

राष्ट्रीय अवसंरचना वित्तपोषण और विकास बैंक (नैबफिड)

National Bank for Financing Infrastructure and Development (NaBFID)

Ref: NaBFID / IS / RFP / 14/ C2

Corrigendum-II for Procurement, Implementation and Management of Cloud-based Digital Rights Management Solution and Cloud-based Endpoint Patch Management and Security Solution (**Ref: NaBFID / IS / RFP/14 dated September 30, 2026**) - **GEM Bid Ref No: GEM/2026/B/ 8101289**

Date of release of the corrigendum: October 26, 2026

Corrigendum – Part A:

Sr No	RFP Clause	Existing Clause			Amended Clause
1	Index	9.	Deliverables & Implementation Timelines.....	21	The Index contents (Sr. No. #9 - #39) may be read as Sr. No. #7 - #37.
		10.	Cost of bidding.....	21	
		11.	Language of bid.....	21	
		12.	Services and Adherence to Standards.....	22	
		13.	Clarification and Amendments on RFP/ Pre-Bid Meeting:	22	
		14.	Contents of Bid Document.....	22	
		15.	Bid Preparation & Submission.....	23	
		16.	Period of Bid Validity.....	23	
		17.	Bid Integrity.....	23	
		18.	Bid Security/ EMD (Refundable).....	23	
		19.	Amendment of Bidding Documents.....	24	
		20.	Authorization to Bid.....	24	
		21.	Technical & Commercial bids.....	25	

		22.	Rejection of Bid.....	26			
		23.	RFP Clarifications/ Bidder's queries.....	26			
		24.	Technical Bid Evaluation.....	26			
		25.	Evaluation Methodology.....	27			
		26.	Awarding of contracts / Projects.....	28			
		27.	Penalties & Payment Terms.....	28			
		28.	Right to Audit.....	30			
		29.	Sub-Contracting.....	31			
		30.	Limitation of Liability.....	31			
		31.	Confidentiality.....	31			
		32.	Delay in Service Provider's Performance.....	32			
		33.	Service Provider's Obligation.....	32			
		34.	Liquidated Damages.....	32			
		35.	Termination for Default.....	33			
		36.	Force Majeure.....	33			
		37.	Disputes/ Arbitration (Applicable only in case of successful bidders)	34			
		38.	RFP Ownership.....	35			
		39.	Tender/ RFP Cancellation.....	36			
2	Annexure I Functional and Technical Compliance Sheet II. Cloud-based Endpoint Patch management and Security (EMS) solution	Sr. No.	Solution Capabilities	Compliance (Yes/ No)	Sr. No.	Solution Capabilities	Compliance (Yes/ No)
		9	The solution shall support peer-assisted delivery, an existing endpoint as cache/distribution point, remote caching and content pre-staging without requiring a dedicated server.		9	The solution shall support distributed content delivery to remote offices, allowing existing endpoints or designated systems to act as local distribution points that cache and serve software packages, patches, and other content to endpoints – reducing bandwidth consumption without requiring a dedicated server at every remote location.	
		13	Centrally manage agent settings and staged, unattended upgrades; show versions and failures and support recovery/rollback where available.				
		16	The solution shall protect agents against unauthorised stop/uninstall; disclose and control CPU, memory, disk and network usage.		13	The solution shall be able to centrally manage agent settings and staged, unattended upgrades; show versions	

		24	The solution shall identify prerequisites, dependencies, supersedence, conflicts and required sequencing before deployment.				and failures and support recovery where available.	
		27	The solution shall provide approved patch-policy templates with versioning for assessment, approval, testing, deployment, exclusion, retry, reboot and reporting.			16	The solution shall protect agents against unauthorised stop/uninstall; and monitor CPU, memory, disk and network usage.	
		29	The solution shall support patch approval workflows, risk acceptance, time-bound exceptions, exception ownership, expiry and escalation for overdue or failed remediation.			24	The solution shall be capable to identify prerequisites, dependencies, supersedence, conflicts and required sequencing before deployment.	
		32	The solution shall apply maker-checker approval, confirmation and full audit to high-risk or bulk actions.			27	The solution shall provide approved patch-policies for approval, testing, deployment, exclusion, retry, reboot and reporting.	
		45	The solution shall maintain secure software-supply-chain controls for hosted repositories, agents, connectors and content delivery; provide an SBOM and disclose third-party dependencies.			29	The solution shall support patch approvals, patch exclusions, and notifications for failed deployments.	
		58	Remote-control chat, collaboration, session handover, keyboard/mouse lock and file transfer shall be configurable; file transfer shall be disabled by default unless authorised.			32	The solution shall provide comprehensive auditing of all high-risk and bulk actions performed within the solution.	
		61	The solution shall support controlled file, folder or registry permission changes and remote registry editing capabilities with approval, rollback and audit controls.			45	The solution shall maintain secure software-supply-chain controls for hosted repositories, agents, connectors and content delivery; and disclose third-party dependencies.	
		68	The solution shall integrate with ITSM (Freshworks) for ticket			58	The solution shall provide configurable options for view-only sessions, keyboard/mouse lock, and monitor blackening.	
						61	The solution shall support controlled file, folder or registry permission changes and remote registry editing capabilities and audit controls.	

			creation, assignment, tracking, asset lifecycle and verification, with configurable field mapping, workflows and automated synchronisation.		68	The solution shall support integration with ITSM (Freshservice).																																																																																																					
3	Payment Terms	<u>Payment Terms</u> Following payment terms will be followed during the project implementation/ period: For cloud-based DRM solution: <table><tr><th>SL No</th><th>Payment Milestone</th><th colspan="3">Payment [% of Project Cost] [1T of Commercial bid doc]</th></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>Delivery of licenses of all components</td><td colspan="3">50% (Payment schedule below)</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>(at Start of) Year 1</td><td>(at Start of) Year 2</td><td>(at Start of) Year 3</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>20%</td><td>20%</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>2.</td><td>Implementation UAT sign-off</td><td colspan="3">10%</td></tr><tr><td>3.</td><td>Production sign-off</td><td colspan="3">25%</td></tr><tr><td>4.</td><td>Submission of 5% BG</td><td colspan="3">5%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="5">Recurring Cost</td></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any</td><td colspan="3">Half-yearly, in advance</td></tr></table> For cloud-based EMS solution: <table><tr><th>SL No</th><th>Payment Milestone</th><th colspan="3">Payment [% of Project Cost] [2T of Commercial bid doc]</th></tr></table>			SL No	Payment Milestone	Payment [% of Project Cost] [1T of Commercial bid doc]			1.	Delivery of licenses of all components	50% (Payment schedule below)					(at Start of) Year 1	(at Start of) Year 2	(at Start of) Year 3			20%	20%	10%	2.	Implementation UAT sign-off	10%			3.	Production sign-off	25%			4.	Submission of 5% BG	5%			Recurring Cost					1.	Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any	Half-yearly, in advance			SL No	Payment Milestone	Payment [% of Project Cost] [2T of Commercial bid doc]			<u>Payment Terms</u> Following payment terms will be followed during the project implementation/ period: For cloud-based DRM solution: <table><tr><th>SL No</th><th>Payment Milestone</th><th colspan="3">Payment [% of Project Cost] [1T of Commercial bid doc]</th></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>Delivery of licenses of all components</td><td colspan="3">60% (Payment schedule below)</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>(at Start of) Year 1</td><td>(at Start of) Year 2</td><td>(at Start of) Year 3</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>20%</td><td>20%</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>2.</td><td>Implementation UAT sign-off</td><td colspan="3">10%</td></tr><tr><td>3.</td><td>Production sign-off</td><td colspan="3">25%</td></tr><tr><td>4.</td><td>Submission of 5% BG</td><td colspan="3">5%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="5">Recurring Cost</td></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any</td><td colspan="3">Half-yearly, in advance</td></tr></table> For cloud-based EMS solution: <table><tr><th>SL No</th><th>Payment Milestone</th><th colspan="3">Payment [% of Project Cost] [2T of Commercial bid doc]</th></tr></table>			SL No	Payment Milestone	Payment [% of Project Cost] [1T of Commercial bid doc]			1.	Delivery of licenses of all components	60% (Payment schedule below)					(at Start of) Year 1	(at Start of) Year 2	(at Start of) Year 3			20%	20%	20%	2.	Implementation UAT sign-off	10%			3.	Production sign-off	25%			4.	Submission of 5% BG	5%			Recurring Cost					1.	Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any	Half-yearly, in advance			SL No	Payment Milestone	Payment [% of Project Cost] [2T of Commercial bid doc]		
SL No	Payment Milestone	Payment [% of Project Cost] [1T of Commercial bid doc]																																																																																																									
1.	Delivery of licenses of all components	50% (Payment schedule below)																																																																																																									
		(at Start of) Year 1	(at Start of) Year 2	(at Start of) Year 3																																																																																																							
		20%	20%	10%																																																																																																							
2.	Implementation UAT sign-off	10%																																																																																																									
3.	Production sign-off	25%																																																																																																									
4.	Submission of 5% BG	5%																																																																																																									
Recurring Cost																																																																																																											
1.	Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any	Half-yearly, in advance																																																																																																									
SL No	Payment Milestone	Payment [% of Project Cost] [2T of Commercial bid doc]																																																																																																									
SL No	Payment Milestone	Payment [% of Project Cost] [1T of Commercial bid doc]																																																																																																									
1.	Delivery of licenses of all components	60% (Payment schedule below)																																																																																																									
		(at Start of) Year 1	(at Start of) Year 2	(at Start of) Year 3																																																																																																							
		20%	20%	20%																																																																																																							
2.	Implementation UAT sign-off	10%																																																																																																									
3.	Production sign-off	25%																																																																																																									
4.	Submission of 5% BG	5%																																																																																																									
Recurring Cost																																																																																																											
1.	Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any	Half-yearly, in advance																																																																																																									
SL No	Payment Milestone	Payment [% of Project Cost] [2T of Commercial bid doc]																																																																																																									

