

Response to Queries

(May 18, 2021)

To the

Request For Proposal

Appointment of QA Partner Agency

for

UMANG

(Unified Mobile Application For New-Age Governance)



May, 2021

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
1	3 - Page 8	Request for Proposal – Objective - e) Regression Testing – Backend, Frontend and Voice/ Chat Bot	We understand UMANG Helpdesk is not in scope for Regression testing. Please confirm.	Yes, not relevant to Helpdesk; Regression testing is applicable to UMANG mobile apps (Android, iOS) and Web app including UMANG website & Assisted Mode. Refer to Corrigendum-I, clause 3 & 4.
2	5.3.2.2 - Page 16	Digilocker (NeGD, MeitY) - Access of stored documents, upload any document stored in mobile or scanned by the mobile camera, sharing of documents along with Departmental service	Is there any limit on the file size of the documents to be uploaded or stored? What are all the types of documents?	Not relevant. If the service offered for the FAT has the option to upload document(s) then that need to be tested as per the specifications furnished in FRS (Functional Requirements Specification) document, as per the type & size limitations, if any.
3	5.3.2.3 - Page 16	PayGov (PayGov of MeitY or as provided by Departments) - Payment/charge is taken from citizen for availing the services	What are all the Payment Gateways involved? Please provide a list	Not relevant. If the service offered for the FAT has payment option then that need to be tested for proper functioning by the QA partner, irrespective of the underlying Payment Gateway.
4	6.1 - Page 26	Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT)	Is there any existing Governance Model between QA and other Dev/Business stakeholders?	Pl refer to the Responsibility Matrix as available in different RFPs (Refer Clause 4 of this RFP).
5	6.1 - Page 26	Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT)	1. How many APIs are in scope 2. What are the types of APIs in scope	Services on-boarded on UMANG are in the scope of FAT. No. of APIs is dependent on service(s) on-boarded; For types of services on-boarded, refer Clause no. 5.2.1 of UMANG Frontend RFP.
6	6.1 - Page 26	Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT)	Please provide how many applications within each category and their details * UMANG Backend - DBs / APIs / etc. - Apps & details * UMANG Frontend - Apps & details * UMANG Helpdesk - Apps & details * UMANG Conversational AI based Voice/Chat Bot - Apps & details	Query not clear. However, relevant RFPs (Refer Clause 4) may be referred for further details about the scope of Backend, Frontend, Helpdesk, Conversational AI based Voice/Chat Bot.

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
7	6.1 - Page 26	Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT)	What is the number of features in each apps under each category?	The features are Service specific; please refer to already on-boarded services on UMANG app for better understanding.
8	6.1 - Page 26	Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT)	How many new applications will be added newly and what would be volume of features?	Pl refer to "Quantum of Work" under clause 6.1 on page 28
9	6.1 - Page 26	Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT)	Does umang use any existing Regression Suite? If so, what is the number of test cases in this suite? Is it completely manual and/or automated testing?	All the Tools/ Testers/ Scripts are in the scope of QA Partner at his cost.
10	6.1 - Page 26	Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT)	Please provide details of any existing automation / manual tools available	All the Tools/ Testers/ Scripts are in the scope of QA Partner at his cost.
11	6.1 - Page 26	Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT)	Please provide details of any existing test management tools. If no, would the client prefer Licensed or Open Source tools?	All the Tools/ Testers/ Scripts are in the scope of QA Partner at his cost.
12	6.1 - Page 27	Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT) - Point (F) - UI/UX Testing - Compliance to Government Websites Standards	Please provide the details of Compliance to be tested	UMANG complies to various requirements issued by Government or other standards and best practices issued from time to time. For such compliances, for example GIGW, UI/UX guidelines etc., in case they are implemented shall have to be tested by the Bidder.
13	6.1 - Page 28	Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT)	We understand the Umang will provide devices such as Android, IOS & other necessary infra for test execution. Please confirm	No, required devices and other necessary infra for test execution shall be arranged by the QA partner including any tools/ tester/ scripts etc. at its cost.
14	6.2 - Page 29	Security Audit - b) UMANG Frontend (including international instance)	Please elaborate on International Instances	There are two instances of UMANG Mobile app (Android & iOS). One for India and the other for rest of the world. There are some difference in work flow in both the instances.
15	6.3 - Page 30	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly	We request NeGD to confirm / correct our	Yes, raw logs and needed data/details (to be requested by the

