



Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development

Department of State Accounts

PROCUREMENT DOCUMENT

(Two Envelope System: Single-Stage Two Envelope Bidding Procedure)

Addendum I

Procurement of Design, Development and Implementation of a Payroll System for Government Organizations

IFB No: DSA/PROC/NCB/2026/01

Employer:

Director General
Department of State Accounts
Room Number 101, 1st Floor,
The Secretariat, Colombo 01.

07 May 2026

Addendum 01
to the
Invitation for Bids (IFB)
Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
(MOFPED)

Department of State Accounts (DSA)

**Procurement of Design, Development and Implementation of a Payroll
System for Government Organizations**

IFB No: DSA/PROC/NCB/2026/01

1. Background

The **Chairman, Ministry Procurement Committee (MPC)** on behalf of the **Department of State Accounts (DSA)** invited sealed bids from eligible bidders for the **Procurement of Design, Development and Implementation of a Payroll System for Government Organizations** on **29th March 2026** and Pre-Bid meeting conducted on **21st April 2026**. Based on the clarifications sought by the bidders, it has been deemed necessary to provide additional information to further clarify certain aspects of the Bidding Document.

All bidders are required to thoroughly review the information provided in **Addendum 01 and the issued Clarifications** in order to ensure the accurate and comprehensive preparation of both the Technical and Financial parts of their bids.

Bids must be delivered to the address given below **on or before 2.00 p.m. on 21st May 2026**, consequent to the extension of the bid submission deadline by a period of seventeenth (17) days. Late submissions will not be accepted under any circumstances. Bids will be opened immediately after the closing time, in the presence of bidders' authorized representatives who may wish to attend. All other terms, conditions, and requirements of the bidding document shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

Any clarifications regarding **Addendum 01** must be received by the **Employer no later than 10 days prior to the Deadline for Submission of Bids**. All clarifications must be addressed to the contact information provided in the Bidding Document. Any questions or clarifications submitted **after 21 May 2026 will not be addressed** by the **DSA**.

This addendum consists of the following;

1. Addendums to the original Bidding Document.
2. Responses to the Clarifications

All above amendments to the bidding documents will be formally incorporated into an Addendum 01 with additional Clarifications, and will be shared with all prospective bidders and published on the relevant official websites.

Chairman,

Ministry Procurement Committee (MPC),

Department of State Accounts,

Room Number 101, 1st Floor,

The Secretariat, Colombo 01.

07 May 2026

2. Addendums to the original Bidding Document

SN	Clause No.	Original Content	Amended Content
Volume I & III – Section II – Bid Data Sheet			
1.	ITB 22.1	The bid validity period shall be 119 days after the Deadline for Submission of Bids, as specified below in reference to ITB Clause 26. The bid shall be valid until and inclusive of September 01, 2026	The bid validity period shall be 119 days after the Deadline for Submission of Bids, as specified below in reference to ITB Clause 26. The bid shall be valid until and inclusive of 17th September 2026.
2.	ITB 23.2	Bid Security must be submitted using only the prescribed form included in this Procurement Document. Bid Security should be from a Commercial Bank and valid for 28 days beyond the original validity period of the bid. i.e September 29, 2026	Bid Security must be submitted using only the prescribed form included in this Procurement Document. Bid Security should be from a Commercial Bank and valid for 28 days beyond the original validity period of the bid i.e. 15th October 2026.
3.	ITB 26.1	For <u>Bid submission purposes</u> only, the Employer's address is: Attention: Chairman, Department Procurement Committee Address: Department of State Accounts, Room Number 101, 1st Floor, The Secretariat, Colombo 01 The Deadline for Submission of Bids is: Date: May 05, 2026 Time: 2.00 pm	For <u>Bid submission purposes</u> only, the Employer's address is: Attention: Chairman, Department Procurement Committee Address: Department of State Accounts, Room Number 101, 1st Floor, The Secretariat, Colombo 01 The Deadline for Submission of Bids is: Date: 21 st May 2026 Time: 2.00 pm

