Esri or equivalent) will be leveraged and provided by APEPDCL, or whether the SI must procure GIS engine licences afresh; (b) which specific third-party licences the SI is required to procure; (c) the number of named and concurrent users to be licensed, for each licensed component; and (d) confirmation that operating system, database, virtualisation, container platform and security tool licences on DISCOM-provided infrastructure are the DISCOM's responsibility. Confirm also how licences procured by the SI but registered in APEPDCL's name are to be treated commercially.	AS per RFP

Page 100-101 Security & Infrastructure (c); Governance & Incident Management (ii)	The SI shall integrate the solution with the Utility's existing WAF, NGFW, IDS/IPS, anti-malware, NAC, SIEM, EDR and managed DDoS protection. The SI shall integrate with the Utility's existing SIEM and 'provide 24x7 security monitoring through a SOC (or equivalent managed service)'.	Confirm (a) that the security infrastructure listed exists at APEPDCL and will be made available, and that the SI's obligation is integration only and not supply; and (b) whether the 24x7 SOC is APEPDCL's existing SOC (to which the SI must forward events) or must be provided by the SI as a managed service. If the SI must provide a SOC, request that it be identified as a separate priced line item, and confirm whether it must be staffed on-site.		AS per RFP
Page 101 Governance & Incident Management (ii)	Logs shall be centrally aggregated in a SIEM, protected against tampering through write-once/immutable storage, and retained for a minimum of 180 days online and as further required by law or Utility policy.	Confirm that the storage required for SIEM log aggregation, immutable/WORM storage and 180-day online retention is provided by APEPDCL and is to be sized and reported separately from application and analytics storage in Annexure 2. Confirm the total retention period required beyond 180 days online.		AS per RFP

Page 25, 93, 103, 113 Section 4.2 - COTS Software Solution; Intellectual Property (IP) and Rights; Maintenance Support (c)(i)(2); Exit Management and Handover	Section 4.2 awards up to 10 marks for a demonstrated COTS software solution. Page 93 vests in the Utility all processed data, derived insights and trained ML models resulting from Utility data. Page 103 requires the SI to 'Deliver customized source code along with perpetual licenses and documentation for all components'. Page 113 requires a zero-cost Exit Management Plan with handover of complete editable documentation, source code, AI/ML models, schemas and APIs to both APEPDCL and ISA.	Read together, these provisions require an indigenous product company to transfer its core product. Request confirmation or amendment that: (i) pre-existing and background intellectual property, the COTS core platform, proprietary frameworks and libraries, and pre-trained base models remain the exclusive property of the SI; (ii) ISA and APEPDCL receive a perpetual, irrevocable, non-exclusive and non-transferable licence to use the core platform for their own internal purposes in respect of the modelled network, rather than ownership of or title to it; and The present drafting is inconsistent with the RFP's own COTS scoring criterion, since no COTS product owner can transfer its product source code and retain a viable business. We request to remove source code handover to ISA/APEDCL.		AS per RFP

Page 113 Exit Management and Handover (b)(i) - ISA's Rights (The Baseline Release)	'The ISA holds a perpetual, global, royalty-free, and sub-licensable license to the Baseline Release (all software, development, and configurations completed up to the end of the First Year Subscription). These rights apply even if the contract is terminated or not renewed after the first year.'	Clarify the intended scope and purpose of the sub-licensable right, in particular whether ISA intends to sub-license, redistribute or deploy the Baseline Release to other DISCOMs, ISA member countries, or third-party system integrators. Request that (a) the licence be limited to ISA's own internal use and to APEPDCL's use for the modelled network, and be made non-sub-licensable and non-transferable; or (b) any onward deployment to other utilities or member countries be undertaken through, or under licence from, the SI on mutually agreed commercial terms; or (c) if global sub-licensable rights are genuinely required, that a separate line item be provided in Form G so that the value of those rights can be priced. As drafted, the clause permits royalty-free global redistribution of an indigenous product after a single year, which would be commercially unsustainable for an Indian product company.	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

				perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Page 97 Project Management (b) - Development of AI/ML Logic	'The AI/ML models, business rules, prompts, workflows, feature engineering logic, training methodologies, and analytical algorithms developed under this project shall be fully documented and shared with ISA and APEPDCL. No proprietary or black-box AI logic that prevents understanding, validation, modification, or future enhancement by ISA or APEPDCL shall be incorporated into the solution without prior written approval.'	Disclosure of model architecture, input features, target variables and hyperparameters cannot be shared as it comes under Intellectual Property rights of SI. We request to reconsider this in RFP.	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

				perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Page 93 Intellectual Property (IP) and Rights (i) - Ownership of Insights	'All processed data, derived insights, and trained ML models resulting from Utility data remain the exclusive property of the Utility.'	Confirm that the Utility's ownership extends to (a) the APEPDCL data itself, (b) the outputs, insights and reports generated from it, and (c) the specific model instances and fine-tuned weights trained on APEPDCL data for APEPDCL's use - and does not extend to (i) the underlying model architectures, training code and pipelines, (ii) base or foundation models and models developed before or outside this contract, or (iii) the SI's right to deploy its platform and its generic model architectures for other clients. Confirm also whether the SI may use APEPDCL data in anonymised and aggregated form for model training, validation and improvement, and whether a separate data sharing agreement and DPDP Act 2023 compliance framework will be executed.	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

				perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Page 113 Exit Management and Handover (a)	'The System Integrator (SI) must execute a zero-cost Exit Management Plan upon contract expiry, termination, or if APEPDCL does not continue the subscription beyond the first year.'	Request that (a) a defined transition period (for example three months) be provided, with the scope of transition support specified and capped in effort (person-days), and a mutually agreed transition charge payable where transition support extends beyond that cap; (b) the SI's obligations following completion of handover be expressly concluded; and (c) exit obligations be proportionate where the contract is not continued for reasons unrelated to the SI's performance, such as the absence of budgetary provision.	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically

			under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge,

				documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Page 93 Intellectual Property (IP) and Rights (ii) - Right to Re-Platform	'The Utility maintains a perpetual, royalty-free right to modify, enhance, and share all exported schemas, code, and model architectures with any third-party successor for the purpose of re-platforming the Digital Twin services.'	Since Solution provided by SI would be a Intellectual property of SI only and Any SI would not want to provide royalty free rights for their software solution as well RFP statement inclines toward commercial exploitation, sub-licensing or transfer to other utilities or entities. We request you to reconsider this clause	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically

			under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge,

				documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Page 94 Deliverables (d)(vi) - Architecture Governance Forum (AGF)	'Approval of the High-Level Design (HLD) and Low-Level Design (LLD) milestones is contingent upon the SI providing a comprehensive Integration Architecture Blueprint... certified by the Architecture Governance Forum (AGF) as compliant with the Utility's open-platform, no-vendor-lock-in objectives.'	Request details of the Architecture Governance Forum: its constitution, mandate, meeting cadence, quorum and the maximum timeline within which it will issue certification or comments. Confirm that (a) HLD/LLD review comments will be consolidated and issued within a defined period (for example 15 working days) of submission; (b) any delay in AGF certification, or any iteration arising from changes in the Utility's requirements, will extend the affected milestone dates without liquidated damages or SLA penalty; and (c) the certification criteria will be issued in advance.		AGF shall be cosntituted from ISA and APEPDCL

Page 98-100 Platform & Software Standards (a) to (h)	The platform must function as a Platform-as-a-Service application hosting environment with a plug-and-play application framework, an Application Repository/App Marketplace with installation, upgrade, configuration, licensing, monitoring and removal of third-party applications, application certification and onboarding, published Open APIs, SDKs and developer tools; support IEC 61968/61970 (CIM), IEC 61850, IEC 60870-5-104, DNP3, OGC (WMS/WFS), REST, GraphQL, MQTT and OPC-UA; remain hardware-, OS-, database- and cloud-agnostic; and support Oracle, PostgreSQL/PostGIS, Microsoft SQL Server, MySQL 'or equivalent'.	Clarify (a) whether a full third-party application marketplace, developer certification programme and application lifecycle governance capability must be delivered and operational within the 9-month implementation, or whether it is an architectural and roadmap requirement to be evidenced by design; (b) which protocols and standards must be demonstrably implemented and tested at Go-Live (by reference to the systems actually being integrated), as distinct from supported by architecture; and (c) whether 'database-agnostic' requires the SI to certify and test the platform on all four named databases, or to deliver on one with documented portability. As drafted, these are open-ended obligations that cannot be reliably scoped or priced.		As per RFP

Page 134-135, 138 Form G Table 1; footnote to Table 1; Annexure 1B total line	Form G Table 1 line 2 reads 'Other Costs (Annual Levelized Subscription Cost* for 5 year)'. The footnote requires 'a single, all-inclusive annual subscription fee, which shall remain fixed and applicable throughout the entire five (5) year subscription period'. The total line of Annexure 1B reads 'All-Inclusive 5-Year Levelized Subscription Fee (Carried to Table 1 of Form G)'.	Confirm unambiguously whether the amount to be entered against 'Other Costs' in Form G Table 1 - and therefore included in the 'Total Amount of Financial Proposal' used for the FP Rating - is (a) the annual levelized subscription fee, or (b) the annual fee multiplied by five. The two readings differ by a factor of five and, if bidders interpret this differently, the financial comparison under the 70:30 combined scoring method will be distorted and the lowest-price benchmark rendered meaningless. Request that a corrected Form G and Annexure 1B, with an unambiguous format and explicit statement of the amount to be carried forward, be issued by corrigendum.		As per RFP

Page 134, 138 Form G Table 1; Annexure 1B	Form G Table 1 states 'All Bidders shall quote only one price (Incl of taxes and etc) for development of the AI solution platform'. The same table contains a separate row for 'Taxes (if applicable)' before 'Total Amount of Financial Proposal'. Annexure 1B contains a separate 'Applicable Taxes' row.	Confirm whether prices are to be quoted (a) inclusive of all taxes as a single figure, or (b) exclusive of GST with GST shown separately. Confirm also (i) whether the financial comparison will be on the pre-tax or post-tax amount; (ii) the GST treatment of the ISA-funded portion of the engagement, having regard to ISA's status as an international organisation, including whether any exemption, zero-rating or refund mechanism applies and whether ISA will issue the requisite certificate; (iii) the treatment of TDS/TCS and any withholding on payments by ISA and by APEPDCL; and (iv) whether the GST position differs as between the ISA-contracted development and Year-1 subscription and the APEPDCL-contracted Years 2-5 subscription.		As per RFP

Page 134-135, 22 Note to Form G; BDS 18, 19, 21	The subscription is initially contracted for one year from Go-Live, borne entirely by ISA, with APEPDCL having no payment obligation during that period. APEPDCL may at its sole discretion continue for a further four years at the same rate, subject to satisfactory performance and budgetary provisions, under a separate Letter of Award 'incorporating the applicable standard Terms and Conditions of APEPDCL'.	Confirm (a) that ISA is the contracting party for the development phase and the Year-1 subscription; (b) that APEPDCL will contract separately for Years 2-5 under its own standard terms; and (c) that there is no committed revenue beyond Year 1. Request that APEPDCL's applicable standard Terms and Conditions - which will govern the Years 2-5 contract, including the CPG, liquidated damages, SLA, payment, price variation and dispute resolution provisions - be issued as part of the corrigendum. Bidders are being required to quote a price fixed for five years against contractual terms that have not been disclosed.	As per RFP

Page 135 Note to Form G	'the annual subscription fee shall remain the same as the rate quoted by the successful Bidder' for the extended four-year period; and the fee 'shall remain fixed and applicable throughout the entire five (5) year subscription period'.	Confirm that no price indexation applies for five years. Request that a limited price adjustment mechanism be provided for (a) changes in law, statutory levies or tax rates; (b) foreign-currency-denominated third-party subscriptions where these are in the SI's scope (LLM/AI services, cloud services, GIS engine licences); and (c) increases in scope volumes beyond a stated band (assets, users, DERs, smart meters, data volume), which otherwise expose the SI to unquantifiable cost growth over a five-year horizon.		As per RFP

Page 18, 20, 105-108 ITB 40.1, 42.1; BDS 7; Payment terms and conditions	Advance payment upon signing of contract: Not Allowed. Payment terms shall be within thirty (30) days after receipt of invoice and certification of acceptance of work. Milestone M1 (10%) at T0+1 month; 85% of the development price released between T0+2 and T0+9 months. All milestone deliverables shall be duly approved by the DISCOM for payment acceptance.	Confirm (a) the acceptance process and the maximum period within which ISA/APEPDCL will accept or comment on each milestone deliverable, and that payment will not be withheld where acceptance is delayed for reasons not attributable to the SI; (b) that milestone payments will not be withheld on account of delays attributable to the Utility or to third parties (data, API access, approvals, infrastructure); and (c) whether a mobilisation advance of up to 10% against an equivalent bank guarantee may be permitted, which would materially improve participation by startups and Micro & Small Enterprises.		As per RFP
Page 108 Payment terms and conditions - footnotes # and ##	'# % of the price quoted for development of the AI platform'. '## On basis of the quoted subscription cost'. M8 FMS is payable quarterly.	Confirm (a) that the M1 to M7 percentages apply to the Professional Fees (development) amount only; (b) that M8 quarterly payments are computed as one-fourth of the annual subscription fee; and (c) the invoicing cycle and documentation required for quarterly FMS invoices.		As per RFP

Page 20-21 BDS 8 - Liquidated Damages	'the contractor shall be liable to pay ISA the liquidated damages of a weekly charge of 5% (five percent) of the total contract sum, for each week of the weekly occurrence, up to a maximum amount of 20% (twenty percent) of the contract sum'. ISA may issue a Notice of Breach in the first instance and terminate in the second instance.	As drafted, a two-week delay in a single deliverable would attract liquidated damages of 10% of the entire contract value, and the maximum is reached after four weeks. Request that (a) liquidated damages be computed on the value of the delayed milestone or deliverable rather than on the total contract sum, consistent with footnote 3 to the payment table which states that 'Penalty/LD shall be imposed on the invoice deliverable in each milestone'; (b) the weekly rate be reduced to 0.5% per week of the value of the delayed deliverable, with an overall cap of 5% to 10% of the contract value; (c) liquidated damages apply only to delays attributable to the SI, with express exclusion of delays caused by the Utility, third-party system owners, pending approvals (including AGF certification and CERT-In audit closure) and force majeure; and (d) the relationship between liquidated damages under BDS 8 and SLA penalties under the Facility Management SLA be clarified so that the same event is not penalised twice.		Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

Page 20-21 BDS 8 - Liquidated Damages; ITB 38.1	'ISA may in the event of the contractor's default or failure to meet a timeline issue a Notice of Breach as a warning of first instance; and in the second instance terminate the contract'.	Confirm (a) the cure period allowed following a Notice of Breach before a second-instance termination may be effected; (b) that termination will be preceded by written notice and an opportunity to remedy; and (c) that on termination the SI will be paid for all work completed and accepted up to the date of termination, and reimbursed for committed third-party costs, license procurement costs		As per RFP
Page 116-121 Facility Management Phase SLA - Remark 1; KPIs 1.1 to 1.8, 2.1 to 2.3	Remark 1 caps the total cumulative penalty for applicable SLA breaches at 18% of the quarterly invoice amount. Individual KPIs are capped at 2% or 4% of the quarterly subscription cost, and the helpdesk KPI at 5% per quarter.	Confirm (a) the overall cumulative cap that applies (18%); (b) whether 'quarterly invoice amount' and 'quarterly subscription cost' are the same base; and (c) that the cumulative cap prevails over the sum of individual KPI caps.		Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