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
			<p>understanding: The raw logs will be provided by the application / monitoring tool; based on these we need to cleanse the data and create meaningful dashboards and reports for consumption / submission to authorities. Please confirm</p>	<p>QAP to cover the SLA/O&M audit scope) shall be furnished by the concerned UMANG Partner i.e. Backend, Frontend or Helpdesk. QAP shall perform all needed actions for a proper, correct & comprehensive audit. This shall include, at a minimum, to validate the completeness (ability to infer health/ availability of all major components of the Platform) and correctness of data, cleanse it (without disturbing the underlying information/characteristics of the data, preserve the discarded data & present the basis/logic of cleansing), calculate/assess the SLA parameter values, interpret it and draw meaningful inferences etc. SLAs need to be interpreted comprehensively in the context of all major functionality of the Platform towards all stakeholders.</p>
16	6.3 - Page 31	Table 5 – SLA/ O&M Audit Timelines	Request NeGD to give more clarification on what is referred to as 'iteration' and what is expected out of each iteration.	Iteration refers to process of request (offering for audit) and response (revert with results including bug/ faults or demand for more inputs/ details/ clarification etc.). Every pair of request/response is an iteration. During every iteration, QAP shall revert with results of whatever level of testing is possible and the request for fixing the bugs/vulnerabilities and/or additional information/data and/or clarifications.
17	6.3 - Page 31	Table 5 – SLA/ O&M Audit Timelines	We request NeGD to consider the following: The timelines documented for the iterations needs to be increased to minimum a month for iteration 1.	No change in the timelines. The audit timelines mentioned are not for all the 4 categories together. They are applicable individually/separately for all 04 categories/segments of SLA/O&M audits i.e.

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
			<p>This is required since the data from each of the sources need to be studied and cleansed and automated. Automation of this one time would be useful for further purposes.</p>	<p>a) Backend b) Frontend (including international instance) c) Helpdesk d) Voice/Chat Bot</p> <p>Automation should be done concurrently.</p>
18	6.3 - Page 31	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly	Request NeGD to confirm the source of data for SLA audit? For instance, Logs, APIs, and so on	<p>The logs/raw data/tickets details etc. will be provided by UMANG partners i.e. by Backend, Frontend, Helpdesk and AI Bot partners as recorded in the system.</p> <p>Primarily logs will be used for auditing but there could be other sources as well depending on the SLA parameter and the context such as fault tickets, API request-responses, other reports/data from system/platform etc. QAP shall be able to ask for the required/ relevant data/ details from the owner.</p>
19	6.3 - Page 31	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly	Request NeGD to confirm the frequency of data transfer to the systems provided for Audit? Is it Realtime, Daily basis, Monthly basis or every Quarter	SLA/O&M audit frequency is quarterly, so, typically logs/data shall be shared quarterly but it can be more frequent if QAP suggests merit in doing so.
20	6.3 - Page 31	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly	<p>Request NeGD to confirm the following for each of the below 4 line items: Will the logs / data, provide for the identification of the points of interest in terms of: 1) UMANG Backend data like - Time taken by the server to complete the request originating from the mobile upon receiving the request - Availability of the</p>	<p>Raw logs and all related data shall be furnished against the demand of the QAP. Logs/ data required need to be spelt out clearly & demanded by the QAP. However, some amount of processing and interpretations may be required by the QA partner.</p>

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
			services - Number of requests to be successfully processed by the platform - Test case Pass % and so on	
21	6.3 - Page 31	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly	Will the logs / data, provide for the identification of the points of interest in terms of: 2) UMANG Helpdesk data like - System uptime - Average speed to answer - Call abandon rate - Average Hold time - Average Wrap Time - Quality of Service (QoS) - AVERAGE RESPONSE TIME FOR EMAIL and so on	Raw logs and all related data shall be furnished against the demand of the QAP. Logs/ data required need to be spelt out clearly & demanded by the QAP. However, some amount of processing and interpretations may be required by the QA partner.
22	6.3 - Page 31	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly	Will the logs / data, provide for the identification of the points of interest in terms of: 3) UMANG Frontend data like - Availability of the services and so on	Raw logs and all related data shall be furnished against the demand of the QAP. Logs/ data required need to be spelt out clearly & demanded by the QAP. However, some amount of processing and interpretations may be required by the QA partner.
23	6.3 - Page 31	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly	Will the logs / data, provide for the identification of the points of interest in terms of: 4) AI Based Conversational Voice & Chat Bot related data like - Availability of services - Delivery of Change (from scoping to implementation) - Average Response time for any user utterance and so on	Raw logs and all related data shall be furnished against the demand of the QAP. Logs/ data required need to be spelt out clearly & demanded by the QAP. However, some amount of processing and interpretations may be required by the QA partner.
24	6.3 - Page 31	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly	Request NeGD to confirm whether there is any	Data source shall primarily be the system logs (raw and may

