

**System Implementation Partner (SIP) for Design, Development, Implementation, Rollout and Maintenance of electronic Government Procurement (e-GP) System in Sri Lanka**

Second Pre-Proposal Clarifications dated 25-June-2026

# 1 Evaluation

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section II, ITP 39.9, "Additional Qualification Measures", page 57	<b>Clarification:</b> Please clarify whether the Product Demonstration is conducted only for the highest-ranked bidder or for multiple shortlisted bidders.	Product demonstration is not envisaged during the bid evaluation. Proposers are advised to provide a detailed write-up explaining their system and its compliance to the requirements specified in the bidding document.
2	Section II, ITP 39.9, "Additional Qualification Measures", page 57	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the Product Demonstration will carry a separate marking scheme or whether it will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis.	Refer to item 1 of section 1 in this document.
3	Section III, 2.4, "Detailed Technical Evaluation Criteria", page 62	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether solution demonstration / PoC is part of technical evaluation, and expected timelines. Kindly confirm whether it will be conducted online or offline.	Refer to item 1 of section 1 in this document.
4	Section I, ITP 32.1, "Rated Criteria", page 33, and Section II, ITP 32.1, page 52	<b>RFP Text:</b> Proposals will be evaluated with weightings: Technical & Non-price Factors 30%, Proposal Cost 70%. <b>Clarification:</b> Considering the strategic importance of the national e-GP platform, kindly review whether a higher technical evaluation weightage may be considered to ensure selection of a technically robust, scalable, and future-ready solution rather than primarily a lowest-cost basis.	No change as clarified in Item 17 of Section 1 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
5	Annex 01, "Feature-wise Grouping of Requirements", pages 6–7; Section III, 2.4, "Detailed Technical Evaluation Criteria", page 62	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Integration-related items carry technical weightage (CIDA, ITMIS, ROC, NPC, Payment Gateway, etc.).</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Since integrations will be executed only after award, and bidders cannot complete such integrations at bid stage, kindly clarify the basis for assigning technical marks for these items. Request reconsideration of the weightage methodology or evaluation based on demonstrated integration capability instead of pre-existing integrations.</p>	<p>No change. <i>“As a part of its technical proposal, the Proposer shall submit a compliance statement individually for all the e-GP system functionality...”</i> explained in detail in the functional requirements. Refer item 2 of Section 1 in the first pre-proposal clarifications for further details.</p> <p>”</p>
6	Section III, 2.4, "Detailed Technical Evaluation Criteria", page 62	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Compliance of the proposer's e-GP product will be verified vis-à-vis the functional requirements. The Proposer shall submit a compliance statement: (a) Readily available in the product; (b) Can be configured and deployed; (c) The software will be customized and deployed; (d) The product addresses above and beyond the requirement.</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Kindly elaborate the meaning of "Readily available in the product." Does this mean standard out-of-box functionality without customization?</li> <li>b) Kindly elaborate the meaning of "Readily available in the product."</li> <li>c) Kindly elaborate the meaning of “Readily available in the product.” Does this mean standard out-of-box functionality without customization?</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to item 19 of section 1 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		d) Kindly elaborate the meaning of “Product addresses above and beyond the requirement.” Will such additional capabilities attract extra technical marks?	
7	Section III, 2.4, "Detailed Technical Evaluation Criteria", page 62	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly elaborate the meaning of "Product addresses above and beyond the requirement." Will such additional capabilities attract extra technical marks?	Refer to item 20 of section 1 in the first pre-proposal clarifications. As explained in item 2 of section 1 in the first pre-proposal clarifications: <i>A score of 4 will be assigned when the product addresses above and beyond the requirement, which the vendor offers to provide within the quoted proposal price.</i>
8	Annex 01, "Feature-wise Grouping of Requirements", pages 6–7	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether FRS feature-wise weightages are applicable only for technical evaluation, commercial evaluation, or both.	Refer to item 2 of the second addendum to the procurement document. Specifically <i>“Functional compliance (35 marks): Compliance of the proposer’s e-GP product will be verified vis-à-vis the functional requirements specified in the procurement document. The weightage allocated for the e-GP system features, as defined in the “Annexure: Functional requirements” annexed with this procurement document, will be taken as input for rating the system compliance.”</i> Refer serial numbers 4 and 5 in Section III – Evaluation and Qualification criteria for financial evaluation and combined evaluation procedures.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
9	Not referred	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether PCA-3 Form is mandatory for all bidders or only under specific eligibility conditions.</p>	Proposers are not required to submit PCA- 3 form.
10	Section III, 1.4.2, "Specific Experience", page 75	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "The e-GP product owned by the proposer or a JV member must have been installed and implemented government-wide in at least two (02) government installations at central or state level..."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Does SaaS Procurement Module-based solution qualify (ownership of e-GP layer)?</p>	SAAS e-Procurement installation experience does not qualify. As explained in item 14 of the second addendum to the procurement document <i>“An e-GP installation established by a government-owned or controlled entity to process e-Tenders will be considered as a government installation.”</i>
11	Section II, ITP 4.1, PDS ITP 4.1, "Eligible Proposers / Joint Ventures", page 9	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> A Proposer may be a firm that is a private entity, or any combination of such entities in the form of a joint venture (JV) under an existing agreement or with the intent to enter into such an agreement.</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please clarify if participation specifically as a "Consortium" (for instance, a strategic consortium arrangement between a Lead System Integrator and an OEM under a Memorandum of Understanding) is permitted as a valid alternative to forming a formal Joint Venture structure.</li> </ul>	No change in the bidding document. Consortium of bidders is NOT permitted.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please clarify if participation as a "Consortium" under an MOU is permitted as an alternative to a formal JV structure.</li> </ul>	
12	Section III, 1.4.2, "Specific Experience", page 75	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The e-GP product owned by the proposer or a JV member must have been installed and implemented government-wide in at least two (02) government installations at central or state level during the last seven (07) years, wherein at least one installation must have processed a minimum of ten thousand (10,000) e-Tenders.</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The qualification criteria mandate that the proposed e-GP product must have been installed and implemented government-wide in at least two (02) government installations at the central or state level. Given the scale and complexity of procurement managed by large public sector entities, we humbly request the Purchaser to consider and accept similar enterprise-grade e-procurement portals developed and implemented for national-level public organizations or Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs) as valid citations to fulfill this specific experience requirement.</li> <li>b) We request the Purchaser to consider and accept enterprise-grade e-procurement portals developed for national-level public organizations or PSUs as valid citations.</li> </ul>	As explained in item 14 of the second addendum to the procurement document <i>“An e-GP installation established by a government-owned or controlled entity to process e-Tenders will be considered as a government installation.”</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
13	Section III, 1.4.2, "Specific Experience", page 75	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "The e-GP product owned by the proposer or a JV member must have been installed and implemented government-wide in at least two (02) government installations at central or state level..."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Does SaaS Procurement Module-based solution qualify (ownership of e-GP layer)?</li> <li>b) Can OEM implementation references be used?</li> <li>c) Does submission of MAL satisfy qualification requirements?</li> <li>d) If system is operational but managed by OEM/third party, is bidder eligible?</li> <li>e) Are OEM reports acceptable? Is client certificate mandatory?</li> <li>f) Must it cover entire country or is large state/province acceptable?</li> <li>g) If the principal owner has fulfilled 10,000 e-tenders but the Proposer does not, will the Proposer be disqualified?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Refer to Item 10 of section 1 in this document</li> <li>b) The e-GP product owner must be the proposer or a JV member. Refer "<i>The e-GP product owned by the proposer or a JV member...</i>"</li> <li>c) MAL for e-GP solution does not apply as the e-GP product must be the proposer or a JV member.</li> <li>d) The question is unclear. Refer to (b) above.</li> <li>e) Refer to 11.2 (j) (11) for documentary evidence requirements</li> <li>f) Refer to Item 14 of the second addendum to the procurement document.</li> <li>g) Refer to b above</li> </ul>
14	Section III, 1.5, "Manufacturer's Authorization", page 58	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> In the case of proprietary commercial software... the Proposer must provide Manufacturer's Authorizations.</p> <p><u>Clarifications:</u></p>	<p>The e-GP product owner must be the proposer or a JV member. Refer "<i>The e-GP product owned by the proposer or a JV member...</i>"</p> <p>Refer to item 38 of section 1 in the first set of clarifications</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sCan OEM implementation references be used for government-wide installations / 10,000 e-Tenders?</li> <li>• Does submission of MAL satisfy qualification requirements if OEM meets thresholds?</li> </ul>	
15	Section II, ITP 11.2 (j), page 48,12	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The e-GP product proposed must be operational in at least one of the installations (client confirmation shall be provided), managed either by the Proposer or the JV member.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> If system is operational but managed by OEM/third party, is bidder eligible with IP ownership or valid MAL?</p>	No change. The e-GP product owner must be the proposer or a JV member. Refer “ <i>The e-GP product owned by the proposer or a JV member...</i> ”
16	Section III, 1.4.2, “Specific Experience”, page 75	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The Proposer is required to submit a client certificate, contract copies or similar documents as documentary evidence...</p> <p><u>Clarifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Are OEM reports or domain-based audit reports acceptable?</li> <li>b) <u>Is</u> the client certificate mandatory?</li> </ul>	Refer to 11.2 (j) (11) for documentary evidence requirements
17	Section III, 1.4.2, “Specific Experience”, page 75	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> installed and implemented government-wide in at least two (02) government installations at the central or state level..."</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Must it cover entire country or is large state/province acceptable?</p>	The RFP text is clear. e-GP installations operational at the State or provincial level systems will be considered adequate.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
18	Section III, 1.4.2, "Specific Experience", page 75	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The e-GP product owned by the proposer or a JV member must have been installed and implemented government-wide in at least two (02) government installations at central or state level (governed by separate contracts) during the last seven (07) years. wherein at least one of the installations (identified by a domain name) must have processed a minimum of ten thousand (10,000) e-Tenders (i.e., covering online proposal submission).</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> If the principal owner (e.g., xxx e-procurement module) has fulfilled 10,000 e-tenders and has three government references, but the Proposer does not have 10,000 e-tenders, will the Proposer be disqualified?</p>	No change. The e-GP product owner must be the proposer or a JV member. Refer " <i>The e-GP product owned by the proposer or a JV member...</i> "
19	Section I, ITP 4.1, "Eligible Proposers / Joint Ventures", page 7	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm whether bidders without a registered legal entity in Sri Lanka may participate through a local partner/reseller, branch office after award, or consortium / JV route.</p>	<p>As explained in Section 6, Item 10 of the first pre-proposal clarifications.: Section 1; 4.1 "<i>A Proposer may be a firm that is a private entity, a state-owned enterprise or institution subject to ITP 4.6, or any combination of such entities in the form of a joint venture (JV) under an existing agreement or with the intent to enter into such an agreement supported by a letter of intent.</i>" Specifically refer to "<i>...or with the intent to enter into such an agreement supported by a letter of intent</i>"</p> <p>In addition, refer to Item 6 of section 1 in the first pre-bid clarifications dated 04-June-2026.</p>
	Annexure 2, Section – I	<p><u>RFP clause:</u> The Proposal Security or the Proposal-Securing Declaration of a JV shall be in the name of the JV that submits the Proposal. If the JV has not been legally constituted into a legally enforceable JV at the time of submission of Proposals, the Proposal Security or the Proposal-Securing Declaration shall be in the names of all future members as named in the letter of intent referred to in ITP 4.1 and ITP 11.5</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p>	

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>a) Clause 20.8 of ITP refers to the JV being “legally constituted into a legally enforceable JV”. Please clarify if the reference legally constituted into a legally enforceable JV, means that the JV has to be incorporated under the Companies Act No. 07 of 2007 or whether the JV can be a an unincorporated JV?</p> <p>b) Clause 20.8 of ITP refers to the JV being “legally constituted into a legally enforceable JV”. Please clarify if the reference legally constituted into a legally enforceable JV, means that the JV has to be incorporated under the Companies Act No. 07 of 2007 or whether the JV can be a an unincorporated JV?</p> <p>c) Is an Unincorporated Joint Venture acceptable? (i.e., A consortium governed purely by a legally binding Joint Venture Agreement between two independent member firms, establishing joint and several liability, without forming a new, separate corporate entity).</p> <p>d) Or is an Incorporated Joint Venture mandatory? (i.e., Is it a strict requirement for the participating members to register and form a distinct, separate corporate entity/company under the relevant Companies Act to be considered a "legally constituted" JV for the execution of this contract?)</p>	
20	Not referred	<p><b>Clarification:</b> What is the total number of central purchasing entities? What is the total number of requesting entities? Are requesting entities authorized to initiate procurement requests</p>	<p>Refer to the revised functional requirements for a detailed response to the queries on system functionality. As stated in Section VII, 1.3, page</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>within a defined financial threshold without referring to the central purchasing entity, or is central approval always required? How are external oversight bodies' authorities defined? How are higher authority (e.g., Minister level) roles defined? At the institutional level (Secretary-General, Head of Internal Audit, Governor, Deputy Governor), do these roles have authority to review all tenders within the entity?</p>	<p>137 <i>“The e-Government Procurement (e-GP) application software will be used as a shared infrastructure by all the procuring entities of the Government of Sri Lanka including the Ministries, Departments, Local Government and Public Sector Enterprises.”</i></p>
21	<p>Section IV, 3.7, "Operations and Maintenance Cost – Post Warranty Period O&amp;M Cost", page 128</p>	<p><b>Clarification:</b> During the pre-bid meeting we understood the TCO structure. To us it looks more like a COTS solution on dedicated infrastructure and then having a yearly O&amp;M post implementation. This structure is not aligned to SaaS software as SaaS software will have yearly fees that cannot be broken down by infrastructure and module fees. Is MOF SL open to change the TCO construct to align with SaaS solutions?</p>	<p>There is no change to the bidding document. As explained in Item 20 of the second addendum to the bidding document: <i>A SaaS / multi-tenant e-GP solution is not acceptable to the purchaser.</i></p>
22	<p>Annex 01, "General Questions"</p>	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Is SaaS Procurement application acceptable (XYZ Technology Cloud) or is MOF looking at On-premise version (XYZ Technology EBS) on MOF servers? Is MOF willing to go for a Hybrid approach with SaaS?</p>	<p>Refer to Item 20 of the second addendum to the bidding document and Items 13 and 14 of Section 3 in the first set of clarifications.</p>
23	<p>Section III, ITP 11.2, page 48</p>	<p><b>Clarification:</b> We are the SaaS solution provider. As MOF would want bidders to have one single contract for end to end services, we will have one of our authorized partners with local presence to front-end the bid. Bidder's would not be a signatory on the</p>	<p>As explained in Item 20 of the second addendum to the bidding document: <i>A SaaS / multi-tenant e-GP solution is not acceptable to the purchaser.</i> The e-GP product owner must be the proposer or a JV member.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		contract; we will have a back-to-back arrangement with our authorized partner. Let us know if this construct is okay.	
24	No specific reference provided in the query	For an e-GP product implemented in multiple government installations, please confirm whether a separate client-issued experience certificate is required for each installation to be considered under this criterion, or whether a single certificate from one installation would be acceptable.	Refer to Section III, 1.4.2 “The e-GP product owned by the proposer or a JV member must have been installed and implemented government-wide in at least <b>two (02) government installations at central or state level (governed by separate contracts).</b> ” As the installations shall be governed by separate contracts, it is unclear how a single certificate could be issued for both. Hence, the following clarification: <i>The government installations cited by the proposer to qualify for this criterion must be from different clients. Two separate contracts signed by the same client will be treated as one installation.</i>
25	ITP 39.9; Page 53	<p><b><u>Clarifications:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will product demonstration be required as part of evaluation? If yes, please specify scope.</li> <li>• Is a product demonstration part of the technical evaluation?</li> <li>• When will solution demonstrations be requested, if at all?</li> </ul>	Production demonstration by the proposer during the bid evaluation stage is not envisaged.