4.	ITB 29.1	<p>The Bid opening shall take place at: Address: Department of State Accounts, Room Number 101, 1st Floor, The Secretariat, Colombo 01 Date: May 05, 2026 Time: 2.00 pm</p>	<p>The Bid opening shall take place at: Address: Department of State Accounts, Room Number 101, 1st Floor, The Secretariat, Colombo 01 Date: 21st May 2026 Time: 2.00 pm</p>
Volume II – Schedule of Requirements (SOR)			
<p>Following addendum is issued in relation to the eGPS of Sri Lanka, aligning with the requirements outlined in the SOR. The bidder shall comply with the following additional technical, architectural, and commercial conditions.</p>			
5.	SOR		<p>1. API Integration Framework</p> <p>The proposed Payroll System shall include a standardized and extensible API Suite to enable seamless integration with both internal and external government information systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system must support secure, scalable, and reusable APIs for data exchange across government platforms. • APIs shall facilitate integration with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SLUDI (Sri Lanka Unique Digital Identity) for employee master data synchronization ○ Government HRIS for leave and attendance data ○ Other internal systems such as Treasury, ERP, and analytics platforms • The API framework must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adhere to RESTful design principles with secure authentication mechanisms (e.g., OAuth2, JWT) ○ Support both real-time and batch data exchange ○ Ensure data integrity, traceability, and auditability <p>This requirement aligns with the integration architecture defined in the SOR, where the payroll system operates as a central hub interacting with multiple government systems.</p>

6.	SOR	<p>2. Compliance with Open Standards and Data Ownership</p> <p>To ensure long-term sustainability and independence of the Government, the bidder must strictly comply with the following:</p> <p><u>2.1 System Flexibility and Standards Compliance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The solution shall be designed in compliance with widely adopted open standards across all architectural layers. • The system shall be deployable across cloud and on-premise environments without architectural constraints. • The database layer shall be based on an open-standard compliant, enterprise-grade relational or distributed database platform capable of supporting national-scale workloads. • Any use of proprietary frameworks, encryption mechanisms, or vendor-specific technologies must be explicitly disclosed. • The bidder shall ensure that such components do not impede interoperability, extensibility, or future evolution of the system architecture. <p><u>2.2 Data Ownership</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All system data, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Employee records ○ Payroll transactions ○ Audit logs ○ Historical data shall be the exclusive property of the MOFPED. • The bidder shall not impose any restrictions on data access, storage, processing, or usage. <p><u>2.3 Data Portability and National Systems Integration</u></p>
----	------------	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MOFPED shall retain unrestricted rights to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extract, transfer, and reuse data ○ Integrate with future national systems, dashboards or analytics platforms • No additional licensing fees, technical constraints, or vendor dependencies shall be imposed for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data extraction ○ Data migration ○ System integration <p>This is consistent with the SOR requirement for centralized governance, reporting, and interoperability with national-level systems.</p>
7.	SOR		<p>3. Software Licensing Requirements</p> <p>The bidder shall provide a complete and transparent and lifecycle-oriented licensing model covering all required software components.</p> <p><u>3.1 Scope of Licensing</u></p> <p>The proposal must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Database licenses shall be included with enterprise Database support. • Application software licenses • Middleware and integration tools • Third-party licensed libraries tools and frameworks (e.g., rule engines, reporting tools, workflow engines) <p><u>3.2 Licensing Period</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All licenses must cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The full implementation period ○ A minimum of seven (07) years of continuous operation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Warranty period ▪ Post-warranty support and maintenance period <p><u>3.3 Cost Transparency</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All licensing costs must be fully disclosed within the Bill of Materials (BOM).

