Request for Proposal (RFP)

Design, Development and Maintenance of Integrated Project Management System (IPMS) for BMRCL

Pre-bid Queries and Responses

S.No	Question	Response
Eligibility & Bidder Qualification		
1	If a System Integrator bids as Sole Bidder proposing a premier OEM's COTS platform, is a Manufacturer's Authorization Form (MAF) from the OEM sufficient, or must the OEM be a formal Consortium Member?	A Manufacturer's Authorization Form is sufficient
2	We request this [the 6-project experience requirement] to cover experience in any Enterprise globally across Industries.	This is a technical evaluation requirement under Section 3.3.1, not a Stage 1 pass/fail eligibility criterion. As per Section 3.3.1 the RFP specifically asks for experience in LCPM/infrastructure, Metro/Rail and Public Sector projects. Enterprise software or data-platform implementations may be submitted if relevant, but projects more closely aligned to large-scale construction/infrastructure/metro/public-sector requirements are expected to score higher.
3	For Section 3.2's minimum five-year experience requirement, is the criterion based on the bidder legal entity's age, five years of continuous qualifying technology development/project management/software development operations, or five years specifically in infrastructure project-management solutions?	As per Section 3.2, the bidder must be a legal entity in India and must have minimum 5 years of operations in relevant technology development / LCPM / project management in infrastructure / custom app / software development.
4	For the six project execution reports, must all six relate specifically to large-scale construction/civil infrastructure/metro-rail/public-sector work, or may relevant enterprise software, project-management and data-platform implementations also qualify?	This is a technical evaluation requirement under Section 3.3.1, not a Stage 1 pass/fail eligibility criterion. Projects more closely aligned to large-scale construction/infrastructure/metro/public-sector requirements are expected to score higher.
5	Are the six completed-project records a mandatory pass/fail Stage 1 eligibility condition, or a technical-evaluation (Stage 2) requirement? Please identify the applicable section if evaluated later.	This is a technical evaluation requirement under Section 3.3.1, not a Stage 1 pass/fail eligibility criterion.
6	Must all six project completion certificates be in the bidding legal entity's name? Where no formal certificate was issued, can a signed acceptance letter or project closure confirmation be accepted instead?	Acceptance of alternate evidence such as signed acceptance/closure letters where formal completion certificates are not available may be considered.
7	May the bidder engage disclosed specialist implementation partners for BIM, scheduling and other construction-domain modules? Can those partners' project credentials and named experts be credited in the technical evaluation?	Yes, the bidder may propose specialist implementation partners or OEM/COTS components where relevant. Partner credentials will not be counted toward technical scoring.
8	Are consortium or joint-venture bids permitted? If so, which member must meet the 5-year requirement, and how are project credentials, contractual responsibility and financial capacity assessed across members?	Consortium bids are permitted under the RFP, and the contract will be executed with the Lead Member. The RFP expressly states that Lead Member turnover and headcount will be considered for the relevant criteria.
9	Please confirm there is no Earnest Money Deposit (EMD), bid security or performance bank guarantee required for submission of this RFP.	The RFP does not prescribe any EMD, bid security, bid bond, performance bond or performance bank guarantee requirement for proposal submission. Bidders should follow the submission requirements stated in the RFP.
10	For a reference project (SAIL DPMS) with go-live 31 Aug 2024 but an active 60-month maintenance contract running to Aug 2029, requests confirmation that go-live + 1 year of maintenance counts as 'completed' for eligibility purposes.	The RFP requires projects to have been completed within the specified period. If go-live has occurred and client acceptance/closure evidence is available, it would satisfy the 'completed project definition'
11	Asks whether private-sector projects may satisfy the Relevant Project Experience criterion where the bidder lacks any Government/Public Sector experience, provided the project is comparable in scope/scale/technology/complexity to this RFP.	Private-sector projects of comparable scale/complexity may be submitted as references, but absence of Public Sector credentials may affect technical scoring against the stated criterion.
12	Asks whether the 50-page limit applies per Form/file or to the whole proposal, and what's excluded from the count.	Section 2.2 states that all submission materials should be less than 50 pages each, including annexures, with minimum 12 font size. Project execution reports should not be more than five pages each. CVs, certificate are excluded from the 50 page count.
13	RFP eligibility text says 'completed between Jan 2021-June 2026' but Form 3 says 'start date in last 5 years' — asks which date governs.	Section 3.3.1 states that each project must have been completed in the last 5 financial years, between January 2021 and June 2026. Therefore, the completion/end date is the relevant reference point for the 5-year project window.
14	Asks whether bidder-level ISO 19650 certification is mandatory, or demonstrating CDE/BIM process compliance suffices.	The RFP states that technical submissions must be compliant with ISO 19650 standards and that BIM/CDE processes should comply with ISO 19650.
15	Where an SI proposes an OEM as technology partner (not formal consortium), should the OEM's headcount also be considered alongside the SI's, since core technical support/enhancement is OEM-provided?	No, the OEM's headcount will not be counted.

16	Where final completion certificates are delayed due to RA bill reconciliation, requests that a statutory auditor certificate supported by GST returns be accepted as evidence of project completion.	Acceptance of alternate evidence such as signed acceptance/closure letters where formal completion certificates are not available may be considered.