		<table><tr><td>1.</td><td>Delivery of licenses of all components</td><td>50% (Payment schedule below)<table><tr><td>(at Start of) Year 1</td><td>(at Start of) Year 2</td><td>(at Start of) Year 3</td></tr><tr><td>20%</td><td>20%</td><td>10%</td></tr></table></td></tr><tr><td>2.</td><td>Implementation UAT sign-off</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>3.</td><td>Production sign-off</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td>4.</td><td>Submission of 5% BG</td><td>5%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Recurring Cost</td></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any</td><td>Half-yearly, in advance</td></tr></table>	1.	Delivery of licenses of all components	50% (Payment schedule below) <table><tr><td>(at Start of) Year 1</td><td>(at Start of) Year 2</td><td>(at Start of) Year 3</td></tr><tr><td>20%</td><td>20%</td><td>10%</td></tr></table>	(at Start of) Year 1	(at Start of) Year 2	(at Start of) Year 3	20%	20%	10%	2.	Implementation UAT sign-off	10%	3.	Production sign-off	25%	4.	Submission of 5% BG	5%	Recurring Cost			1.	Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any	Half-yearly, in advance	<table><tr><td>1.</td><td>Delivery of licenses of all components</td><td>60% (Payment schedule below)<table><tr><td>(at Start of) Year 1</td><td>(at Start of) Year 2</td><td>(at Start of) Year 3</td></tr><tr><td>20%</td><td>20%</td><td>20%</td></tr></table></td></tr><tr><td>2.</td><td>Implementation UAT sign-off</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>3.</td><td>Production sign-off</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td>4.</td><td>Submission of 5% BG</td><td>5%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Recurring Cost</td></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any</td><td>Half-yearly, in advance</td></tr></table> Note: The licenses procured by the Bank needs to be valid for a period of three years, against which the Bank will release payments as per the schedule provided above.	1.	Delivery of licenses of all components	60% (Payment schedule below) <table><tr><td>(at Start of) Year 1</td><td>(at Start of) Year 2</td><td>(at Start of) Year 3</td></tr><tr><td>20%</td><td>20%</td><td>20%</td></tr></table>	(at Start of) Year 1	(at Start of) Year 2	(at Start of) Year 3	20%	20%	20%	2.	Implementation UAT sign-off	10%	3.	Production sign-off	25%	4.	Submission of 5% BG	5%	Recurring Cost			1.	Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any	Half-yearly, in advance
1.	Delivery of licenses of all components	50% (Payment schedule below) <table><tr><td>(at Start of) Year 1</td><td>(at Start of) Year 2</td><td>(at Start of) Year 3</td></tr><tr><td>20%</td><td>20%</td><td>10%</td></tr></table>	(at Start of) Year 1	(at Start of) Year 2	(at Start of) Year 3	20%	20%	10%																																											
(at Start of) Year 1	(at Start of) Year 2	(at Start of) Year 3																																																	
20%	20%	10%																																																	
2.	Implementation UAT sign-off	10%																																																	
3.	Production sign-off	25%																																																	
4.	Submission of 5% BG	5%																																																	
Recurring Cost																																																			
1.	Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any	Half-yearly, in advance																																																	
1.	Delivery of licenses of all components	60% (Payment schedule below) <table><tr><td>(at Start of) Year 1</td><td>(at Start of) Year 2</td><td>(at Start of) Year 3</td></tr><tr><td>20%</td><td>20%</td><td>20%</td></tr></table>	(at Start of) Year 1	(at Start of) Year 2	(at Start of) Year 3	20%	20%	20%																																											
(at Start of) Year 1	(at Start of) Year 2	(at Start of) Year 3																																																	
20%	20%	20%																																																	
2.	Implementation UAT sign-off	10%																																																	
3.	Production sign-off	25%																																																	
4.	Submission of 5% BG	5%																																																	
Recurring Cost																																																			
1.	Annual Charges [AMC/ ATS], if any	Half-yearly, in advance																																																	
4	6.5 Deliverables, Documentation and Acceptance	Additional Clause	7. The Bank, at its discretion, may ask the OEM(s)/ Bidder(s) to conduct a Proof-of-Concept (POC) to demonstrate the capabilities of the tool during any stage of the procurement process.																																																

Corrigendum – Part B: Responses to Queries received from Bidders till ‘Last date for requesting clarification/ Queries’, i.e. Up to 4.00 PM on October 16, 2026:

Vendor Name	SI. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	1	3, 5, 7, 27	Sec 1 Objective; Sec 6 Scope of Work; Sec 23(d) Evaluation	Single RFP for (i) Cloud DRM – 100 users and (ii) Cloud EMS – 500 endpoints, with combined QCBS evaluation on Grand Total (1T + 2T + 3T).	DRM and Endpoint Patch Management are two distinct technology categories with separate OEM ecosystems. Bundling both into one bid with a combined Grand Total restricts participation to bidders holding authorisations for both, and reduces competition for each component. We request the Bank to split the procurement into two independent lots (Lot 1 – DRM; Lot 2 – EMS + related FMS), each with its own eligibility, technical scoring and commercial evaluation. Alternatively, please permit a bidder to tie up with two different OEMs (one per component) and evaluate L1 lot-wise.	Please be guided by the RFP. The SI may invite 2 separate OEMs for participating in the Bid.
Bidder 1	2	20	II. Cloud-based Endpoint Patch management and Security (EMS) solution, Sr No. 68	The solution shall support integration with ITSM (Freshservice).	The RFP specifically requires integration with Freshservice. Please provide the current Freshservice edition/version and confirm whether the required API access and licensing will be provided by NaBFID.	The version/ edition details may be provided to the selected Bidder. API access and licensing will be provided by the Bank.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	3	11	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 4	The solution shall separate content from encryption keys and support Bank-approved encryption, HSM protection, key rotation, revocation, backup and recovery.	As the solution is a cloud-based SaaS offering, could the Bank please clarify whether OEM-managed encryption keys within the India-hosted SaaS environment, using industry-standard AES-256 encryption, would be acceptable? Bank-approved HSM, key rotation and key backup/recovery are typically associated with on-premise or BYOK deployments. Suggestion for the Bank's consideration: The Bank may kindly consider deleting this clause, as data and key residency in India is already covered under Sr. No. 1.	Clause stands deleted. The deployment of encryption standards to be in line with regulatory, statutory, and industry standards.
Bidder 1	4	11	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 5	The solution shall provide resilient architecture, committed uptime, encrypted backups, India-based DR, defined RTO/RPO and annual restoration testing.	Could the Bank please confirm whether the OEM's latest SOC 2 Type II report, which independently covers backup restoration and DR testing of the SaaS platform, would be acceptable as evidence of annual restoration testing?	SOC 2 Type II Report covering Backup restoration and DR testing will suffice for the requirement.
Bidder 1	5	11	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 7	The solution shall integrate with Microsoft Entra ID and AD/LDAP; support SSO, MFA, groups and automated user lifecycle management.	Could the Bank please clarify the expected scope of "automated user lifecycle management"? Would it meet the requirement if user joiner / mover / leaver changes made in the Bank's Entra ID / AD are automatically reflected in the DRM solution through directory integration? Suggested wording for the Bank's consideration: "The solution shall integrate with Microsoft Entra ID and AD/LDAP; support SSO, MFA, groups and user lifecycle changes through directory synchronisation."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall integrate with Microsoft Entra ID and AD/LDAP; support SSO, MFA, groups and user lifecycle changes through directory synchronisation."

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	6	11	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 9	The solution shall enforce least-privilege RBAC, MFA, segregation of duties and maker-checker controls; administrators shall not automatically access protected content.	Could the Bank please clarify the administrative activities for which maker-checker control is expected? Would role-based administrator controls with segregation of duties and a complete audit trail of all administrative changes meet the Bank's requirement? Suggested wording for the Bank's consideration: "The solution shall enforce least-privilege RBAC, MFA, segregation of duties and administrator controls with a complete audit trail; administrators shall not automatically access protected content."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall enforce least-privilege RBAC, MFA, segregation of duties and administrator controls with a complete audit trail; administrators shall not automatically access protected content."
Bidder 1	7	12	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 13	The solution shall block unauthorised copy, Save As, export and conversion; permit protected-to-protected copying only where policy allows.	Could the Bank please confirm whether the objective of this clause is to ensure that Bank content does not leave in unprotected form? Would it be acceptable if any file created through Save As, export or conversion automatically retains the same protection as the parent file? Suggested wording for the Bank's consideration: "The solution shall protect content against unauthorised access and ensure that files created through Save As, export or conversion retain the same protection as the parent file; permit protected-to-protected copying only where policy allows."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall protect content against unauthorised access and ensure that files created through Save As, export or conversion retain the same protection as the parent file; permit protected-to-protected copying only where policy allows."
Bidder 1	8	12	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 21	The solution shall support access start date, expiry date, time window and duration-based controls.	Could the Bank please clarify the expected behaviour of "time window" based access (for example, access permitted only during defined office hours), so that bidders can confirm compliance accurately?	"Time window" based access refers to duration-based access (e.g. during defined hours)

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	9	12	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 26	The solution shall track and revoke protected emails and attachments through supported Outlook workflows, including Sent Items.	Could the Bank please confirm whether protection applied by the user while sending an email (manual protection through supported Outlook workflows) would be acceptable for tracking and revocation of protected emails and attachments?	Yes. Protection applied by the user while sending an email shall be acceptable for tracking and revocation.
Bidder 1	10	13	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 32	The solution shall have the capability to enforce protection on the basis of Microsoft Purview and approved DLP/classification tools.	Could the Bank please clarify whether protection based on Microsoft Purview and other DLP / classification tools is part of the current scope?	The solution shall have the capability to inherit the classifications from the approved DLP/classification tools.
Bidder 1	11	13	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 33	The solution shall automatically protect supported Office files on save or close and alert on protection failure.	Could the Bank please clarify the expected mode of alerting on protection failure? Would logging of protection failures. Suggested wording for the Bank's consideration: "The solution shall automatically protect supported Office files on save or close; protection failures shall be logged and made available to the Bank's SIEM."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall automatically protect supported Office files on save or close; protection failures shall be logged."
Bidder 1	12	13	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 34	The solution shall support folder-based bulk protection, format filters, inheritance, overrides and failure alerts.	Could the Bank please clarify the expected mode of failure alerts for folder-based bulk protection? Suggested wording for the Bank's consideration: "The solution shall support folder-based bulk protection, format filters, inheritance and overrides; failures shall be logged and made available to the Bank's SIEM."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall support folder-based bulk protection, format filters, inheritance and overrides."