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
			identification for the data source. For instance, in the case of Frontend, how is the data different for Mobile and Web?	be from different stages of processing), exception reports from different components/ modules of the Platform/Solution, manual records etc. Data segregation may be by source, relevant fields in the log structure, by correlation of different records/logs and/or any combination thereof.
25	6.3 - Page 31	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly	Request NeGD to confirm the typical volumes of data to be processed on a quarterly basis?	Please refer the response to Query Number 27.
26	6.3 - Page 31	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly	Request NeGD to confirm where the data will reside - On-premise or Cloud based infrastructure?	Required and/or QAP requested data/ logs shall be furnished through some online transfer mechanism for which QAP shall have the capability, to manage the high-speed transfer as well as storage for processing/ audit purposes.
27	6.3 - Page 31	SLA (O&M) Audit - Quarterly Table 5 – SLA/ O&M Audit Timelines b) Description - Data cleansing/ normalization	Please provide: - DB technology & DB Counts - Volume of data to be cleansed / normalized - Frequency of this activity	1. Requested details that is relevant at this stage is available in the RFP (mainly clauses 5, 6, 9 and Anexures-1 A, B, C, D) and the referenced RFPs of the Backend, Frontend, Helpdesk and Conversational AI Voice/ Chat Bot (clause 4). QAP should be able to assess/ infer. 2. Bidder may refer the daily department transactions that is published on UMANG website and do it's due diligence to assess the volume. Since the frequency of O&M audits is quarterly, the bidder will be required to measure SLA based on the logs/data submitted quarterly and wherever required Bidder may create scripts to gain meaningful information (i.e. Clean and/or normalise) from the logs/data.
28	6.4 - page 32	Regression Testing of the Build	Please confirm if the vendor needs to test for	1. Regression testing will be done in English language only.

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
			all languages in Regression Testing It is mentioned that on iOS and Android are in scope. Can you please provide the list of Browsers to be tested in Regression	2. Currently Regression testing scope is for iOS & Android mobile apps and the Web app (including UMANG website & Assisted Mode). 3. Top browsers by usage covering atleast 90% user-base
29	6.4 - Page 32	Regression Testing of the Build	Please define the quantum of test case under the regression testing similar to Table 3 - FAT (50 test cases) etc.	Test cases can be estimated by looking into the functionality of UMANG Mobile app (excluding the departments Services/ Applications on-boarded on UMANG).
30	7.1 - Page 33	Project Timelines and Services to be executed by QA Partner Agency - Table 7 - Points 2 & 3	We request to consider 20 days of period as timeline for each activities instead of 10 days. As we need to deploy resources from other location as we don't have office in Delhi.	No Change. Also, please refer to Corrigendum-1, clause 5, wherein requirement to set-up operating office in Delhi NCR has been amended
31	8 - Page 34	Manpower and Resource Management - NeGD, at its discretion team, may call for the meeting at NeGD office or any other location	Can you please confirm the location of execution of services - will it be Delhi or Mumbai?	The Audit will be done from Bidder's own premises. However, on need basis, the bidder resources may be called to NeGD office or its UMANG Partner's office in Delhi NCR for face to face meetings.
32	8 - Page 34	8. Manpower and Resource Management	We request to remove this clause (highlighted in red) as this being Fixed bid and also transition activity is already mentioned which shall be carried incase of any replacement within 1 year also. Any request for replacement can only be considered after completion of 1 year, subject to merit of the case and prior approval of NeGD for any replacement shall be must. If replacement of any	Objective is to ensure stability in team and consistency in quality/ delivery. However, cases beyond the control of the QAP are excluded from this such as resignations, prolonged illness, performance, discipline etc. Refer to Corrigendum-1, clause 5.