Page 114 Facility Management Phase SLA Overview - Monthly Availability Formula and footnote 7	'% Availability = ((Actual Uptime + Scheduled Downtime) / Total Monthly Hours) x 100'. Footnote 7: 'Actual Uptime is measured before or after excluding scheduled maintenance'.	As drafted, adding scheduled downtime to actual uptime can yield an availability figure exceeding 100%, and footnote 7 is internally ambiguous. Request a corrected formulation, for example: Availability = Actual Uptime / (Total Monthly Hours - Scheduled Downtime) x 100, with Actual Uptime measured exclusive of scheduled maintenance. Confirm also that infrastructure and hardware failures on DISCOM-provided servers, and network unavailability, are excluded from the availability computation, consistent with the exclusion already provided in KPI 1.1 condition 2.	As per RFP

Page 104, 115 Maintenance Support and Service Levels (d)(i)(1)(a); Section A - Typical Response Time Standards, item 1	'Average loading time of Static Page in a Web Portal for all the applications... < 50 milli seconds', 'Measured by TTFB via third-party tool (by SI)'. Dynamic content pages: < 1 second.	An average static page load time of under 50 milliseconds measured as time-to-first-byte at the client, via a third-party tool, is not physically achievable over a wide-area network, since the network round-trip time alone between a user location and the data centre will ordinarily exceed this, irrespective of application design. Request that this parameter be either (a) revised to a realistic value (for example under 500 milliseconds at the client, or under 1 second for pages served over WAN), or (b) measured at the server or application boundary within the DISCOM data centre, excluding client network latency, with the measurement point, tool and reference client location specified. Request the same clarification for the sub-1-second dynamic page response requirement and for the map rendering, spatial query and file upload timings on page 104-105.		As per RFP

Page 92, 119 Facility Management Service (vi) Evaluation Criteria items 1 and 3; SLA KPI 1.5 AI Model Accuracy & Performance	'Accuracy: Data and AI predictions with <1% error rate across all features.' 'AI Effectiveness: >90% accuracy in analytics, simulations, chat responses and predictive tasks.' KPI 1.5 penalises failure to maintain 'accuracy thresholds approved during UAT'.	A blanket requirement of a sub-1% error rate 'across all features' is not a meaningful or attainable specification for probabilistic tasks. Load flow analysis is a deterministic computation whose accuracy depends on network model and measurement quality, whereas demand and load forecasting are inherently probabilistic and depend on weather, exogenous events, and the completeness and timeliness of source data. Request that (a) accuracy KPIs be defined per use case, specifying the metric (MAPE, RMSE, MAE, precision/recall, F1 or equivalent), the reference dataset, the baseline, the measurement window and the agreed threshold; (b) such thresholds be jointly established and frozen during UAT, as KPI 1.5 itself contemplates and as the Governance section has already done for security acceptance criteria; and (c) periods in which source data is incomplete, delayed or of deficient quality be expressly excluded from measurement. Request that the criteria on page 92 be replaced by the UAT-agreed thresholds.		As per RFP

Page 92, 120 Facility Management Service (vi) Evaluation Criteria item 4; SLA KPI 1.6 Third-Party Integration Support	'Integration: Robust connectivity with DISCOM systems, <2-second API latency, >99% sync reliability.' KPI 1.6 requires 99.5% successful API/connector availability, 'excluding failures attributable to third-party systems or Utility infrastructure'.	Confirm that the sub-2-second API latency and the sync reliability targets (a) are measured on the APIs, connectors and integration middleware developed by the SI, and exclude latency, throttling, downtime and data- quality failures of DISCOM and third-party source systems, network and DISCOM- provided infrastructure, consistent with the exclusion already stated in KPI 1.6; and (b) the measurement methodology, sampling basis, monitoring tool and reporting format will be jointly agreed and approved before Go-Live under Remark 4. Confirm also how the two differing thresholds (>99% on page 92 and 99.5% in KPI 1.6) are to be reconciled.		As per RFP

Page 121 Facility Management Phase SLA - Section C, items 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 (Helpdesk Service Levels)	Item 2.1 'Batch Operation Completion / High priority / resolved within 6 hours' is described against 'The high impact problem with effect on the efficiency of users'. Item 2.2 'Critical Incident - Business Disruption' is mapped to 'Medium priority / 24 hours'. Item 2.3 'Partial System Impact' is mapped to 'Low priority / 48 hours'. Section B on page 115-116 defines High/Medium/Low differently.	The severity labels, descriptions and resolution timelines in Section C items 2.1 to 2.3 appear to be mismatched, and are inconsistent with Section B - notably, a Critical Incident causing business disruption is classified as Medium priority with a 24-hour resolution. Request a corrected table aligning severity, definition, response time and resolution time with Section B, and confirm which table governs.		As per RFP
Page 115-116, 137 Facility Management Phase SLA - Section B; Annexure 1B item 5	Section B prescribes maximum response times of 1 hour (High), 2 hours (Medium) and 8 hours (Low) and resolution times of 6, 24 and 48 hours. Annexure 1B item 5 requires a '24x7 Support Hub: Centralized L1, L2, and L3 support (phone, email, web portal)'.	Confirm (a) whether 24x7 coverage is required for L1, L2 and L3, or 24x7 for L1 with business-hours L2/L3; (b) whether any on-site helpdesk presence is required at the APEPDCL Corporate Office or at circle offices; (c) the expected ticket volume per month, to enable the helpdesk to be resourced and priced; and (d) whether the support hub may be operated from the SI's own premises.		As per RFP

Page 112, 119-120, 96 Project Activities checklist item 15; SLA KPIs 1.5 and 1.8 (Warranty/Stabilisation Period); Project Management	Project Activities checklist item 15 requires 'Demonstrated stable functioning of all key modules for six continuous months including real- time data flow and dashboard updates'. KPIs 1.5 and 1.8 provide that 'The first six (6) months from Go- Live shall constitute the Warranty/Stabilization Period'. Implementation is to be completed within 9 months, with Go-Live at M7 (T0+9 months).	A six-month period of demonstrated stable functioning cannot be accommodated within a 9-month implementation period ending at Go- Live. Confirm (a) whether item 15 relates to the post-Go-Live stabilisation period rather than to the implementation period; (b) that the six- month Warranty/Stabilisation Period runs from Go-Live and forms part of the Year-1 subscription; and (c) that the Warranty/Stabilisation exclusion from SLA penalties applies to all SLA KPIs and not only to KPIs 1.5 and 1.8. Request that the project activities checklist and the milestone table be reconciled by corrigendum.		As per RFP

Page 92, 96, 136-138 Facility Management Service (vii) items 1- 11; Project Management (a)(iv)(3); Annexure 1B item 7	FMS (vii) requires all platform releases, version upgrades, AI model improvements, LLM connector updates, API/SDK/middleware updates, library and OS dependency updates, security updates, performance optimisation and technology refresh at no additional payment, while item 11 provides that any new functional module, business capability, workflow or feature that materially expands scope shall be treated as a Change Request implemented only after written approval under mutually agreed commercial terms. Project Management (a)(iv)(3) requires the quoted price to cover 'Change requests' for the entire lifecycle. Annexure 1B item 7 lists 'Change Management' as a subscription line item.	These provisions are inconsistent: (a)(iv)(3) appears to include unlimited change requests in the quoted price, while page 92 item 11 treats scope-expanding changes as separately priced Change Requests. Confirm that page 92 item 11 governs, and that the quoted price covers maintenance, upgrades and defect resolution in respect of delivered functionality but not new functional scope. Request that bidders be permitted to submit an indicative man-day rate card for Change Requests (which will not form part of the evaluated price), and that a change control procedure with an annual change-request allowance be defined.		As per RFP

Page 137 Annexure 1B item 1 - Disaster Recovery	'Disaster Recovery (DR): Real-time data replication and failover drills at APEPDCL Data Centre.'	Confirm (a) whether a separate DR data centre exists, its location and the inter-DC connectivity bandwidth available; (b) the required RPO and RTO; (c) whether DR is active-active, active-passive or cold standby; (d) that DR infrastructure, storage and connectivity are provided by APEPDCL; and (e) the required frequency of failover drills. DR configuration is a material driver of both sizing and cost.	DC at Visakhapatnam, DR at Vijayawada. Required bandwidth will be provided by APEPDCL

Page 93, 7-8, 13 Statutory Compliance for All Personnel; ITB 22.3 (ISA GTC not provided)	'All responsibilities, obligations, and liabilities - whether statutory, contractual, financial, or otherwise - shall rest exclusively with the bidder. Under no circumstances shall the authority/client be held liable for any act, omission, default, or non-compliance on the part of the bidder or its personnel, subcontractors, agents, or representatives.'	This clause, read with the fact that the ISA General Terms and Conditions have not been provided, leaves the SI's liability position unbounded. Confirm (a) whether the ISA GTC provides an overall cap on the SI's aggregate liability, and if so at what level, and request that liability be capped at the contract value; (b) that indirect, incidental, consequential and punitive losses and loss of profit are excluded; (c) the insurance cover required of the SI (professional indemnity, cyber liability, workmen's compensation, public liability) and the limits and duration; and (d) that the Utility indemnifies the SI in respect of the accuracy, completeness, legality and third-party rights of data provided by the Utility, and in respect of decisions taken by Utility personnel on the basis of AI-generated recommendations. We note that the principal-to-principal formulation is understood and accepted as regards the SI's own personnel and statutory compliances.		As per RFP

Page 13, 18-19 ITB 22.3, 43.1; ISA GTC (not provided)	ISA may withdraw the RFP at any time where the mandate or funding of ISA applicable to the RFP is curtailed or terminated. The ISA General Terms and Conditions govern the contract but have not been provided.	Confirm (a) the governing law, seat and rules of arbitration, and dispute resolution mechanism applicable to (i) the ISA contract for the development phase and Year-1 subscription and (ii) the APEPDCL contract for Years 2-5; (b) whether ISA asserts immunity from suit or jurisdiction, and if so the mechanism available to the SI to enforce its rights; and (c) the consequences for the SI, including payment for work completed and committed costs, if ISA withdraws the RFP or terminates under clause 43.1 for funding or mandate reasons.		As per RFP

Page 20, 22 BDS 5; BDS 18	Proposal Validity Period: 90 days. Expected date for commencement of Contract: November 2026. Bid submission: 13 September 2026.	Ninety days from 13 September 2026 expires on or about 12 December 2026. Confirm the indicative evaluation schedule (technical evaluation, demonstration, financial opening, award) and that any extension of proposal validity sought under ITB 17 will be requested before expiry and will be without change to the quoted price. Confirm also whether the nine-month project duration is reckoned from the date of the Letter of Award (T0) as stated in Project Management (a)(v).		As per RFP

		The RFP requires data ingestion from a minimum of two DISCOM IT/OT systems, such as SCADA, MDMS, AMI, OMS, ERP, Billing, Outage Management or Asset Management. Since live interfaces or data from these systems may not be available during the demonstration, kindly clarify whether bidders may demonstrate this capability using representative Excel/CSV datasets from any two such systems and show the ingested data on the proposed GIS platform. Kindly confirm whether this approach will be accepted for the stipulated evaluation criterion.		As per the RFP, the Bidder shall demonstrate and substantiate its capabilities through the required demonstrations.

		Considering that simulation of multiple external IT/OT systems such as SCADA, AMI, MDMS, ERP and Billing may not be practical during the demonstration, and that the core scope of the RFP is GIS and Network Analysis, kindly consider limiting the 5-mark bidirectional integration demonstration to the GIS and Network Analysis systems/interfaces. This will enable all bidders to demonstrate the complete end-to-end workflow within the core scope of the RFP. Kindly confirm.		As per the RFP, the Bidder shall demonstrate and substantiate its capabilities through the required demonstrations.

		Since bidders/OEMs may not have access to live DISCOM IT/OT systems or real-time operational data during the demonstration, kindly consider evaluating this criterion using a common controlled/representative data feed. Bidders may demonstrate the capability using Excel/CSV datasets representing any two such systems, with the ingested data visualized in the proposed GIS platform in a controlled demo environment. Kindly confirm whether such an approach would qualify for the stipulated 5 marks.		As per the RFP, the Bidder shall demonstrate and substantiate its capabilities through the required demonstrations, which may be based on live/dummy data.
		Since live DISCOM IT/OT systems and enterprise data may not be available during the demonstration, kindly consider providing a common representative utility use case to all bidders for the Agentic AI demonstration, enabling uniform and objective evaluation of the required AI capabilities without dependence on access to live DISCOM systems.		As per the RFP, the Bidder shall demonstrate and substantiate its capabilities through the required demonstrations, which may be based on live/dummy data.

		The RFP specifies an average loading time of <50 ms for a static Web Portal page. We understand this to refer to application/server response time under a defined test environment, excluding network latency, browser rendering and human input time. Since GIS maps, dashboards and data-driven applications involve additional factors such as spatial data volume, map layers, rendering and query complexity, we understand that their performance would be assessed based on appropriate application-specific parameters rather than the static-page benchmark. Kindly confirm our understanding and that the assessment will be based on common, predefined test scenarios and conditions applicable to all bidders.		As per RFP

		The RFP specifies an average response time of <1 second for Dynamic Content Pages. We understand this to refer to application/server response time under a defined test environment. Since GIS and network-analysis applications involve factors such as spatial data volume, map layers, query complexity and analytical processing, we understand that their performance would be assessed using appropriate application-specific parameters. Kindly confirm our understanding and that the assessment will be based on common, predefined test scenarios, dataset and user-load conditions applicable to all bidders.		As per RFP

		The RFP specifies an average response time of <1 second for ISA Business Applications. We understand this to refer to application/server response time under a defined test environment. Since GIS and network-analysis applications involve factors such as spatial data volume, query complexity, map rendering and analytical processing, we understand that their performance would be assessed using appropriate application-specific parameters. Kindly confirm our understanding and that the assessment will be based on common, predefined test scenarios, dataset and concurrency levels applicable to all bidders		As per RFP

		The RFP specifies real-time data replication and failover drills as part of the DR requirement. We understand that the required DC/DR infrastructure will be provisioned by APEPDCL/the Prime Bidder. Accordingly, the GIS OEM's scope would cover the required production GIS software components for the DC deployment and the applicable GIS software licensing required for the DR environment. Kindly confirm whether our understanding is correct.		As per RFP

		We understand that the “source code security audit” requirement is applicable to project-specific custom code, extensions and interfaces developed as part of the implementation, and does not extend to the proprietary source code of standard COTS OEM products. For standard COTS products, we also understand that an OEM declaration on its letterhead, provided periodically/as applicable, covering identified vulnerabilities and their remediation/security updates, would be considered sufficient without requiring disclosure of proprietary source code. Kindly confirm.		As per RFP, pg no 101

		If GIS Server licensing is linked to the underlying CPU cores, any future hardware augmentation may result in additional GIS licensing and associated commercial implications for APEPDCL. To ensure predictable long-term TCO, kindly consider specifying that the proposed GIS Server licensing shall be independent of CPU cores/hardware augmentation, such that future infrastructure scaling does not result in additional GIS licensing costs. Kindly confirm our understanding and specify this in the corrigendum.		As per rfp; over and above if any licenses is required then it shall be responsibility of the bidder

Section 4.2 — Pre-Qualification: Years of Operation		The criterion as drafted creates a structural disadvantage for AI/ML-native companies. Years of operation is a poor proxy for capability in a rapidly evolving technology domain. A company incorporated in 2022 with live deployments at two DISCOMs is materially more capable than a legacy SI incorporated in 2010 with no AI/ML track record. Separately, the criterion does not clarify whether it applies to the Sole/Lead Bidder only, or whether a Consortium Member's years of operation may satisfy the criterion.	ISA should add a distinct qualification track for companies recognized under the MoP Powerthon 2.0 programme. For such entities, criteria as such demonstrated live deployment with a DISCOM should be sufficient to score top marks. This is consistent with the spirit of GoI Ministry of Power's selection of these companies for the purposes for furthering innovation in the sector and is in line with what has been seen in tenders by MSEDCL and UPPCL	As per RFP