17	Scoring depends on the product being adopted by 200+ companies, which restricts competitiveness where open-source or multiple smaller products exist in the market.	The intent of this criterion is to assess the maturity, reliability, scalability and implementation track record of the proposed solution, given the criticality of the IPMS platform for BMRCL. The criterion is not intended to restrict competition to any specific product or OEM.
18	RFP scores 1000+ headcount as full marks and <500 as zero, but 50-100 employees is more than adequate for IPMS design/development; this restricts competitiveness.	The headcount criterion is intended to assess organizational capacity, delivery resilience and ability to support a multi-module implementation across solution design, configuration / development, integrations, testing, training, documentation, hypercare and ongoing support within compressed timelines. The RFP does not disqualify bidders solely based on headcount, provided they meet Stage 1 eligibility requirements. Headcount carries limited weight within the overall technical evaluation, and bidders with smaller teams may still score competitively through strong project credentials, solution architecture, implementation approach, team quality, relevant partnerships and delivery methodology.
19	No marks are given for technology companies with integrated-systems implementation experience in government departments, while full marks are given for Metro experience specifically — alleged to defeat competitiveness and transparency.	The evaluation framework recognizes multiple categories of relevant experience, including large-scale construction / infrastructure project management, Metro / Rail sector experience, and public-sector implementation experience. Metro / Rail experience is given importance because the proposed IPMS is intended for a metro infrastructure environment with specific requirements around civil works, systems interfaces, BIM, scheduling, inspections, contractor workflows and project governance. At the same time, relevant government / public-sector integrated systems experience may be submitted and will be evaluated for relevance to the RFP scope.
20	Organization has ~3 years of independent operation but is an authorized Nemetschek partner; asks whether an organization under 5 years may participate based on domain experience, or whether the principal technology organization's/partner's credentials can be considered toward the 5-year requirement.	As per the RFP, the bidder / Lead Member is required to meet the minimum 5-year operations requirement. An organization with ~3 years of independent operation would not meet this requirement as a standalone bidder. Principal technology organization / OEM partner credentials may support the technical proposal where relevant, but would not substitute the mandatory 5-year eligibility requirement for the bidder / Lead Member. The organization may participate as a specialist partner with an eligible bidder / Lead Member, subject to RFP provisions.
21	Organization does not have 2 qualifying Metro/Railway project references; asks whether a bidder without these would still be eligible, or whether an implementation partner's credentials could be considered.	This is a technical evaluation requirement under Section 3.3.1, not a Stage 1 pass/fail eligibility criterion. Yes - a bidder without meeting these criteria would still be eligible. No, the implementation partner's credentials would not be considered.
Functional Scope & Module Requirements		
22	For major IPMS modules (BIM, BoQ/takeoff, scheduling, document management, inspections, reporting), can BMRCL distinguish what's expected to be custom-developed vs. configured on a third-party product vs. integrated with existing BMRCL systems?	Section 4.2.5 sets out the functional requirements for each of the 9 IPMS modules. 2 modules - Daily Update Digitization and Progress Monitoring Dashboards require custom build. However, SI partner is expected to provide their solution which is industry standard, cost effective and scalable in nature for IPMS kind of program at scale.
23	For scheduling, must the IPMS integrate with an existing platform such as Primavera P6 or MS Project, or is native schedule creation/dependency management/critical-path calculation required? Please identify any mandated platform.	No single platform is mandated. Section 4.2.5 requires advanced scheduling capabilities including baseline management, CPM/PERT, critical path, variance analysis, schedule comparison, scenario planning, alerts, and XER/XML import/export.
24	Could BMRCL confirm the definitive module-by-module scope, deliverables and measurable acceptance criteria for each release, including any required pilot, UAT and go-live gates?	The core IPMS module-wise scope is defined in Section 4.2.5, release mapping is defined in Section 5, and payment/acceptance milestones are defined in Section 7. Bidders should base their proposals on these sections. Pilot, SIT/UAT, training, go-live and handover gates are included in the implementation timeline and payment milestones.
25	Kindly clarify whether payment processing and disbursement are expected to be executed within the IPMS or through an existing ERP/financial system, and define the functional boundary between IPMS and ERP.	The IPMS is expected to digitize invoice submission, validation, approval workflows, variation tracking and integration with contract/BoQ/progress/ERP systems. The ERP/finance system is expected to remain the system of record for financial/payment processing, with IPMS supporting workflow, validation, traceability and reporting.
26	Notes that a standard COTS solution would not have a custom-build component by definition, and asks whether BMRCL's preferred approach is (a) a market-available SaaS/OEM solution using predominantly OOTB capabilities, or (b) a custom-built/platform-based solution minimizing OEM dependency. Also asks whether capabilities may be sourced predominantly from a single OEM platform not packaged in the RFP's 9-module structure.	The RFP is technology-neutral and permits bidders to propose an appropriate combination of OOTB/COTS/SaaS and custom components. It expects use of industry-standard COTS solutions where suitable, while keeping custom-built components as needed. A single OEM platform may be proposed if it meets all functional, technical, integration, security, interoperability, portability and commercial requirements across the 9-module scope.