## 2 Implementation Schedule and Payment Terms

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section VII, "Implementation Schedule", page 169	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Start of Exit Management / Transition Management at G + 27 months.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify scope, duration, deliverables, acceptance criteria, and whether separate commercial line items may be quoted for Exit / Transition Management support.</p>	Refer to item 24 of section 2 in the first pre-proposal clarifications. Refer to item 1 of the fourth addendum for the exit and transition management scope.
2	Section VII, 2.1, "System Analysis, Design and Customization/Development", page 153	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> 2.1 System Analysis, Design and Customization/Development — prototype methodology.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether nationwide rollout is required in Phase 1, or whether rollout shall be phased ministry-wise / department-wise.</p>	Refer to item 16 of section 2 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.
3	Section VII, "UAT Committee", page 164	<p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Kindly specify expected size, composition, roles, and quorum of the UAT Committee.</li> <li>b) Kindly confirm whether the Purchaser will nominate UAT members within planned project timelines to avoid implementation delays.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Refer to Item 11 of Section 2 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.</li> <li>b) Refer section 7, Implementation Schedule, page 169, serial number 2 for the timeline associated with constitution of the UAT committee (T + 21 days). Also, refer to Item 3, fourth addendum to the bidding document</li> </ul>
4	Section VII, "UAT Committee", page 164	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify deemed acceptance mechanism in case UAT feedback is not provided within defined timelines.</p>	UAT will be done as per the procedures explained in the bidding document / RFP. There is no deemed acceptance.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
5	Section VII, 2.1, "System Analysis, Design and Customization/Development", page 153	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> 2.1 System Analysis, Design and Customization/Development — i, ii, iii, iv, v, vi, vii — prototype methodology.</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The project mandates a prototype methodology for software development where user feedback is iteratively incorporated. To prevent scope creep and safeguard the 52-week Phase 1 delivery schedule, please define the boundary or maximum number of iterative feedback cycles allowed per module before any further functional modification is treated as a formal Change Order under GCC Clause 39.</li> <li>b) Please confirm whether there is any limit on the number of iterations during the Enhanced Prototype stage. Also clarify whether major redesign requests from the Purchaser will lead to timeline extensions or change requests.</li> <li>c) To prevent scope creep and safeguard the 52-week Phase 1 delivery schedule, please define the boundary or maximum number of iterative feedback cycles allowed per module before any further functional modification is treated as a formal Change Order under GCC Clause 39.</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to Items 21 and 26 of Section 2 in the first Pre-Proposal Clarifications. The proposer to note specifically the following: The UAT team will give additional time to the proposer to implement non-essential requirements in a feature after the launch as explained in section 2.1 (iv):</p> <p><i>Based on the demonstration by the Proposer and testing of the software deployed in the test environment, the UAT team will provide its feedback confirming the extent of compliance, identify non-compliances if any and prioritize the work areas as under:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Gaps in software functionality to be addressed before the launch</i></li> <li><i>ii. Gaps in software functionality to be implemented subsequently (i.e., after the launch and at no additional cost to the Purchaser).</i></li> </ul>
6	Section IX, SCC GCC 1.1(e)(xiii), "Post-Warranty Period", page 269	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The post-warranty service period shall be three (03) years following the completion of the original contract period. Immediately upon completion of the original contract, a separate contract shall be executed for the provision of post-warranty services, based on the adjustment rate for O&amp;M costs quoted by</p>	<p>As stated in GCC 1.1 (e) (xiii), page 269 and given in the cited text: <i>Immediately upon completion of the original contract, <u>a separate contract shall be executed for the provision of post-warranty services.</u> The percentage increased quoted in L1 (Section IV, Table</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>the Supplier in its Proposal. The annual percentage adjustment quoted in the proposal shall not exceed seven percent (7%) per year.</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please clarify if the bidder is strictly mandated to execute this post-warranty contract at the time of initial bidding, or if its execution will be subject to mutual agreement at the end of the initial 4-year term.</li> <li>b) Please clarify if the bidder is strictly mandated to execute this post-warranty contract at the time of initial bidding, or if its execution will be subject to mutual agreement at the end of the initial 4-year term based on prevailing technological and commercial conditions.</li> <li>c) Please clarify the timing and nature of this commitment: Is the bidder obligated to execute this formal agreement at the time of the initial bid submission? Alternatively, is the execution of the post-warranty contract intended to be subject to mutual agreement upon the expiration of the initial four-year term?</li> </ul>	<p>3.7), will be included in the contract signed with the proposer.</p> <p><i>The Purchaser may decide to extend the O&amp;M period (with a post warranty service contract), in which case the proposer shall maintain the software for an additional 3 years according to the percentage increase quoted by the proposer in L1 of Table 3.7.</i></p>
7	Section VII, 4.3, "Operational Acceptance Tests / UAT", page 163	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The UAT committee will authorize the launch of a software feature... The UAT committee will take a decision on acceptance of the system.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Acceptance criteria?</p>	Refer to the section “Feature-wise – User Acceptance Criteria” in the Functional Requirement Specification document.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
8	Section VII, "System Inventory Table and Associated Payment Terms", pages 172–175	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Payment due to the Proposer shall be made only to the extent features are implemented by the Proposer and accepted by the Purchaser.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Detailed milestone %? Are payments linked to deliverables/FRS?</p>	Refer to item 6 of section 2 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.
9	Section VII, 4.3.2, page 164	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly provide milestone-based payment schedule for implementation and O&amp;M phases.</p>	Refer to item 6 of section 2 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.
10	Section VII, "System Inventory Table", page 172; Section IV, Table 3.7, "Post-Warranty O&M", page 126	<p><b>Clarification:</b> We understand that the quoted price for the post-warranty Operations &amp; Maintenance (O&amp;M) period will be considered for bid evaluation; however, it will not be included in the original contract. Instead, the 'percentage increase quoted by the proposer (in row L1 of Table 3.7)' will be applied, and a separate contract will be executed at the end of the initial contract period. We kindly request that provisions be considered for adjustments based on exchange rate fluctuations and inflation, in addition to the quoted percentage increase, when determining the post-warranty O&amp;M costs.</p>	Adjustments related to exchange rate fluctuations wont apply because according to ITP 18.2, <i>The Proposer may express the Proposal price in any currency. If the Proposer wishes to be paid in a combination of amounts in different currencies, it may quote its price accordingly but shall use no more than three foreign currencies in addition to the currency of the Purchaser's Country.</i> Please also see forth addendum (item no 39) for additional clarification on the basis of quoting the percentage increase up to a maximum of 7 percent.
11	Section VII, 5.4, "Software Change Control — 100 Man-Month Allocation", pages 165–167	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Section 5.4 estimates 100 man-months for change requests during the 4-year support period.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether this effort is only for enhancements requested by the Purchaser or also includes bug fixing and regulatory changes. Kindly clarify how additional effort beyond 100 man-months will be handled.</p>	The 100 man-months allocation is for Purchaser-requested software change requests (enhancements and new features). Bug fixes, warranty defect rectification, and maintenance of existing functionality are part of the Supplier's standard O&M obligations and are not counted against this allocation. The proposer shall include the cost of bug fixing and software maintenance

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p>under the O &amp; M line item. As explained in Section VII, 5.4 “Purchaser will require the Proposer to implement functional requirements not envisaged in this procurement document.” as a software change. Refer to section 5.4 for a detailed explanation about the software change control procedure. The man month rates quoted by the proposer in its financial bid will be included in the contract and it shall remain valid for change requests exceeding 100 man-months for the entire contract duration.</p>

### 3 Infrastructure and Software Licenses

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	<p>Section VII, 1.4.2, "Infrastructure, Deployment and License / Support Requirements", page 143</p> <p>Section VII, 3.1, "Computing Hardware Specifications", page</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Dedicated cloud account with admin visibility for Purchaser.</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) We don't have a plan to have DC in SL. Please let us know if MOF SL is open to hosting in Singapore on a long-term basis.</li> <li>b) Kindly confirm whether hosting must be within Sri Lanka only, or overseas cloud hosting is permissible</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to Item 5 of Section 3 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	163; Section IX, SCC GCC 16.1(a)(iii)	subject to data residency, cybersecurity, and applicable legal compliance requirements.	
2	Section III, 1.5, "Manufacturer's Authorization", page 57	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Since all services will be hosted in the public cloud, we assume no physical hardware is required for the e-GP system's overall deployment. In such case, who will be responsible for signing the Manufacturer's Authorization letter? Must proposers collect an authorization letter from public cloud service providers? Do we consider them manufacturers in this regard?</p>	Proposers are not required to provide a Manufacturer's Authorization Letter from public cloud service providers. Refer to Item 5 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document.
3	Section VII, 1.4.2, "Infrastructure, Deployment and License / Support Requirements", page 143	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Solution will be centrally hosted on a cloud platform provided by the Proposer based on IT requirements.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> For accurate infrastructure sizing and commercial estimation, kindly provide indicative transaction volumes such as annual tender count, supplier/bidder count, internal user count, number of departments/entities, estimated document storage size, and rollout approach (centralized or phased).</p>	Refer to Item 11 of Section 4 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
4	Section VII, 1.5.1, "Cloud Infrastructure — CSP Selection, Data Sovereignty and DR Requirements", pages 145–146	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Section 3.1 and 1.5.1 describe the cloud infrastructure approach.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the Purchaser has any preferred cloud provider or hosting region requirements. Also clarify who will be responsible for cloud security audits, backups, and disaster recovery management.</p>	<p>Refer to Item 5 of Section 3 of the first pre-proposal clarifications. The Purchaser has no preferred cloud service provider and no mandatory hosting region requirement per SCC GCC 16.1(a)(iii).</p> <p>As explained in Items 7 and 8 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Proposers are solely responsible for ensuring the security of the e-GP software application and the cloud infrastructure in which the software is deployed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Proposers shall continuously subject the software application and the infrastructure to security audits to verify and confirm that the e-GP system as a whole complies with international cybersecurity best practices.</i></li> </ul> <p>As explained in Item 9 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document, <i>The Purchaser shall have the system audited by internal resources or a 3rd-party IT security auditor at its cost to verify compliance with international best practices drawn from established standards in IT security such as Top 10 Open Web Application Security Project (OWASP), ISO 27001, PCI DSS, NIST 800, ISO 27017 and Penetration Testing Execution Standard (PTES).... the proposer should make the necessary</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p><i>changes to the software and infrastructure at its own cost to remedy the issues identified by the auditor.</i></p> <p>As explained in Item 10 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document <i>The proposer is responsible for performing and safely storing timely, regular backups of its data and Software in accordance with accepted data management principles, and for ensuring compliance with the RPO specified in the bidding document.</i></p> <p>DR procedures will be finalized during the project implementation phase.</p>
5	Section VII, 1.5.1(6), "DC-DR Replication", page 146	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify when the Purchaser expects to take a decision for DR site activation, as bidders are required to price related services.	Refer to item 8 of Section 2 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.
6	Section VII, 1.5.1(6), "DC-DR Replication", page 146	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> If the Purchaser decides to set-up a DR, the Proposer shall replicate its existing production set-up configuration onto the DR. (RTO not specified.)</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <p>a) Kindly confirm whether Disaster Recovery Plan is required to be submitted along with the proposal. Kindly also clarify expected DR model (hot/warm/cold), activation timeline, and applicable RPO/RTO requirements.</p>	Refer to Item 21 of Section 3 in the first pre-proposal clarifications. Refer section VII, 1.5.1, page 145: 1. <i>Back up the e-GP application data, file system, and system logs at regular intervals such that Recovery Point Objective (RPO) does not exceed 30 Minutes. For database, the RPO should be less than 5 minutes.</i> The DR model and RTO requirements will be finalized during the project implementation phase. Refer to Item 6, fourth addendum to the bidding document for about the DR replication costing.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>b) What is required Recovery Time Objective (RTO)?                      c) FRS targets a Recovery Point Objective of 5 minutes. Please confirm RTO targets and whether an active-active DR site is required, as this materially affects infrastructure sizing and licensing.</p>	
7	<p>Section VII, 1.5.1(6), "DC-DR Replication", page 146</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The Proposer shall include its service charges for setting up the DC-DR replication in its bid price as part of its Operations and Maintenance (O&amp;M) costs.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> We would like to enquire whether the cost of the DC-DR replication should be included in our quoted amount under Operations and Maintenance?</p>	<p>It is explicitly clarified in Item 6 of the fourth addendum that the ... <i>purchaser will procure, at its cost, the secure data connectivity, server infrastructure, and any other software required for the DC-DR replication, as recommended by the proposer. The proposer shall quote only its service charges to enable DC-DR replication, as a part of its Operations and Maintenance (O &amp; M) costs.</i></p>
8	<p>Section VII, 3.1, "Computing Hardware Specifications", page 161</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Production, Pre-production, Training in cloud; Dev/Test under implementation/O&amp;M cost.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm that pricing should include Production, DR (if applicable), Pre-production, Training, Test, and Development environments. Kindly also clarify required DR sizing ratio (1:1 / warm standby / cold standby).</p>	<p>Proposers can host the development, and test environments in any location of their choice. Proposers shall include the cost of the infrastructure for hosting the development and test environments under the Software Development and Implementation and O &amp; M cost heads.</p> <p>Refer to section VII, 3.1: (viii) <i>The production, pre-production and training environments shall be deployed in the cloud and the bill of materials associated with these environments shall be included by the Proposer in its quote under the Server-Side Infrastructure. However, the Proposer shall include the cost of the infrastructure for</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p><i>hosting the development and test environments under the Software Development and Implementation and O &amp; M cost heads</i></p> <p>The purchaser will procure the DR infrastructure at its cost. As stated in Item 6 of the fourth addendum, <i>the proposer shall quote only its service charges to enable DC-DR replication, as a part of its Operations and Maintenance (O &amp; M) costs.</i></p> <p>Further, refer to item 9 of section 4 in the first pre-proposal clarifications for costing DR infrastructure. DC – DR sizing ratio will be communicated during the project implementation phase.</p>
9	Section VII, 3.1, "Computing Hardware Specifications / Table 3.5(b)", pages 161–163	<p><b>Clarification:</b> The requirement mentions that the Purchaser will pay for compute facilities in the cloud infrastructure based on the provided bill of materials. Please clarify if the cloud hosting rental costs for the Development, System Integration Testing (SIT), and User Acceptance Testing (UAT) environments during the implementation phase will also be borne directly by the Purchaser, or if the SIP must factor these environments into the SDI costs.</p>	<p>As stated in the section VII, 3.1, (viii) <i>the Proposer shall include the cost of the infrastructure for hosting the development and test environments under the Software Development and Implementation and O &amp; M cost heads.</i></p>
10	Section IV, "Price Schedule 3.5(b) and	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Note (i) specifies that the Purchaser will pay for Type 2 and Type 3 items, such as storage and bandwidth utilization (outbound data transfer), at actuals.</p>	<p>Refer to Section IV, 3.5 Server-Side infrastructure, Notes:</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Note (i)", pages 123–125	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm that all data egress and storage costs exceeding the indicative unit counts will be treated as direct pass-through costs and fully reimbursed by the Purchaser without any financial penalization to the System Implementation Partner.	(i) The Purchaser will pay for the remaining items (i.e., the items under type 2 and type 3 in Table 3.5 (b) such as storage, bandwidth utilization and firewall) <u>at actuals</u> .  <i>As explained in (j) During the contract execution, the Purchaser – after due consultations with the Proposer – will define the Bill of Materials (i.e., all items under type 1, type 2 and type 3) to be purchased from the cloud service provider. Accordingly, the Proposer will buy the services and invoice for the purchased services together with the overhead costs computed basis the percentage quoted in Table 3.5 (c). The payment for such invoices will be made within 4 weeks of the invoice receipt date.</i>
11	Section IX, SCC GCC 12.1(g), "Cloud BoM Payment Mechanism"; Section IV, Table 3.5(b)	<b>Clarification:</b> Payment Arrangement for Cloud BoM: We read SCC GCC 12.1(g) to mean the Proposer is the sole invoicing party. Could the Department confirm if this is the only arrangement contemplated, or if it would consider direct payments to the Local Representative for recurring cloud costs and separate payments to the Proposer for system implementation and maintenance?	Purchaser will make payment to “supplier” as defined in GCC 1.1 (b) (iv) ““Supplier” means the firm or Joint Venture whose proposal to perform the Contract has been accepted by the Purchaser and is named as such in the Contract Agreement.” Refer to Item 12 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document. The Purchaser will not make direct payments to a supplier nominated Local Representative or any third party under this contract.
12	Section I, ITP 18, "Currencies of Proposal and Payment"; Section IX, SCC GCC 12.4	<b>Clarification:</b> Settlement Currency: For the cloud BoM line invoiced in USD, will the Purchaser settle the invoice directly in USD per ITP 18.1, or convert the amount to Sri Lankan Rupees as of the invoice date per SCC GCC 12.4?	Refer GCC 12.4 “Payments shall be made in the currency(ies) specified in the Contract Agreement, pursuant to GCC Clause 11. For Goods and Services supplied locally, payments shall be made <b>as specified in the SCC.</b> ” Refer to the SCC corresponding to GCC 12.4:

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p><i>The Supplier will invoice the Purchaser in the currency used in the Contract Agreement and the Price Schedules it refers to. Refer to Item 13, fourth addendum to the bidding document for an updated version of the SCC GCC 12.4</i></p>
13	<p>Section IX, SCC GCC 12.1(g), "Periodic Revision of Cloud BoM"; Section IV, Table 3.5(b)</p>	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Periodic Revision of BoM: Since consumption may vary over the years, can the BoM be revised periodically (e.g., quarterly)? What is the intended procedure for approval and lead times?</p>	<p>The BoM will be revised periodically during contract execution. The procedure to be followed for such a revision is explained in SCC GCC 12.1 (g).</p>
14	<p>Section IV, "Price Schedule Table 3.5(b)", page 123; Section VII, 1.4.2, "Infrastructure, Deployment and License / Support Requirements"</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> (ix) The Proposer shall quote the cloud infrastructure rental costs as published in the web portal of a reputed public cloud service provider.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> As per this bidder will be paid on proposed cloud resources based on the rates mentioned in the web portal of cloud provider. In this case cost for proposed cloud infrastructure will be considered for the commercial evaluation? If that so how will be the cloud resource cost will be calculated? will that be based on the prevailing rate in the web portal at the bid evaluation is done?</p>	<p>The rates quoted in Table 3.5 (b) gets rolled into Table 3.5, which in turn gets rolled into Table 3.1 "Grand Summary Cost Table". Item 14 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document explains the process for computing SKU pricing in the event of a discrepancy.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
15	Section III, Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Criterion 9, page 66; Section VII, 1.4.3, "Email and SMS Requirements", page 144	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Establishment of the email server is specified by the proposers. Refer section 1.4.3.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Is it required to install email server by bidder or only pushing emails to a mail gateway? Since EGP system push outbound mails only is there a requirement of deploying a mail server?</p>	<p>Establishing a dedicated email server for the e-GP project is not envisaged.</p> <p>Refer 1.4.3 (3) <i>“For bulk mails, the Proposer is advised to select a cloud email service provider and integrate the e-GP system with the cloud email service provider. The proposer shall include the cost of integrating the e-GP system with the cloud service provider in its bid price within the software development and implementation line item. The service charges incurred for sending the mails shall be borne by the Purchaser.”</i></p>
16	Section VII, 1.4.3, "Email and SMS Requirements", page 144	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The purchaser shall select the SMS service provider and pay for the service charges incurred for sending the SMS.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm that bidder is required to quote only implementation/integration cost, while recurring SMS/email usage charges shall be borne directly by the Purchaser.</p>	<p>The requirement is clear. Refer to the previous response regarding email usage charges. For SMS, refer Section VII, 1.4.3 (4): <i>The Proposer shall include within its bid price, the cost of implementing 30 SMS types and integrating with the SMS service provider. The purchaser shall select the SMS service provider and pay for the service charges incurred for sending the SMS.</i></p>
17	Annex 01, 2.1(J), "Government User Management / OTP Validation", page 17	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "In addition to email address validation, the Government may seek to implement One-Time Password (OTP) validation of the user's mobile number."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Will the SMS Gateway API consumption costs for OTP generation be borne by the Purchaser via an existing</p>	<p>Refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 6, Item 3 of the first pre-proposal clarifications and the previous response.</li> </ul>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Annex 01, 2.1, "Government User Management / OTP Validation", pages 17–18	<p>government SMS gateway, or should the SI embed the SMS consumption costs into the Recurrent O&amp;M commercial tables?</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Section 2.1.K states the government 'may seek to implement' OTP validation for mobile numbers. Please confirm whether OTP is in baseline scope, who provides/owns the SMS gateway, expected transaction volume per month, and whether per-message charges are borne by the customer.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item 34 of section 5 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.</li> </ul>
18	Section VII, 1.4.3, "Email and SMS Service — Cloud Provider Selection and Cost Responsibility", page 144	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the list of 30 SMS types is already defined or will be finalized during requirement gathering. If additional SMS types are required later, will it be treated as a scope change? Also clarify who will manage email API credentials and whether the Purchaser can share the preferred SMS gateway vendor details.</p>	<p>The 30 SMS notification types will be finalized during the pilot and O &amp; M phases. The proposer is required to handle minor modifications to a SMS template as a part of the O &amp; M contract. The creation of additional SMS types beyond 30 will be considered as a scope variation. The purchaser will share the SMS gateway vendor details during the project implementation phase. The procedure for managing API credentials will be finalized during the project implementation phase.</p>
19	Section VII, 1.5.2(7) and 1.5.2(15), "Security Requirements", page 146; Section IV, Table 3.5(b), Line Item 9 "Firewall", page 123	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The system must be adequately protected against OWASP Top 10 risks and requires comprehensive logging of the traffic through the network and applications. Table 3.5(b) lists "Firewall" as an infrastructure line item.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b></p>	<p>The proposers are required to design a cost-effective solution that keeps the e-GP system safe and secure while complying with the latest IT security best practices. According to ITP 39.1, <i>The weight to be given for cost is: 70 %.</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could the Purchaser clarify if a Cloud-Native WAF (AWS/Azure WAF) is sufficient, or does the Purchaser expect the SI to provision a dedicated Enterprise Next-Generation Virtual Firewall (NGFW) with advanced Intrusion Prevention System (IPS) and URL filtering subscriptions to fulfill these deep traffic logging and threat prevention requirements?</li> <li>• Kindly confirm whether AWS Network Firewall is acceptable. Additionally, if a third-party firewall solution such as Check Point is required.</li> </ul>	<p>The line items in 3.5 (b), type 3 are indicative. This is clarified in items 15-17 in the fourth addendum to the bidding document.</p>
20	<p>Section IV, Table 3.5(b), Line Item 9 "Firewall", page 123; Section IV, Table 3.5(d), "Other Server-Side Infrastructure"</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Cloud Infrastructure Rental table (3.5(b)) lists "Firewall" as an infrastructure line item.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Regarding the "Firewall" line item in the Cloud Infrastructure Rental table (3.5(b)), should the SI include the software licensing subscription costs for the firewall within this specific line item, or should the software licenses be priced strictly under Table 3.5(d) "Other Server-Side Infrastructure Costs"?</p>	<p>The line items in 3.5 (b), type 3 are indicative. This is clarified in items 15-17 in the fourth addendum to the bidding document. Firewall is an indicative Type 3 item. SI may include the firewall item in 3.5 (b) or in 3.5 (d). The terms governing the payment vary as explained below:</p> <p><i>Refer to the notes section in page 125 (e) The items in the Table 3.5 (b) shall include only those items purchased from the cloud service provider.</i></p> <p><i>Refer (g) in page 125: For the items listed in 3.5 (d), the margins and overhead costs shall be included in the quoted price. The Proposer can invoice for these items upon completing the supply and installation.</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
21	Section VII, 1.5.2(5), "Security Requirements / Anti-Virus", page 146; Section VII, 3.0.5, "Anti-Virus Software"	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> 1.5.2(5) states "All servers should have anti-virus installed," while 3.0.5 states "The purchaser will buy a suitable Anti-virus software" based on the SI's advice.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> To ensure seamless architectural integration, can the Purchaser confirm if we should architect the environment to integrate with an advanced Extended Detection and Response (XDR) platform, or is there an existing government enterprise agreement for a specific legacy AV vendor that the SI must implement and maintain?</p>	<p>Refer to Item 18 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document for a revision about the inclusion of Anti-virus software in the proposer's quote. Anti-virus solution must be provided by proposers as an integral component of their solution.</p>
	Section VII, 1.5, "Security Requirements", page 146	<p>Kindly confirm whether there is any specific antivirus/security solution that should be included in the costing.</p>	<p>The proposers are required to design a cost-effective solution that keeps the e-GP system safe and secure while complying with the latest IT security best practices.</p>
22	Section VII, 1.5.2(5), "Security Requirements / File Upload Scanning", page 146	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Real-time virus scanning of uploaded files is not envisaged.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Given that public vendors are allowed to upload files up to 30MB, would the Purchaser accept and look favorably upon an architecture that integrates API-based sandboxing and real-time malicious payload scanning before files reach the cloud storage buckets, to ensure strict zero-trust security?</p>	<p>No change in the bidding document. The proposers are required to design a cost-effective solution that keeps the e-GP system safe and secure while complying with the latest IT security best practices. According to ITP 39.1, <i>The weight to be given for cost is: 70 %.</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
23	Section VII, 3.0.3, "Audit Log Shipping"; Section VII, 1.5.2(4), "SIEM Systems", pages 146 and 159	<b>Clarification:</b> Can the Purchaser clarify if the SI is required to propose, implement, and license a net-new SIEM platform specifically for this e-GP environment, or will the e-GP system simply forward logs (via Syslog/CEF) to an existing Security Operations Center (SOC) / SIEM operated by the Ministry of Finance?	The purchaser will provide a central SIEM platform to which security logs and events recorded in the e-GP system will be shipped in a machine-readable format. During the project implementation phase, the SIEM platform owner will specify the log requirements, data format, and protocol for data sharing. Refer to Item 19 of the fourth addendum for further details.
24	Section VII, 1.5.2(4), "Database Query Logging / Database Activity Monitoring", page 146	<b>RFP Text:</b> "Database query logging should be enabled to track and record all the queries executed in the system." <b>Clarification:</b> Does the Purchaser require a dedicated Database Activity Monitoring (DAM) solution to ensure segregation of duties, or is native database engine audit logging acceptable provided the logs are securely forwarded to the central SIEM?	No change to the bidding document/RFP. The proposers are required to design a cost-effective solution that keeps the e-GP system safe and secure while complying with the latest IT security best practices. According to ITP 39.1, <i>The weight to be given for cost is: 70 %.</i>
25	Section IV, Table 3.5(b), "Server-Side Infrastructure", page 123; Section VII, 4.3.2, "Operational Acceptance Tests"	<b>RFP Text:</b> Specifies Server-Side Infrastructure requirements and mandates a strict infrastructure security audit prior to Operational Acceptance. <b>Clarification:</b> Given that the system will be deployed on a public cloud and must undergo a strict 3rd-party infrastructure security audit prior to Operational Acceptance (FRS 4.3.2), does the Purchaser expect the SI to include a Cloud Security Posture Management (CSPM) or Cloud Native Application Protection Platform (CNAPP) tool within the Server-Side Infrastructure	No change to the bidding document/RFP. The proposers are required to design a cost-effective solution that keeps the e-GP system safe and secure while complying with the latest IT security best practices. According to ITP 39.1, <i>The weight to be given for cost is: 70 %.</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		BOM to continuously monitor for cloud misconfigurations and ensure sustained ISO 27001 compliance?	
26	Section VII, 1.4.2(3), "License Restrictions", page 143	<b>Clarification:</b> Does ownership refer to entire software stack or application layer?	As stated in 1.4.2 (3) <i>The e-GP application software and its associated system software shall NOT have any license restrictions ...</i> The term “e-GP application software and its associated system software” may be read as “ <i>the entire solution stack</i> ”.
27	FRS, 10.4, "PKI Server", page 83	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The e-GP vendor may be required to set up a Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) server to meet the e-GP system's PKI-based encryption and signing requirements.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b></p> <p>a) Kindly confirm the total number of environments required for the PKI Server deployment for UAT / Pre-Production and Production.</p> <p>b) Kindly confirm if the setting up the DR centre is within the scope of the proposer or will it be arranged by Ministry.</p> <p>c) Kindly confirm whether the PKI Server deployment in the production environment is required to be configured in High Availability (HA) mode.</p>	<p>a) The proposer is required to set-up PKI server in as many environments as required (i.e., training, production, UAT and pre-production). Kindly note that a simple, freely available public-private key pair generation application is adequate, provided the proposed solution addresses the minimal functional requirements sought under the PKI server heading.</p> <p>b) As explained in Item 6 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document “<i>The purchaser will procure, at its cost, the secure data connectivity, server infrastructure, and any other software required for the DC-DR replication, as recommended by the proposer. The proposer shall quote only its service charges to enable DC-DR replication, as a part of its Operations and Maintenance (O &amp; M) costs.</i>”</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p>c) The proposer must set-up the PKI server with adequate reliability. Refer (a) above for additional details.</p>
28	FRS, 10.4, “PKI Server”, page 83	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> An authorized officer will approve the issuance of digital certificates based on application forms received outside the system.</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <p>(a) Kindly let us know the total number of digital certificates to be issued by the e-GP PKI Server, to enable the Proposer to provide accurate hardware sizing.</p> <p>(b) Provide the estimated count of Vendors and Govt users which will be very much useful for server sizing.</p>	<p>Response to (a): As explained in Item 21 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document “<i>The certificates generated by the PKI server will be used only for encryption and NOT for signing.</i>” and “<i>The generation of procurement-specific private-public key pair by integrating the PKI server with the e-Tendering module is accepted as a valid alternative to generating user-specific keys.</i>” There is no limit on the certificates to be generated by the PKI server. As clarified above “<i>a simple, freely available public-private key pair generation application is adequate</i>”</p> <p>Response to (b): Refer to item 11 of section 4 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.</p>
29	<p>Annex 01 (FRS), 10.4, "PKI Server", page 83; Section VII, 3.08, "Digital Signature", page 160</p> <p>Annex 01, Section 10.4, "PKI Server"; Annex 01,</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The RFP requires a PKI server with digital signature and encryption capabilities, which necessitates a Hardware Security Module (HSM) for cryptographic key management.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since the proposed solution's architecture is cloud-based, we seek clarification on whether the Sri Lankan regulatory and legal framework permits using a software-based HSM (SoftHSM) or a cloud-hosted</li> </ul>	<p>Setting up a dedicated HSM is not a requirement. The government does not seek to set up a CA-type infrastructure. A simple, freely available public-private key pair generation application is adequate, provided the proposed solution addresses the minimal functional requirements sought under the PKI server heading. The proposer must provide the PKI server.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	<p>Section 10.5, "Asymmetric Key Bid Encryption"</p> <p>Annex 01, 10.4, "PKI Server", page 83</p>	<p>HSM service (such as AWS CloudHSM or Azure Dedicated HSM) in lieu of a physical on-premise Hardware HSM. If so, shall the proposer include the cost of the physical HSM as a separate line item in the commercial proposal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the secure generation, storage, and management of the keys used in Asymmetric Key Bid Encryption, does the Purchaser mandate the use of a dedicated Hardware Security Module (HSM) (Cloud HSM)? If an HSM is required, should the provisioning and rental costs be included in the Server-Side Infrastructure (SSI) BOM?</li> <li>• "The PKI server shall NOT maintain a copy of the private keys..." (HSM not specified). Who provides HSM?</li> </ul>	
30	<p>Section VII, 3.08, "Digital Signature", page 160</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> System shall use valid key-pair certified by recognized Certification Authority.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) list of recognized Certification Authorities in Sri Lanka;</li> <li>(ii) whether foreign trusted CA certificates are acceptable;</li> <li>(iii) whether cloud signing / remote signing solutions are permitted;</li> <li>(iv) whether hybrid digital signature + e-sign workflows are acceptable;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) National Certification Authority (NCA), Sri Lanka is the highest-level CA in Sri Lanka. LankaSign is presently accredited by NCA.</li> <li>(ii) The e-GP system presently does not envisage accepting certificates issued by foreign trusted CAs.</li> <li>(iii) Cloud signing is envisaged. Refer section 10.5.6 (G), in the revised functional requirements for further details.</li> <li>(iv) The use of digital signature in workflows is envisaged. Refer 10.5.6 (I), in the revised functional requirements for further details.</li> </ul>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>(v) whether any National PKI exists for mandatory integration; and</p> <p>(vi) whether certificate cost shall be borne by Purchaser or SIP.</p>	<p>(v) The e-GP system should read the certificates issued by the NCA.</p> <p>(vi) Regarding certificate cost, refer to Item 6 of the second addendum to the bidding document.</p>
31	Section VII, 3.08, "Digital Signature", page 160	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "Signing function... Verify integrity of the signature..."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b></p> <p>a) Are e-procurement &amp; digital signatures legally recognized?</p> <p>b) Are digital bids legally enforceable? Is there a national PKI/CA?</p> <p>c) Must SIP implement PKI?</p> <p>d) Are standards like WebTrust required?</p>	<p>a) E-Procurement and digital signatures are legally recognized</p> <p>b) Same as A. National Certification Authority (NCA), Sri Lanka is the highest-level CA in Sri Lanka.</p> <p>c) PKI server is a phase 2 requirement. As explained in section VII, 4.3.2 (viii) <i>"The Proposer is required to implement Phase 2 features during the O&amp;M phase, as per work order issued by the Purchaser from time-to-time...."</i></p> <p>d) The use of Webtrust type of set-up in the context of PKI server is not required.</p>
32	Annex 01, 10.4, "PKI Server / Certificate Authority Role", page 79	<p><b>Clarification:</b> FRS requires the partner to set up a PKI server. Please confirm whether &lt;&lt;Agency name&gt;&gt; must operate as the Certificate Authority (CA) issuing certificates, or only deploy the software for the government to operate as CA.</p>	<p>The government does not seek to set up a CA-type infrastructure. A simple, freely available public-private key pair generation application is adequate provided the proposed solution addresses the minimal functional requirements sought under the PKI server heading.</p>
33	Annex 01, 10.5.1, "Asymmetric	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Section 10.5.1.L excludes reading certificates from USB tokens. Please clarify the chosen private-key storage</p>	<p>As per the revised functional requirements in the first addendum, the following requirement was deleted: <i>It is</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Encryption / USB Token", page 80	mechanism and whether client-side JavaScript libraries must be provided by the customer.	<i>assumed that the keys will be uploaded as a file. The reading of certificates from USB tokens is NOT in scope. Refer to the revised functional requirement, section 10.5.6, (E), page 87 “The e-GP system should have the ability to read the private and public key of the Digital Signature from a browser or API or token or folder system as appropriate.”</i>
34	Section VII, 3.07 / 3.08, "Electronic Signature vs. Digital Signature — Scope of Implementation", pages 159–161	<p><b>Clarification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Will the Government provide the PKI infrastructure and CA services, or is the Proposer expected to provision and manage the complete PKI setup?</li> <li>b) Is symmetric key-based signing alone acceptable at Phase 1 go-live, with PKI-based signing to follow in Phase 2 — or are both required from Day 1?</li> <li>c) Is there a Government-approved CA that the system must support?</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to Section 5, Items 6, 7, 8, 19, 20, and 37 of the first set of clarifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) As explained in Item 21 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document the proposer “...<i>may be required to set up a Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) server to meet the e-GP system's PKI-based encryption requirements.</i>” As explained in Item 24 of the second addendum to the bidding document: The system will recognize and read certificates issued by the PKI server and by the National CA (i.e., issued by sub-CAs such as Lanka Clear). The usage pattern of PKI server-generated certificates and Lanka clear issued certificates will be finalized during the project implementation. The system must be capable of using a PKI server-generated key for bid encryption and National CA-issued certificates for digital signing.</li> </ul>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p>b) PKI server is a Phase 2 requirement. As explained in section VII, 4.3.2 (viii) <i>“The Proposer is required to implement Phase 2 features during the O&amp;M phase, as per work order issued by the Purchaser from time-to-time. The Purchaser reserves the right to seek implementation of one or more Phase – 2 features during the Pilot Phase (i.e.) earlier to start of the Operations and Maintenance Phase.”</i></p> <p>c) Refer to (a) above.</p>
35	Section VII, 3.0.8(1)(b)(ii), "Digital Signature", page 160	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> valid Certification Authority recognized by the e-GP system</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Will the Purchaser provision digital certificates for government users via an existing National CA (LankaSign), or must the SI implement, host, and license a complete independent PKI/Sub-CA infrastructure?</p>	The government does not seek to set up a CA-type infrastructure. A simple, freely available public-private key pair generation application is adequate provided the proposed solution addresses the minimal functional requirements sought under the PKI server heading. Refer to Items 6 and 24 of the second addendum for further details.
36	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 6.1, "Bid Opening — PKI Based Encryption"	<p><b>Clarification:</b> How mandatory is the PKI based encryption to qualify in this RFP process?</p>	Refer to qualification and technical evaluation criteria in the bidding document for details
37	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 2.2, "Vendor	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Please share the following metrics:</p>	The count of suppliers that will get registered on the system is unknown. As explained in Item 3 in Section 3 of