Section 4.2 — Pre-Qualification: Relevant Project Experience		Financial value of prior contracts is a poor proxy for technical depth in the AI/ML space. A startup that has successfully deployed a novel ML based analytics platform for a DISCOM pilot at a grant value of \$80,000 has demonstrated more relevant capability than a legacy SI that has billed \$600,000 for a standard GIS mapping exercise. A good example of how this plays out is with regards to start-ups recognized selected for Powerthon-scale pilots funded under the RDSS programme by MoP. The total contract value is \$200,000 across two DISCOMs by programme design — meaning that new, innovative start-ups focused primarily on delivering MoP guided pilots would score only 13 marks rather than the maximum 20, with no path to top marks regardless of quality. Further, the clause states that out-of-India deployments are not explicitly mentioned as eligible or ineligible. AI/ML capability for power distribution is nascent globally; international deployments at comparable utilities should qualify.	For companies recognized under MoP Powerthon 2.0, we request that a live, operational deployment at a power distribution company — verified by a client letter or formal completion certificate — qualifies for maximum marks, with contract value thresholds waived. For start-ups, engagements in the pipeline that are not yet delivered but whose existence can be attested to be appropriate counterparty communications like LoIs, Agreements etc. should be included other the definition of "eligible engagements".	As per RFP

Section 4.2 — Pre-Qualification: Demonstrated Experience in Multi-Software Integration		The criterion as written requires integration to be achieved via REST/SOAP APIs, which excludes structured data pipelines and batch ingestion — methods that are common and technically equivalent in AI/ML-native distribution analytics platforms, particularly in pilot contexts where live API integrations may not yet be in place. A bidder who has built a unified analytics platform ingesting SCADA/RMS, consumer billing, and DER data through structured pipelines scores zero marks under a strict reading of this criterion, despite demonstrating the same functional outcome. Further, 'zero marks' is stated as the consequence of no prior experience, which is distinct from all other criteria where a minimum score is awarded for some level of demonstration. The practical effect is that any bidder who does not meet the integration threshold is disqualified regardless of their score on all other criteria.	We request ISA revise the criterion language to read: 'Proven track record of consolidating data from multiple specialised power-sector software systems into a single operational analytics platform, whether via real-time APIs, structured data pipelines, or documented batch ingestion processes.' This better reflects the state of the art in distribution analytics and avoids excluding capable AI/ML-native bidders who deliver the same functional outcome through different technical means.	As per RFP

Section 4.2 — Pre-Qualification: Key Personnel		The criterion rewards headcount, not capability. For an AI/ML-native platform company with a lean, highly qualified team — including PhDs in power systems, electrical engineering, and machine learning with direct utility deployment experience — this structure systematically awards lower scores than a large legacy SI with a predominantly junior team. A company with 4 power systems engineers and 2 ML researchers all holding advanced degrees and live DISCOM deployments scores only 5 marks, while a company with 11 generalist developers with no domain expertise scores 15 marks. This inverts the relationship between score and actual delivery quality.	We request ISA revise the Key Personnel criterion to assess expertise and qualifications rather than headcount. Suggested scoring: • 2 or more team members with PhD-level qualifications in power systems, electrical engineering, computer science, or machine learning, with 3+ years of relevant sector deployment experience: 15 marks • 2 or more team members with Masters-level qualifications in the above fields, with 3+ years of relevant experience: 10 marks • Relevant experience without the above qualification profile: 5 marks This approach directly assesses the analytical and technical depth that determines whether the platform delivers on the RFP's requirements.	As per RFP

Section 4.2 — Pre-Qualification: Startup Exemption		The RFP contains only a footnote reference to GFR and DPIIT startup provisions, with no substantive qualification pathway, scoring adjustment, financial threshold exemption, or documentation alternative for early-stage companies. The provision also implies that only DPIIT certified start-ups would be made exempt. Eligible and innovative start-ups, with a proven track record, that do not currently have DPIIT certification would have to face the full extent of the requirements.	We request ISA to add the following language: Bidders incorporated within the last 2 years that hold valid DPIIT recognition, or have been recognized under national innovation programmes such as the Ministry of Power's Powerthon initiative, will be exempted from the evaluation criteria regarding financial capacity. For such entities, Turnover and working capital are treated as alternative proofs; the Bidder need satisfy only one. External	As per RFP

Section 4.2 — Pre-Qualification: Financial Capacity		The turnover tiers are calibrated for established IT firms and exclude early-stage technology companies whose financial profile does not reflect their technical capability. An AI/ML startup with \$80,000 in annual revenue from live utility pilots is materially more capable than the score suggests. The existing note that work orders from international NGOs count toward financial assessment is helpful, but the criterion does not address: (a) whether institutional funding (VC, development finance, government grants) may be aggregated with revenue; (b) whether working capital is truly an alternative to turnover or must be demonstrated in addition; or (c) whether the criterion is pass/fail at the minimum threshold or purely scored.	private, philanthropic, development finance funding sources will be considered under financial capacity	As per RFP

Section 5 — IP and Rights: Ownership of Trained ML Models		As written, this clause transfers ownership of not just APEPDCL-specific outputs and fine-tuned model weights, but potentially the underlying model architectures, training methodologies, and analytical frameworks the SI brings to the engagement as pre-existing intellectual property. For an AI/ML-native SI, these frameworks — developed independently over years, tested across multiple deployments, and continuously improved — represent the company's core technical asset. A clause that transfers ownership of pre-existing frameworks to the Utility eliminates the SI's ability to improve its product for other customers and fundamentally undermines the commercial model for innovative technology companies bidding on this and future ISA tenders. The clause also does not distinguish between utility-specific outputs (which should belong to APEPDCL) and the SI's pre-existing analytical capabilities (which should not). This is a critical distinction in AI/ML platform engagements.	We request ISA adopt a Background IP / Foreground IP framework, as is standard in World Bank, ADB, and EU-funded technology procurement: • Background IP — the SI's pre-existing software, algorithms, model architectures, training methodologies, and analytical frameworks, plus all improvements and extensions to these made during the engagement — remains the exclusive property of the SI. APEPDCL and ISA receive a perpetual, non-exclusive, royalty-free licence to use Background IP solely for operating the delivered solution. • Foreground IP — all processed data, derived analytical outputs, reports, and project-specific deliverables produced using APEPDCL's data under this engagement — is the exclusive property of APEPDCL.	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

			This framework fully protects APEPDCL's right to its own data and insights while preserving the SI's ability to continue developing and improving its platform across other deployments.	perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Section 5 — IP and Rights: Perpetual Right to Re-Platform — Share Code with Third Parties		This clause grants APEPDCL the right to share the SI's complete codebase — source code, schemas, and model architectures — with any third-party competitor, royalty-free, from the moment the contract ends. Combined with the mandatory source code delivery and the zero-cost exit management clause, this means any competitor can receive and operate the SI's technology after Year 1 at no cost. This provision eliminates any contractual protection for the SI's recurring subscription revenue and would deter every capable technology company from participating. The right to re-platform is legitimate; the right to share the SI's code with competitors is not.	We request ISA revise the Right to Re-Platform as follows: 'APEPDCL maintains the right to appoint a successor technology provider upon contract expiry or in the event of material breach. Upon exercise of this right, the SI will provide APEPDCL with a structured export of all APEPDCL data in an agreed, technology-neutral format, and will provide transition support for a period of [X] months. The SI's source code, model architectures, and Background IP are not transferred and are not available to successor providers, except as released from escrow under the conditions defined in the Escrow clause.' Source code escrow with defined trigger events (insolvency, material uncured breach, mutual agreement) provides adequate continuity protection for APEPDCL without requiring open	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

			transfer of the SI's core technology to competitors.	perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Section 5 — Exit Management: Zero-Cost Mandatory Source Code Handover		A zero-cost mandatory handover of complete, editable source code, AI/ML models, schemas, and APIs — triggered automatically upon contract expiry or non-renewal — is functionally a full IP transfer with deferred delivery. APEPDCL and ISA receive the SI's entire technology stack at no additional cost the moment the Year 1 subscription ends, regardless of whether the contract has been performed satisfactorily. This provision, combined with the perpetual re-platform right and ISA's sub-licensable perpetual licence (see D4), means the SI has no sustainable commercial model beyond Year 1 of the engagement. No capable technology company can accept these terms.	We request ISA replace the mandatory source code handover with a source code escrow arrangement: the SI deposits a version of the platform source code with a mutually agreed third-party escrow agent, with release to APEPDCL triggered only upon: (a) insolvency or dissolution of the SI; (b) material uncured breach of contract by the SI after expiry of the agreed cure period; or (c) mutual written agreement between APEPDCL and the SI. Released code is licensed to APEPDCL solely for the purpose of operational continuity and may not be commercialised, sub-licensed, or transferred to third parties. This structure provides full continuity protection for APEPDCL while giving the SI a sustainable commercial model in which its technology investment retains value beyond Year 1.	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

				perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Section 5 — Exit Management: ISA Perpetual Sub-Licensable Licence to Baseline Release		ISA acquiring a perpetual, global, royalty-free, sub-licensable licence to the SI's entire platform as delivered at the end of Year 1 means ISA can deploy, modify, and commercialise the SI's technology across its 121 member countries without restriction or payment. This goes far beyond what is needed to protect continuity at APEPDCL and represents an unconstrained IP transfer of the highest severity. The sub-licensable nature of the licence means ISA could license the SI's platform to other DISCOMs, governments, or third parties in direct competition with the SI, without any compensation.	We request ISA remove the clause granting ISA a perpetual, global, royalty-free, sub-licensable licence to the SI's Baseline Release. This provision is not a continuity protection measure; it is an unconstrained IP transfer that enables ISA to commercialise the SI's technology across its global membership without consent or compensation.	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

				perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Section 5 — Exit Management: APEPDCL Perpetual Rights to All Enhancements		APEPDCL acquiring exclusive perpetual rights to all enhancements made during the subscription period would mean that every product improvement the SI makes to the platform during the APEPDCL engagement — whether driven by APEPDCL's needs or by the SI's own product development — becomes APEPDCL's exclusive property. If the SI improves its load flow model or consumer indexing algorithm during the APEPDCL engagement, APEPDCL owns those improvements exclusively, and the SI cannot incorporate them into deployments at other utilities. This makes the APEPDCL engagement a subsidised product development programme for APEPDCL, with all IP upside accruing to the utility.	We request ISA revise APEPDCL's rights to all enhancements as follows: 'APEPDCL holds perpetual rights to all data, outputs, and project-specific configurations created for APEPDCL under this engagement (Foreground IP). Improvements and enhancements to the SI's platform made during the engagement — including improvements that benefit APEPDCL — remain the property of the SI, with APEPDCL receiving a non-exclusive licence to those improvements for the duration of the engagement.'	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with

				perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL's name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI's Background IP or APEPDCL's project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

Section 5 — IP and Rights: All Third-Party Software in APEPDCL's Name		Requiring all third-party software licences to be registered in APEPDCL's name imposes significant administrative and procurement overhead on both the SI and APEPDCL. Many SaaS vendors do not offer enterprise agreements directly with government utilities; they license to the SI as part of their platform offering. Further, some third-party components (e.g., weather data licences, cloud AI inference APIs) are licensed per-platform by the SI across multiple deployments as part of the platform's operating model. Registering these in APEPDCL's name is not operationally feasible.	We request ISA revise this requirement to: 'All third-party software licences specifically procured for APEPDCL's exclusive use under this engagement shall be registered in APEPDCL's name where technically feasible and supported by the relevant vendor. Platform-level services and infrastructure that form part of the SI's multi-client technical stack are excluded from this requirement.' We propose that a list of APEPDCL-specific third-party licences be agreed at contract commencement.	All licenses shall be obtained and maintained in the name of APEPDCL, as specified in the RFP. However, where any license is required to be procured in the bidder's name as an integral part of the bidder's platform offering, the bidder shall obtain prior written approval from APEPDCL and ISA, along with proper written justification for such requirement.

Section 5 — ToR — AI and Analytical Capabilities: AI/ML Model Documentation and Sharing		This clause requires the SI to fully document and share its core analytical algorithms, ML model architectures, feature engineering logic, and training methodologies — the precise assets that constitute an AI/ML company's core intellectual property. The prohibition on 'black-box AI logic' and the requirement for prior written approval of any proprietary component effectively require the SI to make its entire analytical stack transparent and modifiable by APEPDCL and ISA. Combined with the IP clause (see Section D), this means the SI's most valuable technical assets must be documented and shared, and APEPDCL and ISA acquire the rights to those assets. This would deter every capable AI/ML company from bidding and sets a precedent that is inconsistent with GoI's stated goal of building an AI innovation ecosystem.	We request ISA revise this clause to distinguish between: (a) analytical methodology transparency — which the SI can provide through documentation of the analytical approach, validation of outputs against ground truth, and model review sessions — and (b) proprietary algorithm and architecture disclosure — which goes beyond what is necessary for oversight and constitutes a transfer of core IP. Suggested revised language: 'The SI shall provide APEPDCL with documentation of the analytical methodology underpinning each platform capability, including data inputs, output definitions, validation approach, and known limitations. The SI shall conduct periodic model review and validation sessions with APEPDCL and ISA. The SI is not required to disclose proprietary source code, model weights, or	As per RFP

			training pipelines that constitute Background IP.'	

Section 5 — ToR: AI Agent Builder and Autonomous Task Execution Framework		An AI Agent Builder — a no-code framework through which utility staff create, configure, and deploy autonomous AI agents for arbitrary business functions — is a distinct product category from a grid analytics platform. It requires a dedicated agent runtime, multi-agent orchestration infrastructure, tool-calling APIs, scheduling and event-driven execution, and persistent context management. Building this as a feature within a 9-month implementation is not feasible. The requirement that users be able to create agents 'without software development' further implies a low-code UI builder on top of the agent framework — a substantial additional product surface. The Agent Builder paradigm is also, as stated in the RFP's own framing, an 'old paradigm.' Modern best practice is a single configurable agent with access to all platform tools, whose behaviour is shaped by user instructions and role-based permissions — not a platform through which multiple distinct agents are created and managed.	We request ISA reconsider the AI Agent Builder requirement. The operational outcomes sought — querying analytical data, running workflow sequences, and generating reports — can be achieved more effectively through a single, configurable AI agent with access to all platform analytical tools, whose scope and permissions are set by role-based access controls. We propose replacing the Agent Builder requirement with: 'The platform must provide an AI-powered agentic interface through which authorised APEPDCL staff can issue natural language instructions to trigger analytical processes, run scenarios, and generate reports, with the agent having access to all platform capabilities available through the GUI, subject to the user's role-based permissions.'	As per RFP

			This approach is technically sounder, more secure, and more aligned with the current state of agentic AI systems. If a no-code AI agent builder must be included, the pricing for this will be based on token usage, rather a flat subscription fee alongside all the platform's other capabilities	

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: Application Hosting Platform (PaaS) and App Marketplace		This requirement asks the SI to build a Platform-as-a-Service cloud infrastructure is separate from a grid analytics platform. An App Marketplace with application certification, third-party developer onboarding, lifecycle management, and runtime isolation is not a utility analytics feature; it is an enterprise cloud product. The underlying intent — interoperability, extensibility, and not being locked into a single vendor — is legitimate and can be achieved through a well-documented API and SDK layer, without requiring the SI to build a general-purpose application hosting runtime.	We request ISA remove or substantially revise the PaaS/Application Marketplace requirement. The legitimate goal of extensibility and interoperability can be achieved through: (a) A documented, versioned API layer through which third-party applications can query and consume platform data and outputs; (b) An SDK or integration guide enabling APEPDCL's own teams or approved third parties to build applications against the platform's APIs; (c) A webhook framework for event-driven integrations. This is a more modern, maintainable, and secure approach to extensibility than an on-platform application runtime, and is achievable within the engagement timeline. We propose the Platform & Software Standards section be revised to specify these	As per RFP

			API/SDK requirements rather than a PaaS hosting obligation.	