27	Asks whether Digital Partner must supply BIM authoring licenses, or only a federation/viewing/clash platform, given DDC authors models.	The RFP requires the IPMS to support BIM using 3D models, import/manage/view models from leading authoring tools, support model validation, clash detection, collaboration, ISO 19650 and COBie. BIM authoring as well as federation, hosting, viewing and clash detection is in the digital partner's scope
28	Asks whether the Automated Quantity Take-off requirement is limited to extraction/computation of quantities directly from 3D/BIM models.	No. The Automated BoQ/Takeoff requirement includes extraction from both 2D drawings and 3D BIM models. The RFP specifically mentions DWG, PDF, RVT, IFC and DGN input support, dynamic updates with design changes, BoQ/cost mapping, auditability and traceability.

29	Asks whether the Central Mobile Application requirement mandates a new custom build, or whether existing OEM mobile apps with native integrated access may be proposed instead.	BMRCL currently has a custom mobile application, which the selected SI can integrate and enhance with the proposed IPMS platform/ develop custom mobile app. Bidders may additionally propose OEM/OOTB mobile applications where there is no associated license cost and can support unlimited users.
30	Requests actual (not indicative) peak concurrent users, data volumes, API call volumes and dashboard refresh expectations.	Section 4.1.1 in RFP gives details regarding the indicative usercount. Bidders should size their solution based on the user/concurrency/performance assumptions specified in the RFP, including 100 dashboard users, upto 100 mobile app users.
31	Notes stated throughput targets ('millions of events/second') far exceed what 200 dashboard users need — asks for confirmation these are indicative, not literal sizing requirements.	Bidders should size their solution based on the user/concurrency/performance mentioned in RFP (100 dashboard users, up to 100 mobile app users). For real time (or near real-time) data processing, you may consider throughput ranging from Hundreds to thousands of events per second, with the ability to scale further based on workload requirements.
32	Section 4.3.1 sets fixed throughput/latency SLAs while Section 4.2.3 ties benchmarks to 'the capabilities of the existing infrastructure.' Asks whether the Digital Partner must guarantee the fixed SLAs regardless of infrastructure sizing, and who bears the cost if existing infrastructure cannot support the stated benchmarks.	Bidders should size their solution based on the user/concurrency/performance. Section 4.1.1 in RFP gives details regarding the indicative usercount. Bidders should size their solution based on the user/concurrency/performance assumptions specified in the RFP, including 100 dashboard users, upto 100 mobile app users.
33	Requests the specific criteria/benchmarks (functional test cases, ISO 19650 conformance, open API coverage depth) that will be used to certify a non-listed OEM stack as 'equivalent' for scoring under Section 3.3.1.	Equivalence will be assessed against the functional, technical, performance, security, interoperability, standards and integration requirements stated in the RFP. Section 4.1.1 clarifies that references to named products are indicative only and bidders may propose equivalent or superior technologies.
34	Requests DDC's current Revit version, central-file hosting/worksharing method (ACC/BIM 360/on-prem server), and a sample federated model to validate real-time cloud worksharing compatibility.	This can be provided to selected SI during the low level design phase
35	Must e-signature be legally valid under the IT Act 2000 (Aadhaar eSign/DSC), or is a system-generated visual signature with audit trail enough?	Where a legally valid signature is required, the solution shall support electronic/digital signatures compliant with the Information Technology Act, 2000 and applicable CCA requirements, including DSC and/or approved eSign mechanisms. A system-generated visual signature with audit trail may be used for internal workflow approvals where a legally recognized electronic signature is not specifically required.
36	Notes the WhatsApp Business API cannot read personal group messages; asks who bears Meta/BSP costs.	Whatsapp is an option for communication channel, and the Meta/BCP costs (if opted) would be part of operating expenses
37	IE11 is EOL — can it be dropped? Does Kannada apply to UI only, or also COTS modules/content?	IE11 may be excluded from the supported browser list. The solution shall support current stable versions of modern browsers, including Microsoft Edge, Google Chrome, Mozilla Firefox and Apple Safari. The mobile app / mobile web access shall support current stable Android and iOS versions, with compatibility tested on representative devices. Any OEM / SaaS-specific browser or mobile OS limitations should be clearly disclosed in the proposal. The RFP specifies English and Kannada language support. At minimum, custom portal/app user-facing labels and workflows should support the required languages. It is not mandated for OEM SaaS modules that do not natively support it.
38	Notes iOS doesn't allow full screenshot blocking (only detection/obscuring) — asks if Android-block + iOS-detect is acceptable.	The RFP requires security controls to prevent copying data or taking screenshots on the field app. If full technical blocking is not possible on a platform such as iOS, bidders should propose equivalent platform-appropriate controls such as screenshot detection/obscuring on iOS with proper masking, detection, watermarking, access restrictions and audit logging (whatever is applicable).
39	Section 4.2.6 vs. 4.4.1 give different OS version expectations — can minimum follow OEM app support?	The RFP specifies mobile platform support requirements, including Android 10 and iOS 13 and above, and also expects compatibility with latest OS versions. Proposed OEM mobile apps should meet or exceed the RFP's minimum supported OS requirements. Any deviation should be clearly stated for evaluation.