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
			<p>deployed resource is sought by NeGD or due to attrition in the deployed team, the QA Partner Agency must replace the resources within thirty days and shall ensure proper handover without any impact on ongoing FAT/ Audit schedule and/or quality. Any delay with either the FAT/ Audit shall attract a penalty as per Note (v) of clause 9.4. QA Partner agency need to get approval from NeGD team if they want to replace the existing resource or structure.</p>	
33	8 - Page 34	8. Manpower and Resource Management	<p>Can you please provide the current team size supporting FAT & O&M Audit? Whether similar kind of team size is required as we understand scope testing is mainly required for upgrade, customizations for Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT) of services enabled on UMANG and AI Voice/Chat Bot and Backend, Frontend, Helpdesk and Voice/Chat Bot as O&M/SAL Audit</p>	<p>It is an outsourced activity and NeGD doesn't have details.</p>
34	10.1 - Page 36	Components of Commercial Structure - Table 8 - IV (10,11) - Build Regression Testing - A4	<p>We request to give logic/understanding of "24" mentioned as quantity</p>	<p>Quantities (no. of audits/FAT) mentioned in commercial/ financial format are for financial Bid evaluation ONLY, whereas billing/payment shall happen on the actuals</p>
35	10.1 - Page 36	Components of Commercial Structure - Table 8 - III (6, 7, 8, 9) - SLA (O&M) Audit -A3	<p>We request to give logic/understanding of "12" mentioned as quantity. Does it means 12 times report has to be submitted by QAP in 3 years? Please clarify</p>	<p>Quantities (no. of audits/FAT) mentioned in commercial/ financial format are for Bid evaluation ONLY, whereas billing/payment shall happen on the actuals</p>

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
36	10.1 - Page 36	Table 8 - Components of Commercial Structure	How many test cases are created approximately for services with past experience of umang services?	Please review the on-boarded services on UMANG app and have an assessment on the no. of test cases for proper FAT of these.
37	10.1 - Page 36	Table 8 - Components of Commercial Structure	We need to understand better on below components as all three linked to functional testing Functional Acceptance Test (FAT) – A1 Build Regression Testing – A4 New or Enhanced Functionality (Contingent) Audit – A5	These are functional testing, covering positive & negative test cases, in the context of: a) newly on-boarded or revamped services - FAT (A1) b) updated Releases/Builds (Android, iOS or Web including UMANG website & Assisted Mode) - Regression testing to ensure existing core/common services/ functionalities/ features are working fine without any degrade (A4) c) this is to manage testing of unforeseen functionality, quote is being asked for a set of 50 tests - New or Enhanced Functionality (Contingent) Audit (A5). Please refer response to Query No. 39 for more details on this component particularly.
38	10.1 - Page 36	Table 8 - Components of Commercial Structure	What is meant by Build regression testing. Does it refer to any automation testing or packs of testing execution release. We are interpreting this as test execution packs and testing automation tools & services are not needed by Umang. Please confirm	Whenever any new release/build is planned for a mobile app (Android or iOS), there is a need to test the build(s) to make sure that all existing core functionality/ features (including UI/UX) are working fine, app is not crashing, performance has not deteriorated and so on. This is called the Regression Testing.
39	10.1 - Page 37	Components of Commercial Structure - Table 8 - V (12) - Benchmarked @ 50 test cases (approved by NeGD) and part/ multiples thereof	We understand from pre-bid meeting discussion that performance /benchmarking is not in scope. Point 12 in commercial component refers to performance/ benchmarking test or is it something else. Please clarify	This is not referring to Performance or Load testing. Against this line item bidder need to furnish quote for testing any new/unforeseen functionality, if that require total 50 test cases to be executed. In case, any such functionality require more than 50 test cases to be executed (to be agreed with NeGD before