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: Plug-and-Play Application Framework		The plug-and-play framework requirement, read together with the PaaS and App Marketplace requirements, implies the platform must support a containerised or sandboxed multi-tenant application runtime where third-party code executes alongside the core platform. This is a security, infrastructure, and engineering challenge of a fundamentally different order of magnitude from building an analytics platform. The requirement to install and remove third-party applications 'without impacting core platform operation' implies sophisticated runtime isolation (containers, sandboxing) that is not part of any grid analytics platform's standard architecture.	We request ISA revise the plug-and-play framework requirement to: 'The platform will be configurable, allowing authorised users to build custom dashboard views, define analytical workflows, and create custom reports within the platform interface, without requiring SI involvement for routine configuration changes.' This delivers the operational flexibility sought without requiring the SI to build a third-party application runtime.	Outcome and capability prescribed; implementation architecture left to the SI, subject to meeting the RFP.

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: IEC 61968/61970 (Common Information Model)		IEC 61968/61970 CIM compliance requires the SI to adopt a highly prescriptive data model for all utility assets and relationships. CIM-based data modelling is a multi-month specialist engagement in its own right, and its value depends on other systems in the ecosystem also being CIM-compliant — which is rarely the case in Indian DISCOM IT environments. The SI should retain the right to represent data internally in whatever format is most appropriate for its analytical engine, with CIM support provided at the platform boundary (import/export) where required.	We request ISA clarify whether IEC 61968/61970 (CIM) compliance is required at the internal data representation level, or only at the system integration boundary — i.e., the platform must be capable of ingesting CIM-formatted data from external systems and exporting outputs in CIM format where required. We support CIM compatibility at the platform boundary; requiring CIM as the internal data representation would significantly constrain the platform's design without operational benefit.	Outcome and capability prescribed; implementation architecture left to the SI, subject to meeting the RFP.

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: IEC 61850, IEC 60870-5-104, DNP3		IEC 61850, IEC 60870-5-104, and DNP3 are equipment communication and control protocols, primarily used for real-time communication between SCADA systems and field devices (RTUs, IEDs, protection relays). They are not data platform standards. A grid analytics and forecasting platform does not communicate directly with field equipment; it ingests data from the SCADA system or data historian. Specifying these protocols as platform requirements suggests the RFP was written for a SCADA or ADMS product, not an analytics platform.	We request ISA clarify the intended application of IEC 61850, IEC 60870-5-104, and DNP3 within this RFP. These are equipment communication protocols for SCADA/IED interaction, not analytics platform standards. If the intent is that the platform should be capable of ingesting data from systems that use these protocols (e.g., reading from a SCADA historian that exposes IEC 60870-5-104 data), we support this as a conditional data integration requirement. However, if the intent is that the platform itself must implement these protocols for direct field device communication, we request clarification on the specific use case, as this would imply a materially different scope from a grid analytics platform.	As per RFP

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: OGC WMS/WFS		OGC WMS (Web Map Service) and WFS (Web Feature Service) are older GIS data sharing standards used primarily for serving base map imagery and geospatial feature data between systems. Their relevance depends on whether APEPDCL's existing GIS publishes data in these formats. We are supportive of GIS interoperability but request clarification on whether APEPDCL's GIS actually uses OGC WMS/WFS endpoints, or whether this is a standard carried over from a previous RFP without assessment of applicability.	We request ISA confirm whether APEPDCL's existing GIS platform exposes OGC WMS and WFS endpoints that the SI would be expected to consume. If so, we are prepared to support integration with these endpoints. If APEPDCL's GIS uses a different data sharing mechanism (e.g., REST APIs, direct database access), we request the requirement be updated accordingly to avoid specifying a standard that is not operationally relevant.	As per RFP

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: GraphQL		GraphQL is a specific API query language and runtime, not an industry standard in the sense of IEC or OGC standards. Mandating GraphQL as a required API technology is equivalent to specifying that the platform must use React as its front-end framework — an architectural technology choice that is the SI's prerogative, not a utility procurement requirement. GraphQL and REST APIs serve similar purposes; both are modern, widely supported API paradigms. Mandating one over the other without a specific operational justification is unnecessary technology prescription.	We request ISA remove the GraphQL requirement or rephrase to 'documented REST APIs, with support for GraphQL where APEPDCL systems require it.' Mandating a specific API query language without operational justification is not standard practice in technology procurement and unnecessarily constrains the SI's architectural choices. REST APIs will be provided as standard and will meet the interoperability requirements of this engagement.	As per RFP

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: MQTT and OPC-UA		MQTT is an IoT messaging protocol used for lightweight communication between IoT devices and brokers. OPC-UA is an equipment communication protocol for industrial automation systems. Both are relevant for direct field device communication, which is not within the platform's intended scope — the platform integrates with SCADA systems, not directly with field devices. As with IEC 61850 and DNP3, these protocols appear to have been carried over from an OT/SCADA procurement template rather than assessed for relevance to a grid analytics platform.	We request ISA clarify the specific use case for MQTT and OPC-UA within this engagement. If the intent is that the platform must be capable of consuming data from IoT devices or industrial automation systems that publish via MQTT or OPC-UA, we request APEPDCL confirm which specific devices or systems are involved and whether this is a baseline requirement or a future conditional integration. Direct device communication protocols are outside the standard scope of a grid analytics and forecasting platform.	As per the RFP, the specified standards and protocols shall be supported where applicable and required to meet the desired deliverables.

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: ISO/ANSI and POSIX/X/Open		ISO and ANSI are standards organisations covering thousands of unrelated standards across every industry; 'ISO/ANSI compliant interfaces' has no specific technical meaning in the context of a cloud-deployed analytics platform. POSIX and X/Open are operating system base standards, primarily relevant to UNIX-based server environments. Specifying POSIX-compliant operating environments for a cloud-native SaaS platform is technically confused — cloud platforms abstract away the underlying operating system, and specifying the OS base standard contradicts the 'cloud-agnostic' requirement stated elsewhere in the same section.	We request ISA remove the ISO/ANSI and POSIX/X/Open requirements, or replace them with the specific standards intended — for example, 'the platform must comply with CEA Cyber Security Regulations 2021 and applicable CERT-In guidelines' rather than generic standards organisation references. If APEPDCL has a specific OS or server environment requirement, we request this be stated explicitly.	As per RFP

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: Hardware, OS, Database, and Cloud Agnosticism		Requiring a platform to be simultaneously hardware-agnostic, OS-agnostic, database-agnostic, and cloud-agnostic means the SI cannot make any fundamental architectural decisions about the platform's technology stack. Every platform — including AWS, Azure, and GCP themselves — makes infrastructure technology choices that determine its capabilities, performance, and cost. The requirement to support Oracle, PostgreSQL/PostGIS, Microsoft SQL Server, and MySQL simultaneously implies that the platform must either abstract its data layer across all major relational databases, or be rebuilt for each deployment. This is not a reasonable requirement for a SaaS analytics platform. The cloud-agnostic requirement directly contradicts the requirement elsewhere in the section that 'application software, operating system files and Digital Twin operational data shall reside on separate storage volumes or disk partitions' — disk/volume separation is an on-premise server concept, not a cloud architecture concept.	We request ISA revise the hardware/OS/database/cloud agnosticism requirement. A deployable, maintainable analytics platform must make fundamental infrastructure decisions. We propose the following: (a) APEPDCL and ISA specify the preferred deployment environment (cloud provider, region, and deployment model — cloud-hosted SaaS, private cloud, or on-premise) at contract commencement, and the SI designs for that environment; (b) The SI's internal database and data storage architecture is the SI's prerogative, subject to data residency and security requirements; (c) Integration with APEPDCL's existing systems should be achieved through documented APIs and standard data exchange formats, not through shared database access.	As per RFP

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: Unbounded Integration List		The phrase 'non exhaustive' transforms an already extensive integration list into an open-ended obligation. 'Future enterprise applications' with no further definition means the SI could be required to integrate with any system APEPDCL adopts during the contract period at no additional cost. APEPDCL replacing its GIS system during the contract period, for example, would trigger a substantial re-integration exercise for the SI — which would be unpriced under a 'non exhaustive' integration obligation.	We request ISA replace the 'non exhaustive' integration list with a specific, agreed list of in-scope integrations to be confirmed with APEPDCL at contract commencement. We further request that any integration with systems not on the agreed list, or with new systems adopted by APEPDCL during the contract period, be treated as a change request subject to separate scoping, agreement, and pricing. An open-ended integration obligation is not compatible with a fixed-price subscription model.	As per RFP

Section 5 — ToR — Platform & Software Standards: Deployment Strategy — All Options		Requiring a single platform to support all deployment models (hybrid cloud, private cloud, public cloud, and on-premises) without functional limitations means the SI must build and maintain four separate infrastructure configurations of the same platform. On-premises deployments of a cloud-native analytics platform require a fundamentally different infrastructure and operations model. This requirement needs to be resolved before bid submission so the SI can design and price for the actual deployment environment.	We request APEPDCL and ISA confirm the preferred deployment model for this engagement before bid submission. The four deployment options listed have materially different infrastructure, security, and operational implications, and cannot be treated as interchangeable without significant design trade-offs. We request that a single deployment model be agreed at contract commencement, with any subsequent migration to a different model treated as a change in scope.	On premises; if the bidder is proposing hybrid then the cloud related charges shall be taken by bidders

Section 5 — ToR — AI and Analytical Capabilities: DISCOM-Specific Fine-Tuned LLM		Fine-tuning a large language model on DISCOM-specific data is not how production AI systems for enterprise contexts are built. Modern best practice uses retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) — where a general-purpose model queries a structured knowledge base at inference time — rather than fine-tuning, which is expensive, requires regular retraining as data and regulations change, and produces models that are less flexible and harder to update. Hardcoding regulatory compliance rules into model response logic creates a brittle, hard-to-maintain system that requires manual updates whenever SERC/CERC regulations change. A well-designed RAG system with a regularly updated regulatory knowledge base achieves the same outcome more reliably.	We request ISA remove the requirement for a fine-tuned DISCOM-specific LLM and replace it with: 'The platform must provide an AI-powered natural language interface grounded in APEPDCL's operational data and relevant regulatory context. The SI may implement this using retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) or equivalent architecture, provided the system's responses are demonstrably grounded in APEPDCL's data and applicable regulatory frameworks.' This approach is technically sounder, more maintainable, and more aligned with the current state of the art in enterprise AI.	Outcome and capability prescribed; implementation architecture left to the SI, subject to meeting the RFP.

BDS Item 42 — Liquidated Damages: Rate and Cap		A liquidated damages rate of 5% of the total contract sum per week is approximately 7–10x above international IT procurement norms. At this rate, the 20% LD cap is reached in under 4 weeks of delay. Further, the LD mechanism is applied to the total contract sum rather than the value of the delayed milestone, which means a delay on a minor milestone has the same daily LD exposure as a delay on the most critical milestone.	We request ISA revise the Liquidated Damages rate to align with international procurement norms for IT and analytics platform contracts. The standard for comparable World Bank and ADB-funded technology engagements is 0.05–0.1% of the delayed milestone value per week. Specifically, we request: (a) The LD rate be set at 0.1% of the value of the delayed milestone per day of delay; (b) A 14-calendar-day cure period be introduced before LD accrual commences, from the date of written notice of delay; (c) LDs be capped at 10% of the total implementation fee; (d) LDs apply to the value of the delayed milestone, not the total contract sum. We further request that LDs and SLA penalties be clearly defined as distinct mechanisms: LDs apply to	Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

			milestone delivery delays, and SLA penalties apply to performance shortfalls during the subscription period.	

BDS Item 42 — Liquidated Damages: Non-Satisfactory Performance Trigger		The LD clause covers both delivery delay AND 'non-satisfactory performance of the contract' — a broad and subjective trigger that gives ISA discretion to impose LDs during the subscription period for platform performance issues, in addition to the SLA penalty framework elsewhere in the contract. The two mechanisms — implementation LDs and subscription SLA penalties — should be clearly separated. Non-satisfactory performance during the subscription phase should be addressed exclusively through the SLA penalty framework, not through the LD mechanism.	We request ISA confirm that Liquidated Damages apply only to milestone delivery delays, and that performance shortfalls during the subscription period are governed exclusively by the SLA penalty framework. We further request ISA clarify what constitutes 'non-satisfactory performance' for LD purposes, and whether this trigger is separate from and additive to the SLA penalty mechanism.	Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

Section 10 — Payment Milestones: DISCOM Approval Required but No Timeline Defined		Every milestone payment requires APEPDCL's written approval, but no timeline is specified for when APEPDCL must respond to a milestone submission. If APEPDCL's nodal officer delays review, the milestone payment may be deferred indefinitely while the overall contract timeline — and the LD clock — continues running. This creates an asymmetric risk: the SI is subject to LDs for missing timelines, but APEPDCL has no defined obligation to review and approve milestone submissions within any particular period.	We request ISA introduce a defined DISCOM approval timeline for milestone submissions: APEPDCL must accept or formally reject (with written reasons) a milestone submission within 15 business days of receipt. If APEPDCL has not responded within 15 business days and has raised no formal objection, the milestone is deemed accepted and the corresponding payment is due. Any delay in APEPDCL's response beyond 15 business days constitutes an excusable delay and extends the subsequent milestone dates accordingly.	As per RFP

Section 10 — Payment Milestones: Subscription Renewal — Uncertain Post-Year 1 Revenue		Year 1 subscription is funded by ISA. Years 2–5 depend on APEPDCL's agreement and 'budgetary provisions' with no room for negotiation on pricing revisions due to scope expansion, addons or increase in technology and labour costs. With no price escalation clause, the subscription rate is locked at bid-time for all 5 years, creating exposure to inflation and technology cost increases over the contract period. If APEPDCL's budget is constrained in Year 2, the subscription simply does not renew and the SI has no recourse.	We request ISA to provide room for renegotiation of subscription terms between APEPDCL and the SI at the end of year 2. We'd also request ISA to clarify the terms for the 4-year renewal — specifically, whether renewal is automatic subject to SLA performance, or requires a separate agreement at APEPDCL's discretion. ISA should also carve out room for the SI to offer add-on services and usage based pricing to APEPDCL on an additional cost basis, which APEPDCL is free to accept or refuse. These will sit outside the base platform subscription fee.	As per RFP

BDS Item 19 — Scope Variation: 25% at Award		A 25% unilateral scope variation right at the same unit price is particularly onerous for a platform subscription contract where the primary cost driver is the number of circles/substations covered, not a fungible quantity of goods. A 25% increase in the number of circles (e.g., adding a sixth circle) triggers additional field integration, model recalibration, and FDE deployment that cannot be absorbed at the original subscription rate. A 25% downward variation after mobilisation is equally damaging: the SI may have already incurred infrastructure and staffing costs priced for the full scope.	We request ISA to remove this clause. A 25% scope upward or downward revision without cost implications can have a significant financial impact, particularly for young and innovative start-ups. By including this, the RFP is structurally in favour of larger established firms, that typically lack access to the best talent at the frontier of these technologies and who will move slower to deliver value to the utility. If there is significant scope expansion, renegotiation on costs should be allowed.	As per RFP the variations in the quantity shall be on quoted unit rate basis
Project Management iv, pp. 96-97; FMS vii.11, p. 92	Lifecycle price is stated to include change requests, while materially new scope is stated to be treated as a Change Request under mutually agreed commercial terms.	Please distinguish included configuration/enhancement effort from billable Change Requests, and specify the approval workflow, rate card/pricing method and timeline impact mechanism.	The treatment of change requests is open in the RFP which can result in material difference in terms of solution economics	As per RFP