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Registration / Supplier Metrics"	1. Total number of suppliers 2. Number of active suppliers.	the first pre-proposal clarification to the bidding document “ Refer: The e-GP application software and its associated system software shall NOT have any license restrictions on the number of users or number of CPU’s or Cores and in any other scalability aspect, to the extent the system is used to process procurement undertaken by the Government of Sri Lanka. The term "users" here refers to all types of users of the e-GP system including suppliers and government users.”
38	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 2.2, "Vendor Registration / User Count"	<p><b>Clarification:</b> How many users will be using the Supplier Management solution? Are all of them power users? If not, can you provide us with the breakdown of users as follows?</p> <p>User Definitions -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Power Users: Users with the ability to                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Add New Suppliers</li> <li>- Create Forms, Scorecards and Action Plans</li> <li>- Edit Supplier Profile</li> <li>- View Suppliers, Forms, Scorecards &amp; Reports</li> <li>- Approve Suppliers</li> <li>- Score Supplier Scorecards</li> <li>- Evaluate Supplier Information</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	As explained in Item 3 in Section 3 of the first pre-proposal clarification to the bidding document “ Refer: The e-GP application software and its associated system software shall NOT have any license restrictions on the number of users or number of CPU’s or Cores and in any other scalability aspect, to the extent the system is used to process procurement undertaken by the Government of Sri Lanka. The term "users" here refers to all types of users of the e-GP system including suppliers and government users.”

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Create Reports</li> <li>- Search Suppliers</li> <li>- Export Reports</li> <li>- Create Form &amp; Scorecard Templates</li> </ul> <p>Business User:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- View Suppliers, Forms, Scorecards &amp; Reports</li> <li>- Approve Suppliers</li> <li>- Score Supplier Scorecards</li> <li>- Search Suppliers</li> <li>- Export Reports</li> </ul>	
39	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 4, "Procurement Creation / Sourcing — User Count"	<p><b>Clarification:</b> How many users will be using the Sourcing solution? Are all of them power users? If not, can you provide us with the breakdown of users as follows?</p> <p>User Definitions -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Power Users: Users with the ability to                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Create Sourcing Events &amp; Reports</li> <li>- Edit Sourcing Events &amp; Reports</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>As explained in Item 3 in Section 3 of the first pre-proposal clarification to the bidding document “ <i>Refer: The e-GP application software and its associated system software shall NOT have any license restrictions on the number of users or number of CPU’s or Cores and in any other scalability aspect, to the extent the system is used to process procurement undertaken by the Government of Sri Lanka. The term "users" here refers to all types of users of the e-GP system including suppliers and government users.</i> ”</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- View Sourcing Events &amp; Reports</li> <li>- Score Sourcing Events</li> <li>- Search Sourcing Events</li> <li>- Export Reports</li> <li>- Create Sourcing Templates</li>   <li>• Business Users: Users with the ability to</li> <li>- View Sourcing Events &amp; Reports</li> <li>- Score Sourcing Events</li> <li>- Search Sourcing Events</li> <li>- Export Reports</li> </ul>	
40	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 7, "Award of Contract — Contract Management User Count"	<b>Clarification:</b> How many users will be using the Contract Management solution to create Contracts?	Contract management module is NOT included in the scope of the bidding document.
41		<b>Clarification:</b> Since price adjustment is restricted, kindly clarify how cloud infrastructure cost escalations over the 7-year	

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Section I, ITP 18, "Currencies of Proposal and Payment"; Section VII, 1.7.2.5	<p>contract period will be handled. Kindly confirm whether bidders may quote cloud charges as annual pass-through costs.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify how cloud infrastructure cost escalations over the 7-year contract period will be handled. Kindly confirm whether bidders may quote cloud charges as annual pass-through costs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to Item 15, Section 3 of the first pre-proposal clarifications. The purchaser is reimbursing the cloud costs essentially.</li> <li>• Refer to section IV, 3.5 Server-Side Infrastructure, Notes: The overhead costs incurred by the Proposer to purchase, install, and manage the cloud set-up shall be quoted as a percentage of the Cloud Infrastructure Rental costs, in Table 3.5 (c). (This percentage shall also be applicable for the post-warranty period.)</li> </ul>

## 4 Service Level Requirements

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section VII, 1.7.2.5, "Load and Performance SLR — Transaction Mix Definition", page 153	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The Load &amp; Performance SLR mentions 15,000 transactions per hour with a defined transaction mix (workflow:tender publication:bid submission = 25:25:50).</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please share the expected yearly procurement transaction volume so that infrastructure sizing can be planned properly. Also clarify whether load testing should simulate a peak event or continuous peak load for one hour.</p>	<p>As explained in the Section 4, Item 11 of the first pre-proposal clarifications “The system must be designed to handle the load specified in section VII, 1.7.2.5, “Load and Performance SLR” The load testing will verify the requirements specified in 1.7.2.5. The requirement is quite clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concurrent connects to application server: 1000</li> <li>b) Capacity of the application and database servers: 15000 transactions per hour.</li> </ul> <p>Refer to Item 2, Section 4 of the first pre-proposal clarification for a query related to load handling.</p>
	Section VII, B. "Information Materials", 0.4, "Existing Information Systems", page 177	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "The Government of Sri Lanka has implemented the web portal www.promise.lk..."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether historical transaction volumes, concurrency statistics, or utilization metrics from the existing www.promise.lk platform will be shared with bidders to support accurate infrastructure sizing.</p>	
	Sizing values	For us to carry out the sizing for the Cloud infrastructure to host the proposed eGP application landscape, we need	

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>the following volumetrics. Please provide your best estimates for each metric.</p> <p>Total number of Vendors</p> <p>Total number of Buyers (Procurement entities)</p> <p>Average number of Bid/RFQ creations per month</p> <p>Average number of Bid/RFQ submissions per month</p> <p>Peak number of Bid/RFQ submissions during the busy hour</p> <p>Average number of submissions per published Bid/RFQ</p> <p>Percentage of created Bid/RFQ's that will be awarded</p> <p>Average number of Purchase Orders created per bid</p> <p>Average concurrent users on the eGP system (Vendors + Buyers)</p> <p>Peak number of concurrent users on the eGP system (Vendors + Buyers)</p>	
2	Section VII, 1.7.2.5, "Load and Performance SLR", page 152	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Concurrent connections: 1000; Capacity: 15,000 transactions per hour.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b></p> <p>a) Kindly confirm whether bidder infrastructure sizing may be based on the stated benchmarks. In case actual volumes exceed these limits post</p>	<p>The e-GP system must be designed to handle the requirements specified in the load and performance SLR, page 152. For further information, refer to Section IV, 3.5 Server-Side infrastructure, Notes:</p> <p><i>(h) The Purchaser will pay for the compute facilities (i.e., type 1 in the table 3.5 (b) covering virtual machines and their</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>go-live, kindly confirm whether additional infrastructure cost shall be borne by the Purchaser through change request or mutually agreed commercial mechanism.</p> <p>b) Kindly confirm whether bidder infrastructure sizing may be based on the stated benchmarks. In case actual volumes exceed these limits post go-live, kindly confirm the additional infrastructure cost mechanism.</p>	<p><i>associated system software) only to the extent quoted by the Proposer in its proposal. Any additional compute resources (i.e., in excess of the quantities specified in the Proposer's bill of materials) to operate the e-GP system shall be borne by the Proposer at its cost.</i></p> <p><i>(i) However, if the actual load handled by the e-GP system exceeds the peak work load envisaged in the procurement document, the Purchaser will pay for the additional compute requirements. The Purchaser will pay for the remaining items (i.e., the items under type 2 and type 3 in Table 3.5 (b) such as storage, bandwidth utilization and firewall) at actuals.</i></p>
3	Section VII, 1.7.2.5, "Load and Performance SLR", page 152	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "Capacity of the application and database servers: 15,000 transactions per hour."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether the 15,000 transactions/hour requirement represents peak concurrent transactional throughput, average throughput, or combined system-wide throughput across all modules.</p>	It is combined through put
4	Section VII, 1.7.2.5, "Load and Performance SLR", page 152	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "Capacity of the application and database servers: 15,000 transactions per hour."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether performance testing scripts, expected user concurrency models, and benchmark datasets will be provided by the Purchaser for SLA validation.</p>	<p>The requirement in the bidding document is clear. Refer to Section VII, 1.7.2.5, Load and Performance SLR, Notes:</p> <p><i>(2) The tools for testing this load will be provided by a 3rd party audit agency engaged by the Purchaser. The Proposer shall provide the requisite support in loading the application</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p><i>on to the tool as required to successfully complete this load testing activity.</i></p> <p><i>A transaction in the Purchaser's context for load simulation purpose shall refer to i) Workflow transactions (ii) Tender publication and (ii) Online bid submission. These 3 transaction types shall be combined in the ratio of 25:25:50 respectively for load and performance testing purposes.</i></p> <p><i>A back-up copy of the database available at that time will be used as the base data for conducting the load testing activity.</i></p>
5	Section VII, 1.7.2.1, "Availability SLR", page 150; Section VII, 1.7.2.2, "Page Loading Time SLR", pages 150–152	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Availability of the system: Greater than 97% during business hours averaged on a quarterly basis. Definition of business hours: 0700 hours – 2400 hours on all days of the week.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly define "business hours" for the purpose of measuring system availability. Kindly confirm whether scheduled maintenance, telecom outages, and force majeure events are excluded from SLA calculations.</p>	Refer to items 3, 4 and 5 of section 4 of the first pre-proposal clarifications.
6	Section VII, 1.7.2.2, "Page Loading Time SLR", page 150	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Page loading time = Less than or equal to 5 seconds during business hours averaged on a quarterly basis.</p>	Refer to Items 6 and 14 of Section 4 of the first pre-proposal clarifications.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p><b>Clarification:</b> For page loading time SLA, kindly clarify the reference measurement location (Data Center LAN / Colombo public internet / nationwide average).</p>	
7	<p>Section VII, 1.7.2.1, "Availability SLR", page 150</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Availability of the system: Greater than 97% during business hours.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm whether additional loads beyond the stated benchmarks shall be treated through mutually agreed change request / additional commercial mechanism.</p>	<p>Availability and load SLRs are separate. Refer to the response provided in item 2 above about handling loads exceeding the benchmark specified in the load and performance SLR. As clarified in Item 20 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document, <i>“when the actual workload exceeds the metrics specified in the load and performance SLR, the purchaser will augment the server-side infrastructure at its cost. However, any software changes required to handle the workload must be implemented by the proposer within the quoted bid price.”</i></p>
8	<p>Section VII, 1.7.2.1, "Availability SLR", page 150</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Availability of the system: Greater than 97% during business hours.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly define "business hours" for the purpose of measuring system availability. Kindly confirm whether scheduled maintenance, telecom outages, and force majeure events are excluded from SLA calculations.</p>	<p>Refer to Items 3, 4, and 5 of Section 4 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.</p>
9	<p>Section VII, 1.7.2.1, "Availability SLR", page 150</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Availability of the system: Greater than 97% during business hours. Lower performance: 5% of QMC; Breach: 8% of QMC.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Max downtime before penalty?</p>	<p>Refer to the baseline requirement in the referred section.</p> <p><i>Baseline   Availability of the system: Greater than 97% during business hours   Penalty: None</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
10	Section VII, 1.7.2.2, "Page Loading Time SLR", page 150	<b>Clarification:</b> For page loading time SLA, kindly clarify the reference measurement location.	Refer to items 6 and 14 of section 4 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.
11	Section VII, 1.7.2.1, "System Availability SLR — Business Hours Definition and Scheduled Maintenance", page 150	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The RFP defines business hours as 0700 hours – 2400 hours on all days of the week. Scheduled maintenance may be performed between 0001 hours and 0659 hours.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Is the 6.5-hour overnight window (12:00 AM – 6:30 AM) the only permitted slot for all maintenance activities? Will emergency maintenance triggered by critical security vulnerabilities or infrastructure incidents be excluded from SLR downtime calculations? Is the 97% availability target computed against calendar hours or business hours?</p>	<p>Refer to items 1, 3, 4, and 5 of section 4 in the first pre-proposal clarifications. As clarified in Item 1 <i>“The Proposer shall take concurrence of the Purchaser if scheduled maintenance is to be done during the business hours. During such maintenance work, the SLR automation tool implemented to compute availability of the system will be shut down.”</i></p> <p>Availability will be measured in business hours. As explained in note 3 of 1.7.2.1, <i>Definition of business hours is 0700 hours – 2400 hours on all days of the week.</i></p> <p>The 97% availability target is computed against business hours (0700–2400, all days) on a quarterly basis.</p>
12	Section VII, 1.7.2.5, "Load and Performance SLR — 3rd Party Load Testing", page 154	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The tools for testing this load will be provided by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party audit agency engaged by the Purchaser. The Proposer shall provide the requisite support in loading the application onto the tool.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly elaborate on the load testing requirement. Kindly confirm the type of testing, the applicable time frame, and who will bear the cost.</p>	Refer to SCC GCC 25, page 275. The load testing requirement is detailed in section VII, 1.7.2.5. As explained in Item 18 of the second addendum <i>“The purchaser will engage and pay the 3rd party audit agency for the IT security audit scope detailed in the procurement document. The Proposer shall make requisite changes to the software and associated processes to address the audit findings and ensure compliance as a part of the quoted bid price.”</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
13	Annex 01, 1.7.2.5, "Load and Performance SLR", page 152	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether the required infrastructure sizing should include future scalability projections for additional government entities and procurement volumes beyond initial rollout.	As explained in Item 11, of the first pre-proposal clarifications, <i>“the system must be designed to handle the load specified in section VII, 1.7.2.5, “Load and Performance SLR””</i> . Further, as explained in Item 2 of the fourth addendum: <i>When the actual workload exceeds the metrics specified in the load and performance SLR, the purchaser will augment the server-side infrastructure at its cost. However, any software changes required to handle the workload increase must be implemented by the proposer within the quoted bid price.</i>
14	Section VII, O&M; Section VII, 1.7.2.3, "Resolution of Critical and Non-Critical Faults", page 151	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify warranty period post go-live and defect rectification timelines / SLA.	Refer to Section VII, 1.7.2 for the SLR during the Operations and Maintenance phase.
15	Section VII, O&M Phase; Section VII, 1.7.2, "Service Level Requirements"	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm whether O&M support requirement is 8x5, 12x6, or 24x7.	Proposers shall provide O & M support as explained in Section VII, 1.7.2 of the bidding document.