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	13	13	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 35	The solution shall support API- or connector-based protection of files exported from approved ECM and ERP systems.	Could the Bank please clarify whether API / connector-based protection for ECM and ERP systems is part of the current scope? If yes, could the Bank share the list of ECM / ERP applications.	Clause modified to: "The solution shall have the capability to support support API- or connector-based protection of files exported from approved ECM and ERP systems."
Bidder 1	14	13	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 36	The solution shall protect email body and attachments inline through supported Outlook desktop, web and mobile workflows.	Could the Bank please clarify whether inline protection of email body and attachments across Outlook desktop, web and mobile is part of the current scope? If yes, could the Bank share the number of users who would require email protection?	Clause modified to: "The solution shall have the capability to protect email body and attachments inline through supported Outlook desktop, web and mobile workflows."
Bidder 1	15	14	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 45	The solution shall support current Bank-approved Office, PDF, text and image formats; disclose legacy and OpenDocument compatibility.	Could the Bank please specify the legacy file formats (and OpenDocument formats, if any) that need to be supported, so that bidders can confirm compatibility accurately?	Clause modified to: "The solution shall support current Bank-approved Office, PDF, text and image formats."
Bidder 1	16	30	For cloud-based DRM solution:	Payment [% of Project Cost]	The payment percentages across the defined milestones do not add up to 100% of the project cost. Please review and correct the split.	Please refer to Corrigendum – Part A #3 of the Corrigendum 2 of the RFP.
Bidder 1	17	3	Table of Contents / section numbering	Contents lists Sec 9 'Deliverables & Implementation Timelines' etc., while the body numbers it Sec 7; several cross-references (e.g., Sec 19 'criteria 1 to 7') do not match.	Please issue a corrigendum aligning section numbering and cross-references between the Contents, body and Annexures, so that compliance responses reference the correct clauses.	Please refer to Corrigendum – Part A #1 of the Corrigendum 2 of the RFP.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	18	8	Sec 6 – Project period	The total project period will be Three years, from the date of implementation sign off.	Since OEM SaaS subscription billing commences from the date of tenant activation/licence delivery (Week 4 as per Section 7), we request the Bank to consider the three-year subscription tenure from the same date. Otherwise, kindly allow the bidder to quote the subscription charges applicable during the implementation period separately. The Bank is also requested to clarify the alignment of the subscription tenure with the GeM contract period of “3 Year(s) 1 Day(s)”	Please be guided by the RFP. The license validity is three years from the date of implementation sign-off.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	19	8, 31	Sec 6 Overall Implementation Scope (3) & (5); Sec 27 Sub-Contracting	(3) OEM-backed implementation through certified resources/ partners ... (5) implementation ... shall be carried out by resources provided by the OEM (and not the Bidder) ... Sec 27: sub-contracting is not permitted.	Point (3) permits deployment through OEM-certified partners/resources, whereas Point (5) requires deployment exclusively through OEM resources. Further, Section 27 prohibits sub-contracting. These provisions appear inconsistent and may create ambiguity regarding the permissible implementation and support model. Accordingly, we request the Bank to kindly clarify/amend the relevant clauses as follows: Implementation Resources: Permit implementation either through OEM resources or suitably qualified/certified resources of the bidder/OEM-authorised partner, under OEM supervision and support, ensuring compliance with the OEM's prescribed implementation standards. OEM as Bidder: Confirm that where the OEM itself participates as the bidder, the requirement regarding OEM resources shall be deemed fully satisfied. Sub-contracting Clarification: Confirm that engagement of the OEM for implementation/support and utilisation of the underlying Cloud Service Provider (CSP) for hosting/infrastructure services, as inherent components of the proposed SaaS/cloud solution, shall not be construed as sub-contracting under Section 27.	Please be guided by the RFP. Implementation to be done only via OEM/ certified partners. Sub-contracting is not permitted during the ongoing activities of the projects.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	20	9	Sec 6.2 (1) – Endpoint estate	Implement the endpoint security and patch management solution for management of 500 desktops and laptops ...	Please share the endpoint break-up by OS and version (Windows client versions, macOS versions, Linux distributions/versions), by location (Mumbai HO, New Delhi branch, remote/WFH users), and by type (physical/VDI). Please confirm that servers are out of scope of the 500 EMS licences.	Necessary details will be provided to the selected Bidder.
Bidder 1	21	9	Sec 6.2 (4)	Configure application whitelisting/ application control, software inventory, prohibited software detection, endpoint configuration baselines, USB/ peripheral control or other security telemetry features available within the procured ... module.	USB/peripheral device control is not listed in Annexure I. Please confirm that (a) Annexure I is the governing compliance list, (b) USB/peripheral control is not a mandatory requirement, and (c) the bidder is required to configure only those features that are available within the proposed EMS module.	Please refer to Corrigendum – Part A #2 of the Corrigendum 2 of the RFP.
Bidder 1	22	9, 15-21, 58-64	Sec 6.1 (4), 6.2 (5); DRM #54; EMS #67 – SIEM/SOC integration	Integration with the Bank's SOC/ SIEM processes; forward relevant events to the Bank's SIEM in near real time and provide the log dictionary.	Please specify the SIEM product and version, the preferred ingestion method (Syslog/CEF/LEEF, REST API, cloud connector), and whether the SOC is in-house or outsourced. Please confirm that any SIEM-side parser, connector or collector licence/VM will be provided by the Bank, and that standard Syslog/CEF or API-based forwarding will be treated as compliant.	Necessary details will be provided to the selected Bidder.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	23	10, 11, 21, 62	Sec 6.5 (1); Sec 7 Deliverables; DRM #2; EMS #45 (Annexure I)	Bill of material (inclusive of SBOM) ... submit the SBOM ... provide an SBOM and disclose third-party dependencies.	Please clarify the scope and format of the SBOM: (a) components deployed in the Bank's environment (endpoint agent, connectors, relay/distribution components) or the complete SaaS back-end, and (b) format (SPDX / CycloneDX) and update frequency. Since the SaaS back-end is a multi-tenant platform, request that the SBOM for back-end components be provided as a summary attestation or made available for viewing under NDA, while a full SBOM is provided for agent/on-premise components.	Necessary details will be provided to the selected Bidder.
Bidder 1	24	11, 15, 40, 59	DRM #1; EMS #1, #5, #6; Annexure B #8–9 – Hosting & data residency	Cloud-based SaaS ... hosted in India, with all Bank data, encryption keys, logs, backups and disaster-recovery copies stored and processed in India.	Please confirm that (a) SaaS hosted on a MeitY-empanelled cloud service provider's India region (e.g., AWS/Azure/GCP/Oracle India regions) or in OEM-operated India data centres is acceptable; (b) DR in a second India region / data centre is acceptable; (c) MeitY empanelment of the SaaS itself is not mandatory; and (d) OEM support engineers may access the tenant (without data export) under Bank-approved, audited, just-in-time access. Please also provide the format of the OEM self-declaration required under Annexure B #8–9.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	25	15-21, 58-64	Sec 6 Functional Requirements (EMS) vs Annexure I (EMS)	The EMS requirement table in Sec 6 (pages 15–21) differs from the Annexure I compliance sheet (pages 58–64) for items #9, #13, #16, #24, #27, #29, #32, #45, #58, #61 and #68.	The two tables carry different wording and, in several items, additional requirements in Annexure I. Please issue a single consolidated EMS requirement table and confirm which version prevails. We request that the Sec 6 version be treated as governing, as the additional Annexure I wording introduces requirements (e.g., maker-checker, risk-acceptance workflows, P2P delivery, remote-control chat/collaboration) not stated in the Scope of Work.	Please refer to Corrigendum – Part A #2 of the Corrigendum 2 of the RFP.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	26	26, 55	Sec 20 Rejection of Bid; Annexure I header	Non-compliance of any point will lead to rejection of the bid ... [Compliance to all line items is Mandatory].	Sec 22 permits bidders to substantiate a different specification and Annexure E allows a list of deviations, which conflicts with the 'all mandatory' position. Request the Bank to (a) permit compliance responses such as 'Compliant through alternate approach', 'Compliant through integration' or 'Compliant via configuration/customisation within implementation timeline', with justification; and (b) classify advanced items (e.g., EMS #55-#63 remote-control extras, privilege elevation, child-process control) as 'Desirable' instead of mandatory.	Please be guided by the RFP. Bidder should comply with all the points mentioned in the scope of work, technical specifications and all other clauses of RFP. Non-compliance of any point will lead to rejection of the bid.
Bidder 1	27	15, 59	EMS #2 – Multi-OS support	Manage supported ... Windows, macOS and Linux endpoints through one web console; provide an OS-wise feature and compatibility matrix.	Please confirm the Linux distributions/versions in use. Please also confirm that full feature parity across OSs is not expected where the OS vendor does not support a capability (e.g., patch rollback on macOS/Linux, certain inventory attributes), and that such differences declared in the OS-wise matrix will not be treated as non-compliance.	The Bank deploys multiple Linux distributions (e.g. Ubuntu, etc.) Full feature parity across OSs is not expected where the OS vendor does not support a capability (e.g., patch rollback on macOS/ Linux, certain inventory attributes)
Bidder 1	28	15, 59	EMS #4 – Directory integration	Support integration with multiple on-premises Active Directory structures and Microsoft Entra ID, including SAML 2.0-based SSO.	Please share the number of AD forests/domains and trust relationships, and confirm whether Entra ID is synchronised (Entra Connect). If an on-premises connector is required for AD sync to the SaaS console, please confirm the Bank will provide a VM for the same.	Necessary details will be provided to the selected Bidder. For a cloud-based EMS requirement, no VM will be provided by the Bank.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	29	15, 59	EMS #7 – Network requirements	Document required outbound ports, protocols, URLs/FQDNs, proxy and certificate requirements; use TLS 1.2+ ...	Please indicate whether the Bank's internet proxy uses authentication and/or SSL/TLS inspection. Please confirm that the Bank will whitelist the OEM's SaaS FQDNs and exempt agent-to-cloud traffic from SSL inspection where certificate pinning is used.	Necessary details will be provided to the selected Bidder.
Bidder 1	30	15, 59	EMS #9 – Content distribution (Sec 6 vs Annexure I)	Sec 6: existing endpoints or designated systems act as local distribution points. Annexure I: peer-assisted delivery, existing endpoint as cache/distribution point, remote caching and content pre-staging without a dedicated server.	NaBFID has a head office in Mumbai and one branch in New Delhi. Request the Bank to accept a distribution point / relay agent on an existing endpoint or Bank-provided VM, with caching and pre-staging, as fully compliant (Sec 6 version). Peer-to-peer delivery between endpoints may please be treated as 'Desirable'.	Clause modified to: "The solution shall support distributed content delivery to remote offices, allowing existing endpoints or designated systems to act as local distribution points that cache and serve software packages, patches, and other content to endpoints – reducing bandwidth consumption without requiring a dedicated server at every remote location."
Bidder 1	31	16, 59	EMS #12 – Gold image / VDI	Support inclusion of the agent in a gold image/VDI template with documented identity regeneration ...	Please confirm whether VDI is in use, the platform (Citrix / VMware Horizon / AVD), persistent or non-persistent, and the number of VDI desktops included in the 500 licences.	VDI is not currently in use by the Bank.
Bidder 1	32	16, 60	EMS #16 – Agent protection & resource usage	Sec 6: monitor CPU, memory, disk and network usage. Annexure I: disclose and control CPU, memory, disk and network usage.	Please clarify 'control'. We request that 'control' be satisfied through disclosure of the agent's typical resource footprint plus configurable bandwidth throttling, scan scheduling and maintenance windows, as hard CPU/memory capping is OS-dependent.	Clause modified to: "The solution shall protect agents against unauthorised stop/uninstall; and monitor CPU, memory, disk and network usage."
Bidder 1	33	16, 60	EMS #18 – Admin access	Enforce Entra ID SSO, MFA, segregation of duties and controlled break-glass access ...	Please confirm that a break-glass local administrator account protected by MFA, with credentials vaulted by the Bank and all usage logged, is acceptable.	Please be guided by the RFP.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	34	17, 60	EMS #22 – Assessment reporting time	For online endpoints, new or updated patch assessment results shall be reported within a bidder-stated measurable period ... in minutes.	Assessment latency depends on agent check-in interval, scan schedule and endpoint availability. Please confirm that the bidder may state the period as 'within X minutes of the next agent check-in / scan cycle (configurable)', and that this declared value is for disclosure only and will not be scored competitively or used for penalties.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	35	17, 61	EMS #26 – Withdrawn / faulty patches	Validate patch metadata and packages, disclose known issues and promptly notify the Bank of withdrawn, faulty or compromised patches.	Please confirm that notification via the console and email within the OEM's regular catalogue update cycle meets this requirement. The OEM can relay vendor advisories on withdrawn or faulty patches but cannot guarantee detection of defects in third-party vendor patches beyond published vendor advisories.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	36	17, 61	EMS #27, #29 (Annexure I) – Policy templates, risk acceptance & exceptions	Approved patch-policy templates with versioning ... patch approval workflows, risk acceptance, time-bound exceptions, exception ownership, expiry and escalation for overdue or failed remediation.	Risk acceptance and exception ownership are vulnerability-governance / GRC workflow functions. Request the Bank to accept (a) native patch approvals, exclusions with expiry and failure notifications within the EMS (Sec 6 version), and (b) risk-acceptance, ownership and escalation workflows implemented through the integrated ITSM (Freshservice) change/approval process, as compliant.	Clause modified to: "The solution shall support patch approvals, patch exclusions, and notifications for failed deployments."
Bidder 1	37	17, 61	EMS #32 – High-risk / bulk actions (Sec 6 vs Annexure I)	Sec 6: comprehensive auditing of all high-risk and bulk actions. Annexure I: maker-checker approval, confirmation and full audit to high-risk or bulk actions.	Please confirm that the Sec 6 version prevails. If maker-checker is required, please confirm that a requestor–approver role-based approval workflow within the console, or approval through the ITSM change process, is acceptable.	Clause modified to: "The solution shall provide comprehensive auditing of all high-risk and bulk actions performed within the solution."