BDS 8, pp. 20-21; SLA remarks, p. 121	LD may reach 20% of total contract sum; SLA penalties are capped at 18% of the quarterly invoice.	Please confirm whether LD and SLA penalties are separate or cumulative, requesting to modify the aggregate liability cap for all penalties/LD at a ceiling of 10%	Potential exposure and calculation base require clarity. Aggregation capping would assist in costing risks and internal approvals	Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.
ITB 37, p. 18; BDS 20, p. 22	ISA may vary quantity up to 25% and may award the contract in whole or part to one or more proposers.	Please clarify the scope-splitting methodology and price adjustment treatment, and whether unit rates would be same	A multi-award or quantity variation can materially change solution economics.	As per RFP, the variations in the quantity shall be on quoted unit rate basis
Introduction/System Architecture, pp. 31-34; Integration, pp. 75-78	The solution must integrate with existing GIS/mobile and multiple IT/OT systems; final architecture is to be assessed during implementation.	Please provide the complete existing-system inventory with product/OEM, version, hosting, interface method, API availability, data owner, environment availability and responsible support contact.	Integration effort cannot be accurately estimated without the as-is landscape.	As per RFP

Form A point b page 123 Section 2 Clause 3.1 page 7 Section 4 Evaluation criteria- Eligibility, page-23	We hereby declare that our firm, its affiliates or subsidiaries or employees, including any JV/Consortium /Association members or subcontractors or suppliers for any part of the contract: have not been suspended, debarred, sanctioned or otherwise identified as ineligible by any UN Organization or the World Bank Group or any other international Organization; A vendor should not be suspended, debarred, or otherwise identified as ineligible by any UN Organization or the World Bank Group or any other international Organization. Vendors are therefore required to disclose to ISA whether they are subject to any sanction or temporary suspension imposed by these organizations. Bidder is not suspended, nor debarred, nor otherwise identified as ineligible by any UN Organization, ADB or the World Bank Group or any other international Organization in accordance with ITB clause 3 and Country Governments	Requesting to Change these clauses	EY is a global professional services organization that serves a diverse portfolio of clients, including government bodies, private sector enterprises, funding institutions, and donor agencies across multiple jurisdictions worldwide. Accordingly, providing the requested declaration would necessitate extensive collection, validation, and consolidation of information from numerous engagements and geographies, making the exercise significantly time intensive. In light of the above, we respectfully propose that the clause be revised to require the bidding firm to declare that it has not been blacklisted by any Government of India ministry, department, public sector undertaking (PSU), International Solar Alliance, and Andhra Power sector entities. We believe that such a revision would adequately	As per RFP

			meet the underlying objective of the requirement while ensuring that the declaration remains practical, reasonable, and verifiable. We would be grateful if you could confirm whether the proposed amendment would be acceptable.	

Introduction p. 31; Deliverables e/vii, p. 95	Existing GIS is described as comprehensive, but SI must ETL unformatted GIS data into a connected/routable model.	Please share GIS platform/version, data model, formats, coordinate system, topology status, attribute completeness, consumer indexing coverage, current data-quality metrics and sample datasets.	The stated GIS maturity and required transformation scope is critical for SI for preparing integration plan	As per RFP
Integration g, p. 77	The proposed solution should integrate with APEPDCL's proposed Data Lake for large-volume datasets.	Please confirm whether the Data Lake already exists, its technology stack, expected availability timeline, supported interfaces, security pattern and the datasets intended to be exchanged.	The term proposed makes the dependency and implementation timing unclear.	As per RFP
Integration note 1, p. 78	SI must integrate all new/existing systems necessary throughout the contract, including MoP/MNRE systems as directed.	Please define the number and named list of integrations included in the base scope and establish a change-control mechanism for future/unidentified integrations introduced after award.	An unlimited future-integration obligation is not priceable without boundaries.	As per RFP
GenAI Subscription Flexibility, p. 55; Annexure 1, pp. 136-138	DISCOM may use its own GenAI subscription/API key in lieu of SI subscription.	Please confirm the pricing assumption for GenAI consumption: SI-provided, DISCOM-provided, or a separately priced option. If DISCOM-provided, specify provider/model, quotas, security controls and availability date.	LLM consumption cost can be material and is should be conclusively allocated.	As per RFP

AI Agent long-running/scheduled execution, pp. 53-54; Server sizing, pp. 139-141	The platform must support background, scheduled and event-driven agents, but workload assumptions are not defined.	Please provide expected named/concurrent users, number of agents, peak simultaneous executions, typical/max task duration, schedule frequency, token volumes and retention requirements for agent artefacts/logs.	These inputs are required for compute and subscription sizing.	Baseline user base across the existing DISCOMs shall be considered as approximately 10,000 users, with concurrent users assumed at 30% of the total user base. However, the SI shall ensure that the system capacity, scalability and performance remain compliant with the prescribed SLA requirements throughout the Contract Period, irrespective of any increase in the total user base or concurrent users beyond the aforesaid baseline.
Deliverables i, p. 96; Responsibilities b.4, p. 111; Security & Infrastructure, pp. 100-101	Deployment may be on-premise/cloud/hybrid; DISCOM provisions server/cloud/network resources, while SI must size and implement safeguards.	Please confirm the target deployment model and clearly allocate responsibility and cost for compute, GPU, storage, network, cloud usage, OS, database, middleware, backup and monitoring licenses.	Hosting and infrastructure cost ownership requires clarity for accurate efforts and pricing calculations.	As per RFP
Annexure 2, pp. 139-141	Bidders must size infrastructure using reasonable workload assumptions.	Please provide current and five-year projections for concurrent users, smart meters, telemetry points, ingestion frequency, retention, map layers, reports, AI requests, HA/DR topology and growth rates.	Baseline assumptions are must and therefore requested for comparable sizing.	As per RFP

Relevant Project Experience, p. 24; Form D, p. 126	Section 4.2 accepts projects executed or under execution, while Form D asks for assignments successfully completed in the last three years.	Please confirm whether ongoing projects qualify for PQ/technical marks and what evidence and value recognition apply to partially completed engagements.	The two sections use different completion status requirements.	Eligible as per RFP
Exit d, p. 114	All third-party software, subscriptions and certificates must be registered in APEPDCL's name.	Please confirm whether this applies from project initiation or only at exit, and how bidder/OEM enterprise licences and cloud/LLM subscriptions that cannot be assigned will be treated.	Some licensing models may not permit direct registration or transfer.	As per RFP from project initiation
Project baseline, p. 32; Training, p. 84; Annexure 2, pp. 139-141	The RFP provides indicative asset quantities and training counts but does not provide a single confirmed Go-Live and subscription-period baseline, including concurrent users.	Please confirm the number of platform users and concurrent users to be covered at Go-Live and during the subscription period, including expected annual growth.	The confirmed baseline drives licensing, infrastructure sizing and deployment effort.	Baseline user base across the existing DISCOMs shall be considered as approximately 10,000 users, with concurrent users assumed at 30% of the total user base. However, the SI shall ensure that the system capacity, scalability and performance remain compliant with the prescribed SLA requirements throughout the Contract Period, irrespective of any increase in the total user base or concurrent users beyond the aforesaid baseline.

Training, pp. 84-86	Approx. 90-100 implementation-team trainees and 750 end users per DISCOM are stated.	Please confirm number of DISCOMs/locations, batches, language(s), duration, training infrastructure, travel assumptions and whether repeat/refresher sessions are included.	Training logistics and quantity need a firm pricing basis.	AS per RFP
Section 4.2 - Relevant Project Experience, Page 24	Eligible projects must have been executed or be under execution within the last three years from the date of issuance of the RFP.	Considering the complexity and typical implementation duration of utility digital-transformation projects, we request that the experience period be increased from three years to seven years ending on the bid submission date. This will enable participation by experienced System Integrators with proven, operational utility platforms.		As per RFP

Section 4.2 - Relevant Project Experience and Eligible Projects Note, Pages 24 and 26	The experience clause covers AI platforms, Digital Twin, network analysis, AI/ML, IT/OT integration, LLM and Agentic AI projects. However, the note defines an Eligible Project as one consisting of geospatial and technical data capture of power-grid assets and a GIS web application.	The narrow definition in the note appears inconsistent with the broader experience categories. Kindly amend Eligible Projects to include utility analytics, Digital Twin, network analysis/load flow, demand or renewable forecasting, scheduling, energy accounting, AMR/MDAS, asset management, GIS, AI/ML, LLM/Agentic AI and IT/OT integration projects, individually or in combination, for generation, transmission or distribution utilities and other critical infrastructure sectors.		As per RFP
Section 4.2 - Relevant Project Experience, Page 24	Projects under execution are eligible, while the supporting evidence refers to signed contracts/work orders and, for pilots without work orders, completion certificates and evidence of funding.	Kindly confirm that ongoing projects will be evaluated based on the awarded contract value and approved scope. Please accept a work order/contract together with a client certificate, milestone acceptance, invoice or project-status certificate as evidence for work completed or under execution.		Eligible as per RFP

Section 4.2 - Aggregate Project Value, Page 24	Marks are based on aggregate project value in USD excluding taxes.	Kindly specify the currency-conversion date and source for contracts denominated in INR or other currencies, and confirm that the aggregate awarded value of all eligible projects, excluding applicable taxes, will be considered. We suggest using the UN Operational Rate of Exchange prevailing on the RFP issuance date for uniform evaluation.		As per RFP
ITB Clause 14 and Section 4.2, Pages 9-10 and 24-26	Relevant project, integration and COTS experience may be met by any consortium member, while years of operation, quality certification and financial capacity are assigned to the Sole/Lead Bidder.	Kindly provide a consolidated consortium credential matrix stating which criteria may be met cumulatively, by any one member, or only by the Lead Bidder. Please confirm that eligible technical experience and key personnel of all consortium members will be considered jointly, without duplication.		As per RFP

ITB Clause 14 and Form C, Pages 9-10 and 125	JV/Consortium participation is permitted, but the maximum number of members, minimum Lead Member participation and required bid-stage agreement are not specified.	Kindly specify the maximum permitted consortium members, minimum participation/share of the Lead Member, joint and several liability requirements and whether a signed consortium MoU/letter of intent is acceptable at bid stage, with a definitive agreement to be submitted after award.		As per RFP
Section 4.2 - Multi-Software Integration, Page 25	The supporting document specified for multi-software integration experience is BOM/BOQ.	A BOM/BOQ may not establish successful integration or operational use. Kindly accept work orders/contracts, completion or performance certificates, client references, architecture documents, UAT/SAT reports or case studies as supporting evidence. Where client documents are confidential, a bidder declaration supported by redacted evidence may also be accepted.		Eligible as per RFP

Section 4.2 - Availability of COTS Software Solution, Page 25	Marks are linked to a demonstrated COTS-based AI-enabled solution for the power sector.	The RFP elsewhere requires an open, modular and customizable platform. Kindly clarify the definition of COTS and accept any mature, production-proven bidder-owned, OEM-backed, SaaS, configurable or custom-developed utility platform that meets the functional requirements. The evaluation should remain technology-neutral and should not mandate a particular commercial delivery model.		As per RFP
Section 4.2 - Key Personnel, Page 25	Marks are based on the number of full-time professionals with relevant qualifications and experience; CVs are required.	Kindly clarify whether full-time employees of the Lead Bidder and consortium members will be counted jointly and specify the required documentary evidence, reference date and treatment of personnel proposed through an OEM or approved subcontractor. Please also confirm that one professional may be mapped to only one principal role for scoring.		As per rfp shall meet the creteria with its sol/lead/consortiums

Section 4.2 - Quality Certification, Page 26	The Sole/Lead Bidder should have ISO 9001, with additional marks for ISO 27001, ISO 20000 or other relevant certifications.	Kindly clarify whether equivalent quality certifications such as CMMI Level 3 or above may be considered and whether additional ISO certifications held by a consortium member can be counted for the additional five marks. All certifications should be valid on the bid submission date.		As per rfp
Section 4.2 - Financial Capacity, Page 26	The Sole/Lead Bidder must show minimum annual turnover and working capital in the last two financial years, but only turnover slabs are provided and the document requirement refers to average annual turnover.	Kindly clarify whether scoring is based on average annual turnover or turnover in each of the last two audited years. No working-capital threshold or scoring method is specified; therefore, please either delete the working-capital requirement or provide the exact threshold, formula and supporting-document format.		The marking is based on turnover; however, bidders shall submit the documents related to Working Capital & turnover as specified in the RFP

Section 4.2 - Startup Note, Page 26	Startups shall be governed by applicable GFR and DPIIT rules and guidelines.	Kindly specify the exact relaxations available to DPIIT-recognized startups and registered MSEs, including relaxation in prior turnover, years of operation, prior project experience and any security/guarantee requirements. Please also confirm the documents required to claim such relaxation and how the corresponding marks will be awarded.		As per RFP
Section 4.3, Criterion 1, Page 27	Utility analytics, integration and grid-intelligence capability may be supported by presentation, MVP demonstration, work orders, completion certificates or client certificates.	Kindly clarify whether marks under Criterion 1 will be awarded based on documentary credentials, live demonstration, or both. Please provide a sub-criterion-wise evidence matrix so bidders can submit the correct proof without ambiguity.		As per RFP

Section 4.3, Criterion 1, Page 27	The bidder must demonstrate ingestion from at least two DISCOM IT/OT systems and bidirectional publishing to at least two systems.	Kindly confirm that the required capabilities may be demonstrated across one or more eligible projects or through the proposed platform using standard APIs. Requiring all integrations within a single historical project may unduly restrict competition despite equivalent proven capability.		As per RFP
Section 4.3, Criterion 2, Pages 27-28	Several sub-criteria state that marks will be awarded 'if all below sub-features are demonstrated'.	Kindly publish item-wise marks for each sub-feature under Map Visualization, Load Flow/SLD, Agentic AI and Natural Language Querying. Proportionate marks should be awarded for each successfully demonstrated capability instead of an all-or-nothing approach.		As per RFP
Section 4.3, Criterion 2, Pages 27-28	A live demonstration is required for GIS, load flow, SLD, Agentic AI, LLM copilot, multi-agent architecture and natural-language querying.	Kindly confirm that bidders may use anonymized, synthetic or representative utility datasets and a bidder-hosted environment for the demonstration. Please also clarify whether internet access, external model APIs and pre-recorded backup clips will be permitted in case of venue connectivity failure.		Allowed, Internet to be provided

Section 4.3, Criterion 3, Page 29	Experience is scored using annual energy input or peak demand successfully modeled, or any other quantifiable use cases.	Kindly confirm whether energy/peak-demand values may be aggregated across multiple projects and across generation, transmission and distribution assignments. Please define 'other quantifiable use cases' and accept client certificates, regulatory/public records or a statutory-auditor-certified declaration where the work order does not state MU or MW.		As per RFP
Section 4.3, Criterion 4, Page 29	The proposed solution demonstration carries 30 marks and the indicative presentation time is approximately 60 minutes.	Given the breadth of the mandatory modules, kindly provide the presentation agenda, time allocation, maximum presenters, mode/venue, notice period and evaluation panel composition. We request at least 90 minutes, including questions and live demonstration, to ensure fair assessment of the complete solution.		As per RFP

Section 4.3, Criterion 4 and Evaluation Notes, Page 29	A bidder scoring less than 10 marks in Criterion 4 is liable for rejection, while a minimum overall Technical Evaluation score of 70 is also required.	Kindly confirm that both thresholds are mandatory and independent, and replace the phrase 'may be considered technically disqualified' with an unambiguous pass/fail rule. Please also clarify whether scores will be averaged across evaluators and rounded to two decimal places.		As per RFP
BDS 17 and Section 4.3, Pages 22 and 29-30	BDS specifies a 70:30 technical-financial distribution, while the formula in Section 4.3 uses the wording 'e.g. 70/100' and 'e.g. 30/100'.	Kindly confirm that the final QCBS weights are exactly 70% for Technical Proposal and 30% for Financial Proposal and issue the final formula without illustrative wording.		As per RFP
Section 4.3 - Presentation and Demonstration, Pages 27-29	The RFP permits consortium participation and relies on multiple specialized technologies and software products.	Kindly confirm that the Lead Bidder may involve consortium members, proposed key experts and OEM/product specialists in the technical presentation and live demonstration, while retaining the Lead Bidder as the single point of responsibility.		As per RFP