## 5 Technical Requirements

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section VII, 2.5, "Data Conversion and Migration", page 157	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly provide details of: (i) existing systems and data volumes; (ii) databases/documents to be migrated; (iii) data quality status; (iv) responsibility for data cleansing and validation (Purchaser or SIP); (v) source formats (DB/Excel/CSV/PDF/API); and (vi) migration cut-off date and whether parallel run is expected.</p>	<p>As explained in Item 11 of the second addendum “<i>Data migration is not envisaged within this contract</i>”. Any data migration requirements that arise during project implementation will be handled through a variation order.</p>
2	Section VII, 2.5, "Data Conversion and Migration", page 157	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The Proposer would be required to migrate data to the extent it is defined in the Functional Requirements Specification.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Is there any data migration is expected from the bidder? As per the section 2.5 "The Proposer would be required to migrate data to the extent it is defined in the Functional Requirements Specification." however no data migration scope is mentioned in the FRS. Please clarify. If data migration is required, do we need to migrate Tenders as well from the existng system or only registered vendors?</p>	<p>Refer to the previous response and Item 2 of section 5of the first pre-proposal clarification.</p>
3	Section VII, 2.5, "Data Migration Scope — PROMISE.lk Portal Data and Existing	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The Government currently operates the www.promise.lk portal.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b></p>	<p>Refer to the previous response and Item 2 of section of the first pre-proposal clarification.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Procurement Records", page 156	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please confirm whether existing data, users, vendors, tenders, and contracts from this system need to be migrated. Also clarify who will be responsible for data cleansing and validation before migration.</li> <li>• Any current system for the e-procurement at MoF? Do you expect to migrate past data to the new system.</li> </ul>	
4	Section VII, 2.5, "Data Conversion and Migration"; Section VII, 1.7.2.5	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Master Data and Transaction data are not specified in the FRS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kindly provide the average transaction data volumns per day, week, month.</li> <li>2. Estimated transactions or number of years of Open data to be migrated to new system</li> <li>3. Expected master data volumns. (e.g. Items master, Supplier master, Item category master, etc.)</li> </ol>	Refer to the previous response and Item 2 of section 5 of the first pre-proposal clarification.
5	Section VII, 2.1(vi), "Launch of the Software", page 154	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Production launch subject to successful infrastructure audit and VAPT.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether the cost of security audit, VAPT, compliance audit, and any third-party certification shall be borne by the Purchaser or included in bidder quotation.</p>	As explained in Item 18 of the second addendum, <i>“The purchaser will engage and pay the 3rd party audit agency for the IT security audit scope detailed in the procurement document. The Proposer shall make requisite changes to the software and associated processes to address the audit findings and ensure compliance as a part of the quoted bid price.”</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
6	Section VII, 1.5.2, "Security Requirements — OWASP Audit", page 147	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The Purchaser shall have the system audited using internal resources to ensure that it is adequately protected against the latest OWASP Top 10. The Proposer must apply system changes required to secure the system in compliance with security best practices.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> We regularly conduct internal application security testing. Is that sufficient? If not, kindly confirm who will conduct the application security testing, the applicable time frame, and who will bear the cost.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 5, Items 23, 24, and 35 of the first set of clarifications. As explained in Item 7 of the fourth addendum, <i>Proposers are solely responsible for ensuring the security of the e-GP software application and the cloud infrastructure in which the software is deployed.</i> To ensure security, proposers must conduct security audit using their internal resources at their cost. In addition, <i>“The purchaser will engage and pay the 3rd party audit agency for the IT security audit scope detailed in the procurement document. The Proposer shall make requisite changes to the software and associated processes to address the audit findings and ensure compliance as a part of the quoted bid price.”</i></p>
7	Section VII, 2.1(vi), "Launch of the Software — Infrastructure Audit and VAPT", page 154	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The version of the software cleared for launch shall be deployed in the production set-up subject to the successful completion of the infrastructure audit and the VAPT.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> We regularly conduct internal application security testing and VAPT. Is that sufficient? If not, kindly confirm the type of testing/audit requirement, who will conduct such testing, the applicable time frame, and who will bear the cost.</p>	<p>Refer to the previous response. In addition, refer to Item 9 of the second addendum to the bidding document for the audit scope and audit procedure. In the Implementation schedule, section VII, page 169, the table shows the time frame for the audit.</p>
8	Section VII, 2.6.1.2, "Documentation Requirements — 3rd	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The Proposer shall provide all documentation and associated clarifications sought by the 3rd party audit agency. Any modifications sought by the audit agency</p>	<p>Refer to the previous response.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Party Audit Agency Assessment", page 157	<p>within scope shall be implemented by the Proposer for no additional payment.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm the type of testing/audit requirement, who will conduct such testing, the applicable time frame, and who will bear the cost.</p>	
9	Section VII, 4.3.2, "Operational Acceptance Tests — 3rd Party Audit Deliverables", page 164	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> A 3rd party audit agency engaged by the Purchaser will conduct a detailed study and submit deliverables: infrastructure security audit report, application security audit report, and load/performance testing results.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm the type of testing/audit requirement, who will conduct such testing, the applicable time frame, and who will bear the cost.</p>	Refer to the response given to query 7 above.
10	Section VII, "Implementation Schedule — 3rd Party Auditor Milestones", page 171	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Milestones include: 4. 3rd party auditor kick-off; 5. Security audit guidelines submission; 8. Cloud deployment and VAPT audit; 11. Audit report; 16. SLR automation audit report; 17. Performance testing; 18. Performance testing report; 19. Functional compliance report.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm the type of testing/audit requirement, who will conduct such testing, the applicable time frame, and who will bear the cost for each of these Implementation Schedule milestones.</p>	Refer to the response given to query 7 above.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
11	Section VII, 1.3, "Architectural Requirements", page 137	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm whether bidder is free to propose any technology stack, database, middleware, and cloud-native architecture subject to compliance with standards and security requirements.	The proposer may adopt a solution stack of its choice, provided the technical, functional, and service level requirements specified in the bidding document are addressed.
12	Section VII, 1.5.1, "Data Archival and Backup", page 145	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify required backup frequency, retention period, archival policy, and log retention duration.	The proposer is required to propose backup frequency to comply with the RPO requirements specified in Section VII, 1.5.1 of the bidding document. The e-GP system data shall be retained online for at least 7 years. During the implementation phase, the purchaser and proposer will agree on the log retention period. Refer to Item 23 of the fourth addendum for relevant details.
13	Section VII, O&M Phase; Section VIII, GCC 29.4, "Warranty Period"	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify the warranty period post go-live and defect rectification timelines / SLA.	Refer to section IV – proposal forms, table 3.4: <i>Operations &amp; Maintenance Cost (O&amp;M) for 12 quarters (i.e., first 3 years) - Warranty period O&amp;M Cost</i> . During this O & M phase, the proposer shall maintain the system in compliance with the SLR defined in section VII, 1.7.2.
14	Section VII, "External Integrations", page 63; Annex 01, 9.1–9.5	<b>Clarifications:</b> a) Kindly confirm which external systems must be integrated at Go-Live (Treasury, IFMIS, Tax, ID Registry, Banking Systems, etc.). b) Kindly confirm which external systems must be integrated at Go-Live.	Refer to Item 13 of Section 7 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
15	Section VII, "External Integrations", page 63; Annex 01, 9.1–9.5	<p><b>Clarification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Kindly confirm whether API specifications for required integrations are already available, or whether SIP is expected to design and develop APIs/interfaces.</li> <li>b) If third-party departments delay APIs / integration readiness, kindly confirm whether corresponding timeline extension shall be granted.</li> <li>c) The scope involves complex external integrations with CIDA, ITMIS, ROC, and NPC. Because delays in third-party API readiness can directly impact the strict 52-week Phase 1 Go-Live timeline, please confirm if the REST/SOAP APIs for all these external government systems are already developed, secured, and ready for consumption by the System Implementation Partner (SIP) from Day 1 of the project.</li> <li>d) Please confirm whether all required APIs and test environments will be provided by the Purchaser before integration starts. Also clarify how dependency delays from external systems will be managed.</li> </ul>	Refer to Item 33 of Section 5 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.
16	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 9, "External IT System Integration — API Availability"	<p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) For each of the integrations listed (CIDA, ITMIS/IFMIS, Registrar of Companies, Tax Authority, PKI, Payment Gateway, OCDS) — does</li> </ul>	Refer to the previous response regarding API documentation. Integration modes are explained in the relevant sections of the functional requirements.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>DoF SL have existing API documentation, sandbox environments, or integration middleware available? What is the expected integration mode (real-time API, batch file, or manual upload?)</p> <p>b) For CIDA: "Web services" (pg 67). For ROC: "API-based integration" (pg 70). No explicit sandbox guarantee. Will API specifications and sandbox environments be provided?</p>	
	<p>Section VII, 2.3 / Annex 01, Section 9, "System Integration Scope — Banks, ITMIS, CIDA, RoC, NMRA, NPC", page 156</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Section 2.3 and FRS Section 9 mention integrations with Banks, ITMIS, CIDA, RoC, NMRA, and NPC.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether APIs/web services for these systems are already available and ready for integration. Also confirm whether API documents, sandbox environments, and credentials will be shared before development starts.</p>	
17	<p>Section VII, Part 9, page 197</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Various integration descriptions (ITMIS, CIDA, ROC). Responsibility not explicitly assigned.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Who is responsible for third-party coordination?</p>	<p>A dedicated Project Implementation Unit established by the purchaser will assist the proposer in coordinating the integration with 3<sup>rd</sup> party.</p>
18	<p>Annex 01, 10.10, "General Requirements /</p>	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Section 10.10.T requires the bidder to account for 5 additional unspecified external integrations</p>	<p>The requirement for the additional integrations has been deleted. Refer to Item 25 of the second addendum to the RFP.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	5 Additional Integrations", page 94	'similar to Business registration'. Please define the technical profiles of these 5 systems.	
19	Section III, 1.4.2, "Specific Experience" / Not referred	<p><b><u>Clarifications:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Currently, no integration with the government's electronic registration system (e-ROC) – vendor validation is manual." Any regulatory gaps?</li> <li>• Any regulatory gaps related to the absence of e-ROC integration? How should the system handle vendor validation in the interim? Will API specifications and sandbox environments be provided by the respective government agencies?</li> </ul>	There is not any known regulatory gap. For clarification on API specifications, refer to Item 33 of Section 5 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
20	Section VII, 1.3.1, "SSO Authentication — Integration with Existing Government Identity Systems", page 138	<p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please confirm whether an existing Government Identity Provider (IdP) or LDAP system is already available for integration, or if the Proposer needs to set up the complete SSO/LDAP infrastructure. If an existing system is available, confirm whether API and technical documents will be provided during requirement gathering.</li> <li>• For the Single Sign-On (SSO) Authentication layer validating against LDAP, is the SI expected to provision a dedicated enterprise IAM solution specifically for the e-GP platform, or will the system need to federate via SAML/OIDC with an existing national identity provider (such as Lanka Gate)?</li> </ul>	The Proposer is required to design and implement the necessary SSO/authentication infrastructure required for the e-GP system, in accordance with the architectural requirements in Section VII, 1.3. Integration of the e-GP system with government-wide identity solutions is presently not envisaged.
21	Section VII, 2.3 / Annex 01, Section 9.2, "ITMIS Integration — Downstream Activities"	<b>Clarification:</b> Which system will be used for downstream activities like creating a Purchase Order, Receiving, Invoicing, etc.	Refer to Items 1 and 2 of Section 7 and Item 14 of Section 5 of the first pre-proposal clarifications. Auto-generation of legal contracts is NOT in scope.
	FRS, 9.2.2, "ITMIS Purchase Order Creation / Contract Award", page 68	<b>Clarification:</b> The understanding is that the contract will be created in the e-GP system after creation of the Purchase Order. Is both PO and Contract issued to the supplier? Does the Contract include legal clauses which need to be redlined and negotiated with suppliers?	