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	38	17, 61	EMS #34 – Third-party patch catalogue	Support OS and third-party application patching based on a maintained supported-product catalogue; the bidder shall provide catalogue coverage and update frequency.	Please share the list of third-party applications (with versions) in the Bank's estate so bidders can confirm catalogue coverage. Please confirm that applications not in the OEM catalogue (including in-house applications) may be handled through custom packaging / software deployment during implementation and will not be treated as non-compliance.	Necessary details will be provided to the selected Bidder.
Bidder 1	39	18, 62	EMS #44 – Payload validation	Obtain payloads only from trusted/OEM sources and validate digital signatures, hashes, provenance and malware-scan status.	Please confirm that validation of vendor digital signatures and SHA-256 hashes against OEM-curated metadata, with malware scanning performed within the OEM's content pipeline and attested by the OEM, is compliant. Per-patch malware-scan reports are not typically exposed to customers.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	40	19, 63	EMS #55–#58 – Remote control (Sec 6 vs Annexure I)	#55: shall provide policy-based remote view/control ... #56–#57: If remote control is provided ... #58 (Annexure I): remote-control chat, collaboration, session handover, keyboard/mouse lock and file transfer shall be configurable ...	#55 makes remote control mandatory while #56–#57 say 'if provided'. Please clarify whether remote control is mandatory. Request the Sec 6 version of #58 (view-only sessions, keyboard/mouse lock, monitor blackening) to prevail, with chat, collaboration and session handover treated as 'Desirable'. Please also confirm that internet-based remote sessions relayed through the OEM's India-hosted infrastructure are acceptable.	Please be guided by the RFP. The solution shall provide policy-based remote view/control of authorised endpoints from the web console.
Bidder 1	41	19, 63	EMS #59 – Wake-on-LAN	Support Wake-on-LAN, including across subnets where network design permits, bulk announcements and controlled process/service management.	Please confirm that WoL across subnets through an online agent acting as a WoL proxy in the target subnet is acceptable, and that the Bank will permit the required network configuration. Please also clarify what is meant by 'bulk announcements' (e.g., broadcast messages to endpoints).	Please be guided by the RFP.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	42	19, 63	EMS #60 – Configuration baselines	Support controlled distribution of certificates, firewall rules and endpoint configuration baselines without conflicting with Bank-managed GPO, Intune or EDR policies.	The bidder cannot guarantee non-conflict with policies of third-party tools outside its control. Request rewording to: 'shall support controlled distribution of certificates, firewall rules and baselines; the Bank will define policy ownership/precedence between GPO, Intune, EDR and the EMS, and the bidder will coordinate during design.' Please also confirm whether Intune is used for Windows Update management, so that responsibilities between Intune and the EMS can be defined to avoid duplication.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	43	20, 63	EMS #61 – Registry/permission changes	Support controlled file, folder or registry permission changes and remote registry editing capabilities with approval, rollback and audit controls.	Please confirm that 'rollback' may be achieved by capturing the previous value and deploying a reverse script/task, and that 'approval' may be implemented through role-based task approval or the ITSM change process.	Clause modified to: "The solution shall support application-specific privilege elevation, temporary time-bound application/privileged access, and user request/approval workflows."
Bidder 1	44	20, 63	EMS #62, #63 – Application control & privilege elevation	Application allowlisting and blocklisting ... with audit/learning and enforcement modes ... application-specific privilege elevation, temporary time-bound application/privileged access, child-process control and user request/approval workflows.	Application control and Endpoint Privilege Management (EPM) are typically separately licensed modules, and child-process control is an EDR/EPM capability. Please confirm (a) whether these are mandatory within the 500 EMS licences or may be offered as add-ons, (b) whether the Bank already has an EDR solution (and which), and (c) request that 'child-process control' be treated as 'Desirable' or permitted to be met through the Bank's existing EDR.	Please be guided by the RFP.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	45	20, 64	EMS #68 – ITSM integration (Sec 6 vs Annexure I)	Sec 6: support integration with ITSM (Freshservice). Annexure I: integrate with ITSM (Freshworks) for ticket creation, assignment, tracking, asset lifecycle and verification, with configurable field mapping, workflows and automated synchronisation.	Please confirm the ITSM product (Freshservice by Freshworks) and plan/version (API access). Please confirm that integration through REST APIs/webhooks with standard field mapping is compliant, that the Bank will provide Freshservice API credentials and a sandbox, and that workflow configuration on the Freshservice side will be done by the Bank's ITSM team/vendor.	The version/ edition details may be provided to the selected Bidder. API access and licensing to be provided by the Bank.
Bidder 1	46	20, 64	EMS #70; Sec 7 Deliverables – Certifications	Maintain ISO 27001, SOC 2 Type II or equivalent assurance ... Security capability documents ... including OEM SOC2 Reports.	Please confirm that ISO/IEC 27001, together with ISO/IEC 27017/27018 and/or a security audit / VAPT report by a CERT-In empanelled auditor, will be accepted as 'equivalent' to SOC 2 Type II. Please also confirm that certifications of the hosting cloud service provider (for infrastructure) combined with the OEM's certifications (for the application) are acceptable.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	47	20-21, 64	EMS #71, #72, #73 – Optional modules	OS deployment, MDM/UEM and software asset & licence management shall be made available as optional, separately licensed modules.	Please confirm that for #71–#73 the bidder needs only to declare availability, that these modules are not to be priced in Annexure C2 (there are no line items), are not part of evaluation, and are excluded from the UAT under #74.	The optional modules shall be available as an upgraded licensing requirement within the product suite as on start of project implementation.
Bidder 1	48	21, 64	EMS #74 – UAT	Demonstrate every requirement through Bank-observed UAT ... literature alone shall not constitute acceptance.	Please confirm that the UAT scope excludes optional modules (#71–#73) and items qualified with 'where technically supported / where available', and that the Bank will provide test endpoints for each OS type and the required access for integration testing.	The UAT scope excludes optional modules. The Bank will provide test endpoints for each OS type for integration testing.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	49	39	Annexure B #1 – Registration & Mumbai office	... should have office in Mumbai. The bidder should be in existence for a period of at least 5 years as on March 01, 2026.	Request the Bank to accept either an office in Mumbai or an undertaking to establish a support presence in Mumbai (directly or through the OEM/authorised partner) within 30 days of the purchase order, since the L-1 resource will be deployed onsite. Please also confirm the reference date, as other criteria use September 30, 2026.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	50	39; GeM p6	Annexure B #7 – EMS OEM experience	OEM for the proposed EMS solution should have ... at least three ... deployments with minimum 500 licenses each in Public Sector Banks or AIFIs in India during the last 5 years.	Same concern as Annexure B #6 (GeM disclaimer clause 8). Request (a) broadening to BFSI, Central/State Government, PSUs and regulated entities in India; (b) acceptance of on-premise as well as cloud deployments of the same OEM endpoint/patch management product line, since cloud delivery models of established products are relatively recent; and (c) acceptance of deployments where patch management is part of the OEM's unified endpoint management/IT operations suite.	Please be guided by the RFP.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	51	40	Annexure B #10, #11 – OEM years in product category	The OEM for the proposed DRM / EMS solution should have more than 10 years (as on September 30, 2026) in the product category of the proposed solution.	A requirement of more than 10 years in the specific product category is highly restrictive. Cloud-delivered endpoint/patch management and DRM are comparatively recent categories, and this clause excludes capable Indian OEMs whose products are actively deployed in BFSI/government today. Product maturity is already tested through the OEM deployment criteria (Annexure B #6, #7), the technical scoring (Annexure C1) and the mandatory Bank-observed UAT (EMS #74). We therefore request the Bank to (a) delete criteria #10 and #11; or (b) reduce the requirement to a minimum of 3 years of commercial availability of the proposed product; and (c) in either case, measure the OEM's track record as its years of existence as a software OEM in the broader IT infrastructure / IT operations / endpoint management software category, rather than years of the specific product. Please also confirm that a product launched in on-premise form and later offered as SaaS is counted from its first commercial release.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	52	40	Annexure B #12 – Certified professionals	At least five professionals having valid security certifications of CISSP/ CISA/ CISM/ ... / any other Advanced-level certification in the proposed solution ...	Please confirm that OEM-issued product certifications on the proposed DRM/EMS solutions qualify as 'Advanced-level certification in the proposed solution', and that where the OEM is the bidder, OEM employees count towards this requirement.	OEM-issued product certifications on the proposed DRM/ EMS solutions qualify as 'Advanced-level certification in the proposed solution'
Bidder 1	53	25, 43	Sec 19 – Technical bid contents; Annexure C1	Evidence to prove technical scoring for items/ criteria 1 to 7.	Annexure C1 contains five criteria (1 to 5). Please confirm the correct reference and whether any additional scoring criteria are intended.	Please be guided by the RFP.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	54	43	Annexure C1 #1, #2 – Number of implementations	Five marks per assignment ... Maximum 20, Minimum Qualifying Score 15 (DRM and EMS each).	A minimum qualifying score of 15 equates to three implementations for each solution – duplicating the eligibility criteria and turning a scoring parameter into a pass/fail gate. Request reducing the minimum qualifying score to 5 marks (one implementation), and confirming that implementations of the same OEM product (on-premise or cloud) by any partner, counted by distinct customer, will be accepted.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	55	43	Annexure C1 #3 – DRM licences delivered	Five marks per 200 licenses delivered in the same organization; Maximum 20; Minimum 2.5.	The minimum of 2.5 marks is not achievable under a 5-mark slab. Please clarify the slab for partial marks (e.g., 2.5 marks for 100 licences). As the requirement is 100 DRM users, request scoring at 5 marks per 100 licences (maximum at 400).	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	56	43	Annexure C1 #4 – EMS licences delivered	Five marks per 1000 licenses delivered in the same organization; Maximum 20; Minimum 2.5.	Full marks require 4,000 endpoints in a single organisation against a requirement of 500, which is disproportionate. The minimum of 2.5 is also not achievable under a 5-mark slab. Request scoring at 5 marks per 250 licences (full marks at 1,000) with clear partial slabs, aggregation of multiple orders from the same organisation, and acceptance of on-premise and cloud deployments of the proposed OEM product.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	57	44	Annexure C1 – Note on minimum marks	The bidder must obtain a minimum of 45 out of 100 marks overall and meet the minimum qualifying marks specified for each individual point ...	The per-criterion minimums (15+15+2.5+2.5+10) add up to exactly 45, so any shortfall in one parameter disqualifies a bidder even if its total is well above 45. Request the Bank to remove per-criterion minimums and retain only the overall threshold of 45 marks.	Please be guided by the RFP.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	58	37	Annexure A – Bid Form	... we offer to provide our consultancy services ... We have not sought any deviation from the terms and conditions of the RFP.	Annexure A refers to 'consultancy services' and states no deviation has been sought, while Annexure E provides for listing deviations. Please confirm that the Bid Form may be read as 'supply, implementation and management services' and that deviations listed in Annexure E (if accepted by the Bank) will not conflict with Annexure A.	The Bid Form may be read as 'procurement, implementation and management services'.
Bidder 1	59	GeM p2	GeM – Evaluation method	Evaluation Method: Total value wise evaluation; QCBS Weightage (Technical:Financial) 30:70.	Please confirm that the final evaluation will be on QCBS (30:70) as per RFP Sec 23, and that the value to be entered on GeM is the Grand Total (1T+2T+3T) as per Annexure C2 note 1.	Please be guided by the RFP.
Bidder 1	60	28-29	Sec 25(a), (b) – SLA: DRM / EMS availability	Minimum availability 99.5% ... measured monthly ... reference value: yearly license cost ... A < 98.5%: additional 1% for every 0.1% reduction.	Request (a) definition of availability as availability of the SaaS service/console measured by the OEM's monitoring, excluding scheduled maintenance notified 72 hours in advance, Bank-side network/proxy/internet issues, endpoint-side issues and force majeure; (b) penalty computed on the monthly (yearly/12) subscription value of the affected solution, not the yearly licence cost; and (c) a cap on SLA penalty of 10% of the monthly value per month, as the current incremental slab is uncapped.	Please be guided by the RFP.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 1	61	30	Sec 25 Payment Terms (a) & (b) – DRM and EMS	Delivery of licenses 50% (20% start of Year 1, 20% start of Year 2, 10% start of Year 3); UAT sign-off 10%; Production sign-off 25%; Submission of 5% BG 5%.	SaaS subscriptions are billed by OEMs annually in advance. Under the current terms, a large part of the licence value is deferred and linked to implementation milestones, so the bidder pre-funds OEM subscription costs. Request: (a) licence/subscription cost (1a/2a) paid 100% yearly in advance at the start of each year, with Year 1 paid on licence delivery; (b) one-time implementation cost (1b/2b) paid 60% on UAT sign-off and 40% on production go-live; and (c) PBG submission not linked to a payment percentage. Please also clarify whether the percentages apply to the total 1T/2T or only to the licence component.	Please refer to Corrigendum – Part A #3 of the Corrigendum 2 of the RFP. Bidder to note that the licenses procured by the Bank needs to be valid for a period of three years, against which the Bank will release payments as per the schedule provided.
Bidder 1	62	46	Annexure C2 – Note 7 (Hardware)	Required hardware components at locations where Bank's applications are hosted will be provisioned by the Bank ...	Please confirm that any on-premise components required for the solution (e.g., distribution point/relay VM, AD connector, SIEM log forwarder, remote-control relay) will be provisioned by the Bank, including VM, OS licence and database where applicable.	For SaaS-based procurements, ideally, no hardware/ on-premise component is required as part of the scope of this project.
Bidder 1	63	33-34	Sec 33 Termination for Default; Sec 34 Termination for Convenience	Termination for convenience with 90 days' notice ... Service Provider entitled to payment for Services rendered up to the effective date.	Please confirm that subscription fees for the current contract year, paid or committed to the OEM in advance, are non-refundable and will be payable on termination for convenience. Please also define the exit/transition period (e.g., 90 days), the data export format, and the data deletion certificate requirements at exit.	Please be guided by the RFP.