BDS 19; TOR Introduction and Project Management, Pages 22, 31 and 96	BDS states a maximum contract duration of nine months, whereas the TOR provides nine months for implementation followed by one year of subscription and an optional extension of four years.	Kindly confirm that the initial contract period is nine months of implementation plus twelve months of subscription from Go-Live, with a further optional four-year subscription. Please align the BDS, TOR, Form G and contract provisions accordingly.		As per RFP
Project Management and Payment Milestones, Pages 96 and 105-108	All milestone timelines are measured from T0, defined as the date of Letter of Award.	Implementation depends on contract execution, infrastructure, data, APIs, site access and stakeholder availability. We request that T0 be defined as the later of contract signing, kick-off and written confirmation of readiness/access to the agreed project environment, data and interfaces.		As per RFP
System Architecture; Roles b.4; Annexure 2,	The final deployment may be on-premise, cloud or hybrid. The DISCOM is to provision server/cloud and network resources, while bidders must	Kindly finalize the deployment model before bid submission and confirm that APEPDCL will procure/provide the Production, DR, UAT and Development infrastructure, operating environment and network connectivity based on SI sizing. If any		As per RFP

Pages 33, 111 and 139-141	submit mandatory sizing.	infrastructure or cloud service is to be included in the bidder's price, please provide a detailed BOQ, hosting period, cloud region, compliance requirements and ownership model.		As per RFP
User Management and Security - DR, Page 80	The SI must implement and maintain DR for all solution components at the APEPDCL Data Centre, but RTO, RPO, DR location and capacity are not specified.	Kindly provide the required RPO, RTO, DR-site location, replication mode, DR capacity percentage, failover/failback frequency, network bandwidth and responsibility for DR hardware/cloud resources. These parameters are essential for accurate architecture and commercial sizing.		Maximum RTO is 1 Hr and Maximum RPO 15 minutes
Project Area, Performance Requirements and Annexure 2, Pages 32, 103-105 and 139-141	Bidders must size the complete platform, but concurrent users, transaction rates, telemetry frequency, retention and detailed source-data volumes are not specified.	Kindly provide authoritative sizing inputs: named and concurrent users by role, SCADA/RMS tag count and scan rate, smart-meter interval and daily volume, GIS layer/feature count and imagery size, historical retention, annual growth, API transaction rates, document/RAG corpus size, AI-agent concurrency, report frequency and backup retention.		As per RFP

Annexure 2 - Server Capacity Sizing, Pages 139-141	The prescribed sizing specifically lists NVIDIA A100 40/80 GB and SSD storage for primary and archive workloads.	To maintain vendor neutrality and cost efficiency, kindly permit current-generation equivalent or superior GPUs based on benchmarked performance. Please also allow economical archive tiers such as HDD/object storage where performance permits, while retaining SSD for latency-sensitive workloads.		As per RFP
Integration with DISCOM Data Systems and Roles b.2, Pages 75-77 and 110-111	The platform must integrate with GIS, SCADA, RMS, MDMS/AMI, billing, OMS/DMS/ADMS, ERP/CIS, FMS, PM-KUSUM portals and other systems.	Kindly provide an as-is integration inventory covering product/OEM, version, hosting location, protocols, API availability and limits, database technology, data owner, sample schemas/payloads, historical availability, update frequency, authentication, network zone and existing license restrictions for each system.		As per RFP

Integration Note 1, Page 78	The SI must integrate all new or existing systems required during the contract, including MoP/MNRE systems and future policies, schemes or programmes.	This creates an unbounded obligation that cannot be priced at bid stage. Please freeze the baseline integrations and number of interfaces/endpoints in the RFP. Any new system, material interface change or future policy requirement should be handled through the mutually agreed Change Request process with corresponding cost and schedule impact.		As per RFP
Roles and Responsibilities b.1-b.6, Pages 110-111	APEPDCL is responsible for data, API/interface access, infrastructure, network bandwidth, field coordination, approvals and a Nodal Officer.	Kindly include a dependency and delay-relief clause confirming that milestone dates and SLAs will be extended without penalty for delays or deficiencies attributable to ISA/APEPDCL, third-party OEMs, unavailable/changed APIs, inadequate data quality, infrastructure/network outages, approval delays or force-majeure events.		As per RFP

Deliverables e-g; Roles a.1.4 and b.3; Footnote 6, Pages 95 and 109-112	The SI is responsible for data collection, cleansing and transformation, while DISCOM field teams validate physical assets and the footnote limits SI scope to analysis based on GIS data provided by the Utility.	Kindly confirm that fresh field survey, physical asset verification, consumer indexing and creation of missing base GIS data are excluded from SI scope. The SI should identify anomalies and process data supplied by the Utility, while APEPDCL remains responsible for ground-truth validation, source-data correction and timely sign-off.		Yes
Existing Enterprise GIS Integration; Project Management,	The solution must integrate with the existing enterprise GIS, and all GIS, Network Analysis and Load Forecasting software licenses must be procured and supplied.	Kindly disclose the existing GIS product/OEM, version, license inventory, Utility Network/network model, database, API/OGC services and customization constraints. Please specify whether the SI must extend the existing product or may propose an open-standard equivalent, and provide the required		As per RFP
Pages 77 and 96		named/concurrent license quantities for each environment.		

Training, User Management and Scope, Pages 78-86	The RFP specifies extensive role-based access and training but does not state the total named/concurrent application users or module-wise license counts.	Kindly provide the organization/user matrix by role, circle and module, including named users, peak concurrent users, mobile users, administrators, API/service accounts and read-only users. These figures should form the licensing and performance baseline.		Baseline user base across the existing DISCOMs shall be considered as approximately 10,000 users, with concurrent users assumed at 30% of the total user base. However, the SI shall ensure that the system capacity, scalability and performance remain compliant with the prescribed SLA requirements throughout the Contract Period, irrespective of any increase in the total user base or concurrent users beyond the aforesaid baseline.
AI Agent Framework; AIOps; Annexure 1-B, Pages 51-63, 93 and 136-138	The solution includes LLMs, RAG, Agentic AI, model monitoring, token consumption and model retraining.	Kindly clarify whether managed external LLM/embedding APIs are permitted, the required data-residency boundary, approved providers/models, internet connectivity, treatment of confidential/consumer data, expected token/model usage and who will bear variable API/GPU consumption costs. Please also confirm whether on-premise models are mandatory for any use case.		As per RFP

IP and Rights; AI/ML Logic; Exit Management, Pages 93, 97 and 113-114	The Utility/ISA receives rights in schemas, code, model architectures, source code, AI/ML models and future enhancement, including re-platforming rights.	Kindly add a clear carve-out for each party's pre-existing IP, reusable accelerators, generic libraries, COTS/OEM proprietary software, open-source components and third-party models. Project-specific custom source code, configurations, schemas and documentation may be handed over, while proprietary components should be licensed under their standard terms without mandatory source-code transfer.		As per RFP
Maintenance Support and Form G, Pages 103, 134-138	The RFP requires customized source code with perpetual licenses, while also seeking a five-year annual subscription covering platform upgrades, FMS and third-party services.	Kindly distinguish the perpetual components from subscription-based components and specify the rights available if the optional subscription is not renewed. Please clarify which functions must continue perpetually, which depend on third-party subscriptions and whether the Year-1 subscription includes warranty/stabilization support already included in the implementation price.		As per RFP

Performance Requirements and SLA, Pages 103-105 and 115	Static web pages must have average TTFB below 50 milliseconds irrespective of configuration and sizing; several other response times are stated without test load or network conditions.	A 50 ms end-to-end TTFB is not practical across enterprise security layers and wide-area networks. We request a realistic threshold, such as ≤ 2 seconds for standard pages, measured at the application entry point under agreed load, dataset, cache state and LAN conditions. Utility network, third-party system and client-device latency should be excluded.		As per RFP
AI Model Accuracy SLA 1.5, Pages 118-119	AI outputs must meet acceptance criteria and accuracy thresholds approved during UAT and maintained throughout the contract.	Kindly define use-case-wise accuracy metrics, benchmark datasets, minimum data sufficiency, validation method, retraining frequency and sign-off process during requirements/HLD, before model development. No penalty should apply where degradation arises from data drift, missing/incorrect Utility data or unavailable third-party services beyond the SI's control.		As per RFP

Milestone M7; Project Activity 15/20; SLA 1.5/1.8, Pages 108 and 113-120	M7 provides Go-Live and Final Acceptance at T0+9 months; the activity checklist requires six continuous months of stable operation before formal Go-Live; the SLA treats the first six months after Go-Live as stabilization.	Kindly reconcile these provisions. We suggest Production Go-Live at T0+9 months, followed by a six-month warranty/stabilization period within the first subscription year, with Final Acceptance after stabilization. Milestone payment and applicable SLAs should be aligned to this sequence.		As per RFP
Payment Terms, Pages 105-108	Milestone payments require DISCOM approval, but no review, comment or deemed-acceptance timeline is	Please provide a defined acceptance mechanism: review and consolidated comments within 10 working days of submission, resubmission review within 5 working days and deemed		As per RFP
	specified.	acceptance if no response is received within the applicable period. Payment should be released within 30 days of invoice and acceptance, without linkage to unrelated deliverables.		

Project Management - License Lifecycle, Page 96	The quoted price must cover change requests and periodic mobile updates throughout the contract.	Please define the number or effort ceiling for included minor change requests, along with classification and approval criteria. New modules, policy changes, material workflow changes, new integrations and changes exceeding the agreed effort should be implemented through a priced Change Request with schedule adjustment.		As per RFP
Training and Knowledge Base, Pages 83-86	Training is specified for approximately 90-100 implementation personnel and 750 end users per DISCOM, in English and the local language, at corporate and site offices.	Kindly confirm that only APEPDCL is covered and provide the exact trainee count, number of batches, batch size, duration, locations, training calendar, language and refresher-session count. Please confirm that APEPDCL will provide venues, systems, connectivity, participant coordination and timely attendance; bidder travel outside the stated locations should be reimbursable or separately priced.		As per RFP

Maintenance Support and FMS, Pages 89-93 and 102-121	The SI must provide 24x7 monitoring, helpdesk and operational support, but the required onsite staffing and deployment locations are not specified.	Kindly specify the minimum onsite and remote staffing, skill mix, shifts, support locations, working calendar and whether L1 may be provided by APEPDCL. In the absence of specified onsite manpower, bidders should be permitted to propose an SLA-based hybrid support model with onsite presence for critical activities.		As per RFP
Network Protection, Security and Governance, Pages 97-101	The solution must integrate with WAF, NGFW, IDS/IPS, NAC, SIEM, EDR, DDoS, PAM, KMS and SOC controls.	Kindly provide the inventory, make/version, available capacity and integration interfaces of APEPDCL's existing security tools and confirm which items will be provided by APEPDCL. Any new security product, license, SOC service or hardware to be supplied by the SI should be listed in a separate BOQ with quantity and term.		As per RFP

Security Assessment and Governance, Pages 100-101 and 137	CERT-In VAPT/source-code audits are required before Go-Live, every six months and after major changes; annual privacy audits and audit remediation are also required.	Kindly define the number and scope of included audits, the meaning of a major change and the responsibility for auditor appointment and fees. We suggest one pre-Go-Live audit and one scheduled audit per contract year in the base price; additional event-triggered audits should be reimbursed at actuals unless necessitated by an SI-attributable security incident.		As per RFP
BDS 8 and Facility Management SLA, Pages 20 and 114-121	LD is 5% of the total contract sum per week up to 20%, while multiple SLA penalties may apply up to 18% of a quarterly invoice.	The LD and penalty exposure is disproportionate and may result in double recovery for the same event. We request LD of 0.5% per week of the delayed milestone value, capped at 10% of that milestone, and an aggregate SLA cap of 10% of the affected quarterly invoice. The same event should not attract both LD and SLA penalty, and client/third-party dependency delays should be excluded.		Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

Form G and Subscription CPG, Pages 134-138	The annual subscription fee must remain fixed for five years; the optional four-year extension is subject to a separate APEPDCL LoA and a 10% CPG for the total extension value.	Considering inflation in skilled manpower, cybersecurity tools and AI/API services, please permit year-wise subscription pricing or annual escalation linked to WPI/CPI, capped at 5%. Renewal notice should be issued at least 90 days before expiry. We also request that the CPG be reduced to 3% in line with prevailing GFR principles and be renewable annually against each subscription year rather than blocked for the full		As per RFP
		four-year value.		
BDS 10 and 17; Form G, Pages 21-22 and 134-138	The financial proposal includes professional fees and a five-year levelized subscription although four subscription years are optional. Form G also refers to an all-inclusive price and separately lists taxes.	Kindly confirm the exact evaluated financial price: professional fees plus all five subscription years, or professional fees plus only the committed first year. Please also clarify whether prices are to be quoted exclusive or inclusive of GST/other taxes and how tax components will be treated in financial comparison for Indian and overseas bidders.		As per RFP

Section 2 – Instructions to Bidders, Clause 29: Evaluation of Eligibility and Qualification – Page 18	They are able to comply fully with ISA General Terms and Conditions of Contract;	Please provide the complete ISA General Terms and Conditions of Contract referred to in this clause and allow bidders to identify proposed deviations in a contractual-deviation schedule.	ISA shall provide the applicable General Terms and Conditions of Contract. Bidders may submit a clearly identified contractual- deviation schedule for ISA's consideration.	Access the links provided in the Section 2 of the RFP
Section 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria (Pre- Requisite) – Page 26	The Bidder must obtain a minimum score of seventy (70) points in the Pre-Qualification (PQ) evaluation in order to be considered eligible for the second stage of bidding.	Please provide the complete scoring methodology and treatment of consortium credentials.	The Pre-Qualification stage shall be evaluated using the published scoring methodology. Credentials of consortium members shall be considered in proportion to their stated scope, subject to lead-member requirements expressly stated in the RFP.	As per RFP

Section 4.2 Minimum Eligibility Criteria (Pre-Requisite) – Page 26	The Eligible Project(s) in the Power sector shall mean projects relating to generation or transmission or distribution of electricity.	Please confirm that utility digital-transformation, AMI, CCNB, GIS, ADMS/DERMS, grid-planning, data-platform and AI/analytics assignments executed for distribution utilities companies will qualify as Eligible Projects.	Eligible Projects shall include power-sector digital-transformation, GIS, grid-planning, network-analysis, data-platform, AI/ML and system-integration assignments for generation, transmission or distribution utilities.	Allowed
Section 4.3 Technical Evaluation Criteria – Page 27	Demonstration of integration capability for data ingestion from existing DISCOM IT/OT systems (minimum two systems such as GIS, SCADA, MDMS, AMI, OMS, ERP, Billing, Outage Management, or Asset Management Systems) into the proposed platform: 5 Points	Please confirm whether demonstrations may use prior-project evidence, product demonstrations, reference architecture and/or a sandbox with representative data, since live access to APEPDCL systems may not be available during evaluation.	The bidder may demonstrate capability through prior-project evidence, product demonstration, reference architecture or a controlled sandbox using representative utility data.	As per RFP