40	Requests document/drawing volumes, BIM model sizes, photo/video volumes, retention periods.	The RFP defines expected data types and broad performance/scalability requirements, including documents, drawings, images, videos, BIM files and other structured/semi-structured data. Bidders should state sizing assumptions and propose a scalable architecture. Specific details would be provided to the SI vendor during low level design phase
41	Are 'Handover module'/'Contract Module' separate scope, or covered by the 9 solutions?	The current implementation scope is the 9 prioritized IPMS solutions listed in Sections 4.2.5 and 5. References to handover/contract modules are not part of current scope.
42	Is GST e-invoice (IRN/QR) validation required?	Yes. Where GST e-invoicing is applicable to the supplier/transaction, the proposed solution should support validation of the e-invoice IRN and QR code against the applicable GST e-invoicing framework. For invoices not covered under the e-invoicing mandate, the validation shall not be mandatory.
43	Which AI/ML use cases expected by Feb-2027? Is historical data available for training?	AI/ML is out of scope of this RFP and may be part of future phases.
44	Is IPMS scope limited to Phase 3 packages, or should Phase 2A/2B and future phases also be onboarded? Please list corridors/packages/work fronts in scope.	As of now, the RFP is for IPMS implementation for BMRCL, with the 9 prioritized modules for Phase 3 package. Exact corridors/packages/work fronts to be onboarded will be confirmed. However, the solution should be such that can be adopted for future/other phases as well.

45	Requests branding/UI guidelines; is GIGW/WCAG compliance required?	GIGW is mandatory and WCAG may not be mandatory, but bidders may propose accessibility-aligned UI/UX standards and request branding inputs during implementation. It would be considered as an additional and optional requirement. Additionally, they should follow GoI guidelines.
46	Requests confirmation of the overall IPMS solution boundary across document/workflow, 3D BIM viewer with clash detection/takeoff, 4D/5D BIM, mobile field app, and dashboards.	The individual IPMS module solution expectation, no. of users, have been provided in the RFP section 4.2.5.
47	Asks whether invoice/variation digitization may be fulfilled via a digital workflow where invoices are submitted as documents/records routed through configured multi-level review/validation/approval with audit trail, rather than a purpose-built billing module.	Yes, a configurable document-workflow platform is acceptable for Invoice & Variation Digitization; a separate billing module is not mandated. Bidders must still demonstrate how BoQ validation, tax/budget checks, and variation cost-impact tracking (Section 4.3) are met in the proposed solution and complying with the requirements provided in RFP
48	Asks whether the Central Web Portal requirement may be met via an OEM SaaS landing page providing unified access, linking/embedding external BI reports (e.g., Power BI) via secure integration/SSO.	Central web portal refers to an external web portal that provides a unified landing page for various individual webpages/dashboards in order to increase user experience. This would be used not only for IPMS but for other applications/digital solutions in future too. However, SI partner can share their point of view if that meets the requirements of the specifications given in the RFP.
49	The RFP names specific product tools as preferable in the technology stack table.	As per Section 4.1.1, the RFP clearly states clause on Technology neutrality: References in this RFP to any OEM, brand, software product, platform or technology are intended only to indicate the required functionality, interoperability requirement or an illustrative technology choice and shall be deemed to include “or equivalent”, unless expressly stated otherwise for reasons of compatibility with an existing BMRCL system. Bidders are free to propose equivalent or superior technologies meeting the functional, performance, security and interoperability requirements. No bidder shall receive additional marks merely for proposing a product, OEM or technology specifically named in this RFP.
50	For Daily Update Digitization, would BMRCL accept a custom-developed application with a shared backend architecture, restricting OEM platform licenses only to designated approvers/administrators?	BMRCL currently has a custom mobile application, which the selected SI can integrate and enhance with the proposed IPMS platform/ develop custom mobile app. Bidders may additionally propose OEM/OOTB mobile applications where there is no associated license cost and can support unlimited users.
Commercial & Licensing		
51	Which third-party software/licenses/cloud subscriptions are already available from BMRCL, and which must be procured and priced by the Digital Partner? Please clarify ownership and renewal responsibility.	Assume all licenses required for the build would need to be procured. The licenses need to be procured on behalf of BMRCL. Existing licenses available with BMRCL are: •Autodesk AutoCAD •Autodesk Architecture, Engineering, and Construction (AEC) suite incl. Revit and Navisworks Additional licenses to be procured by Digital Partner. Any costs and responsibilities arising after 15 February 2027 shall be separately arranged and borne by BMRCL post this period.
52	Requests confirmation, module-wise for each of the 9 solutions, of expected user-license counts and license tenure (implementation period vs. ongoing maintenance), plus guidance on presenting costs where an OEM's commercial packaging doesn't map cleanly to the RFP's 9-module structure.	Section 4.1.1 in RFP gives details regarding the indicative usercount. The same is also published separately in the corrigendum.
53	Notes the RFP states 200 Dashboard Users, 80–100 concurrent dashboard users, and 800-to-few-thousand Mobile App Users. Asks explicitly which figures bidders should use for license costing, and whether concurrent users (not just total) should factor into licensing.	Section 4.1.1 in RFP gives details regarding the indicative usercount. The same is also published separately in the corrigendum. Bidders should size their solution based on the user/concurrency/performance assumptions specified in the RFP, including 100 dashboard users, upto 100 mobile app users.