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 2	64	11	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 4	The solution shall separate content from encryption keys and support Bank-approved encryption, HSM protection, key rotation, revocation, backup and recovery.	As the solution is a cloud-based SaaS offering, could the Bank please clarify whether OEM-managed encryption keys within the India-hosted SaaS environment, using industry-standard AES-256 encryption, would be acceptable? Bank-approved HSM, key rotation and key backup/recovery are typically associated with on-premise or BYOK deployments. Suggestion for the Bank's consideration: The Bank may kindly consider deleting this clause, as data and key residency in India is already covered under Sr. No. 1.	Clause to be deleted.
Bidder 2	65	11	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 5	The solution shall provide resilient architecture, committed uptime, encrypted backups, India-based DR, defined RTO/RPO and annual restoration testing.	Could the Bank please confirm whether the OEM's latest SOC 2 Type II report, which independently covers backup restoration and DR testing of the SaaS platform, would be acceptable as evidence of annual restoration testing?	SOC 2 Type II Report covering Backup restoration and DR testing will suffice for the requirement.
Bidder 2	66	11	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 7	The solution shall integrate with Microsoft Entra ID and AD/LDAP; support SSO, MFA, groups and automated user lifecycle management.	Could the Bank please clarify the expected scope of "automated user lifecycle management"? Would it meet the requirement if user joiner / mover / leaver changes made in the Bank's Entra ID / AD are automatically reflected in the DRM solution through directory integration? Suggested wording for the Bank's consideration: "The solution shall integrate with Microsoft Entra ID and AD/LDAP; support SSO, MFA, groups and user lifecycle changes through directory synchronisation."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall integrate with Microsoft Entra ID and AD/LDAP; support SSO, MFA, groups and user lifecycle changes through directory synchronisation."