Section 4.3 Technical Evaluation Criteria – Page 27	Demonstration of bidirectional integration capability by publishing AI insights, alerts, recommendations, or analytics back to existing DISCOM IT/OT systems (minimum two systems such as GIS, SCADA, MDMS, AMI, OMS, ERP, Billing, Outage Management, or Asset Management Systems): 5 Points	Please confirm the expected demonstration scenario, target interfaces, payloads and acceptance criteria for publishing insights back to source systems.	ISA/APEPDCL shall provide representative interface specifications and acceptance criteria; the bidder may demonstrate bidirectional exchange through APIs or an integration sandbox.	As per RFP
Section 5 – AI-Driven Analytics – Page 35	The solution shall seamlessly accommodate the addition of new substations, feeders, Distribution Transformers (DTs), consumer connections, AMI/Smart Meters, Rooftop Solar (RTS), Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS), EV charging infrastructure, and other Distributed Energy Resources (DERs) without requiring major application redesign, database restructuring, or disruption to ongoing operations.	Please define the forecast asset counts, annual growth rates, telemetry volumes, concurrent users and performance benchmarks that bidders must use for sizing and scalability validation.	APEPDCL shall provide baseline and five-year forecast volumes for assets, telemetry, users and integrations. Scalability shall be validated against these agreed sizing inputs.	As per RFP

Section 5 – AI-Driven Analytics – Page 35	The solution shall support scalable bidirectional integration with existing and future DISCOM IT/OT systems and automatically synchronize the data of the newly added assets, network topology changes, increasing data volumes, and real-time data streams across the Digital Twin, GIS, network analysis, load flow studies, AI/ML models, dashboards, reports, and decision-support modules while maintaining the prescribed performance and service levels.	Please identify the authoritative source system for each data domain, the event/change-detection mechanism, update frequency and conflict-resolution rules for automatic synchronization.	During design, APEPDCL shall identify authoritative systems, interface mechanisms, update frequencies and data-conflict rules for each data domain; performance obligations shall apply to agreed interfaces and available source data.	As per RFP
Section 5 – AI-Driven Analytics – Page 42	Sankey diagram showing energy balance	Please confirm the required network hierarchy, time granularity and treatment of technical loss, commercial loss, unmetered supply and billing-cycle differences in the Sankey energy balance.	The Sankey energy balance shall be configured for the agreed electrical hierarchy and time periods using available metering and billing data, with documented rules for estimation and reconciliation.	As per RFP

Section 5 – AI-Driven Analytics – Page 42	AI-powered anomaly detection for maintenance	Please specify the asset classes, labelled failure history, minimum historical-data period, target performance measures and human-validation workflow for anomaly detection.	Anomaly-detection scope and acceptance shall be based on agreed asset classes, available historical data, jointly approved validation datasets and measurable performance thresholds.	As per RFP
Section 5 – What-If Simulations – Page 52	Perform Volt/VAR Optimization (VVO): manage voltage levels and reactive power flow to reduce losses and peak demand using Conservation Voltage Reduction (CVR).	Please clarify whether the requirement is for offline planning studies or closed-loop operational control, and identify the controllable devices, telemetry availability and safety/approval constraints.	VVO/CVR shall initially operate in advisory or offline study mode unless closed-loop control, device interfaces, operating authority and safety approvals are separately defined and accepted.	As per RFP
Section 5 – What-If Simulations – Page 52	Facility to merge two studies in order to work in a distributed environment.	Please define the required merge behaviour, including conflict resolution, version control, user ownership, audit history and treatment of incompatible network-model changes.	The study-management function shall support versioned comparison and controlled merge using agreed conflict-resolution, authorization and audit rules.	As per RFP

Section 5 – AI Agent Builder & Autonomous Task Execution – Page 52	The platform shall enable authorized users to create multiple AI agents without software development.	Please define the permitted autonomous actions, approval gates, restricted systems, audit requirements and liability boundaries for user-configured agents.	AI agents shall operate within administrator-defined tools, data entitlements and approval workflows. Actions affecting operational or source systems shall require explicit authorization and complete audit logging.	As per RFP
Section 5 – AI Agent Builder & Autonomous Task Execution – Page 55	The platform shall provide the DISCOM the option to consume its own GenAI subscription(s), by way of an API key, for use by the SI in delivering the AI Agent Builder and associated Advanced AI capabilities, in lieu of the SI's own GenAI subscription.	Please confirm who will bear subscription, token, network and model-upgrade costs under each option, and how service levels will be adjusted when APEPDCL-provided GenAI services are unavailable or rate-limited.	GenAI consumption charges and responsibilities shall be identified in the commercial schedule. SLA exclusions shall apply to outages, throttling or changes in Utility-provided GenAI services outside the SI's control.	As per RFP

Section 5 – AI Agent Builder & Autonomous Task Execution – Page 55	Subject to Utility security policies and administrator approval, AI Agents shall distribute outputs through approved communication channels including Email, Microsoft Teams, WhatsApp, SMS, mobile applications, web portals and other enterprise collaboration platforms to the discoms officials.	Please identify the channels to be implemented at go-live and confirm that APEPDCL will provide approved tenant access, accounts, gateways, licenses and security clearances.	Go-live channels shall be limited to those identified during design for which APEPDCL provides approved accounts, licenses, gateways, interfaces and security authorization.	As per RFP
Section 5 – Asset Management and Data Repository – Page 70	Sync with Unified Billing System via APIs: real-time updates, with error handling and two-way reconciliation.	Please provide the Unified Billing System API specifications, expected transaction volumes, latency target, master-data ownership, reconciliation rules and non-production test environment.	APEPDCL shall provide supported APIs, specifications, test access and reconciliation rules. Real-time performance shall be measured against agreed volumes and dependencies.	As per RFP

Section 5 – Asset Management and Data Repository – Page 70	Store consumer data: Consumer ID, name, address, meter number, billing status and load category.	Please clarify whether the platform is intended to become a system of record for consumer data or only maintain a synchronized analytical copy, including retention, masking and consent requirements.	The platform shall maintain only the minimum synchronized analytical data required for approved use cases; the designated billing/consumer system shall remain the system of record unless otherwise agreed.	Shall be used for analytics as per the RFP
Section 5 – Integration with Discoms Data Systems – Page 75	The DISCOM shall facilitate integration with existing third-party applications, OEM systems, and enterprise platforms by providing the System Integrator with access to relevant APIs, interface specifications, database schemas, data dictionaries, communication protocols, authentication mechanisms, sample datasets, and technical documentation, wherever available.	Please replace 'wherever available' with a firm dependency-management process and confirm the treatment of scope, schedule and SLA where an interface, license, OEM support or documentation is unavailable.	The DISCOM shall provide available interfaces, documentation, access and OEM coordination. Unavailable or materially changed dependencies shall be handled through agreed change control, with corresponding schedule, cost and SLA adjustments.	As per RFP

Section 5 – Integration with Discoms Data Systems – Page 75	The DISCOM shall also specify the availability, format, frequency, quality, and historical retention period of each dataset (e.g., number of years/months of historical data available) to enable the SI to design, configure, and implement the required integration, AI/ML models.	Please provide the system-wise data inventory and representative samples before bid submission, or permit final model scope and accuracy commitments to be baselined after data discovery.	APEPDCL shall provide a preliminary data inventory and samples before contract finalization. AI/ML performance baselines shall be agreed after data profiling and validation.	As per RFP
Section 5 – User Management and Security – Page 79	Encrypts sensitive operational and consumer data both at rest (stored data) and in transit (during transmission) using AES-256 and TLS 1.3 standards or higher standards.	Please confirm whether equivalent or higher cryptographic controls supported by existing APEPDCL systems will be accepted where a legacy endpoint does not support TLS 1.3.	AES-256 and TLS 1.3 or equivalent approved controls shall be used. Legacy-interface exceptions shall be documented, risk-assessed and approved with compensating controls.	AS per RFP
Section 5 – User Management and Security – Page 79	Enforces multi-layered authentication, combining passwords, biometric verification (fingerprint/face ID), OTP-based login and hardware token authentication.	Please clarify whether all listed factors are mandatory simultaneously or are alternative MFA mechanisms selected by user category and risk level.	MFA shall use at least two approved factors, selected by user category, access channel and risk policy; biometrics and hardware tokens shall apply where specifically approved and provisioned.	As per RFP

Section 5 – Facility Management Service – Page 89	AI model improvements, prompt orchestration enhancements, reasoning engine optimizations and performance improvements required to maintain or improve solution effectiveness.	Please define measurable effectiveness baselines, retraining triggers, data/label availability and the number or frequency of model-improvement cycles included in the fixed price.	Model maintenance shall preserve agreed production baselines using available approved data. Material new use cases, new data domains or changed acceptance targets shall be managed through change control.	As per RFP
Section 5 – Project Management – Page 96	A deliverable shall be deemed complete only upon submission of both hard and soft copies, followed by the corresponding presentation to the ISA.	Please define the review/acceptance period, deemed-acceptance mechanism, consolidated comment cycle and whether electronic submission may satisfy the hard-copy requirement since this is a software and platform based program.	ISA shall review each deliverable within the agreed period and provide consolidated comments. A deliverable shall be deemed accepted if no response is received within that period; electronic submission shall be sufficient unless hard copies are specifically requested.	As per RFP

Section 5 – Network Protection & Security – Page 97	The System Integrator (SI) shall design, implement, operate, and maintain a secure network architecture for the Platform to ensure the confidentiality, integrity, availability, and resilience of all communications between physical assets, Operational Technology (OT), Information Technology (IT), cloud infrastructure, and Digital Twin components.	Please provide the existing IT/OT network architecture, security demarcation, asset ownership and responsibility matrix, and clarify that the SI is responsible only for the platform and interfaces within its contracted control.	The SI shall secure the platform components and interfaces within its contractual control. APEPDCL shall provide the existing architecture and remain responsible for Utility-owned networks, endpoints and third-party systems, subject to an agreed responsibility matrix.	As per RFP
Section 5 – Network Protection & Security – Page 97	Privileged access shall be controlled through a Privileged Access Management (PAM) solution.	Please confirm whether APEPDCL will provide its enterprise PAM platform and licenses or whether the bidder must include a new PAM solution and associated infrastructure.	The solution shall integrate with APEPDCL's designated PAM service where available; any new PAM product, licenses and infrastructure shall be explicitly identified in the priced scope.	As per RFP

Section 5 – Security & Infrastructure – Page 100	Submission of the server sizing details in the prescribed format is mandatory. Failure to furnish the required information, or submission of incomplete or non-compliant details, shall render the bid non-responsive and liable for rejection.	Please provide the baseline transaction, data-volume, user, retention, environments required, availability and AI workload assumptions required to prepare comparable server sizing.	Bidders shall size the solution against the baseline workload and retention assumptions issued by ISA/APEPDCL. Sizing shall be finalized after discovery if actual volumes materially differ.	As per RFP
Section 5 – Security & Infrastructure – Page 100	GPU: NVIDIA A100 (40/80GB)	Please confirm whether NVIDIA A100 is mandatory or whether equivalent/better GPUs or managed AI services meeting benchmarked performance, security and compatibility requirements are acceptable.	NVIDIA A100 or an equivalent or better accelerator/managed service may be proposed, subject to meeting agreed performance, compatibility, security and support requirements.	As per RFP

Section 5 – Scalability, Interoperability, and Transition Support – Page 103	The SI shall ensure that the solution does not impose any vendor lock-in, and all components (including software, data, and configurations) shall remain accessible and usable by the DISCOM or its appointed agencies.	Please clarify how this requirement applies to proprietary OEM software, subscription services, licensed models and third-party components, and define the required export formats and post-termination usage rights.	The SI shall provide Utility data, configurations, documentation and agreed export artefacts in open or documented formats. Continued use of proprietary products shall remain subject to their disclosed license terms.	As per RFP
Section 5 – Roles and Responsibilities – Page 109	The scope of the System Integrator shall be limited to AI/ML-based analysis, Network Analysis and other functionalities/deliverables specified under this RFP, based on the GIS data provided by the Utility.	Please reconcile this limitation with clauses requiring one-time digitization, continuous asset updates, field verification and correction of source-system data, and clearly define the SI's data-remediation responsibility.	The SI shall perform analysis and platform functions using Utility-provided data. Source-data creation, field survey and correction in systems of record shall remain with APEPDCL unless expressly included as a quantified deliverable.	As per RFP

Section 5 – Exit Management and Handover – Page 113	Demonstrated stable functioning of all key modules for six continuous months including real-time data flow and dashboard updates.	Please confirm whether the six-month stabilization period is inside or additional to the nine-month implementation period, define 'key modules' and stability criteria, and state the payment impact of delays caused by unavailable source systems or data.	The stabilization period, covered modules and measurable stability criteria shall be included in the approved project schedule. Delays caused by customer or third-party dependencies shall extend the period without penalty to the SI.	As per RFP
Section 5 – Facility Management Phase SLA Overview (Post Implementation) – Page 138	SLA Compliance: Strict adherence to response/resolution times (High: 6h, Med: 24h, Low: 48h).	Please distinguish response and resolution times, define severity criteria, service hours, clock-stoppage rules, exclusions, escalation and service-credit caps.	The SLA schedule shall separately define response and resolution targets, severity, coverage window, dependency exclusions, clock-stoppage, escalation and aggregate service-credit caps.	As per RFP

ISA GENERAL TERMS OF BUSINESS	11.0 COPYRIGHT, PATENTS AND OTHER PROPRIETARY RIGHTS:	All Intellectual Property rights, schemas, code, and model architectures, developed as part of the project, will remain property of ISA. ISA retains all rights in Source codes even the right to re-platform the same without excluding the BIDDER preexisting IPs/ Third party IPs which can be embedded in the Deliverables. This is highly risky as this might lead to loss of Infosys binary codes and give ISA unauthorised access to retain those Source codes and Infosys will suffer loss.	The SI shall retain ownership of its Background IP, including software, platforms, tools, algorithms, frameworks and other intellectual property developed independently of this engagement, provided that the SI furnishes appropriate IPR registrations, certificates or other documentary evidence establishing its ownership during the Design and Architecture Planning phase. Any ongoing or subsequent developments based on such Background IP that are incorporated into the solution and provide functional or operational benefits to APEPDCL shall be made available to APEPDCL for continued internal use, without transfer of ownership of the underlying Background IP. All bespoke/co-developed project-specific software, configurations, APIs, AI/ML models, documentation and other deliverables developed specifically under this engagement shall be made available to APEPDCL with
R/w	R/W		
Intellectual Property (IP) and Rights	13. Intellectual Property (IP) and Rights		
Pg 93	(Refer Verbiage from RFP)	We propose to add "In the event Infosys(BIDDER) pre existing IPs are embedded in the Deliverables, BIDDER grants to the ISA a non-exclusive, non-transferable, irrevocable, royalty free and perpetual license for the BIDDER's internal use of the same as part of the Deliverables in which they are embedded. Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to grant ISA any right to use or exploit such Infosys pre existing IPs in a stand-alone form separate and apart from the Deliverables. ISA acknowledges that the Deliverables may include thirdparty material. Nothing in this Agreement or any Statement of Work issued hereunder shall be construed to grant ISA rights to such thirdparty material	

		and it shall be the sole responsibility of ISA to obtain the requisite license, unless expressly stated to the contrary in the Statement of Work. Infosys shall reasonably cooperate with ISA, at ISA's cost and expense, to secure appropriate licenses.”	perpetual rights for internal operation, maintenance and further development. Transferable third-party licences procured specifically for the project shall, wherever feasible, be registered in APEPDCL’s name and handed over at Exit Management along with the necessary source code, documentation, credentials and other artefacts required for independent operation. ISA shall have appropriate rights to use the solution and project learnings for case studies, education, knowledge sharing and capacity building with ISA Member Countries, without acquiring ownership of the SI’s Background IP or APEPDCL’s project data. An Exit Management Committee comprising representatives of ISA, APEPDCL and the SI shall be constituted to oversee and facilitate IP, knowledge, documentation, licence, data and system handover at Exit.