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hidden, implicit, or future recurring costs outside the submitted proposal shall be accepted. <p>This aligns with the SOR requirement for full lifecycle support, including warranty and maintenance phases.</p>
8.	SOR		<p>4. Lanka Government Cloud (LGC) Responsibilities</p> <p>The deployment of the ePayroll system shall be aligned with the Lanka Government Cloud (LGC) framework.</p> <p><u>4.1 Infrastructure Provided by Government</u></p> <p>The MOFPED, through LGC, will provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Network firewall (perimeter security) Web Application Firewall (WAF) Virtual Machine infrastructure (compute, memory, storage) <p><u>4.2 Bidder Responsibilities</u></p> <p>The bidder shall be responsible for specifying and including in the BOM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Required compute sizing and resource allocation Container orchestration platform requirements (e.g., Kubernetes, OpenShift), if applicable Application Performance Monitoring (APM) tools Network Monitoring Systems (NMS) Endpoint security solutions (EDR/XDR) <p><u>4.3 Architecture Compliance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed system must be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cloud-ready and horizontally scalable Compatible with containerized and modern deployment environments The bidder must ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High availability and fault tolerance Disaster recovery preparedness Compliance with applicable government security standards

			This aligns with the SOR requirement for cloud-based deployment, scalability, and SLA-driven performance expectations.
9.	SOR		<p>5. Bill of Materials (BOM) Requirements</p> <p>The bidder shall submit a comprehensive Bill of Materials including that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development Instance ○ Production Instance ○ Training Instance ○ Testing Instance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The technical evaluation will place specific emphasis on the bidder's proposed BOM. The evaluation committee will assess whether infrastructure and resource specifications are appropriately sized, cost-effective, and aligned with actual system requirements. ● Bidders are expected to demonstrate a balanced and well-architected solution, ensuring that system performance requirements are achieved through efficient design, proper application architecture, and optimized resource utilization, rather than by unnecessarily increasing hardware or cloud resource capacity. ● Over-provisioning of infrastructure to compensate for suboptimal application design will be viewed negatively. ● Evaluation marks will be awarded based on the bidder's ability to deliver a scalable, efficient, and performance-optimized solution that adheres to best practices without imposing unnecessary cost burdens on the Government.
10.	SOR		<p>6. Compliance with National Scale and Performance Requirements</p> <p>The system shall be designed and validated to support national-scale usage with clearly defined concurrency and</p>

		<p>performance benchmarks.</p> <p>The bidder shall demonstrate, through appropriate architecture design and performance testing, that the proposed solution can support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum of 25,000 concurrent authenticated users under normal peak operating conditions • The ability to scale to 50,000 concurrent authenticated users during exceptional peak periods (e.g., payroll finalization cycles, year-end processing, or policy-driven mass access events) • At least 5,000 concurrent transactional users performing critical operations such as payroll processing, approvals, validations, and updates <p>In addition, the system shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support batch payroll processing for up to 1.5 million employee records within defined and acceptable processing windows • Maintain consistent system responsiveness and throughput under peak load conditions without degradation of critical service levels • Ensure that concurrency handling is achieved through efficient system architecture, including horizontal scalability, workload distribution, and optimized resource utilization, rather than reliance on excessive infrastructure provisioning <p>The bidder shall provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented performance benchmarks and assumptions • Results of load and stress testing demonstrating compliance with the above thresholds • A clear scalability model indicating how the system will accommodate
--	--	--

			<p>future growth in user base and transaction volumes</p> <p>The bidder must demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scalable architecture (e.g. micro services or modular systems) • Parallel processing capabilities • Performance optimization strategies <p>As highlighted in the SOR, the system must support national-level payroll operations with high availability and performance guarantees.</p>
--	--	--	--

Note

This addendum ensures that the proposed eGPS solution:

- Promotes interoperability and integration through open standards
- Ensures architectural flexibility and long-term sustainability
- Guarantees full government ownership and control of data
- Provides cost transparency across the solution lifecycle
- Aligns fully with the Lanka Government Cloud (LGC) strategy and SOR requirements

All bidders are required to strictly adhere to these conditions when preparing their technical and financial proposals.

