

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

First Pre-Proposal Clarifications dated 04-June-2026

1 Evaluation

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section II, page number 53, ITP 39.9 (2): <i>Documentation reviews</i>	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Documents created in the context of previous contracts may be several hundred pages long, and they are subject to confidentiality clauses that restrict disclosure to third parties without prior authorization by the client. Furthermore, these documents also are part of the intellectual property of the Proposer, our clients, and/or third parties, so they cannot be disclosed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please remove the requirement for documentation reviews, as it infringes intellectual property and confidentiality rights. In similar RFPs financed by the World Bank, client attestations and address details of a client representative are more than enough to demonstrate successful delivery of previous contracts. An exception to this would be user manuals that are publicly available on public procurement portals. Any documentation prepared in the context of a similar contract should be directly requested to the client concerned. • Contract of this type usually last many years; in some cases, the maintenance period extends more than 10 years or 'ad infinitum'. Please accept previous implementations that have entered production and are in maintenance 	<p>ITP 39.9 (2) stands revised as follows:</p> <p>The proposer is required to make available any documentary evidence, about the previous assignments cited by the proposer, for the purposes of review by the Purchaser such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Contract documents for the previous assignments b) Project Implementation Plans for previous assignments c) Operational Acceptance Reports for previous assignments d) Final Acceptance Reports for the previous assignments e) End of Project / Assignment Reports for previous assignments. f) Client issued experience certificate <p>Refer to the second addendum for details.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>phase, so no 'End of Project' reports are available.</p>	
<p>2</p>	<p>Section III, page 62, 2.4 Detailed Technical Evaluation Criteria" (p.62), Evaluation criterion 1: Product Fitment</p>	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The RFP indicates that compliance of the proposer's e-GP product against the functional requirements will be evaluated on a 0–4 scale (from "Fully inadequate" to "More than adequate") and that Proposers shall classify each functional requirement (e.g. readily available, configurable, customized, or above and beyond). We kindly request clarification on how marks within the 0–4 scale is assigned for each of the four classification types.</p>	<p>As a part of its technical proposal, the Proposer shall submit a compliance statement individually for all the e-GP system functionality as explained below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readily available in the product. • Can be configured and deployed. • The software will be customized and deployed. • The product addresses above and beyond the requirement, which the vendor offers to provide within the quoted proposal price. <p>In addition, proposers are advised to explain in writing the software functionality that corresponds to the requirements. Grading will be done at the feature level (i.e., 35 features).</p> <p>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. Depending on the extent of compliance, the committee will assign a score of 3 and below.</p> <p>This section will be graded in 0-4 scale and marks will be correspondingly allocated wherein:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = Fully inadequate • 1 = Less adequate

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 = Somewhat adequate • 3 = Adequate • 4 = More than adequate
4	Section IV, "Pricing", page 118	<p><u>Clarification:</u> In the foreign currency line, it has mentioned that, there was 3 currency lines as foreign currency line A, B & C. Hence, can we quote by USD or multiple mix currencies?</p>	<p>Refer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITP 18.1: The currency(ies) of the Proposal and currencies of payment shall be the same. The Proposer shall quote in the currency of the Purchaser's Country the portion of the Proposal price that corresponds to expenditures incurred in the currency of the Purchaser's Country, unless otherwise specified in the PDS. • ITP 18.2: 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.
5	Not referred	<p><u>Clarification:</u> When considering current contract commitments, do we need to consider only specific experience, such as the ongoing e-GP implementations, or can we use general experience from other types of projects as well?</p>	<p>Refer page 90 of the procurement document (RFP): <i>Proposers and each partner to a Joint Venture should provide information on their current commitments on <u>all contracts</u> that have been awarded, or for which a letter of intent or acceptance has been received, or for contracts approaching completion, but for which an unqualified, full completion certificate has yet to be issued</i></p>
6	Section I – Instructions to Proposers (ITP); 20.8	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The Proposal Security or the Proposal-Securing Declaration of a JV shall be in the name of the JV that submits the</p>	<p>Refer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITP 20.8..." the Proposal Security ... shall be in the names of <u>all future</u>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>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><u>Clarification:</u> If the proposal security is taken by the lead JV partner from their nationalized bank, and proposal securing declaration is submitted in the name of the other JV partner, will this be acceptable?</p>	<p><u>members</u> as named in the letter of intent referred to in ITP 4.1 and ITP 11.5.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>PDS, ITP 20.1:</u> “A Proposal Security is required in form of bank guarantee as per the prescribed format given with the proposal forms, named “FORM OF PROPOSAL SECURITY (BANK GUARANTEE)” <p>“This bank guarantee shall be issued by a local commercial bank approved by the Central Bank of Sri Lanka or foreign bank operating in Sri Lanka and also 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>“A Proposal-Securing Declaration: Not applicable”</p>
7	Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria; 1.3.1 Historical Financial Performance	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Submission of audited balance sheets or if not required by the law of the Proposer’s country, other financial statements acceptable to the Purchaser, for the latest three [3] financial years to demonstrate the current soundness of the Proposers financial position and its prospective long-term profitability.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> In case of Joint Venture, do both the members need to submit the audited balance sheets or only the lead JV member?</p>	Refer to section III, 1.3.1, “Historical Financial Performance”, page 73