54	Upon contract transfer/handover to BMRCL, what are the required arrangements for custom-developed IP and source code, third-party licenses, cloud accounts, data, and ongoing maintenance/support responsibility?	Handover requirements are set out in Sections 2.1.2 and 6. For custom components, extensions, integrations, scripts, APIs, workflows, dashboards, reports, data models, automation logic and configurations developed for BMRCL, the Digital Partner must hand over relevant source code, configurations, documentation, deployment artefacts, test scripts and operating manuals.
55	We request 70% of payment to be cleared at Milestone 3B — Release 1 testing, training and acceptance.	Payment milestones are defined in Section 7. Bidders should base their commercial proposals on the published payment schedule unless formally revised.
56	The RFP's initial contract is ~4 months but commercial quotes must remain valid as ceiling rates for 3 years. Requests clarification on post-contract licensing/maintenance arrangement and whether ceiling rates are fixed for 3 years or subject to indexation.	The RFP states that commercial quotes shall remain valid as ceiling rates for 3 years from project initiation, unless otherwise agreed through an applicable procurement process.
57	Confirms whether established OEM/SaaS solutions with recurring subscription costs are acceptable, provided the licensing model is optimized and transparently presented.	Yes, this is acceptable provided license requirements/ costs are clearly identified in the commercial proposal.
58	For established OEM SaaS solutions, mobile access may be subject to the OEM's standard user/subscription licensing model. Asks whether this is acceptable provided license requirements/costs are clearly identified in the commercial proposal.	Yes, this is acceptable provided license requirements/ costs are clearly identified in the commercial proposal. Proposed solution should look to optimize the license costs by using a mix of off-the-shelf and custom built solutions

59	Asks if unlimited-user requirement can be met via custom front-end pushing to COTS back-end via integration accounts.	Yes, if an OEM per-seat/subscription model is proposed, the bidder must ensure the commercial proposal fully covers the required user base and does not result in unpriced additional cost to BMRCL.
60	Asks whether the 40-person-hour AMC change-request allowance is a cumulative pool or applies per individual task.	Section 8.4 states that change requests requiring effort up to 40 person-hours per task shall be covered under the Annual Maintenance/Support Contract at no additional cost. Therefore, the threshold is stated on a per-task basis.
61	Requests the methodology for commercially comparing perpetual vs. subscription licensing models, including whether subscription costs are evaluated over a defined period (e.g., 5 years) against perpetual + maintenance costs.	Commercial evaluation will be based on the three-year total cost of ownership NPV, as defined in Section 3.4, to enable comparison of perpetual and subscription-based licensing models. Bidders shall separately identify: (i) Implementation costs under the current contract up to 15th February 2027; and (ii) O&M and recurring costs from 16 February 2027 onward, which will be arranged and borne by BMRCL. The three-year evaluation horizon is for commercial evaluation and lifecycle-cost comparison purposes and does not extend the current implementation contract beyond 15 February 2027.
62	Asks whether, for an OOTB SaaS solution, costs for implementation/configuration/enablement/migration/integration/reporting may be reported under 'Implementation/Build Cost' given there's no core-product 'build' in the traditional sense.	Yes. For OOTB/SaaS solutions, implementation/configuration, enablement, migration, integration, testing, training, documentation and project-specific extensions should be reported under the relevant implementation/build cost lines.
63	Asks BMRCL to confirm production cloud costs are paid directly by BMRCL and excluded from bid TCO, or specify sizing basis if included.	The RFP requires the bidder to provide a comprehensive BOM and commercial break-up including cloud resources, software licenses and subscriptions required for deployment. Production hosting cost treatment should be included in the bidder's TCO assumptions.
64	Payment for OEM software subscription should be paid within 30 days of invoice at contract start, not milestone-based, consistent with standard OEM subscription commercial terms.	Payment terms are as per Section 7 milestones. Any separate upfront payment treatment for OEM software subscriptions that is not specified in the RFP and would require approval internal team. Bidders should price OEM subscriptions in the commercial bid and state payment assumptions.
65	Should Unifier/P6 licenses for contractors be included in the bid, or will contractors buy their own?	Contractors will procure their licenses independently based on BMRCL suite
66	Asks for a final integration list per release, and confirmation that systems discovered later are handled via change request, not fixed-price scope.	Section 4.2.7 lists indicative integrations and also states that additional critical systems discovered during implementation may require API-based integrations. Bidders should price and plan for integrations reasonably inferable from the RFP and clearly state assumptions.
67	Asks if the unlimited-user requirement can be met via a custom app posting through licensed service accounts rather than named licenses.	Yes, this is acceptable provided license requirements/ costs are clearly identified in the commercial proposal and it is cost effective.
68	For an OOTB (COTS) solution, both the license & source code transfer is not feasible — requests confirmation that handover applies to project-specific configurations/workflows/scripts, while proprietary OEM components remain under standard OEM licensing.	Handover requirements are set out in Sections 2.1.2 and 6. For custom components, extensions, integrations, scripts, APIs, workflows, dashboards, reports, data models, automation logic and configurations developed for BMRCL, the Digital Partner must hand over relevant source code, configurations, documentation, deployment artefacts, test scripts and operating manuals.