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
22	Annex 01, 9.1, "Integration with CIDA", page 67	<p><b>Clarification:</b> FRS describes both batch and real-time integration with CIDA. Please confirm the primary integration pattern, the fallback mode, and whether vendor contractor-grade validation must be synchronous during bid submission.</p>	<p>The integration mechanism will be finalized during the project implementation phase.</p>
23	Annex 01, 9.2.2, "ITMIS Integration", page 68	<p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please confirm whether the customer can provide a validated COA/budget segment structure for pre-validation, and what the user experience should be on ITMIS rejection. Please clarify the contingency when ITMIS is unavailable.</li> <li>• Section D — For budget-funded procurement, the intention to award will be auto-generated by the system upon receipt of fund commitment confirmation from ITMIS. Please share the API availability and number of integration touchpoints with ITMIS. Do you currently have middleware for 3rd party integrations?</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to the ITMIS integration section for the requirements. Further details will be discussed during the implementation phase.</p>
24	Annex 01, 9.3, "ROC Integration / Director Board Limits", page 71	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm the maximum number of director records the system must retrieve and store from the Registrar of Companies, and the refresh frequency.</p>	<p>Refer to section 9.3 for the integration requirements. Further details will be discussed during the implementation phase. The purchaser will coordinate with RoC to obtain API access. Any</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Annex 01, Section 9.3, "RoC Integration — API Availability and Verification Scope", pages 78–79	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether API access is already available and whether there are any transaction limits or additional charges for API usage.	commercial arrangements if applicable will be paid by the e-GP secretariat or by users of the e-GP platform. The proposer need not include the API usage charges.
25	Annex_3 FRS, 3.1 - I - i), page 28	<b>RFP Text:</b> Currency (selection from a predefined drop-down list) <b>Clarification:</b> Technical Validation: Will the system support real-time exchange rate integration (API) to sync these currencies, or will rates be manually defined by the Procurement Officer at the time of publishing?	Refer section 6.2 (Y) in the revised functional requirements: <i>In multi-currency bidding, the Secretary will specify the bid evaluation, currency and input the exchange rate for all the currencies in which bid prices are received. Based on this information, the system will compute the total evaluated bid price of all the bidders in the bid evaluation currency (e.g., LKR).</i>
26	Annex 01, 3.1, "Procurement Plans / Multi-Currency / Exchange Rate", pages 28, 26	<b>Clarification:</b> Technical Validation: Will the system support real-time exchange rate integration (API) to sync currencies, or will rates be manually defined by the Procurement Officer at the time of publishing? For ICB tenders, is the bidder required to pay both amounts, or is it an either/or selection? In which currency should the system record the primary 'Revenue' for financial reconciliation if two different currencies are collected for the same tender?	The procedure for multi-currency bidding is explained within the following sections: a) Procurement creation (base) – Section 4 b) Bid submission (base) – Section 5 c) Bid opening and bid evaluation (base) – Section 6
27	Annex 01, 9.5, "Payment Gateway", page 73	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm whether online Bank Guarantee / Bid Security verification is required. If yes, are banking APIs available, and how many banks need to be integrated with the e-GP solution?	Refer to section 10.9 “Online submission of bid security” in the revised functional requirements. Kindly note “ <i>The purchaser will engage the services of two Internet Payment</i> ”

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<i>Gateways, which must be integrated to facilitate e-Payment of e-GP transaction fees.”</i>
	First addendum dated 29-May-2026, Functional requirements	<b>Clarification:</b> Payment gateway integration. Item 1(m) of the First Addendum requires the e-GP system to integrate with two payment gateways, and item 3 of the clarifications confirms that an existing payment gateway service provider is in place. Please name the two payment gateways now required, confirm whether the integration interface specifications will be provided by the Purchaser, and confirm whether any gateway transaction or subscription charges fall to the proposer or to the Purchaser.	The second gateway is yet to be selected. The following details will be shared during the project implementation phase: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name of the payment gateway provider</li> <li>• Integration interface specifications</li> <li>• Refer to Item 24 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document for information about payment gateway charges.</li> </ul>
28	Annex 01, 9.5, "Payment Gateway / Partial Reconciliation", page 76	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 9.5.D.viii references partial reconciliation. Please confirm whether a bidder can proceed with partially reconciled payments or only fully reconciled payments are accepted.	Reference to partial reconciliation is deleted in section 9.5 in the revised functional requirements, as explained in the first addendum to the bidding document.
29	Annex 01, Section 9.5, "Payment Gateway — Online Fee Collection, Reconciliation and Refund Scenarios", pages 80–81	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the Purchaser has already finalized the payment gateway provider. Also clarify whether the Proposer needs to support multiple payment gateways and who will bear transaction and maintenance charges.	As clarified in Section 7, Item 3 of the first pre-proposal clarification, the purchaser has an existing agreement with a payment gateway service provider. As explained in section 9.5 (b), in the revised functional requirements <i>“The purchaser will engage the services of two Internet Payment Gateways, which must be integrated to facilitate e-Payment of e-GP transaction fees.”</i> As explained in Item 24 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document <i>“The payment gateway service charges shall be borne by the purchaser or end users of the e-GP</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<i>system. The proposer need not include the cost of payment gateway charges in its bid</i>
30	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 9.5, "Payment Gateway"; Section VII, 1.4.3	<b>Clarification:</b> Which payment gateway provider(s) has the Department of Finance approved or mandated for the e-GP platform? Is there an existing government payment integration framework that new vendor solution should connect to? Can vendor make payments outside of e-GP system and upload the receipt for the same?	The payment gateway service provider details will be shared with the selected proposer during the project implementation phase. The use of payment gateway is envisaged for transaction fee. Refer section 10.9 "Online submission of bid security" in the revised functional requirements for online bid security submission procedures.
31	Annex 01, 9.4, "NPC Integration / OCDS Data Sharing", page 72	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 9.4.C leaves it undecided whether OCDS data is pushed by e-GP or pulled by NPC. Please confirm the chosen pattern.	OCDS data sharing and integration with NPC are two different requirements. <i>The approved and the latest DAPP details will be sent from the e-GP system to the NPC software. Whether the data will be pushed from the e-GP system or pulled by the NPC will be decided during the implementation phase.</i>
32	Annex 01 (FRS), 10.6, "Open Contracting Data Standards (OCDS)", page 82	<b>RFP Text:</b> The requirement mandates the e-GP system to accommodate future changes to the OCDS schema. <b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm that any new OCDS schema changes published after the initial system design sign-off will be treated as out-of-scope and managed through the formal Software Change Control (Change Order) process.	No change in the bidding document. As explained in 10.6 (c) <i>The e-GP system must be able to accommodate changes to the OCDS schema and future versions of OCDS over the lifetime of the use of the e-GP system.</i>
33	Annex 01, Section 10.6, "OCDS — Publication	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm the exact OCDS version and compliance expectations for the system. Also clarify	As explained in Section 7, Item 22 of the first pre-proposal clarifications <i>"OCDS and public procurement visibility are two separate requirements, both of which must be implemented</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Scope and API Requirements", page 88	whether data publishing to public portals and APIs is part of the current scope.	<i>under this contract.</i> " The proposer should implement data publishing and API requirements detailed in Section 10.6, of the revised functional requirements.
34	Technical evaluation criteria issued in the addendum	<p>Third-party security audit scoring (15 marks). This criterion refers to the count of installations where the product is certified as secure and reliable by a third-party security audit agency, against three types of assessment: (a). Requirements derived from international application security audit standards such as ISO 27001 and OWASP Top 10; (b). Vulnerability Assessment and Penetration Testing (VAPT); (c). Load and performance testing.</p> <p>Please clarify the following regarding the evaluation criterion "Third-party security audit of the e-GP system (15 marks)" introduced through the addendum:</p> <p>(i). Please confirm whether the audit reports under items (a), (b), and (c) are required to be submitted as part of the proposal as documentary evidence of previous third-party audits conducted on the proposed e-GP product and its installations, or whether these audits are intended to be carried out during contract execution after award. We note that the audits referenced in Clarification Items 21 and 29 appear to relate to launch/go-live activities during project implementation, which seem distinct from this evaluation criterion.</p>	<p>This is a technical evaluation criterion that evaluates the reliability and security of the proposed e-GP product. Proposers must provide a client or audited issued certificate as documentary evidence, including at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Scope of the audit</li> <li>b) Audit or certificate date (when it got concluded in the past)</li> <li>c) Auditor name</li> <li>d) Installation URL</li> <li>e) e-GP product name</li> <li>f) Confirmation that the audit is successfully concluded</li> </ul> <p>An audit that covered all three work areas specified in Item 2 of the second addendum will receive a higher score. Installations where the audit scope covered one or more items will receive a lower score.</p> <p>The purchaser does not seek the security audit reports.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>(ii). Please confirm whether an installation will be counted only if evidence for all three assessment types —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) application security audit against recognized standards,</li> <li>(b) Vulnerability Assessment and Penetration Testing (VAPT), and</li> <li>(c) load and performance testing — is available, or whether each assessment type will be evaluated and scored independently.</li> </ul>	
35	<p>Section VII, 3.07, “Electronic signature: (a) Signing function”, page 159</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. When the sign function is called upon, the e-GP system will instantly generate a key phrase” and send it to the signer’s email address or send it as a SMS to the user’s mobile number. A copy of this “key phrase” along with the audit trial on email / SMS dispatch will be maintained by the system.</li> <li>ii. The signer will input this “key phrase” to complete the sign function, wherein the system will validate whether the key phrase inputted by the signer matched with the “key phrase” generated for the signing action.</li> </ul> <p><b>Clarification:</b> We understand that the Sign function will be applicable to documents uploaded by both Department user</p>	<p>When the key phrase is sent by both email and SMS, the chances of the key not reaching in time reduces significantly. Also, as the adoption of digital signature with legally recognized certificates increases, the need for electronic signature will be minimized.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		and Vendors. In eGP system, when bidding process has to be completed by Vendors in critical times, the dependencies on Key phrase to be sent by email / SMS will become a challenge.	

## 6 General

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section VII, 2.4 / Section III, 2.4, "Training and Knowledge Transfer"	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Training &amp; Knowledge Transfer requirements mentioned.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Kindly clarify: (i) expected number of training programs/users; (ii) whether Train-the-Trainer model is acceptable; (iii) who bears travel/logistics costs for onsite/offsite training; and (iv) whether L1 support will be handled by Purchaser team post handover.</li> <li>b) What training and post-go-live support approach do you envision for users and suppliers/vendors? How many days of training are required? What support services and timing are required? What is the preferred mode of assistance during and post-implementation?</li> </ul>	<p>For (i), (ii) and (iii) Refer to item 4 of Section 6 in the first pre-proposal clarifications. For (iv), refer Section VII, 5.3 “<i>Provision of telephonic helpdesk is NOT in scope of the Proposer. However, the Proposer shall provide L2 and L3 support remotely via email.</i>” The proposer shall provide support during the O &amp; M period in accordance with the service levels specified in the bidding document.</p> <p>For (b) Refer to item 4 of Section 6 in the first pre-proposal clarifications.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
2	Section VII, 2.7.1-1-a, "Key Personnel — Project Manager", page 158	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Project Manager</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. During the Pilot phase                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Education: An engineering or science degree holder, preferably computer science specialization</li> <li>ii. Work experience                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimum 7 years of total work experience.</li> <li>2. Minimum 3 years of work experience in IT implementation Project Management.</li> <li>3. At least 2 years of work experience in development or deployment of the proposers' e-GP system</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Clarification:</b> As per the RFP it is required to deploy the Project Manager on-site during the whole software development phase (1 year). And as per this clause Project manager must have at least 2 years of work experience in the proposers' e-GP system. In this case this will be a huge cost for foreign bidders who are working with local partners, because as per the above condition local PM will not be able to deploy and it will be a huge cost for the foreign bidders if they are going to deploy their PM locally during the whole deployment phase. Therefore we request to remove the condition "3.At least 2 years of work experience in development or deployment of the proposers' e-GP system" from the requested Project Manager's profile.</p>	<p>As clarified in Item 4, Section 2 of the first pre-proposal clarification. Refer Section VII, 2.4.1.1 User: "The Proposer is required to deploy a dedicated Project Manager on-site for the entire Project duration." No change in the bidding document.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
3	Section IV, Price Schedule Table 3.3, "Deployment of Software Development / Expert Resources", page 163	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Deployment of Software Development / Expert Resources to be hired on a need basis.</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will this be considered for commercial evaluation?</li> <li>• Will Table 3.3 (Deployment of Software Development / Expert Resources) be considered for commercial evaluation?</li> </ul>	<p>Refer line item 6 in Table 3.1 “Grand Summary Cost Table” in Section IV of the bidding document: <i>Grand Totals (to Proposal Submission Form)- sum of line items 1,2,3,4 and 5.</i> In this, line item 2 refers to “<i>Deployment of Software Development / Expert Resources to be hired on need basis – SDR – from Table 3.3</i>”. As explained above, the total of 3.3 will be added to the grand summary cost table.</p>
4	Section I, ITP 7.1, "Clarification of RFP Document", page 14	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Please clarify whether the Request for Proposal (RFP) document is required to be purchased, or if it is freely available for submission by any interested proposer.</p>	<p>The RFP document is freely available.</p>
5	Section III, 1.3, "Key Personnel", page 57	<p><b>Clarification:</b> May the firm propose key experts who are not direct employees but will be engaged through contractual arrangements for the assignment?</p>	<p>The key personnel for the core solution must be employees of the Proposer.</p>
6	Section I, ITP 18, "Currencies of Proposal and Payment", page 23	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Proposal may be quoted in multiple currencies subject to conditions. The Proposer may quote in no more than three foreign currencies in addition to LKR.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm whether bidders may quote in multiple currencies such as LKR + USD + one additional foreign currency, and how payment conversion / exchange rates will be applied.</p>	<p>As explained in SCC GCC 12.4 “<i>The Supplier will invoice the Purchaser in the currency used in the Contract Agreement and the Price Schedules it refers to, for conversion between this currency and <b>Sri Lanka Rupees</b> for payment purposes - in case the two currencies are different - will be made as of the invoice date using the selling exchange rate found in <b>Central Bank of Sri Lanka</b></i>”</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
7	Section I, ITP 14, "Taxes and Duties"; Section IX, SCC	<p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kindly clarify applicability of VAT, withholding tax, customs duties, and exemptions under the World Bank funded project.</li> <li>• Should we include the price inclusive VAT &amp; SSCL in the local price line. Please run a check</li> <li>• Tax regime: Please clarify the position on VAT, withholding tax, customs duties, and tax-exemption certificates available to the SIP under the World Bank-financed grant (TF-C1642).</li> </ul>	Refer to Item 30 of the fourth addendum for details.
8	Section VIII, GCC 14, "Taxes and Duties"; Section IX, SCC GCC 14.1 / 14.2	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> GCC 14.1: No taxes applicable to the Services. GCC 14.2: Exception for local VAT or indirect taxes applicable in Sri Lanka on invoiced amounts.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> VAT Treatment: As cloud services are sourced from a non-resident provider via a Local Representative, please confirm if these charges are subject to local VAT under GCC 14.2 or are considered zero-rated services under GCC 14.1.</p>	Refer to the response given to the previous question
9	Section I, ITP 31, "World Bank MAPS Compliance"	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm whether the proposed system will be assessed against World Bank MAPS methodology or equivalent procurement maturity standards.</p>	The Sri Lankan e-GP installation may be subjected to MAPS assessment or any other assessment required during the project implementation period. Refer to Section III, 2.4 for the detailed technical evaluation criteria.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
10	Section II, PDS ITP 20.1, "Proposal Security", page 50	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> This bank guarantee shall be issued by a local commercial bank approved by the Central Bank of Sri Lanka or a foreign bank operating outside of Sri Lanka provided that the relevant Bank Guarantee is confirmed by a local or foreign bank operating in Sri Lanka, which is approved by the Central Bank of Sri Lanka.</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please confirm if a direct Bank Guarantee issued by our primary internationally recognized corporate banker (without requiring confirmation from a local Sri Lankan bank) would be acceptable.</li> <li>• In all comparable RFP procedures issued by the World Bank, proposal securities issued by reputable international banks established in Europe or the United States have consistently been accepted. We kindly request that the restriction concerning the issuer of the bank guarantee be waived and that bank guarantees issued by reputable international banks be accepted.</li> <li>• Please confirm if a direct Bank Guarantee issued by our primary internationally recognized corporate banker (without requiring confirmation from a local Sri Lankan bank) would be acceptable.</li> </ul>	No change to the requirement given under Section II, PDS ITP 20.1