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
8	Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria; 1.3.2 Average Annual Turnover	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Minimum average annual turnover of USD two (02) million calculated as total certified payments received for contracts in progress or completed, within the last (i.e., 2025, 2024 and 2023) three (03) financial years.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> In case of Joint Venture, should both the members cumulatively meet this requirement?</p>	Refer to Section III, 1.3.2 “Average Annual Turnover”, page 73
9	Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria; 1.4.1 General Experience	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Experience under Information System contracts in the role of prime supplier, management contractor, JV member, or subcontractor for at least during the latest five [05] financial years prior to the applications submission deadline.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> In case of Joint Venture, should each JV member meet this requirement individually or cumulatively?</p>	Refer to Section III, 1.4.1, “General Experience”, page 75
10	Section IV – Proposal Forms; Personnel Capabilities- Key Personnel	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Candidate Summary To be completed by the Proposer and, if JV, by each member</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> In case of Joint Venture, should each member of the JV provide the candidate summary?</p>	Refer; Section III; “1.1 Eligibility”
11	Section IV – Proposal Forms; 3.3 Deployment of Software Development / Expert Resources to be hired on a need basis	<p><u>RFP Text:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Person-month rate for Junior Software Development Resources (JSD) 2. Person-month rate for Senior Software Development Resources (SSD) 	Refer Section IV, Proposal Forms, Note, (ii): <i>If the Purchaser requires deployment of the JSD and SSD on-site, the cost of travel and per diem during their on-site will be borne by the Purchaser as per its internal standard (i.e., in addition to the man-month rate quoted by the Supplier).</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>3. Person-month rate for System Administrator (SA)</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Let us know if JSD and SSD resources need to be on-site or off-site for this project?</p>	
12	Section II, ITP 39.9, Page 53	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> As additional qualification measures, the Information System (or components/parts of it) offered by the Proposer with the Most Advantageous Proposal may be subjected to the following tests and performance benchmarks prior to Contract award</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Verification of Previous implementations: The proposer will be required to further verify the previous implementation details provided, to the satisfaction of the purchaser, through an agreed-upon methodology. 2. Documentation reviews: The proposer will be required to make available at least the following documents for purposes of review by the Purchaser: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Contract documents for the previous assignments ii. Project Implementation Plans for previous assignments iii. Operational Acceptance Reports for previous assignments 	Refer PDS, ITP 39.9: <i>“The Information System (or components/parts of it) offered by the Proposer with the Most Advantageous Proposal may be subjected to the following tests and performance benchmarks prior to Contract award”</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>iv. Final Acceptance Reports for the previous assignments</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Please confirm if these documents are required to be submitted by proposer at the time of submission of bid document.</p>	
13	Section II, ITP 39.9, Page 53	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> As additional qualification measures, the Information System (or components/parts of it) offered by the Proposer with the Most Advantageous Proposal may be subjected to the following tests and performance benchmarks prior to Contract award</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Verification of Previous implementations: The proposer will be required to further verify the previous implementation details provided, to the satisfaction of the purchaser, through an agreed-upon methodology. 2. Documentation reviews: The proposer will be required to make available at least the following documents for purposes of review by the Purchaser: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Contract documents for the previous assignments ii. Project Implementation Plans for previous assignments iii. Operational Acceptance Reports for previous assignments 	Refer to the response given to Item 1, "Evaluation" section, First Pre Proposal Clarification to the Procurement Document (RFP).