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 2	67	11	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 9	The solution shall enforce least-privilege RBAC, MFA, segregation of duties and maker-checker controls; administrators shall not automatically access protected content.	Could the Bank please clarify the administrative activities for which maker-checker control is expected? Would role-based administrator controls with segregation of duties and a complete audit trail of all administrative changes meet the Bank's requirement? Suggested wording for the Bank's consideration: "The solution shall enforce least-privilege RBAC, MFA, segregation of duties and administrator controls with a complete audit trail; administrators shall not automatically access protected content."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall enforce least-privilege RBAC, MFA, segregation of duties and administrator controls with a complete audit trail; administrators shall not automatically access protected content."
Bidder 2	68	12	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 13	The solution shall block unauthorised copy, Save As, export and conversion; permit protected-to-protected copying only where policy allows.	Could the Bank please confirm whether the objective of this clause is to ensure that Bank content does not leave in unprotected form? Would it be acceptable if any file created through Save As, export or conversion automatically retains the same protection as the parent file? Suggested wording for the Bank's consideration: "The solution shall protect content against unauthorised access and ensure that files created through Save As, export or conversion retain the same protection as the parent file; permit protected-to-protected copying only where policy allows."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall protect content against unauthorised access and ensure that files created through Save As, export or conversion retain the same protection as the parent file; permit protected-to-protected copying only where policy allows."
Bidder 2	69	12	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 21	The solution shall support access start date, expiry date, time window and duration-based controls.	Could the Bank please clarify the expected behaviour of "time window" based access (for example, access permitted only during defined office hours), so that bidders can confirm compliance accurately?	"Time window" based access refers to duration-based access (e.g. during defined hours)

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 2	70	12	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 26	The solution shall track and revoke protected emails and attachments through supported Outlook workflows, including Sent Items.	Could the Bank please confirm whether protection applied by the user while sending an email (manual protection through supported Outlook workflows) would be acceptable for tracking and revocation of protected emails and attachments?	Yes. Protection applied by the user while sending an email shall be acceptable for tracking and revocation.
Bidder 2	71	13	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 32	The solution shall have the capability to enforce protection on the basis of Microsoft Purview and approved DLP/classification tools.	Could the Bank please clarify whether protection based on Microsoft Purview and other DLP / classification tools is part of the current scope?	The solution shall have the capability to inherit the classifications from the approved DLP/classification tools.
Bidder 2	72	13	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 33	The solution shall automatically protect supported Office files on save or close and alert on protection failure.	Could the Bank please clarify the expected mode of alerting on protection failure? Would logging of protection failures. Suggested wording for the Bank's consideration: "The solution shall automatically protect supported Office files on save or close; protection failures shall be logged and made available to the Bank's SIEM."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall automatically protect supported Office files on save or close; protection failures shall be logged."
Bidder 2	73	13	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 34	The solution shall support folder-based bulk protection, format filters, inheritance, overrides and failure alerts.	Could the Bank please clarify the expected mode of failure alerts for folder-based bulk protection? Suggested wording for the Bank's consideration: "The solution shall support folder-based bulk protection, format filters, inheritance and overrides; failures shall be logged and made available to the Bank's SIEM."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall support folder-based bulk protection, format filters, inheritance and overrides."

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 2	74	13	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 35	The solution shall support API- or connector-based protection of files exported from approved ECM and ERP systems.	Could the Bank please clarify whether API / connector-based protection for ECM and ERP systems is part of the current scope? If yes, could the Bank share the list of ECM / ERP applications.	Clause modified to: "The solution shall have the capability to support API- or connector-based protection of files exported from approved ECM and ERP systems."
Bidder 2	75	13	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 36	The solution shall protect email body and attachments inline through supported Outlook desktop, web and mobile workflows.	Could the Bank please clarify whether inline protection of email body and attachments across Outlook desktop, web and mobile is part of the current scope? If yes, could the Bank share the number of users who would require email protection?	Clause modified to: "The solution shall have the capability to protect email body and attachments inline through supported Outlook desktop, web and mobile workflows."
Bidder 2	76	14	Functional & Technical Requirements – I. Cloud-based DRM solution, Sr. No. 45	The solution shall support current Bank-approved Office, PDF, text and image formats; disclose legacy and OpenDocument compatibility.	Could the Bank please specify the legacy file formats (and OpenDocument formats, if any) that need to be supported, so that bidders can confirm compatibility accurately?	Clause modified to: "The solution shall support current Bank-approved Office, PDF, text and image formats."