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
				hand) then QAP shall be paid (prorated) for that testing according to this quote. For example, if 125 test cases are agreed with NeGD for proper & complete testing, QAP shall be paid, 2.5 (125/50) times this quote.
40	10.2 - Page 37	Payment Milestones	We request to consider the monthly payout for the services rendered. As we have to invest and handle the operations by opening new office in Delhi for this engagement and there is expectation to maintain the Knowledge of application and testing services through out the contract period of 5 years. Based on Payment for the successfully completed FAT and Audits shall be made quarterly Monthly against the submission proper invoices along with all supporting documents (including FAT/ Audit Report and certifications) and relevant artefacts for establishing the SLA compliances, in the absence of which max penalty may be levied	No change in the requirement or the RFP clause
41	11.2.1 - Page 39	Technical Evaluation - Pt. 2 - Experience of performing below Audits/ FAT on additional IT Platforms/ Applications: a. O&M/ SLA Audit b. FAT on multilingual mobile/ web app delivered services c. Security Audit	For Point 2, we request to provide more weightage for key services such as O&M/SLA Audit , FAT and security audit compared to languages preference point. This is a challenge as only key Indian government services like Umang have multi language facilities in their apps which is not possible for our vendor to	Changes proposed as below: Refer Corrigendum-1, clause 2. For every additional project after 1st project (as declared against the Eligibility Criteria), max 10 marks per project (only 03 projects to be considered for evaluation for each activity), as per below marking: a. O&M/SLA audit – 05 marks b. FAT on mobile/web app – 1.5 marks

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
			<p>test. This is a challenge to multiple vendors on giving experience for 10 languages to obtain 5 *3 = 15 marks out of 30</p>	<p>c. FAT – language review/ validation – 0.2 marks per language, max 2 marks d. Security Audit – 1.5 marks Note:- Bidder may submit different projects for each activity (a, b, c & d) for evaluation purposes.</p>
42	11.2.1 - Page 40	<p>Technical Evaluation - Pt. 3 - Experience of performing below Audits/ FAT on AI based Voice & Chat Bot Platforms/ Applications: a. O&M/ SLA Audit b. FAT of voice/chat delivered services c. Security Audit</p>	<p>For Point 3, we request to remove this point as these applications are smaller in nature and typically customer does the testing or the application vendor itself Experience of performing below Audits/ FAT on AI based Voice & Chat Bot Platforms/ Applications We request to remove this point and include point related to QAP industry experience, Employee/Testers Strength, ISO compliance/Certified Automation Consultants</p>	No Change in the requirement or the RFP clause.
43	A1.6.1 - Page 89 C1.4 - Page 97	<p>Severity Level Definition - EY is required to submit all test cases prepared while developing a service to NeGD/ NeGD nominated agency. Service Quality SLA - M/s Daffodil is required to submit all test cases prepared while developing a service to NeGD or its nominated agency.</p>	<p>We understand Umang already has test cases for UMANG Backend and UMANG Frontend respectively for the current or existing version of application by existing QA vendor. - Please confirm if test design for these two categories is in scope or not There is no mention about test cases for the below: * UMANG Helpdesk, managed by M/s Cyfuture * UMANG Conversational AI based Voice/Chat Bot, managed by M/s Senseforth</p>	<p>1. For FAT, though the concerned UMANG Partner shall submit the test cases prepared by them but onus for completeness of test cases (including negative test cases) lies with QAP, who is obligated to create/ add test cases so that the FAT is complete and comprehensive. (clause A1.6.1 & C1.4) 2. FAT for UMANG Conversational AI based Voice/ Chat Bot is in the scope of QAP and the quote for the same has to be provided. Please refer Corrigendum-1 clause 3 &4 3. HelpDesk FAT is not in scope of QAP; only quarterly SLA</p>

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
			- Please confirm if test design for above two is in scope or not	audit is to be performed.
44	Table 9 - Eligibility Criteria- Sr. No. 3 "Experience"- Page No 38	Bidder shall have experience of performing below mentioned Audits/ Testing over at least one 'Large-size IT Platforms/ Applications'# during the last 03 years (FY 2018-19 to FY 2020-21): a. O&M/ SLA Audits b. Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT) of the services delivered on the Platform through mobile app & web app. c. Security* Audit (Experience of the bidder OR the proposed Partner shall be valid for this activity)	Amended to " ERP Modules Audit, Assessment of IT Infrastructure, Network & Cyber Security" OR Assessment Services	ERP is an IT platform and can be considered subject to its meeting the definition of the 'Large-size IT Platform(s)' in the RFP; refer to foot note of Table-9, clause 11.1 of the RFP. No change in the requirement or the RFP clause.
45	10.2 Payment Milestones /Page 37	Payment for the successfully completed FAT and Audits shall be made quarterly against the submission proper invoices along with all supporting documents (including FAT/ Audit Report and certifications) and relevant artefacts for establishing the SLA compliances, in the absence of which max penalty may be levied. M	Max Penalty ?	Refer clause 9.4, Notes (v)
46	Table 10 - Technical	65 Marks	It should be less than 40	Min. marks requirements is already 60 in the RFP.