	General guidance overall on commercial and licensing:	General clarification applicable to Questions 51–68: The current JICA-funded implementation contract covers all implementation activities, deliverables and associated costs required up to and including 15th February 2027, including production go-live, handover and completion of the 30-day hypercare period. From 16 February 2027 onward, O&M will be separately arranged by BMRCL. Bidders shall clearly separate: (i) One-time implementation costs and costs incurred up to 15 February 2027; and (ii) O&M, license renewal, subscription, cloud hosting, support and other recurring costs arising from 16 February 2027 onward. All licenses, subscriptions, cloud accounts, administrative rights, data and project-specific configurations required for continued operation shall be transferred or made available to BMRCL by 15 February 2027. References to three-year TCO, ceiling rates or future services are for commercial evaluation and BMRCL's O&M planning and do not extend the current implementation contract or guarantee future work.
Technical Architecture & Integration		
69	What technology stack is the current BMRCL data lake built on (e.g., Azure Synapse, AWS Redshift, Databricks), and are data pipelines currently exposed via APIs?	There is no cloud setup (or datalake) in BMRCL currently and SI partner is expected to set it up as per clause 4.2.3 and the integration between the IPMS platform and cloud should be using API or equivalent.
70	Requests current DPR formats, shift structure, data captured.	The current platform build is considered as a greenfield deployment and SI expected to either create, suggest or reuse existing data during low level design document.
71	Requests detailed integration scope for on-premises data sources, including interface specifications, APIs, data structures, workflow documentation and sample data specifically for the SIMPLE platform and Axpert dashboards, for integration/migration planning.	As per RFP, the integration of the IPMS platform with on-premise and any other data sources should be based on API. In case, API is not available or not supported by the data source, SI vendor may suggest any other integration method.

72	Proposes Bentley Systems as OEM, whose BIC solution is delivered as a fully-managed, OEM-hosted SaaS (MeitY-compliant) rather than provisioned within BMRCL's own cloud tenancy. Requests confirmation this is acceptable in lieu of deployment in BMRCL's own tenancy or on-premises.	Yes, an OEM-hosted, fully managed SaaS deployment may be proposed, provided it meets BMRCL's functional, security, data residency, interoperability, integration, governance, portability and operational requirements. The RFP remains platform-neutral and cloud-agnostic.
73	The RFP reserves BMRCL's right to migrate build/custom components from the Vendor's environment to BMRCL's own cloud infrastructure at any point. Asks whether this is expected to be exercised proactively (dev/test hosted in BMRCL's tenancy from Day 1) or only as a contingency, and if contingency, what IaC/portability standard (e.g., Terraform, containerized builds) bidders should assume.	As per section 4.2.3, Vendor shall provision, bear the Cloud Infra costs Dev, SIT and UAT and migrate to BMRCL's own cloud infra before go-live for which SI partner would share the plan and method.
74	Is OEM-hosted SaaS acceptable with only custom components in BMRCL's tenancy, given RFP requires infra 'within BMRCL cloud tenancy'?	Yes, an OEM-hosted, fully managed SaaS deployment may be proposed, provided it meets BMRCL's functional, security, data residency, interoperability, integration, governance, portability and operational requirements. The RFP remains platform-neutral and cloud-agnostic.
75	Requests BMRCL's existing Cloud Service Provider(s) (Azure/AWS/GCP), current subscription/tenancy structure, and the access level (Owner/Contributor/scoped resource group) the Digital Partner receives at contract start.	There is no cloud setup (or datalake) in BMRCL currently and SI partner is expected to set it up as per clause 4.2.3. The choice of cloud remains open and SI partner may consider any cloud that meets the given security, scalability and other requirement provided in RFP.
76	Requests SIMPLE/Axpert API documentation, data model, workflow list before bid submission, and asks if Agile Labs is obliged to support integration, at whose cost.	As per RFP, the integration of the IPMS platform with on-premise and any other data sources should be based on API. In case, API is not available or not supported by the data source, SI vendor may suggest any other integration method. The concerned IT team would provide necessary support to SI from source system for the integration.
77	Asks whether an existing ICT API/ingestion specification (schema, auth model, endpoints) already exists, or will be co-designed with the ICT team during implementation — and if co-designed, by which week it should be finalized.	The RFP requires integration with the Integrated Control Tower through secure API-based KPI exchange, real-time/batch updates, data normalization and validation. The ICT ingestion/API specification would be provided to SI partner during the Low level design.
78	The RFP reserves BMRCL's right to migrate build/custom components from the Vendor's environment to BMRCL's own cloud infrastructure at any point. Asks whether this is expected to be exercised proactively (dev/test hosted in BMRCL's tenancy from Day 1) or only as a contingency, and if contingency, what IaC/portability standard (e.g., Terraform, containerized builds) bidders should assume.	As per section 4.2.3, Vendor shall provision, bear the Cloud Infra costs Dev, SIT and UAT and migrate to BMRCL's own cloud infra before go-live for which SI partner would share the plan and method.