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 2	77	59	Annexure I, Part II (EMS), Sr. No. 9	The solution shall support peer-assisted delivery, an existing endpoint as cache/distribution point, remote caching and content pre-staging without requiring a dedicated server.	Annexure I Sr. 9 refers to "peer-assisted delivery", whereas the Section 6 functional table describes the same need as distributed content delivery to remote offices through local distribution points. The underlying objective appears to be reduction of WAN bandwidth at remote offices without a dedicated server at each location. Peer-to-peer (endpoint-to-endpoint) transfer is one specific technique and is not implemented uniformly across solutions. We request the Bank to confirm that the requirement may be met by existing endpoints or designated systems acting as local distribution points that cache, pre-stage and serve content to endpoints at the site, and to amend the clause accordingly. Suggested clause: "The solution should support distributed content delivery to remote offices, allowing existing endpoints or designated systems to act as local distribution points that cache and serve software packages, patches, and other content to endpoints, reducing WAN bandwidth consumption without requiring a dedicated server at every remote location."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall support distributed content delivery to remote offices, allowing existing endpoints or designated systems to act as local distribution points that cache and serve software packages, patches, and other content to endpoints – reducing bandwidth consumption without requiring a dedicated server at every remote location."

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 2	78	60	Annexure I, Part II (EMS), Sr. No. 13	Centrally manage agent settings and staged, unattended upgrades; show versions and failures and support recovery/rollback where available.	Annexure I Sr. 13 includes "rollback" of the agent, whereas the Section 6 table asks only for "recovery where available". Agent version rollback is not a common capability across solutions, while recovery of failed or unhealthy agents (for example, re-deployment of the agent) achieves the operational objective of keeping endpoints managed. We request the Bank to confirm that agent recovery satisfies this requirement and that the term "rollback" may be removed. Suggested clause: "The solution should be able to centrally manage agent settings and staged, unattended upgrades; show versions and failures and support recovery where available."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall be able to centrally manage agent settings and staged, unattended upgrades; show versions and failures and support recovery where available."
Bidder 2	79	60	Annexure I, Part II (EMS), Sr. No. 16	Protect agents against unauthorised stop/uninstall; disclose and control CPU, memory, disk and network usage.	Annexure I Sr. 16 requires the bidder to "disclose and control" CPU, memory, disk and network usage of the agent, whereas the Section 6 table requires the usage to be monitored. Hard per-agent caps on CPU or memory can prevent a security and patching agent from completing its tasks and are not a standard configurable control in most solutions. We request the Bank to confirm that monitoring of agent resource usage (with network usage governed through bandwidth controls) meets the intent, and to amend the clause accordingly. Suggested clause: "Protect agents against unauthorised stop/uninstall and monitor CPU, memory, disk and network usage."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall protect agents against unauthorised stop/uninstall; and monitor CPU, memory, disk and network usage."

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 2	80	61	Annexure I, Part II (EMS), Sr. No. 27	The solution shall provide approved patch-policy templates with versioning for assessment, approval, testing, deployment, exclusion, retry, reboot and reporting.	Annexure I Sr. 27 asks for "approved patch-policy templates with versioning", whereas the Section 6 table asks for patch policies covering approval, testing, deployment, exclusion, retry, reboot and reporting. Formal version history of policy templates is not a standard feature across solutions, and the governance objective is met by configurable, reusable patch policies with auditable changes. We request the Bank to confirm that the requirement may be read as per the Section 6 wording and to amend Annexure I accordingly. Suggested clause: "The solution shall provide patch-policies for approval, testing, deployment, exclusion, retry, reboot and reporting."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall provide approved patch-policies for approval, testing, deployment, exclusion, retry, reboot and reporting."
Bidder 2	81	61	Annexure I, Part II (EMS), Sr. No. 29	The solution shall support patch approval workflows, risk acceptance, time-bound exceptions, exception ownership, expiry and escalation for overdue or failed remediation.	Annexure I Sr. 29 includes risk acceptance, time-bound exceptions, exception ownership, expiry and escalation, whereas the Section 6 table asks for patch approvals, patch exclusions and notification for failed deployments. Risk-acceptance and exception-governance workflows are typically handled in the Bank's ITSM / GRC process rather than within the endpoint patching tool. We request the Bank to confirm that the requirement may be read as per the Section 6 wording and to amend Annexure I accordingly. Suggested clause: "The solution shall support patch approvals, patch exclusions and notification for failed deployments."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall support patch approvals, patch exclusions, and notifications for failed deployments."

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 2	82	61	Annexure I, Part II (EMS), Sr. No. 32	The solution shall apply maker-checker approval, confirmation and full audit to high-risk or bulk actions.	(a) Annexure I Sr. 32 requires maker-checker approval for "high-risk or bulk actions", whereas the Section 6 table asks for comprehensive auditing of all high-risk and bulk actions. Kindly provide the specific list of console actions that the Bank considers high-risk or bulk and for which a maker-checker (two-person) approval is mandatory, so that bidders can respond uniformly. (b) Subject to the Bank's response, we request the Bank to confirm that confirmation prompts and comprehensive audit logging of all high-risk and bulk actions meet the requirement, and to amend the clause accordingly. Suggested clause: "The solution shall provide comprehensive auditing of all high-risk and bulk actions performed within the solution."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall provide comprehensive auditing of all high-risk and bulk actions performed within the solution."
Bidder 2	83	62	Annexure I, Part II (EMS), Sr. No. 45	The solution shall maintain secure software-supply-chain controls for hosted repositories, agents, connectors and content delivery; provide an SBOM and disclose third-party dependencies.	Annexure I Sr. 45 requires an SBOM in addition to disclosure of third-party dependencies, whereas the Section 6 table requires secure software-supply-chain controls and disclosure of third-party dependencies only. An SBOM is a product-level artefact maintained by the software publisher and is generally not released to customers. We request the Bank to confirm that supply-chain controls together with disclosure of third-party dependencies satisfy the requirement and that the SBOM obligation may be removed from this clause and from the Section 6.5 deliverables, if referenced. Suggested clause: "The solution shall maintain secure software-supply-chain controls for hosted repositories, agents, connectors and content delivery; and disclose third-party dependencies."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall maintain secure software-supply-chain controls for hosted repositories, agents, connectors and content delivery; and disclose third-party dependencies."

Vendor Name	Sl. No	RFP Page No	RFP Clause No.	Existing Clause	Query/Suggestions	Response
Bidder 2	84	63	Annexure I, Part II (EMS), Sr. No. 61	The solution shall support controlled file, folder or registry permission changes and remote registry editing capabilities with approval, rollback and audit controls.	Annexure I Sr. 61 requires approval and rollback controls for file, folder and registry permission changes and remote registry editing, whereas the Section 6 table requires controlled changes, remote registry editing and audit controls only. Automatic rollback of such changes is not generally available, as a reversal is done by applying a corrective change. We request the Bank to confirm that controlled changes with full audit logging meet the requirement and to amend the clause accordingly. Suggested clause: "The solution should support controlled file, folder or registry permission changes and remote registry editing capabilities and audit controls."	Clause modified to: "The solution shall support controlled file, folder or registry permission changes and remote registry editing capabilities and audit controls."
Bidder 2	85	29	Payment term	General clause	Please provide clarification regarding the terms associated with the 10% balance payment. Additionally, please confirm whether licenses for the EMS and DRM solutions may be issued on a year-over-year basis, as the bank will disburse payment annually.	Please refer to Corrigendum – Part A #3 of the Corrigendum 2 of the RFP. Bidder to note that the licenses procured by the Bank needs to be valid for a period of three years, against which the Bank will release payments as per the schedule provided.