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
	Evaluation (point 2 to 4) / Page 39			No changes in the requirement or the RFP clause.
47	Section 10.1 page 36	Components of Commercial Structure	<p>1> Does this table needs to be filled for 1 round of testing?</p> <p>2> Does the quantity listed denotes number of test cases or number of services?</p>	<p>1. QAP shall need to complete the testing/audit, irrespective of the no. of rounds/iterations, till the service/ build/ platform (as applicable) is bug/fault free; typically, as observed, not more than 2-3 iterations are needed. However, no penalty shall be applicable to the QAP for more number of iterations as long as every iteration is responded/ reverted in the mentioned timeframes.</p> <p>Refer Notes (iii) under Table-8, clause 10.1 & use format at clause S3-1 for financial bid that must be submitted separately. Also refer Corrigendum-1, clause 3 &4 for amendments in the Commercial structure and financial bi format.</p> <p>2. Quantity listed are for the FAT/Audit items against which bidder shall be furnishing the quotes; these quantities shall be used for financial bid evaluation ONLY. Payment shall be made on actual quantities.</p>
48	Section 5 fig 1 page 10	Fig 1 – UMANG Concept Diagram	Q. In diagram IVR is shown as one of the front end interface, but in scope it is not written, only mobile apps and mobile web is written. Is IVR and sms out of scope or is a miss ?	<p>With regards to IVR only it's uptime has to be audited, which is already part of Helpdesk SLA audit.</p> <p>SMS functionality will be getting tested during Service FAT's OR Regression testing to check whether the SMS is getting delivered or not OR as part of the O&M SLA audit for assessing the UMANG platform and/or services availability as SMS is key component for many service deliveries and hence overall Platform availability</p>

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
49	Section 5.1.1 - Table1 Page 11		Should design guidelines by Google for Android be used as a reference to validate the UI/UX design of the mobile app on KAIOS?	KaiOS testing is currently not in scope. UMANG has its own Design Guidelines against which UI/UX on Android and iOS need to be tested/ validated. However, any latest trends/ developments can be proposed/ suggested for incorporation into UMANG Design Guidelines.
50	6.2 Security Audit, page# 29	QAP shall submit Security Audit Report (with executive summary and detailed audit findings) in the CERT-IN prescribed format and/or in a format acceptable to Cloud Infra Provider, particularly NIC.	Request you to please share the report format prescribed/approved by Cert-In and NIC.	CERT-IN empanelled agencies for security audit will know that.
51	11. Bidding and Evaluation Process, page# 37	Bidder shall have experience of performing below mentioned Audits/ Testing over at least one 'Large- size IT Platforms/ Applications'# during the last 03 years (FY 2018-19 to FY 2020-21): a. O&M/ SLA Audits b. Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT) of the services delivered on the Platform through mobile app & web app. c. Security* Audit (Experience of the bidder OR the proposed Partner shall be valid for this activity)	Request you to please modify the requirement/clause as: Bidder shall have experience of performing any two below mentioned Audits/ Testing over at least one 'Large-size IT Platforms/ Applications'# during the last 03 years (FY 2018-19 to FY 2020-21): a. O&M/ SLA Audits b. Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT) of the services delivered on the Platform through mobile app & web app. c. Security* Audit (Experience of the bidder OR the proposed Partner shall be valid for this activity)	No change in requirement or the RFP clause
52	11. Bidding and Evaluation	Bidder shall have experience of	As per our understanding, a bidder	The contention is not agreeable...