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
11	Section II, ITP 44.1, page 54	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "The maximum percentage by which quantities may be increased is: 5%... The items for which the Purchaser may increase or decrease the quantities are: All items."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> What constitutes 'quantities' in a fixed-scope software project? Does it refer to VM instances, user licenses, Phase 2 modules? How will such variations impact pricing?</p>	Refer to Item 38 of the fourth addendum for details.
12	Not referred	<p><b>Clarification:</b> How many legal entities are available within the procurement department? How many legal entities are required for the implementation?</p>	The question is unclear.
13	Not referred	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Any future plan to extend the e-GP to (Procure to Pay - P2P) on the same invested platform?</p> <p>E.g. PR &gt; RFP/RFQ/Tender/Auction&gt; PO&gt; GRN/SDN/ &gt; AP Invoice &gt; Payment &gt; GL (Accounting)</p>	Additional requirements to the FRS will be handled according to the process given under Section VII, 5.4 Software Change Control in the RFP.
14	Section IV, "Code of Conduct for Proposer's Personnel Form", page 101	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The Proposer shall submit a Code of Conduct that will apply to the Supplier's Personnel employed in the execution of the Contract.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> We understand that the code of conduct should be signed only by the authorized signatory of the Bidder (every member of the JV and subcontractors) and not</p>	It is adequate if the code of conduct form is signed by the authorized signatory during the bidding stage. After contract award, all <i>the Supplier's Personnel (as defined in GCC Clause 1.1) employed in the execution of the Contract at the Project Site/s</i> will be required to sign this form.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		by every member of the key personnel team. Could you please confirm or clarify?	
15	Section I, ITP 6.3, "Obtaining the RFP Document"; Section I, ITP 7.1, "Clarification of RFP Document", page 14	<b>Clarification:</b> Since the procurement documents were downloaded from the official website, is there any specific participation registration, expression of interest, or email notification process required in order to be included in future communications, clarifications, amendments, or addenda for this specific RFP?	No separate registration or expression of interest is required. The RFP is freely available for download from the official websites listed in the SPN. All clarifications, addenda, and official communications are published at <a href="http://www.treasury.gov.lk/procurement/procurement-notice">www.treasury.gov.lk/procurement/procurement-notice</a> . To ensure timely email notification, interested Proposers are advised to register their contact details by emailing <a href="mailto:kavindu.p@egp.gov.lk">kavindu.p@egp.gov.lk</a> , so they may be notified when clarifications and addenda are published.
16	Section I, ITP 7.4, "Pre-Proposal Meeting"; Section I, ITP 7.5	<b>Clarification:</b> Due to the time zone difference, we were unable to participate in the pre-proposal conference. We kindly request a copy of the meeting minutes, including the questions raised and clarifications provided.	In accordance with ITP 7.4/7.5, minutes of the pre-proposal meeting and official clarification responses are transmitted to all Proposers who have acquired the RFP document and are published at <a href="http://www.treasury.gov.lk/procurement/procurement-notice">www.treasury.gov.lk/procurement/procurement-notice</a> .
17	Section I, ITP 8, "Amendment of RFP Document", page 15	<b>Clarification:</b> Kindly confirm whether any clarification, amendment, addendum, or supplementary communication has been issued in addition to the three documents (Annex 1 – Procurement Notice, Annex 2 – Tender Document, Annex 3 – FRS).	All clarifications, addenda, and official communications are published at <a href="http://www.treasury.gov.lk/procurement/procurement-notice">www.treasury.gov.lk/procurement/procurement-notice</a> . To ensure timely email notification, interested Proposers are advised to register their contact details by emailing <a href="mailto:kavindu.p@egp.gov.lk">kavindu.p@egp.gov.lk</a> , so they may be notified when clarifications and addenda are published.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
18	Section II, PDS ITP 23.2, "Deadline for Submission of Proposals"; Section I, ITP 8, "Amendment of RFP Document"	<p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We kindly request an extension of the submission deadline by at least four (04) weeks from the current closing date of 01 June 2026, to ensure sufficient time to prepare a comprehensive and competitive submission.</li> <li>• Kindly confirm whether there has been any extension to the proposal submission deadline, or whether the deadline remains as stated in the RFP document.</li> <li>• Please provide an extension of the submission deadline by at least 3 weeks to enable us to process the answers to questions that are still outstanding.</li> <li>• Is it possible to extend the tender submission deadline in a couple of weeks as we are finalizing engagement with a local partner?</li> </ul>	<p>It is now being extended to July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2026, vide the 4th addendum (please see the extension notice and item no 32 in the 4<sup>th</sup> addendum).</p>
19	Section IV, "Grand Summary Cost Table", Table 3.1, page 119	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "The price quoted for the sum total of 'Cloud Infrastructure' and 'Other Server-Side Infrastructure' shall not exceed 15% of the 'Grand Totals (to Proposal Submission Form)'."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Considering the extensive infrastructure requirements including Software Tools, Cloud Infrastructure, DC/DR setup, security solutions, backup systems, and associated licenses, the prescribed limit of 15% appears restrictive. Request the Authority to kindly</p>	<p>There is no change in the bidding document. Kindly note that <i>The purchaser will procure, at its cost, the secure data connectivity, server infrastructure, and any other software required for the DC-DR replication, as recommended by the proposer. The proposer shall quote only its service charges to enable DC-DR replication, as a part of its Operations and Maintenance (O &amp; M) costs.</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		revise/increase the permissible limit from 15% to 50% of the Grand Total.	
20	Section IV, "Grand Summary Cost Table 3.1", page 119	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "The Grand Total means it's including serial no 1 to 5. Or 1 to 4 only."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> 1. The Grand Total means it's including serial no. 1 to 5. Or 1 to 4 only. Please confirm. 2. In the RFP, mentioned that O&amp;M cost for 4 to 6 years is not mandatory; if we are not mentioning serial no. 5 then grand total will be calculated on 1 to 4 serial no only. 3. The 15% condition is difficult to fulfil; please revise the condition from 15% to 50%.</p>	<p>As clearly stated "Grand Totals (to Proposal Submission Form)- sum of line items 1,2,3,4 and 5". The 15% validation is practical especially considering the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) DR set-up costs are not included in SSI</li> <li>b) Cloud infrastructure quote is for 45 months, wherein the grand total includes the three year post warranty as well.</li> </ul> <p>No change on the following validation: <i>The price quoted for the sum total of "Cloud Infrastructure" and "Other Server-Side Infrastructure" shall not exceed 15% of the "Grand Totals (to Proposal Submission Form)</i></p>
21	Section III, 2.4, "Technical Evaluation Criteria"; Section II, PDS ITP 32.1, "Evaluation Methodology"	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Section 4 of the RFP defines the evaluation criteria and weightages.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether detailed technical evaluation parameters and scoring methods will be shared before bid submission. Also clarify whether the financial score formula is fixed or configurable.</p>	The detailed technical evaluation criteria, sub-criteria, and scoring methodology is provided in Section III, 2.4 of the bidding document.
22	Section VII, 2.6, "Documentation Requirements — Deliverable Templates	<b>RFP Text:</b> Section 2.6 requires submission of multiple technical documents.	The template details will be finalized during the project implementation phase.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	and Approval Timelines", pages 156–158	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether standard templates will be shared by the Purchaser for these deliverables. Also clarify whether document approvals will follow fixed timelines during implementation.	
23	Section IV, "Code of Conduct for Proposer's Personnel Form", page 98	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Comply with this Code of Conduct and all applicable laws, regulations and other requirements, including requirements to protect the health, safety and well-being of Supplier's Personnel.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly elaborate on the requirement related to compliance with the Code of Conduct, all applicable laws, regulations and other requirements, including health, safety and well-being standards, Bank's Anti-Corruption Guidelines, all permits, approvals, and/or licenses applicable to the SIP.</p>	The requirement is clear.
24	Section I, ITP 7.1, "Clarification of RFP Document"; Section II, PDS ITP 7.1	<b>Clarification:</b> Upon receiving your responses to the above-raised queries, we may have certain additional queries for further clarification. We understand that the query/clarification window shall remain open for all bidders to submit their respective queries at any time prior to the bid submission deadline.	The last date for pre-bid query submission is 28-June-2026.
25	Section II, PDS ITP 4.1, "Eligible Proposers / Joint Ventures", page 9	<b>Clarification:</b> Given the strategic importance, scale, and complexity of the proposed solution, and to ensure efficient project execution, seamless operations, and successful achievement of the objectives set forth by the Government	No change in the bidding document

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>of Sri Lanka, we propose to submit our bid as a Joint Venture (JV) comprising four (04) member organizations.</p> <p>The justification for constituting the Joint Venture with four parties is outlined below:</p> <p><b>Member 1:</b> Key Solution Architect  <b>Member 2:</b> Core Solution Provider  <b>Member 3:</b> System Integration and Maintenance Support  <b>Member 4:</b> Overall Project Management</p> <p>However, pursuant to ITP Clause 4.1, the maximum number of members permitted in a Joint Venture (JV) has been limited to two (02). In view of the above justification and the multidisciplinary nature of the proposed solution, we respectfully request consideration to permit up to four (04) JV members. We firmly believe that leveraging the complementary expertise, technical capabilities, and domain strengths of four specialized parties would significantly enhance the effectiveness, risk management, and overall success of the project implementation.</p> <p>We understand that having multiple members in a consortium comes with its own complexities but we are confident that the expertise each partner brings will result in submitting a far more compelling and credentialed solution outweighs any negativity around it. Furthermore, we can ensure that all consortium members are held jointly and severally liable for the collectively implementation of the project, and we as the lead bidder will ensure this is done.</p>	