3. Responses to the Clarifications

SN	Clause No	Issues raised by Bidders	DSA Response
Volume I & III – Section I – Instructions to the Bidders			
1.	ITB 4.8	Amending the procurement conditions to allow foreign partners to participate as Joint Venture (JV) partners with local companies.	Bidders may seek technical, consultancy, or implementation support from foreign entities; however, such entities shall not be allowed to participate as partners in a Joint Venture (JV) for this procurement.
Volume I & III – Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria			
2.	Clause 3.7.7 Specific Experience	Reducing the minimum employee threshold for the largest reference implementation from 200,000 to 100,000 employees within a single organization.	There is no change to the original document.
3.	3.7.7. Specific Experience	Under specific experience you have requested three live payroll implementations with 10000+ employees each. Can	Yes, that is acceptable.

		we use our OEM reference for this requirement?	
Volume II – Schedule of Requirements (SOR)			
4.	SOR	<p>Source Code (ESCROW) The bidder seeks confirmation that, as SAP is a COTS solution, the escrow requirement applies only to custom-developed components, localization elements, and implementation-specific configuration artefacts, while SAP’s core intellectual property and standard components are excluded from the source code escrow arrangement. Written confirmation is requested in line with the understanding reached during the pre-bid meeting.</p>	Accepted.
5.		<p>Hosting at LGC The bidder seeks confirmation that the proposed SAP solution can be deployed on SAP-certified infrastructure within or aligned to the Lanka Government Cloud environment, based on the submitted BOM and required SAP standards. Clarification is also requested on whether the Ministry will provision and bear the cost of the required infrastructure and hardware, as indicated during the pre-bid discussions.</p>	<p>The scope of this Request for Proposal (RFP) is strictly defined to utilize the standardized infrastructure features and services provided by the existing Lanka Government Cloud (LGC) environment.</p> <p>The Government of Sri Lanka (GOSL) will not provision, facilitate, or bear the commercial cost associated with procuring or setting up dedicated, proprietary, or custom certified hardware, infrastructure, or Bill of Materials (BOM) components that fall outside the defined scope of the LGC services outlined in the RFP.</p> <p>Therefore, bidders are required to ensure that their proposed solution's architecture and deployment requirements are fully compliant and operable within the feature set, operating systems, and virtualization/containerization layers currently provisioned by the Lanka Government Cloud (LGC). Any requirement for specialized, non-standard, or out-of-scope infrastructure must be addressed within the bidder’s proposed solution and costing, without</p>

			incurring additional procurement obligations on the GOSL.
6.		<p>Accommodating Subscription Payment & Payment Terms Change</p> <p>The bidder seeks clarification on whether the tender permits recurrent/subscription costs, such as annual OEM licensing fees for enterprise solutions like SAP, to be structured and paid on an annual basis in line with the NPV-based evaluation methodology under Clause 42.1. Additionally, clarification is requested on whether the Employer will accommodate a hybrid payment model, where implementation services are paid through milestone-based payments while recurring subscription costs are settled annually according to OEM payment cycles.</p>	The structure of the cost should match the provided payment schedule, irrespective of the type of costs incurred by the bidder.
Annexure I – Functional Requirements Specification (FRS)			
7.	FRS 1.11.6.	Should routing be user-selected, system-driven, or both?	Both
8.		Who can select/change the workflow route?	Only authorized users
9.		Can the route be modified after workflow initiation?	Route changes may be allowed only through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorized administrator action • With audit trail and justification
10.		What conditions should influence routing (e.g., role, department, approval type)?	Routing shall be configurable based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role / designation • Department / organization unit • Transaction type (e.g., payroll, OT, leave, loan) • Approval amount thresholds • Policy-based conditions
11.	FRS 1.11.6.	Should routing be user-selected, system-driven, or both?	Both
12.		Who can select/change the workflow route?	Only authorized users

13.		Can the route be modified after workflow initiation?	Route changes may be allowed only through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorized administrator action • With audit trail and justification
14.		What conditions should influence routing (e.g., role, department, approval type)?	Routing shall be configurable based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role / designation • Department / organization unit • Transaction type (e.g., payroll, OT, leave, loan) • Approval amount thresholds • Policy-based conditions
15.	FRS 1.11.7.	What priority levels are required? Can they be customized?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System shall support configurable priority levels such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Low o Normal o High o Critical • Priority levels shall be configurable by administrators
16.		Are reminders/alerts needed for approaching deadlines?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes the system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Task deadlines (SLA-based or fixed) o Automated reminders and alerts for approaching deadlines o Escalation alerts for overdue tasks
17.		What should happen when a task is rejected or delegated?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On rejection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Task shall be returned to previous step or initiator with comments • On delegation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Task shall be reassigned to another authorized user o Full traceability shall be maintained
18.		What level of detail is expected in the traceability trail?	The system shall maintain a comprehensive audit trail, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All actions (create, approve, reject, delegate, modify) • User identity and role • Timestamp of each action • Workflow stage history • Linked transaction reference
19.		Should users have access to full history or limited views?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Users shall have role-based access: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Normal users: limited to relevant workflow history o Supervisors/auditors: full process history access