79	Asks if OEM-hosted SaaS is acceptable outside BMRCL's tenancy, and whether an exception process exists for non-India-hosted SaaS.	SaaS is acceptable with data residency within India
80	Requests an inventory of specific contractor/subcontractor systems currently in use across active packages (e.g., which ERP/scheduling tools each EPC contractor uses), to scope integration effort per package.	This platform would be used for Phase 3 for which Contractor/subcontractor is being finalized by BMRCL. These details may be provided to the selected SI partner at later stage during low level design phase.
81	Requests an inventory (source systems, approximate record/document volumes, formats) of historical data expected to migrate into IPMS/CDE, and whether migration is a distinct Section 5 milestone or embedded within each module's build phase.	SI partner may assume data volume, number of source systems etc. for the historical data migration and include this in response.
82	Should contractor data flow via BMRCL-hosted APIs/SFTP, or connectors into each contractor's platform?	SI partner is expected to suggest best practice on this. However, as per RFP, API first approach is adopted by BMRCL wherever applicable.
83	Requests RPO/RTO targets, DR region, backup policy.	Bidders should propose RPO/RTO assumptions and a backup/DR approach aligned with the required 99.5% application availability and support requirements.
84	Is ICT live or under development? Vendor, technology, ingestion API spec.	Integrated Control Tower is currently live and built using Axpert platform (an ERP platform). More details would be shared during the low level design phase
85	Requests ICT status/vendor/interface, and asks if the ICT team is obliged to cooperate on validation/sign-off timelines.	Yes, ICT team would provide necessary support for integration and any source system specific support required.
86	Should CDE be a document/model repository with the data lake as analytics store, or one combined platform?	This is a central data platform with Datalake as analytics store.
87	Will the ERP team build ERP-side interfaces, or is the Digital Partner responsible for both ends?	ERP team would provide ERP-side API availability and exposure. Bidders should state assumptions and integration dependencies.
88	Requests clarification on why ready-to-use software/SaaS is preferred, restricting deployment to cloud only and preventing on-premise hosting.	The RFP states that the Bidder may propose SaaS, cloud-hosted, on-premises or hybrid licensing/ deployment models, or an appropriate combination thereof, based on the functional and non-functional requirements of IPMS. No preference is given to either and the bidder is free to propose deployment model with clear rationale
Security, Compliance & Data Governance		

89	Requests clarification on what evidence is required for the license-adoption-scale metric (global and Indian user companies), and whether an OEM certificate of installed base would be accepted.	The bidder shall submit documentary evidence to substantiate the license-adoption / installed-base criterion for both global and Indian customer organizations. An OEM-issued certificate or declaration confirming the installed base may be accepted, provided it is on the OEM's letterhead, duly authorized, clearly states the relevant customer counts, and is supported by verifiable references/details if requested by BMRCL. BMRCL reserves the right to seek additional supporting documentation for validation.
90	Requests clarification on VAPT cadence/scope, and whether it applies during implementation as well as hypercare/AMC.	The RFP requires VAPT before production release for custom components, integrations, central web portal, mobile app and common landing page, along with remediation.
91	Asks whether 'major production release' means each of Release 1 and Release 2 requires its own VAPT cycle, and whether remediation time is already built into the Section 5 milestone dates.	The RFP requires penetration testing before major production release and support for annual VAPT. VAPT cycle can be done before Milestone 5 for all the modules.
92	Must VAPT use a CERT-In empanelled auditor, and who pays? Should Years 2-3 VAPT be priced in AMS?	The SI partner should include the cost for VAPT.SI partner is also expected to support and mitigate all findings during VAPT. Year 2-3 VAPT cost should not be part of AMS.
93	The RFP states '90–95% unit test coverage for new code' in one place and 'Unit Test coverage >80%' in a quality-gate table in the same section, for what appears to be the same requirement. Requests the binding threshold.	Overall unit test coverage shall be maintained above 80% as a mandatory quality gate, while new or materially modified code should target 90–95% unit test coverage Bidders should aim to meet the higher threshold for new code and at minimum satisfy the quality gate.
94	For OOTB/SaaS modules named as indicative (e.g., Autodesk Construction Cloud, Trimble Connect, Aconex), asks which currently offer India-region hosting, and whether a compensating-control exception process exists for non-India-hosted SaaS.	The RFP requires data localization with regional storage in India on corresponding cloud and SaaS services used and there is no exception to it. Bidders should disclose data residency for each proposed component.
95	Notes HIPAA/FedRAMP are US-specific and don't apply to Indian public infrastructure; asks if ISO 27001/27017/27018 and SOC 2 suffice.	Bidders should comply with applicable security, privacy and audit requirements relevant to the proposed solution, deployment model and data handled. You may exclude HIPAA and FedRAMP as they are not mandatory
96	Beyond India residency, do MeitY empanelment/CERT-In/GoK rules apply? Do backups/logs also need to stay in India?	The RFP requires compliance with recognized standards and applicable government guidelines, data residency/localization requirements, and security controls. Specific applicability of MeitY empanelment, CERT-In, Government of Karnataka hosting rules, and backup/log residency also apply. Yes, backups and logs must also remain within India
97	Which privacy requirements apply (DPDP Act 2023, IS 17428) — worker photos, geo-location, WhatsApp data?	The RFP requires compliance with applicable data security, privacy and government guidelines, including encryption, RBAC, audit logging and secure handling of data. Bidders should assume compliance with applicable Indian data protection requirements and propose controls for photographs, geo-location and WhatsApp-derived data.