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
	Process, page# 37	performing below mentioned Audits/ Testing over at least one 'Large- size IT Platforms/ Applications'# during the last 03 years (FY 2018-19 to FY 2020-21): a. O&M/ SLA Audits b. Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT) of the services delivered on the Platform through mobile app & web app. c. Security* Audit (Experience of the bidder OR the proposed Partner shall be valid for this activity)	who is performing O&M/SLA and Security audit would not do the FAT as it is a case of conflict of interest. Usually, the bidder who gives FAT is different than the auditors.	No change in requirement or the RFP clause.
53	Section 11.2.1 Technical Evaluation Page - 39	Experience of performing below Audits/ FAT on additional IT Platforms/ Applications: a. O&M/ SLA Audit b. FAT on multilingual mobile/ web app delivered services c. Security Audit For every additional project after 1st project (as declared against the Eligibility Criteria), max 10 marks per project (only 03 projects to be considered for evaluation), as per below marking: a. O&M/SLA audit – 02 marks b. FAT on mobile/web app – 1.5 marks	Request you to please modify the requirement/clause as: Experience of performing any two of the below Audits/ FAT on additional IT Platforms/ Applications: a. O&M/ SLA Audit b. FAT on multilingual mobile/ web app delivered services c. Security Audit For every additional project after 1st project (as declared against the Eligibility Criteria), max 10 marks per project (only 03 projects to be considered for evaluation), as per below marking: a. O&M/SLA audit – 05 marks b. FAT on mobile/web app – 05 marks	Refer to the Response to Query no. 41 for the revised markings and to the Corrigendum-1, clause 2 for details.

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
		<p>c. FAT – language review/ validation – 0.5 marks per language, max 5 marks</p> <p>d. Security Audit – 1.5 marks</p>	<p>c. Security Audit – 05 marks</p>	
54	Section 11.1 Page - 38	<p>Eligibility Criteria, Experience;</p> <p>For requirements a) to c), please submit: Copy of the Work Order + Completion Certificates (for Audit/ FAT) from the Client;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Self-certificate (& certified by an independent practising Chartered Accountant) for the Audit/ FAT Completion mentioning the parameters of eligibility criteria clearly</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Additionally, for requirement c), please also submit the: Copy of “CERT-In Empanelment” Letter/Certificate (in the name of Bidder OR its Partner, proposed for Security Audit, as the case may be)</p>	<p>Copy of work order + completion certificate - Will phase completion certificate be acceptable ?</p>	<p>No change in requirement or the RFP clause.</p> <p>However, if the Contract/Agreement is live and the Bidder has successfully completed all the asked activities (audits/FAT) individually, as per item 3, Table-9, clause 11.1 of the RFP, even once, it can be considered.</p>
55	Section 8 Page - 34	Manpower Requirement	For the resources that needs to be deployed in the engagement, is there any minimum requirement from your end like any certifications or year of experience?	No specific requirements but it is expected that the deployed resources shall possess requisite skills and experience and the QAP shall ensure compliance to quality and the SLAs.

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
56	Section 11.1 Page - 38	Eligibility Criteria, Experience	There was a requirement of certificate from a CERT-In empaneled vendor for security audit not the empanelment certificate like certificate of completion	Requirement (item 3, Table-9, clause 11.1) is for: a) Proof of valid empanelment with Cert-In b) Proof for security audit experience as per the Eligibility Criteria
57	12.1 Calendar of Events (Tentative) Page - 42	NA	Is there going to be any further amendments on the clauses or the dates?	Pl keep checking at the NeGD/MeitY/ CPP portal for latest updates till last date/time
58	Section 12.13 Authentication of Bids Page - 47	A letter of authorization shall be supported by a written power-of-attorney accompanying the Bid. The bid shall be signed by the Bidder or a person duly authorized to bind the Bidder to the bid. All pages of the bid, except for un-amended printed literature, shall be initialled and stamped by the authorised person or persons signing the bid.	Letter of authorization and Power-of-attorney, what is the format of POA? Is organization specific POA format accepted?	Use your own format, wherever it is not furnished in the RFP. However, it should convey the intent clearly and fulfill the underlying objective.
59	S2-4. Check List of the Documents Page - 70	S2-4. Check List of the Documents (To be Submitted with the Bid) Confirm the enclosure of all the below listed documents (refer clause 11.1, 11.2.1, clause S2-1, S2-2, S2-3 above and the Schedule III Bid Formats)	Checklist are there, all that formats you have given that we are going to use and apart from that any undertaking can be in our own format?	Yes, use your own format, wherever it is not furnished in the RFP. However, it should convey the intent clearly and fulfill the underlying objective.
60	Section 11.2.1 Technical Evaluation Page - 39, 40	Technical Qualification For every additional project after 1st project	You have written the technical qualification and the same description is been given. So, again with reference to this do we have to give you	Completion Certificate (Self countersigned by CA or from Client with WO) must mention the name of the activities (of the 04 mentioned) and accordingly marks shall be assigned.