20.	FRS 1.11.10.	Which roles can add/view minutes?	Role Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only authorized government officers (as per workflow configuration) may add minutes/ comments/ observations • Viewing access - Based on role-based permissions
21.		At which workflow stages can minutes be recorded?	Workflow Stages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes can be recorded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o At any configured workflow stage o Including approval, review, and escalation points
22.		Are different categories of remarks required (e.g., internal vs official)?	Yes
23.		Should notifications be triggered when remarks are added?	Yes
24.	FRS 1.11.11.	Are additional fields required (e.g., department, location)?	Yes
25.		Should metadata be editable or strictly system-generated?	Metadata shall be system-generated and non-editable
26.		Should all users see this metadata or only specific roles?	Metadata visibility shall be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Visible to authorized users involved in the workflow o Fully visible to auditors/admin users
27.	FRS 1.11.12.	Is language switching required at system level or only for input?	System shall support selection Language system level/ input level
28.		Is translation functionality required?	May be offered as optional enhancement
29.		Should search work across multiple languages?	Yes
30.		Are specific input tools/keyboards required?	System shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Standard Unicode input o No dependency on special hardware keyboards
31.	FRS 1.11.13.	Should sorting be configurable (ascending/descending)?	Yes
32.		What export formats are required (PDF, Excel, etc.)?	System shall support export in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PDF (mandatory) o Excel (mandatory) o Optional: CSV or any other suitable formats
33.		Can users apply multiple filters simultaneously?	Yes

34.		Are there any restrictions on viewing or printing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viewing and printing shall be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Controlled via role-based access permissions o Sensitive records restricted where required
35.	FRS 1.11.14.	Who can approve edits/deletions?	Only authorized senior administrators / approvers can editing or deletion of minutes
36.		What approval workflow is required?	Formal approval workflow (configurable)
37.		Should version history be maintained?	Yes
38.		Should original entries remain visible after changes?	Original entries shall always remain visible. Never be physically deleted from audit history
39.	FRS 1.11.17.	What types of escalations are required (alerts, reassignment, etc.)?	System shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email / portal alerts • Escalation to higher authority • Task reassignment (optional configuration)
40.		Can SLAs vary by workflow or role?	SLAs shall be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Configurable per workflow type o Configurable per role or department
41.		Should weekends/holidays be excluded?	System shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Exclusion of weekends and public holidays (configurable)
42.		How many escalation levels are needed?	Minimum support for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Multi-level escalation (e.g., Level 1, Level 2, Level 3)
43.		Should escalation history be reported?	Yes
44.	FRS 4.1.12.	What qualifies as a backdated entry (cut-off rules)?	Backdated entries refer to any payroll-related data input or amendment entered after the original payroll processing period, but with an effective date in a prior payroll period.
45.		Who can create backdated entries?	Backdated entries shall be created only by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Authorized HR/ Finance/ Payroll users,
46.		Who approves them and what is the approval workflow?	Approval workflow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Entry initiated by authorized officer o Reviewed by Supervisor/Section Head o Final approval by Head of HR / Finance Officer (or designated authority)
47.		Should backdated entries impact already processed payroll?	The system shall maintain a full audit trail including: Creator, approver, timestamps, and changes made. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Adjustments must be processed in the next payroll cycle.