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>iv. Final Acceptance Reports for the previous assignments</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Customer contracts along with Project Implementation Plan and Acceptance reports will be confidential in nature for both system implementer and the user department. It may not be possible to furnish all the required documents.</p>	
14	Section II, ITP 39.9, Page 53	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> As additional qualification measures, the Information System (or components/parts of it) offered by the Proposer with the Most Advantageous Proposal may be subjected to the following tests and performance benchmarks prior to Contract award</p> <p>1. <i>Verification of Previous implementations: The proposer will be required to further verify the previous implementation details provided, to the satisfaction of the purchaser, through an agreed-upon methodology.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Documentation reviews: The proposer will be required to make available at least the following documents for purposes of review by the Purchaser:</i></p> <p><i>i. Contract documents for the previous assignments</i></p> <p><i>ii. Project Implementation Plans for previous assignments</i></p>	Refer to the response given to Item 1, First addendum Pre Proposal Clarification to the Procurement document (RFP).

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p><i>iii. Operational Acceptance Reports for previous assignments</i></p> <p><i>iv. Final Acceptance Reports for the previous assignments</i></p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Request you to modify this clause to accept only the contract document of previous assignments for determining the most advantageous proposal</p>	
15	Section III, ITP 32.1, page 52	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Does failure to achieve 65% technical score result in immediate disqualification before opening the Financial Proposal?</p>	<p>Proposals failing to achieve 65% technical score will be "...considered substantially non-responsive to the request for proposals document".</p> <p><i>Refer ITP 33.1 (b) "...their envelopes marked "SECOND ENVELOPE: FINANCIAL PART" will be returned to them unopened after the completion of the selection process and the signing of the Contract;"</i></p>
16	Not Referred.	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Do category-level minimum technical scores apply, or only the aggregate score?</p>	<p>Category-level minimum scores will not be applied.</p>
17	Not Referred.	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Is the QCBS weighting of 30% technical and 70% financial fixed?</p>	<p>Refer ITP 39.1: <i>The weight to be given for cost is: 70 %</i></p> <p>Refer ITP 32.1: <i>The weighting to be given for Rated Criteria (including technical and non-price factors) is: 30%</i></p>
18	Not Referred.	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Can the technical–financial weighting be revised or reconsidered?</p>	<p>The procurement document (RFP) remains unchanged.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
19	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> What qualifies as “readily available in the product” under the Technical Evaluation Criteria?	A functional requirement “readily available in the product” can be used by the customer without any customization or configuration.
20	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> What is meant by “above and beyond the requirement” in technical scoring?	The software product includes additional features relevant to the requirement (i.e., in addition to complying with the requirement) that are not explicitly specified in the FRS, which the vendor offers to provide within the quoted proposal price.
21	Section III, 2.4, “Detailed Technical Evaluation Criteria”, page 62, Evaluation criterion 1: Product Fitment	<u>RFP Text:</u> 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. <u>Clarification:</u> Can additional features offered free of charge improve technical scores?	The proposer can improve its score by offering software features relevant to the requirement (i.e., in addition to complying with the requirement) that are not explicitly specified in the FRS), within the quoted proposal price. Refer to item 2 above for further details.
24	Section III, 1.4., “Experience”, page 75, 1.4.2 Specific Experience	<u>Clarification:</u> Is the requirement to have processed 10,000 e-tenders mandatory?	Refer Section III, 1.1, “ <i>The Proposer’s qualification shall be assessed in accordance with the Qualification table included in this section.</i> ” Refer Section III, 1.4.2
25	Section III, 1.4., “Experience”, page 75, 1.4.2 Specific Experience	<u>Clarification:</u> Can experience with fewer but high-value tenders be treated as equivalent?	No. Refer Section III, 1.1, “ <i>The Proposer’s qualification shall be assessed in accordance with the Qualification table included in this section.</i> ”
26	Section III, 1.4, “Experience”, page 75,	<u>Clarification:</u> What qualifies as “specific experience” under clause 1.4.2?	Refer to the requirement “1.4.2 Specific Requirement”, page 75.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	1.4.2 Specific Experience		
27	Section III, 1.4, "Experience", page 75	<u>Clarification:</u> Can experience of JV/consortium partners be counted?	Refer to Section III, 1.4, page 75 for details
28	Section III, 1.4, "Experience", page 75	<u>Clarification:</u> How is Joint Venture experience treated for evaluation purposes?	Refer to Section III, 1.4, page 75 for details.
29		<u>Clarification:</u> PCA 3 Form Requirement - Kindly confirm whether submission of the PCA 3 form is mandatory for this tender.	Bidders are not required to submit PCA 3 form in their proposal.
30	Section III, 1.2, "Historical Contract Non-Performance", page 71	<u>Clarification:</u> The document states that in case a pre-qualification process was conducted, this form should be used only if the information submitted at the time of pre-qualification requires updating. We would appreciate it if you could clarify whether this implies that, after submission of the tender, if there are any updates or additional information to be provided by the tenderer, only the relevant details need to be re-submitted using this form.	The proposers must submit documentation detailing their compliance to the factors specified in Section III, 1.2 "Historical Contract Non-Performance"