ISA GENERAL TERMS OF BUSINESS	13.0 CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OF DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION: (Refer Verbiage from RFP)	1. Perpetual CI obligation- We propose to limit the CI obligation for 5years from the date of initial disclosure 2. Standard exclusions are missing. We propose to add "This Agreement will not apply to any information that (i) is or becomes publicly available without breach of this Agreement; (ii) is known by the Recipient without any confidentiality obligation, (iii) is rightfully received from a third party who did not acquire such information by a wrongful or tortuous act; is (iv) is independently developed by the Recipient or (vi) is authorized by the Discloser for release."		As per RFP

ISA GENERAL TERMS OF BUSINESS	14.0 FORCE MAJEURE; OTHER CHANGES IN CONDITIONS (Refer Verbiage from RFP)	1. Missing payment obligation- We propose to add to the clause - Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, A Force Majeure Event shall not relieve ISA of its payment obligations for WORKS rendered by CONTRACTOR prior to the occurrence of Force Majeure Event. 2. Missing remote working- In the event CONTRACTOR is subjected to uncontrollable event(s) including but not limited to pandemic, government action or prohibition, curtailment or prohibition of transportation, affecting health and safety of employees, where CONTRACTOR is unable to provide SERVICES from the service location set out in the AGREEMENT and/or implement its business continuity plan (“Uncontrollable Event”), then ISA hereby agrees that (a) unless otherwise notified by the CONTRACTOR, such Uncontrollable Event shall not be construed as a Force Majeure Event; and (b) the CONTRACTOR shall be entitled to allow its employees to work and perform SERVICES from an alternative location using hardware (laptop or desktop or thin client) provided by CONTRACTOR or the ISA or that is personal to the employee (“Remote Working”). In the event of an Uncontrollable Event leading to		As per RFP

		Remote Working, CONTRACTOR shall notify in writing or through electronic mail to ISA as soon as reasonably practicable of the Uncontrollable Event and CONTRACTOR implementing Remote Working. During the period CONTRACTOR provides SERVICES in Remote Working mode: (1) ISA hereby acknowledges that CONTRACTOR will have limited control over the environment from where the SERVICES are rendered and the SERVICES may be interrupted; (2) CONTRACTOR shall make reasonable efforts to adhere to the obligations set out in the AGREEMENT and/or the AGREEMENT; (3) CONTRACTOR shall be excused from any deficiencies or operational gaps that may arise as a result of the Uncontrollable Event or Remote Working; (4) PARTIES may agree on any specific reasonable security measures that the ISA wishes CONTRACTOR to implement at ISA's costs, while Remote Working; (5) PARTIES shall conduct periodic reviews at reasonable intervals regarding the circumstances surrounding the Uncontrollable Event and Remote Working; and (6) ISA shall be responsible for the security measures of their remote access infrastructure and ISA assets provided to CONTRACTOR, in the event of		

		CONTRACTOR's personnel resources connecting directly via internet using a ISA provided/ personal asset. The PARTIES agree that Covid-19 was a pandemic resulting in an Uncontrollable Event. The PARTIES further agree that CONTRACTOR shall be entitled to Remote Working and this Section shall apply during the period Covid-19 continues to affect the CONTRACTOR.		



ISA GENERAL TERMS OF BUSINESS	15.0 TERMINATION (Refer Verbiage from RFP)	1. Termination for Convenience with 30days notice. We propose to provide 60days prior notice 2. Missing Termination fee/ WIP costs		As per RFP
ISA GENERAL TERMS OF BUSINESS	17.1 Accordingly, the Contractor authorizes ISA to deduct from the Contractor's invoice any amount representing such taxes, duties or charges, unless the Contractor has consulted with the ISA before the payment thereof and the ISA has, in each instance, specifically authorized the Contractor to pay such taxes, duties or charges under protest. In that event, the Contractor shall provide the ISA with written evidence that payment of such taxes, duties or charges has been made and appropriately authorized.	Clause as a whole to be reviewed		As per RFP

41. Liquidated Damages Pg 18 R/w Section 3. Bid Data Sheet 8.42. Liquidated Damages Pg 20	41.1 If specified in BDS, ISA shall apply Liquidated Damages resulting from the Contractor's delays or breach of its obligations as per the Contract. R/w a. Where the contractor fails to fulfill the performance of the deliverables in accordance with the specified timelines in the approved strategy document or b. Where there is non-satisfactory performance of the contract in line with the contract terms, the contractor shall be liable to pay ISA the liquidated damages of a daily charge of 3% (three percent) of the total contract sum, for each day of the daily occurrence, up to a maximum amount of 20% (twenty percent) of the contract sum; which surcharge is deductible from the vendor's outstanding invoices. Provided that ISA may the event of the contractor's default or failure to meet a timeline issue a Notice of Breach as a warning of first instance; and in the second instance terminate the contract; and the invoice due shall be calculated on a pro-rata basis following the provision of this section	1. Total penalty shall be limited to the 20% of the Total Order value.: i. Broad Scope – LD applies broadly to total order value rather than being limited to the affected milestone. The liability should be restricted to maximum 10% of the charges for the delayed portion/ affected milestone. 2. No Re-Planning Option – No provision for Infosys to re-plan milestones if delays occur, especially if caused by the Buyer's failure to meet dependencies. 3. No Earn-Back Mechanism – The clause does not allow Infosys to "catch up" on delivery and recover LD, which is a preferred fallback position. 4. Additional Attribution Missing – No reduction of LD for delays caused by Buyer or where delays are partially attributable to both parties. 5. Setoff of Penalty from payment: We do not permit unilateral set-off; however, we are open to issuing a credit note in lieu of that. This means that while one party cannot automatically deduct amounts owed from payments due to us without mutual agreement, we are willing to offer a credit note that can be applied towards future transactions or invoices, providing a flexible solution for settling outstanding amounts		Liquidated Damages (LD) under Section 3, BDS No. 8 shall be calculated based on the applicable invoice value and shall apply during the development/deployment stage. During the subscription period post-Go-Live, the SLA penalty cap of 18% of the quarterly invoice value shall apply.

42. Payment Provisions Pg 18 R/W 10. Payment terms and conditions Pg 105-108	42.1 Payment will be made only upon ISA's acceptance of the work performed. The terms of payment shall be within thirty (30) days, after receipt of invoice and certification of acceptance of work issued by the proper authority in ISA with direct supervision of the Contractor. Payment will be affected by bank transfer in the currency of contract.	1. Payment should not be contingent upon acceptance of Work. Payment should be made within 30days of receipt of invoice 2. Missing delayed payment interest- In the event ISA's payments are not paid when due under this Agreement, such amounts shall accrue interest at a rate equal to the lower of: (i) twelve percent (12%) per annum for the period commencing on the due date until the same are paid in full; and/or (ii) the maximum amount permitted by Applicable Law. Such interest shall be payable on demand. 3. Missing COLA- For SERVICES rendered on a time-and-materials basis, the FEES shall be as set forth in the FORM OF AGREEMENT and INVOICES will be raised on a monthly basis (in arrears, unless otherwise stated in the AGREEMENT). The FEES in FORM OF AGREEMENT shall be valid for a period of one (1) year from the COMMENCEMENT DATE. The PARTIES agree to negotiate a rate revision at the latest by the first anniversary date from the date of last rate revision based on CPI of each country and if the PARTIES fail to negotiate a rate revision by the anniversary date, the rates shall be increased by three percent (3%) at onsite and five percent (5%) at offshore	As per RFP

		over the prevailing rates. The new rates shall be effective as of the first day of the first calendar month after the anniversary date.		

12. Statutory Compliance for All Personnel (Permanent & Temporary) R/W 1.7.4. Pg 93 R/W ISA GENERAL TERMS OF BUSINESS Clause 20.	The bidder agrees to operate strictly on a principal to principal basis for the purpose of this engagement. All responsibilities, obligations, and liabilities—whether statutory, contractual, financial, or otherwise—shall rest exclusively with the bidder. Under no circumstances shall the authority/client be held liable for any act, omission, default, or non compliance on the part of the bidder or its personnel, subcontractors, agents, or representatives. R/W Maintain compliance with regulatory frameworks, including CERC, CEA and DISCOM-specific IT policies for data governance and cybersecurity. R/W 20.0 OBSERVANCE OF THE LAW: The Contractor shall comply with all laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations bearing upon the performance of its obligations under the terms of this Contract.	1. Compliance with all such a all applicable statutory obligations alongwith regulatory frameworks, all laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations including CERC, CEA and DISCOM-specific IT policies, irrespective of whether it is ISA specific or Bidder specific 2. No provision for ISA notifying Bidder of the required compliances that Infosys needs to follow. 3. Missing- Cost for compliance with ISA specific standards to be borne by ISA.		As per RFP

D. Audit & Compliance Pg 87 R/W 11. Facility Management Service v. Support for Third-Party Audits: Pg 95 R/W 8.4. Data Privacy & "Privacy by Design" Pg 102	Refer Verbiage from RFP	Audit rights can be accepted, provided, the following conditions are observed: 1. ISA should provide minimum 10 business days written notice before initiating audit. 2. Audit shall be conducted only once per year. 3. Before initiating audit, auditor should sign non-disclosure agreement with CONTRACTOR. 4. Such auditors should not be competitor of CONTRACTOR 5. Auditors are not allowed to install any software on CONTRACTOR's system. 6. ISA is responsible for all the cost and expenses relating to audit. 7. We cannot agree to allow audit of subcontractor's as it is violation of confidentiality obligations agreed with them. 8. The scope of audit shall be limited to the systems and resources used for providing Services to the	As per RFP

			ISA. For clarity, procedural and physical audits are permitted, however, no logical access to CONTRACTOR's systems as part of security audit should be granted. The auditor shall have not access to CONTRACTOR's internal costs and margins, third-party costs, internal audit information, data related to other ISA or pertaining to dispute between the parties.	

08. Digital Twin Network Protection & Security R/W 1.7. Ensuring Data Security, Compliance and Cybersecurity Resilience Pg 97, 110	Refer Verbiage from RFP	Missing- ISA shall implement and maintain appropriate security measures, administrative and procedural safeguards to protects its systems and environment under its control in accordance with industry standard [ISO 27001]. ISA may also take appropriate steps for fixing any design or other gaps, vulnerability and weak processes pertaining to ISA controlled environment and systems that may be identified or highlighted by Bidder, if any, as part of delivering services under the Agreement.	ISA shall implement and maintain appropriate security measures, administrative and procedural safeguards to protects its systems and environment under its control in accordance with industry standard [ISO 27001]. ISA may also take appropriate steps for fixing any design or other gaps, vulnerability and weak processes pertaining to ISA controlled environment and systems that may be identified or highlighted by Bidder, if any, as part of delivering services under the Agreement.	As per RFP
11. Maintenance Support and Service Levels Pg 110-117	Refer verbiage from RFP	Clause as a whole to be reviewed		As per RFP

11. Maintenance Support and Service Levels Pg 103	*Penalty shall be imposed on the total awarded project cost deliverable in each phase as defined in RFP. Refer verbiage from RFP		1. Separate penalties for SLA breach other than LDs 2. The total cumulative penalty shall be limited to a maximum of 7% of the quarterly invoice amount.	As per RFP

	Missing clause- OOP		This Agreement, including the schedules attached hereto and all Statement of Works entered into pursuant to its terms, sets forth the entire agreement and understanding of the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof, and supersedes all prior oral and written agreements, understandings, representations, conditions and all other communications relating thereto. Should any inconsistency exist or arise between a provision of this Agreement and a provision of any exhibit, schedule, Statement of Work, or other incorporated writing, the provision of this Agreement shall prevail unless otherwise provided herein	As per RFP

	Missing Clause- Warranty		Bidder warrants to ISA that it will provide the Services and deliverables in accordance with generally accepted industry standards and practices. This warranty shall survive for a period of thirty (30) days following delivery of the relevant Service or deliverable. Bidder and ISA agree that ISA's sole and exclusive remedy for non-conforming Services and deliverables shall be replacement/re-performance by Bidder, or, at Bidder's option, refund of the fees paid for such nonconforming Services and deliverables Except as expressly set forth in this Agreement, Bidder hereby disclaims all warranties (whether implied, statutory or otherwise) with respect to the Services and Deliverables provided under this Agreement and/or statements of work issued hereunder, including but not	As per RFP

			limited to implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. Bidder does not represent or warrant that Services or Deliverables, including but not limited to any software, will be error or bug free or that software will function without interruption or that any of the Services or Deliverables are designed to meet ISA's business requirements.	

	Missing Clause- LOL	The total and aggregate liability of each party (including its Affiliates) to the other party (Affiliates including the service recipients) for any and all claims, arising out of or in connection with this Agreement and all Statements of Work, whether in contract, tort, indemnity (including negligence) or otherwise, shall be limited to twelve (12) times the Average Monthly Charges under the relevant Statement of Work. "Average Monthly Charges" means the total amount of Charges (excluding taxes, deferred payments, expenses, 3rd party pass through charges and reimbursements) paid to Infosys divided by the number of elapsed months. In no event shall either Party be liable for any indirect or special, incidental, consequential, punitive damages or for any for business interruption, loss and/or corruption of data, loss of anticipated savings, loss of goodwill or reputation or loss of profits, howsoever caused, arising out of or in connection with this Agreement and whether or not the Party has been advised of the possibility of such damages	As per RFP

	Missing Clause- Non solicitation	Except as otherwise expressly agreed to by Bidder in writing, during the period of their involvement with the provision of the services and a further period of one (1) year thereafter, ISA agrees not to directly or indirectly or through third parties solicit or hire for employment any of the Bidder's current or previous employees.	Except as otherwise expressly agreed to by Bidder in writing, during the period of their involvement with the provision of the services and a further period of one (1) year thereafter, ISA agrees not to directly or indirectly or through third parties solicit or hire for employment any of the Bidder's current or previous employees.	As per RFP

	Missing Clause- Bank receivables clause- AR Discounting		ISA hereby consents to Bidder assigning all or some of its Receivables under this AGREEMENT to a THIRD PARTY ("Bank") and Bidder is hereby notifying ISA of such assignment. For the sake of clarity, the term "Receivables" is hereby defined as any amounts due from the ISA under an invoice raised by the Bidder for SERVICES delivered under this AGREEMENT. Further, ISA acknowledges that Bidder may share limited excerpts of this AGREEMENT and other details directly relating to the Receivables on a "need to know" basis with the Bank, subject to appropriate confidentiality undertakings by the Bank.	As per RFP

	Missing Clause- Deemed Acceptance		(i) Unless otherwise set forth in the applicable Statement of Work, ISA shall have ten (10) business days following the date on which Deliverables are delivered to it by Bidder to complete testing of the Deliverables (the "Acceptance Period") to provide written notice of acceptance or material non-compliance with the Acceptance Criteria. (ii) If no written notification of acceptance or material non-conformance with the Acceptance Criteria is received by Bidder within ten (10) business days from commencement of the acceptance period or if the Deliverables are utilized for purposes other than testing by ISA, the Deliverables shall be deemed accepted by ISA	As per RFP

37.Right to Vary Requirements at the Time of Award	37.1 At the time of award of Contract, ISA reserves the right to vary the quantity of services and/or goods, by up to a maximum twenty-five per cent (25%) of the total offer, without any change in the unit price or other terms and conditions.	We request to remove this clause. 25% variation in services is not as per the industry practice.	Any variation in the services/goods will be on the mutually agreed terms of ISA and bidder.	As per RFP ISA reserves to vary the quantity by 25% as the same unit price i.e. for the quantity variations cost shall be varies as per the unit cost quoted
40.Bank Guarantee for Advanced Payment Pg 18	Except when the interests of ISA so require, it is ISA's preference to make no advance payment(s) (i.e., payments without having received any outputs). If an advance payment is allowed as per BDS, and exceeds 20% of the total contract price, or USD 30,000, whichever is less, the Bidder shall submit a Bank Guarantee in the full amount of the advance payment.	There is no mention of advance payment in the RFP document.		As per RFP