48.		Is there a time limit for how far back entries can be made?	The system shall support configurable limits with special approval from senior authority.
49.	FRS 6.1.2.	Custom forms and data fields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall allow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Configuration of loan application templates for different loan types (e.g., festival loans, distress loans, vehicle loans). o Addition, modification, or removal of data fields (e.g., loan amount, repayment period, guarantor details).
50.		Validation rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support configurable validation rules, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mandatory fields o Data type validations (numeric, date, text limits) o Range validations (e.g., maximum loan amount)
51.		Eligibility criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loan engine shall support configurable eligibility conditions such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Employee Type o Deductible Salary thresholds o Service period o Existing loan limits or outstanding balances • These criteria shall be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Configured initially by the vendor based on government policy o Significant policy changes may require configuration updates by the vendor.
52.		Approval workflows and routing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support configurable Role-based routing approval workflows
53.	FRS 8.1.14.	Who can change OT status?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall allow OT transaction status (Active/Inactive) to be changed only by: Authorized Payroll Officers, or finance officers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) shall be enforced to restrict unauthorized changes
54.		What is the impact of inactive OT on payroll processing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OT transactions marked as Inactive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Shall be excluded from payroll calculation and processing. o Shall not affect earnings, deductions, or statutory computations.
55.		Should status changes be logged in audit history?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All status changes (Active ↔ Inactive) shall be Fully logged in the system audit history,
56.		Can inactive records be reactivated?	Yes, with appropriate authorization.

57.	FRS 8.1.16.	Should the system block duplicates or only warn users?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The system may allow warning for duplicate OT entries
58.		What defines a duplicate (same date, same hours, same shift)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A duplicate OT entry is defined as an entry where the following key attributes match an existing record: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee ID • Payroll period • Pay item (OT type) • OT date (or overlapping date/time range) • Same shift or time range (start/end time overlap) Note: The system shall support configurable duplicate detection rules to align with organizational policies.
59.		Can authorized users override the duplicate flag?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system may allow authorized users (Define by Entity) to override a duplicate flag, subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mandatory justification o Higher-level approval (configurable workflow)
60.		Should duplicate attempts be logged for audit?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duplicate attempts should be logged for audit.
61.	FRS 8.1.22.	What constitutes “abnormal” OT (thresholds, rules)?	<p>Abnormal OT shall be determined based on predefined and configurable rules, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive OT hours: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o OT exceeding daily, weekly, or monthly thresholds • Unusual frequency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Continuous OT over multiple consecutive days • OT exceeding basic salary thresholds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o OT payments exceeding a defined % of basic salary • Outside approved working schedules: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o OT recorded on holidays, weekends, or non-working hours without prior approval • Duplicate or overlapping OT entries • Department/role-based anomalies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o OT significantly higher than peers in similar roles
62.		Should rules be configurable?	<p>Rules, threshold values and criteria shall be defined and configure during implementation based on government policies.</p>
63.		What type of alerts/notifications are required?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When abnormal OT is detected, the system shall:

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Flag the transaction/employee record o System dashboard alerts
64.		Should flagged cases require approval before payroll processing?	Flagged abnormal OT cases should be configured to require review and approval before payroll processing.
65.		Is there a reporting/dashboard requirement for monitoring?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Dashboard view for monitoring abnormal OT trends o Standard and ad-hoc reports, for flagged transactions
66.	FRS 8.1.24.	What is the required format/structure for ITMIS integration?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support standardized, structured data exchange formats aligned with ITMIS/Treasury interface specifications.
67.		Should exports be manual or automated (scheduled)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support both: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manual export (on-demand by authorized users) • Automated/scheduled export (e.g., after payroll finalization)
68.		What security measures are required (encryption, access control)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall ensure secure data handling through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) for export and integration functions • Data encryption: • Authentication & authorization:
69.		Are there specific approval steps before export?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support configurable approval controls before export.
70.		Is bidirectional integration required (status updates from Treasury)?	Yes
71.	FRS 9.1.11.	What are the exact file formats required by each authority?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support authority-specific file formats, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Structured text (TXT), CSV, or Excel formats o Any prescribed templates issued by relevant statutory bodies
72.		Are there validation rules before file generation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall enforce pre-generation validations, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Completeness of employee and contribution data o Correct calculation of statutory contributions o Mandatory fields (NIC, contribution codes, etc.) o Period consistency (no duplicate or missing periods) • Validation results:

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Errors shall block file generation o Warnings may be allowed with user acknowledgment (configurable)
73.		Should the system support direct submission or only file generation?	Both
74.		Are acknowledgements or receipts required to be stored?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Recording and storage of submission acknowledgements/receipts, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reference numbers o Submission date/time o Status (accepted/rejected/pending)
75.		How should corrections/re-submissions be handled?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Identification of errors or rejected submissions o Correction of underlying data with proper authorization • Re-submission process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Maintain version control of files (original and revised) o Require justification and approval for corrections
76.	FRS 10.1.4.	What qualifies as a “valid” tax identifier?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A valid tax identifier refers to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o TIN (Taxpayer Identification Number) issued by the Inland Revenue authority, or o Any other legally accepted identifier as per prevailing tax regulations.
77.		Who can approve exceptions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval shall be managed through a controlled workflow, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Request initiation with justification o Review and approval by designated authority
78.		Should the system block processing or allow override with warning?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall not block APIT processing and allow override only through an approved workflow, not direct user action. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Override shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Require documented justification o Be time-bound or transaction-specific (configurable)
79.		Should exception cases be reported separately?	Separate reports/dashboard views for exception cases, including Employees processed without valid tax identifiers
80.	FRS 10.4.6.	What are the IRD file format specifications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support IRD-prescribed electronic formats, which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Structured files (TXT / CSV / Excel), or o formats where applicable

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File content shall typically include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Employer details (TIN, name, registration number) o Employee details (TIN, NIC, name) o Tax period o Taxable income and APIT deductions
81.		Is there an API-based integration or file upload process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support both methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o File generation for manual upload via IRD portal (mandatory) o API-based integration shall be supported when IRD provides official interfaces
82.		What validation rules must be applied before submission?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall enforce pre-submission validations, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Presence and validity of TIN for employer and employees o Correct tax calculations (APIT based on applicable rates) o Mandatory fields completeness o Period consistency and duplication checks • Validation behavior: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Errors shall block submission/file generation o Warnings may be allowed with user acknowledgment (configurable)
83.		How should submission failures or rejections be handled?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Capture of error/rejection messages from IRD (where integration exists), or manual entry of such details • Correction process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Users shall be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Correct underlying data with proper authorization § Re-generate and re-submit revised files • Controls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Maintain version history of all submissions (original and revised) o Require justification and approval for re-submissions (configurable)
84.		Should acknowledgements be stored and linked to payroll records?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Storage and tracking of submission acknowledgements/receipts, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Reference numbers § Submission date/time § Status (accepted/rejected/pending) • Integration scenario:

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Acknowledgements may be captured automatically via API • Manual scenario: o Users shall be able to upload acknowledgement documents
85.	FRS 12.1.26.	What events should trigger notifications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support notifications for key events, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll processing milestones (e.g., payroll finalized, payslip available) • Approval workflows (e.g., pending approvals, approvals/rejections) • Exception cases (e.g., abnormal OT, duplicate entries, missing data) • Statutory submissions (e.g., successful submission, rejection notices) • Employee-related updates (e.g., loan approvals, deductions applied)
86.		Can users choose their preferred notification channels?	Yes
87.		Should notifications be sent via multiple channels simultaneously or selectively?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Simultaneous multi-channel notifications (e.g., email + SMS + inbox), or o Selective delivery based on configuration and user preferences • Default <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o To be defined during implementation (e.g., critical alerts via all channels)
88.		Are there templates required for email/SMS?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support configurable templates for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Email notifications (with subject and body) o SMS messages (short, parameterized content)
89.		Is integration with an SMS gateway required? If yes, which provider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system shall support standard API-based integration with SMS providers • SMS provider shall be selected and provided by the client organization • Vendor responsibility to configure and integrate with the selected gateway
90.		Should notification history be stored and viewable?	Yes
91.	FRS 13.1.5.	What systems need to be integrated (e.g., payroll, Treasury, IRD, biometric devices)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Payroll system shall support integration with the following core systems (as applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Payroll system modules (internal integration) o Treasury / ITMIS system o Inland Revenue Department (IRD) system