32	Section II, ITP 32.1	<u>RFP Text:</u> Minimum technical pass mark: 65% <u>Clarification:</u> Please confirm (a) whether failure to achieve 65% on the aggregate Technical Score causes immediate disqualification before opening of the Financial Part	Refer to item 15 in this section.
33	Section II, ITP 32.1	<u>RFP Text:</u> Minimum technical pass mark: 65% <u>Clarification:</u> Please confirm whether category-level minimum scores also apply (e.g., across Product Fitment, Key	Refer to Items 16 and 17 in this section.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		Personnel, Approach & Methodology), or only the aggregate.	
34	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> Will the Purchaser provide a Functional Requirements Traceability Matrix template to standardize compliance statements across the four required categories (Readily Available / Configurable / Customized / Above-and-Beyond)?	Refer to Section III, 2.4, serial number 1: <i>Proposer shall submit a compliance statement individually for all the e-GP system functionality as explained below.</i> To further clarify, proposers are required to state their compliance with each functional requirement specified in the “Functional Requirements Specification” annexed to the procurement document (RFP) (i.e., first addendum to the procurement document (RFP).
35	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> The Cyber Security Expert is now mandatory among Key Personnel (Sec. 1.3). Please specify the minimum qualifications — years of experience and required certifications (CISSP / CISM / CEH / ISO 27001 LA).	The proposed candidate should have relevant industry standard qualifications, certifications, work experience and expertise.
36	Section II, ITP 22.1	<u>Clarification:</u> PDS ITP 22.1 requires both a hard-copy original (plus one copy) and an electronic PDF copy on a USB flash disk. For international Proposers, please confirm: (a) acceptability of courier delivery to Room 109; (b) recommended cut-off for international dispatch to ensure pre-deadline arrival; and (c) whether the PDF on USB must be digitally signed or any specific encryption is required.	Response to (a) and (b) – It is the proposer’s responsibility to ensure that its proposal reaches the address specified in ITP 23.1 before expiry of the proposal submission deadline Response to (c): The PDF need not be digitally signed or encrypted. Refer to items 15 and 22, second addendum, for further details.
37	Section II, ITP 19.1	<u>Clarification:</u> PDS ITP 19.1 sets the Proposal Validity at 160 days from the submission deadline (i.e., ~8 November 2026), while the Proposal Security must remain valid until 6	<i>Refer to section 1, 20.3: “The Proposal Security shall be valid for twenty-eight (28) days beyond the original date of expiry of the Proposal</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>December 2026. Please confirm (a) that the bank guarantee should be issued for the longer (security) validity period; and (b) the procedure to be followed if the Purchaser later requests an extension of Proposal Validity, including the application of the SOFR adjustment factor referenced in PDS ITP 19.3(a).</p>	<p><i>validity, or beyond any extended date if requested under ITP 19.2.</i>", and refer;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1; ITP 19.1,19.2 &19.3.
38	Eligible Proposer	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> <i>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).</i></p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> In case a bidder proposes a proprietary e-GP product owned by an OEM / technology partner and submits valid manufacturer/OEM authorization, can the past government-wide implementation experience of that OEM's product be considered for satisfying the Specific Experience criterion under Section III 1.4.2, even where the OEM is not a JV member?</p>	<p>The procurement document (RFP) remains unchanged. The e-GP product must be <i>owned by the proposer or a JV member</i></p>
39	Specific experience – e-GP product implementation	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> <i>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</i></p>	<p>An e-GP installation established by a government-owned or controlled entity (i.e., in addition to the central or state level agencies) to process e-Tenders will be considered as a government installation.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p><i>separate contracts) during the last seven (07) years.</i></p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> For the purpose of Specific Experience qualification, will successful implementation of the proposed e-GP / eProcurement platform in Public Sector Undertakings, State-Owned Enterprises, or government-controlled entities be considered equivalent to "government installations at central or state level," particularly where such entities conduct regulated public procurement at scale?</p>	<p>Refer to the second addendum for details.</p>
40	Specific experience – e-GP product implementation, Section 1.4.2	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> <i>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.</i></p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> For the purpose of Specific Experience under Section III 1.4.2, where an e-GP installation was originally implemented prior to the last seven years but has continued under formally extended / renewed contracts involving rollout, enhancement, and statewide operational continuation during the last seven years, will such contract extensions / renewals be considered as satisfying the requirement of being "installed and implemented" during the last seven years?</p>	<p>An e-GP installation that handled live e-Tender transactions during the last seven years will be considered as "implemented" in the context of the evaluation criteria 1.4.2 "specific experience".</p> <p>Refer to the second addendum for details.</p>