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
		<p>(as declared against the Eligibility Criteria), max 10 marks per project (only 03 projects to be considered for evaluation), as per below marking:</p> <p>a. O&M/SLA audit – 02 marks</p> <p>b. FAT on mobile/web app – 1.5 marks</p> <p>c. FAT – language review/ validation – 0.5 marks per language, max 5 marks</p> <p>d. Security Audit – 1.5 marks</p>	<p>certificates? Do you want that the certificate should contain all your for example technical qualification point no 2. If we give the completion certificate of any of our completed project, these four points should be mentioned in that or just a completion certificate?</p> <p>If it's not mentioned in work order, can we give a self certificate with details?</p>	<p>Further, all activities may not necessarily be part of the same projects, rather these could be in different projects also. For example, 03 projects may just have O&M/SLA audit (5x3=15 marks) while another 3 projects may have FAT with one or more languages (1.5x3=4.5 & depending on no. of additional languages in these projects further marks @0.2 per language ma assigned) but for any specific activity max 03 projects can only be considered and in extreme example all these activities could be in different projects.</p> <p>Refer to the response to Query/Clarification no. 41 and the Corrigendum-1, clause 2 for the amendment in the marking.</p>
61	Section 11.1 Eligibility Criteria Page - 38 Table 9	<p>Bidder shall have experience of performing below mentioned Audits/ Testing over at least one 'Large-size IT Platforms/ Applications'# during the last 03 years (FY 2018-19 to FY 2020-21):</p> <p>a. O&M/ SLA Audits</p> <p>b. Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT) of the services delivered on the Platform through mobile app & web app.</p> <p>c. Security* Audit (Experience of the bidder OR the proposed Partner shall be valid for this activity)</p>	<p>On the experience side, you have asked for the work order and completion certificate, so there are periodical invoices that we submit. Can we submit that along with the work order plus self certification document which you have said, whether that would be considered as in reference?</p>	<p>Refer to the Response to Query/Clarification no. 60</p>
62	Section 11.2.1	Experience of	Experience of different	Refer to the response to

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
	Technical Evaluation Page - 39 Point 2	performing below Audits/ FAT on additional IT Platforms/ Applications: a. O&M/ SLA Audit b. FAT on multilingual mobile/ web app delivered services c. Security Audit	services and the projects which we'll have to deliver and there are different marks have been given for O&M/ SLA, FAT for mobile and languages. This could be of different different experiences of different applications also? It needs not to be that all these criteria has to be met for a single application.	Query/Clarification no. 41 & 60. Also refer to the Corrigendum-1, clause 2 for the amendment in the marking.
63	Section - 11.2.1 Technical Evaluation, Presentation Point 5 Page - 40	Presentation – technical, procedural/ methodology, technology set-up, company’s relevant experience/ skill, unique value proposition (if any), international best practices, standards/ references, comprehension of the requirements, transition (entry/exit) etc	There will be an online presentation and which you will access these points and give the marks	Presentation will be online. No change in requirement
64			What is your typical on-boarding time for the services to be enabled on UMANG platform? Background can you highlight to us, when these new services and additional would be added up. What is that frequency?	Please refer 6.1, para on "Quantum of Work" of the RFP.
65	NA	Performance Testing	Clarity on respect to performance testing i.e., load testing	Not in Scope
66	Section 11.1 Eligibility Criteria Page - 38 Table 9 Point C	Eligibility Criteria, Experience	For security audit, we can use our partner certificate and experience?	Yes
67	Section 11.1	Eligibility Criteria	Project during the last	Project with mentioned

S. No.	RFP Reference (Clause/ Page)	RFP Clause	Clarifications Sought OR Comments of Bidders	NeGD's Comments
	Eligibility Criteria Page - 38 Table 9		three years, suppose we have got the order in 2017-18 and we have completed project during 2018-19 go-live. Will that be considered?	activities (FAT/audit), one or more, should have completed within the period (as mentioned in the RFP) irrespective of the order date.

END OF DOCUMENT