98	Is India-region hosting mandatory for every SaaS module, or only for BMRCL-owned data repositories and data stores?	Data residency is applicable for SaaS as well as custom solutions.
99	For OEM SaaS components, can VAPT compliance be demonstrated through existing OEM security certifications (ISO 27001, SOC 2, etc.) instead of conducting direct platform-level VAPT?	RFP Section 4.3's VAPT clause lists the components in scope for penetration testing as "Custom build components, Various integrations, Central Web Portal and mobile app, Common landing page. For OEM SaaS core components, existing OEM security certifications (ISO 27001, SOC 2, etc.) may be submitted in place of direct platform-level VAPT. BMRCL retains the right to request VAPT or additional evidence for any component where OEM certification doesn't clearly cover the specific risk surface relevant to this deployment
Delivery, Team & Implementation		
100	Is a full-time onsite delivery team in Bengaluru mandatory? If so, which roles and minimum onsite coverage are required, and which activities may be performed remotely from other Indian locations?	Preference would be given to teams who can be deployed out of Bangalore and would be available in the BMRCL office as required. At a minimum the following roles would need to be colocated out of Bengaluru - Project Lead/ Manager, Solution / Infrastructure Architect, Integration Architect, Delivery Manager, Technology Lead, Metro/Infra mgmt. expert, Construction mgmt. expert, BIM expert, Project controls expert
101	Are you flexible for PAN India resource deployment as a hybrid model?	Preference would be given to teams who can be deployed out of Bangalore and would be available in the BMRCL office as required. At a minimum the following roles would need to be colocated out of Bengaluru - Project Lead/ Manager, Solution / Infrastructure Architect, Integration Architect, Delivery Manager, Technology Lead, Metro/Infra mgmt. expert, Construction mgmt. expert, BIM expert, Project controls expert
102	Considering the extent of customization and integration envisaged under the RFP, kindly confirm whether the stated contract completion date of 15 February 2027 may be suitably extended, if required, based on the finalized scope and implementation complexity.	The contract completion date is 15 February 2027 as specified in the RFP. No extension of the contract period will be allowed under any circumstances. While the completion date may be advanced if the work is completed earlier than planned, it cannot be extended.
103	Notes that Milestone 5 ('Production Go-live') acceptance criteria reads "all 9 modules functional in staging," despite the milestone itself being production go-live, and asks whether this should read 'production' instead.	The acceptance criteria for Milestone 5 would be All 9 modules functional in production setup.
104	How many sites/work fronts, connectivity quality, longest offline period to support?	The mobile app should support offline functionality, automatic synchronization, geo-tagged/time-stamped updates and field usage across civil and systems users. Exact number of active work fronts/sites and connectivity conditions are not specified as Phase 3 is yet to begin
105	Asks if bidders may propose alternative release sequencing (e.g., moving Scheduling to Release 1 to feed initial dashboards).	Bidder may propose an alternative deployment method in their proposal as long as the overall timeline for all modules are respected.

106	At cutover, should open RFIs/NCRs/bills migrate, or be closed in legacy systems?	Migration of relevant historical and current data is required where relevant to support the IPMS platform
107	Requests number of users to train per role, locations/mode, and whether train-the-trainer is acceptable.	Bidders to provide capability building, training and documentation plans, including end-user training, admin training, SOPs, user manuals and knowledge transfer. Specific user counts, training locations and role-wise batches are not prescribed. A train-the-trainer model may be proposed, along with direct training for key user groups.
108	Requests a 2–3 week extension of the submission deadline (to 14 or 21 October 2026), citing: solution design complexity across 9 modules and CDE/integration/security architecture; time needed for written OEM licensing/hosting/rights-transfer confirmations; lead time to obtain client completion certificates (several public sector); lead time to confirm and certify 6 named experts at 100% availability; and dependency of 3-year NPV commercial preparation on OEM confirmations. Also requests query responses be circulated to all bidders at least 7 days before the revised submission date.	The timeline for submission has been extended to 6th October, 2026. The responses to the queries will be published on JICA website.
109	Asks whether the requested development-resource rate card is intended for project-specific services (integrations, reports, extensions, configuration) rather than core product source-code modification, which OEMs typically don't permit.	As per RFP, it is expected from SI partner in order to execute for additional scope that may need to be included in the future. It typically doesn't include product source-code modification, which OEMs typically don't permit.
110	Alleges the post-handholding O&M clause does not provide a knowledge transfer mechanism to the client's IT team.	Section 4.2.3 clearly states that the Vendor shall provide all necessary assistance, including knowledge transfer, configuration details, and support, to ensure a smooth transition without additional cost to BMRCL.
111	Requests clarification on the definition of project start date ('T') and whether the referenced 17-week implementation schedule includes hypercare/support activities or only implementation and rollout.	“T” refers to the effective project start date / contract commencement date, to be finalized at the time of award and onboarding. The 17-week schedule refers to the end-to-end implementation plan defined in the RFP milestones, including production go-live, documentation, handover and the 30-day hypercare completion milestone. Bidders should plan their delivery schedule accordingly, including defect closure, stabilization, support transition and AMC / steady-state support planning within the overall milestone framework.