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Biometric / attendance devices or attendance management systems o Banking/payment systems (if applicable for salary disbursement) o Any other government-approved external systems as required
92.		What type of integration is required (API, file-based, real-time, batch)?	<p>The system shall support multiple integration modes depending on the source system capability, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • API-based integration (preferred method) • File-based integration (CSV / XML / Excel / TXT) • Batch processing (scheduled ETL jobs) • Near real-time integration (where APIs are available)
93.		What data transformation rules are required?	<p>The system shall support configurable ETL transformation rules, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data mapping between source and target systems • Standardization of codes (e.g., department codes, pay codes) • Currency and rounding rules • Date format conversion • Validation and enrichment rules • De-duplication and reconciliation logic
94.		How frequently should ETL jobs run (real-time, scheduled)?	<p>ETL processes shall support configurable scheduling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real-time (API-based events where applicable) • Near real-time (interval-based sync) • Scheduled batch processing (e.g., daily, weekly, payroll-cycle-based)
95.		Are there data validation and error-handling requirements?	<p>The system shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-integration validation (data completeness, format checks) • Post-integration validation (reconciliation checks) • Error handling mechanisms such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Rejection logs o Retry mechanisms o Exception queues for correction and reprocessing
96.		Should logs and audit trails be maintained for ETL processes?	<p>The system shall maintain comprehensive ETL audit logs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data source and destination

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timestamp of execution • Records processed / failed • Error details and resolution status • User/system initiating the process
97.	FRS 13.1.7.	What types of governance rules are expected (HR, payroll, compliance, audit)?	<p>The system shall support configurable rules across domains including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HR rules (attendance, leave, eligibility) • Payroll rules (allowances, deductions, OT limits) • Compliance rules (tax, statutory deductions, APIT, EPF/ETF) • Audit controls (approval requirements, segregation of duties)
98.		Should rules be configurable via UI?	<p>Governance rules shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Configurable via system administration UI o Parameter-driven (no source code changes required)
99.		Are there different rule sets for different departments/entities?	<p>The system shall support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Different rule sets for different departments / organizations / entities if needed o Centralized or decentralized rule management (configurable)
100.		What happens when a rule is violated (block, warning, escalation)?	<p>The system shall support configurable responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Block processing (hard stop) • Warning alerts (soft control) • Escalation to approval workflow • Exception logging for audit review
101.		Should rule changes be version-controlled and audited?	<p>All rule changes shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Version-controlled o Time stamped o User-tracked o Justification-required for changes • Historical rule versions shall be retrievable for audit purposes
102.	FRS 13.1.8.	What are the data retention policies for different data types (employee, payroll, logs)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention periods shall be configurable based on government policy and legal requirements.
103.		When should data be archived vs deleted?	<p>The system shall support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Archiving of historical data (preferred for long-term retention) o Deletion only where legally permitted and explicitly approved

104.		Should archived data remain searchable?	Archived data shall remain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Searchable and reportable o Accessible based on role-based permissions
105.		Are there compliance requirements (e.g., audit retention periods)?	System Shall Support compliance requirements
106.		Who can manage lifecycle policies?	Data lifecycle policies shall be managed by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Authorized System Administrators / IT Unit o In coordination with HR and Finance departments • Policy changes shall require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Approval workflow o Audit logging
107.	Model lifecycle management tools	What type of “models” are being referred to (data models, AI/ML models, reports)?	In this context, “models” refer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data models (HR/payroll data structures) • Reporting models / analytical models • Rules/configuration models • (Optional) AI/ML models if implemented in future analytics modules
108.		Is this requirement within HRIS scope or part of a data/analytics platform?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core requirement is within HRIS/Payroll system scope • Advanced analytics/AI models may be part of a future data platform extension
109.		Should version control and rollback be supported?	The system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Versioning of models/configurations o Ability to rollback to previous versions o Change tracking and audit history
110.		Who manages these models (IT, HR, data team)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model management shall be handled by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o IT Team in the DSA / PMU / System Administrators o With inputs from HR and Finance domain experts