## 7 Functional Requirements

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Annex 01, 2.2.1, "Vendor Registration / Additional Fields", page 19	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 2.2.1.F states, 'Additional data fields will be advised during the project implementation, and the vendor should implement them at no additional charge.' Please cap the maximum number of additional vendor master attributes.	There is no change to the bidding document.
2	Annex 01, 10.10, "General / Non-Functional Requirements", page 94; Annex 01, 10.25, "Audit"	<b>Clarification:</b> Please clarify whether a standard read-only database audit trail verification suffices.	The proposer must comply with the requirements specified in the functional requirements.
3	Section VII B., 1.1, "Procurement Legal Framework", page 137	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "The Procurement guidelines and Manuals issued/recommended by the National Procurement Commission (NPC) is the reference legal and regulatory requirement for the e-GP system."</p> <p><b>Clarifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Will the system strictly comply with 2024 Guidelines?</li> <li>b) Should the system align with Chapter 12 &amp; 13?</li> <li>c) Which guideline prevails in case of conflict?</li> <li>d) Will audits be based only on 2024 Guidelines?</li> </ul>	The proposer is advised to estimate its effort according to the functional and technical requirements specified in the bidding document.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
4	Annex 01, Section 6.2, "Bid Evaluation — Evaluation Criteria Engine", pages 55–58	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> FRS Section 4.1.3 and Section 6.2 describe evaluation criteria and bid evaluation.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the evaluation formulas/methods are already defined. Also clarify whether departments can configure their own evaluation templates and criteria without custom development.</p>	Refer to the revised functional requirements for the procurement methods to be implemented. Refer section 4.1.3 “Evaluation criteria definition” for further details.
5	Annex-3, Page 7, s/no 36 and 37 – Framework Agreement and Shopping	<p><b>Clarification:</b> Does the scope include Catalog/shopping for end users to buy as per pre-negotiated contracts/rate card/price list? Are contract/framework agreement creation, amendments or renewals in scope?</p>	The scope covers Framework Agreement and shopping-related procedures until contract award.
6	Annex 01, Section 8.4 / 8.6, "Pre-Qualification, Expression of Interest and Two-Stage Procurement", pages 67–71	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> FRS Section 8.4 covers Pre-Qualification and EOI processes.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the workflow and evaluation process for EOI and Pre-Qualification are similar to normal tenders or require separate handling. Also clarify whether shortlisted vendors can be directly invited to future tenders through the system.</p>	The procurement method specific variations work on top of the base procedures explained in sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the revised functional requirements. Refer to the base procedures for workflow and evaluation details.
7	Annex 01, Section 11, "e-Auction Module — Auction Types, Bidding Rules and Real-Time Engine", page 103	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> FRS Section 11 covers the e-Auction module.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the auction process, rules, and formats are already finalized. Also clarify whether reverse auction, forward auction, and multi-round auction formats are required in the current scope.</p>	The auction software must be implemented as per the requirements provided in section 11 of the revised functional requirements. To clarify, forward and reverse auctions are in scope. Multi-round auction is NOT in scope.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
8	Not referred	<b>Clarification:</b> Contract Performance Management / Vendor Performance Monitoring is not explicitly mentioned. Kindly confirm whether such modules are within project scope.	The proposer is required to implement the software in accordance with the technical and functional requirements specified in the bidding document.
9	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 1, "Key Procurement Institutions — Procurement Committee", page 15	<b>Clarification:</b> As per our understanding, this requirement refers to enabling committee participation through creation of user groups comprising committee members and assigning appropriate system roles/access to those groups. Kindly confirm if our understanding is correct. If not, please explain.	The referred section explains the committee creation requirements. This committee will need to act on the procurement as explained elsewhere in the functional requirements.
10	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 1, C - "Key Procurement Institutions — Procurement Appeal Committee (PAC)"	<b>Clarification:</b> Can the DoF SL clarify the expected workflow for PAC — specifically, what actions must be performed in-system (e.g., filing appeal, PAC review, decision recording) vs. outside the system?	Online appeal management is NOT in scope. If required, it will be handled through a variation order.
11	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 1, "Key Procurement Institutions — Committee Thresholds"	<b>Clarification:</b> Could the DoF SL please elaborate on the thresholds expected under this requirement? Please explain with an example.	The threshold details will be communicated during the project implementation phase.
12	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 3, "Procurement Plans — Donor Fund Segregation"	<b>RFP Text:</b> K. The system should provide users with the ability to segregate and view the procurement plan funded by donors, the procuring entity's own funds, and budget funds.	The requirement is clear.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<b>Clarification:</b> Can you please provide more details around this requirement?	
13	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 10.10, "General Requirements — Pre-Bid Meeting Records"	<b>Clarification:</b> Can the link to the pre-bid meeting recording be captured and stored in the e-GP system or can meeting recording document itself needs to be stored?	Video recording of the pre-bid meeting is NOT required. This requirement mainly refers to online data exchanges and file uploads pertaining to pre-bid meeting.
14	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 2.5, "Vendor Blacklisting — Blacklist Source and API"	<b>Clarification:</b> Does DoF SL have an identified source with API access for the blacklisted vendors?	Vendor blacklisting will be handled online in the e-GP platform. Hence, there is no need to access third party source with API
15	Section VII, 2.3 / Annex 01, Section 4, "Procurement Creation — Purchase Requisition"	<b>Clarification:</b> Where is the request or purchase requisition to initiate a Sourcing/Bidding event captured? Is it expected to be captured in the e-GP solution?	Refer Section VII, 2.3 and Annex 01 (FRs), Section 4, "Procurement creation"  Procurement events (tenders) are initiated within the e-GP system against approved DAPP line items. A separate purchase requisition module (PR-to-PO) is not in the baseline scope of the e-GP system as defined in the FRS.
16	Annex 01, 10.11, "Reports", page 95	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 10.11.A.h requires the bidder to provision for 10 additional reports to be specified later. Please indicate the complexity profile (simple tabular vs. BI dashboards vs. parameterized operational reports).	The proposer may assume that all the 10 reports are of the parametrized operational reporting type (i.e., user will select one or more parameters and query on demand) or a less complex tabular type.
17	Annex 01, 1, "Key Procurement Institutions", page 13	<b>Clarification:</b> FRS specifies the PE office hierarchy will be built up to a maximum of 6 layers. Please confirm	The proposer may consider 6 as a hard cap.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		whether 6 is a hard cap or whether deeper structures are available.	
18	Annex 01, 1, "Key Procurement Institutions", page 13	<b>Clarification:</b> Please provide the expected average user count for the number of offices and subdivisions within MOF.	This information is presently unavailable. As stated in Section VII, 1.3, page 137 <i>"The e-Government Procurement (e-GP) application software will be used as a shared infrastructure by all the procuring entities of the Government of Sri Lanka including the Ministries, Departments, Local Government and Public Sector Enterprises."</i>
19	Annex 01, 2.2.1, "Vendor Registration / Configurable Fee Structure", page 20	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 2.2.1.L requires registration/renewal fees to be configurable. Please clarify the expected change frequency, whether historical fee versions must be retained for audit, and whether differential pricing by vendor category/turnover is required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expected change frequency is unknown at this point in time.</li> <li>• Historical fee versions must be retained for audit</li> <li>• The following differential pricing is envisaged in the bidding document: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sri lankan or foreign</li> <li>○ New of renewal</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
20	Section VII, 2.6, "Documentation Requirements", page 157	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> End-user manuals required in English; translation out of scope.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether the system user interface must support Sinhala and Tamil languages at go-live, or whether English-only interface is acceptable initially.</p>	Asa explained in item 17 of Section 5 in the first pre-proposal clarifications, <i>"The implementation of Sinhala and Tamil interfaces is not envisaged in the procurement document (RFP)."</i>
21	Annex 01, 2.1, "Government User Management / Position	<p><b>Clarification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FRS requires decoupling of positions and users with role tagging. Please clarify whether 'Position'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positions will be created and maintained on the e-GP system. Tagging of the position to external HR systems is presently not envisaged.</li> </ul>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	vs. Role Decoupling”, pages 16–18	<p>is a structural HR object (mapped to HR System positions) or a procurement-specific construct, and how transfers/acting-positions should be handled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FRS requires decoupling of positions and users with role tagging. Please clarify whether 'Position' is a structural HR object (mapped to HR System positions) or a procurement-specific construct, and how transfers/acting-positions should be handled (auto-revocation timelines, approval delegation rules).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transfer of users will be handled as explained in (I) <i>The transfer of a user will be done by tagging the incoming user to the same role(s) as the outgoing user. When a user is transferred, the incumbent user can view and act upon the activities undertaken by the transferred-out user.</i></li> <li>Meaning of auto-revocation timelines and approval delegation rules is unclear.</li> </ul>
22	Annex 01, 4.5, "Procurement Creation — Bill of Quantities", page 46	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 4.5.B states that a decision on whether the BoQ is editable post-publication will be communicated during implementation. If editable, please clarify how previously submitted bids should be handled.	If editing of BoQ is allowed post publication, the bids in draft or submitted statuses will be deleted and the bidder will be notified about the deletion by email and as alerts within the user account.
23	Annex 01, 5, "Bid Submission / Symmetric Key Generation", page 51	<b>Clarification:</b> Please clarify whether the symmetric key for low-value procurements is generated per bid, and where the key revision numbers are required for resubmissions.	As clarified in 10.1.3 (A) <i>The modus operandi for generating the symmetric key will be finalized during the project implementation phase.</i>
24	Annex 01, 5, "Bid Submission / Encrypted Bid Hash", page 51	<b>Clarification:</b> Please clarify what does it mean by: U) The system will store the following separately: a) Bid hash value; b) Encrypted bid hash value.	Bid hash value is a hash of the bid, and the encrypted bid hash value is a digital signature (i.e., the hash is encrypted with the private key of the user signing the bid).
25	Annex 01, 6.1, "Bid Opening / Trigger Mechanism", page 52	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the automatic bid opening requires a 'virtual presence' acknowledgement by	Automatic bid opening will be implemented as explained in the functional requirements.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		the BEC Secretary, and how the system handles failures (e.g., Secretary unavailable).	
26	Annex 01, 8.1, "NCB / Currency Restriction", pages 62, 35–36	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 8.1 mandates NCB tenders restrict suppliers to LKR only. Please confirm whether currency restriction is enforced strictly by procurement method or case by case.	Refer to the first addendum to the RFP. The restrictions and validations will be implemented as explained in the bidding document.
27	Annex 01, 8.5, "Shopping/RFQ — Minimum Vendor Validation", page 64	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the minimum-three-vendor rule for limited bidding/RFQ is a hard system validation (blocks publication) or a soft warning.	It is a hard system validation.
28	Annex 01, 4.4; Annex 01, 5/11, "Bidder Identity Visibility", pages 46, 52, 107	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 4.4.E states bidder names visible to Liaison Officer. Sections 5.DD and 11.2.6.Q indicate bidder identity must remain hidden. Please confirm the exact pre-submission visibility rules.	No change in the bidding document. The level of transparency in bid opening may change from time to time. The proposer shall make those changes within the quoted bid price.
29	Annex 01, 4.5/4.7, "Clarification Approval Workflow", pages 47–48	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 4.5.G mandates a maker-checker workflow for any clarification or addendum. Section 4.7.E states the approval workflow for online pre-bid clarifications is NOT in scope. Please clarify: is maker-checker required only for addenda (formal documents)?	Online pre-bid clarifications and the addendum / corrigendum issuance are two separate requirements with different requirements. No change in the bidding document. The requirements appear clear.
30	Annex 01, 4.1.2, "Procurement Estimates / Threshold Configurability", page 41	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 4.1.2.I requires procurement-method threshold values to be configurable. Please confirm whether threshold changes are pure parameter	Refer 4.1.2 (I) in the functional requirements: <i>If the verification failed, the system will display a warning message to the LO stating that the chosen method is not in compliance with the laid-down procedures.</i> The requirement is clear.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		updates or require workflow logic changes, and whether historical procurements must be re-evaluated.	
31	Annex 01, 11.2.6, "e-Auction / Invitation Field Changes", pages 105, 107	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 11.2.6.L requires the supplier to implement Government-driven additions/exclusions of invitation data fields 'at no additional charge' as part of maintenance. Please confirm whether this is limited to UI label changes or includes logic-driving fields.	The requirement is clear: <i>The Government will revise this list from time to time. When the Government seeks to edit the Invitation by including or excluding certain data fields, the supplier shall implement the changes as part of its existing maintenance contract for no additional charges.</i>
32	Annex 01, 11.3, "e-Auction / Server Clock Synchronization", page 110	<b>Clarification:</b> For forward/reverse auctions, please clarify how server-time fairness is maintained when bidders have variable network latency.	The requirement is clear. A timer clock may be implemented on the client side, and the server clock time must be synchronized at regular intervals as explained in the requirements.
33	Annex_3 FRS, 3.1-C-c), page 26	<b>RFP Text:</b> c) Currency (i.e., LKR, USD, and such other currencies identified during the project implementation phase). <b>Clarification:</b> Payment Logic: For ICB tenders, is the bidder required to pay both amounts, or is it an either/or selection based on the bidder's residency? Is the Department's intent to ensure long-term scalability and global operational flexibility without requiring a future platform migration?	The quoted text and the clarification is from different sections. In ICB tenders, bidders may pay bid security in any of the multiple currencies. The meaning of global operational flexibility is unclear.
34	Annex_3 FRS, 4.1-L, page 35	<b>RFP Text:</b> For ICB procurement, the system should allow the procurement officer to specify the fees in two currencies (i.e., Sri Lankan Rupee and a foreign currency).	The system will record the currency and amount at the time of payment initiation, against which reconciliation will be done.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p><b>Clarification:</b> Reporting: In which currency should the system record the primary "Revenue" for financial reconciliation if two different currencies are collected for the same tender?</p>	
35	<p>Section VII, 1.2, "Phase 1 vs Phase 2 — Feature Scope and Delivery Boundary", page 137</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> The RFP mentions 35 features divided into Phase 1 (13 features) and Phase 2 (22 features).</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the feature grouping in Annex 3 FRS is the final scope for both phases, or if the Purchaser may change the split after contract award. If any Phase 2 features are moved into Phase 1, will the same payment weightage apply and will additional implementation time be provided?</p>	<p>Refer to Section 2, Item 20 of the first pre-proposal clarifications.</p>
36	<p>Annex 01, Section 2.2, "Vendor Registration — Fee Configuration, Payment Gateway and Foreign Vendor Handling", pages 19–24</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> FRS Section 2.2 mentions configurable vendor registration fees.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether payment gateway charges and bank transaction fees will be borne by the Purchaser or vendors. Also clarify whether fee structures may vary by vendor category and whether tax rules should also be configurable.</p>	<p>As explained in Item 24 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document <i>“The payment gateway service charges shall be borne by the purchaser or end users of the e-GP system. The proposer need not include the cost of payment gateway charges in its bid”</i>.</p> <p>The following differential pricing is envisaged in the bidding document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sri Lankan or foreign</li> <li>• New or renewal</li> </ul> <p>The tax rule computation to be implemented will be finalized during the project implementation phase in consultation with the payment gateway service provider.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
37	Annex 01, Section 4.1, "Procurement Creation — Contract Type Variations and Price Bid Auto-Generation", pages 34–41	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the evaluation and BoQ logic for all contract types is already finalized or will be discussed during requirement gathering. Also clarify whether additional contract types may be introduced later.	Contract types have been identified in the functional requirements. The data fields to be included in the price bid format will be finalized during the implementation phase. Hence the phrase “key details” is used.
38	Annex 01, Section 4.3, "Procurement Approval Workflow — Configuration and Threshold-Based Routing", page 45	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the approval hierarchy will be fully configurable by the department administrator. Also clarify whether workflow changes during the project period will be treated as configuration changes or development scope changes.	Indeed, workflows must be configurable and workflow modifications shall NOT constitute as a scope change.
39	Section VII, "System Inventory Table and Associated Payment Terms", page 172	<b>Clarification:</b> As per the given payment terms for Software Development & Implementation. 10% will be given in advance.70% on UAT.20% on Operational Acceptance of a feature and 10% on operational acceptance for the system for the system wide go live. So the total of milestone based payment percentage here is 110% (10%+70%+ 20%+10%). Please clarify.	Advance payment is optional. Refer section VII, system inventory table and associated payment terms: <i>Advance Payment – 10% of the Software Development &amp; Implementation (SDI) costs, subject to payment of advance payment guarantee. The Proposer can choose to avail the advance payment.</i> The advance payment will be recovered from the supplier’s invoices. The total of all the payments will be 100%.
40	Annex 01 (FRS), Section 3.1, "DAPP — Three Types of Procurement Plans", pages 27–35	<b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm whether the workflow, approval hierarchy, and forms for each DAPP type are already finalized or will be discussed during requirement gathering.	An indicative set of data fields are listed in the functional requirements for the different DAPP types. DAPP approval workflows will be implemented as explained in the functional requirements.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
41	Annex 01, 3.1, "Procurement Plans", pages 32, 68	<b>Clarification:</b> DAPPs allow year-wise break-ups, but ITMIS fund commitments are typically annual. Please clarify how multi-year procurements are committed in ITMIS and how budget revisions mid-year flow back into the DAPP.	ITMIS fund commitment is done when <i>vendor selection is finalized and prior to contract award</i> . Also, refer to Item 27 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document.
42	Annex 01, 2.2.3, "Vendor Bank Details / Hash Value", page 22	<b>Clarification:</b> Section 2.2.3 references a 'hash value' of bank account data. Please confirm whether this is for data-integrity verification or for encryption/tokenization for PCI-DSS compliance, and which entity is the system of record.	It is for data integrity verification.
43	First addendum dated 29-May-2026, functional requirements	<b>Clarification:</b> New procurement methods in scope. Item 1 of the First Addendum adds Request for Proposal, TwoStage Procurement and Public-Private-Partnership to the scope. Please confirm whether these newly added procurement methods fall in Phase 1 or Phase 2 so they can be placed correctly against the 12month and 23-month delivery split in item 17 of the Second Addendum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to “Feature-wise grouping of requirements”, page 7 of the revised functional requirements for feature-wise weightage allocation for two-stage and public-private-partnership. The phase categorization is also specified in that section.</li> <li>• There is no any reference to 23 month delivery split in item 17 of the second addendum.</li> </ul>
44	Section 10.5.6, revised functional requirements, PKI based signing and encryption	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Immediately after a user is assigned to a role (i.e., a new user or a transfer), a notification email will be sent to the user about the role, and the user can log in to perform their authorized sourcing functions.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Will the govt user require to use only the User ID and password to log-in to eGP system?</p>	Refer Item 29 of the fourth addendum to the bidding document: Section 10.5.6, revised functional requirements: <i>The system should allow digital signature based sign-in either on its own or as an add-on security on top of the user name and password based login.</i>

## 8 Legal

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section VIII, GCC 15.4, "Intellectual Property Rights", page 273; Section IX, SCC GCC 15.4	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> Purchaser rights include access/use of source code of custom software.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Kindly clarify whether source code handover applies only to project-specific customizations/integrations, while bidder/OEM pre-existing proprietary platform, reusable frameworks, utilities, and third-party licensed components remain excluded. Kindly also clarify ownership of core product IP, customizations, perpetual license rights, and source code access.</p> <hr/> <p><b>RFP Text:</b> The clauses state that the Intellectual Property (IP) rights for Custom Software will be transferred to the Purchaser.</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm that the IP transfer applies only to the specific, bespoke business logic, custom code, and configurations developed exclusively for this e-GP project, and that the System Implementation Partner firmly retains all inherent rights, titles, and ownership to its pre-existing IP, base product architecture, and proprietary development tools.</p>	<p>No change in GCC 15.4. As explained in Item 21 of the second addendum: <i>The intellectual property rights of the pre-existing eGP product will be retained by the proposer. The purchaser does not seek transfer of source code under this contract.</i> As explained in Item 2 of the fourth addendum, <i>All data created, stored, processed or generated on the e-GP system shall remain the sole property of the Government of Sri Lanka.</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p><b>Clarification:</b> Please confirm that the IP transfer applies only to specific bespoke business logic and custom code, with the SIP retaining all pre-existing IP.</p>	
2	<p>Section VIII, GCC 32, "Intellectual Property Rights Indemnity", page 236</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "Intellectual Property Rights Indemnity... The Supplier shall indemnify and hold harmless the Purchaser..."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> Will Purchaser provide indemnity?</p>	<p>The purpose for which the purchaser will indemnify the proposer is unclear.</p>
3	<p>Section VIII, GCC 12.6, page 206</p>	<p><b>RFP Text:</b> "If the Supplier fails to perform its cyber security obligations under the Contract, an assessed amount, as determined by the Project Manager, may be withheld..."</p> <p><b>Clarification:</b> How is assessed amount calculated? Is it separate from LD? Is there a cap?</p>	<p>An initial definition of Cyber security obligations and the amount that will be withheld in breach conditions are defined in Item 22 of fourth addendum to the bidding document.</p>