2 Implementation Plan

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section VII, 1.2, Page 137,	<u>Clarification:</u> Please clarify the number of months allocated for the implementation of all Phase 2 features.	Refer to Section 4.3, page 164: <i>The Proposer is required to implement Phase 2 features during the O&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>
2	Section VII, A. Implementation Schedule (p.169):	<u>Clarification:</u> The RFP refers to “a total of 7 years of maintenance,” following an initial O&M period of 3 years and a possible extension of 3 years. Please confirm that this is a clerical error and that the total duration of maintenance is 6 years.	“ <i>The Purchaser may decide to extend the O&M period (with a post warranty service contract), in which case the proposer shall maintain the software for an additional 3 years (i.e., a total of 6 years of maintenance).</i> ” Refer to the second addendum for details.
3	Section 10, 10.4, “PKI Server”, page 79	<u>RFP Text:</u> Until the infrastructure for issuing digital signature certificates is in place in Sri Lanka, the e-GP vendor is required to set up a Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) server to meet the e-GP system's digital signature requirements. <u>Clarification:</u> What is the expected timeline for the Government of Sri Lanka to implement or operationalize a national digital signature certificate framework?	Refer to the first addendum to the RFP
4	Section VII, 2.7.1, page 158	<u>Clarification:</u> Is the Project Manager required to be permanently onsite for the full contract duration?	Refer Section VII, 2.4.1.1 User: “ <i>The Proposer is required to deploy a dedicated Project Manager on-site for the entire Project duration.</i> ” The qualification requirements for the Project Manager during the pilot phase and the

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			operations and maintenance phase differ. Refer to section 2.7.1 for details.
5	Section VII, 2.7.2, page 158	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Besides the 2 resources listed above, the Proposer is required to propose a team with diverse skill-sets and personnel required for implementation of the requirements specified in this procurement document. The team proposed by the proposer shall be directly accessible to the purchaser, as and when required, throughout the proposed period.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Is a hybrid onsite/offsite model acceptable during the O&M phase?</p>	Refer Section VII, 2.4.1.1 User: <i>“The Proposer is required to deploy a dedicated Project Manager on-site for the entire Project duration.”</i> The qualification requirements for the Project Manager during the pilot phase and the operations and maintenance phase differ. Refer to section 2.7.1 for details.
6	Section VII, 1.7, page 148, Requirement 1.7.1.2: Timely Implementation of the Software	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> All the Phase 1 features shall be implemented within T + 12 months, wherein “T” refers to the date of signing of the contract.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> What are the specific contract payment milestones?</p>	Refer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section VII; “System Inventory Table and Associated Payment Terms”, page 172. • Section IX; SCC to the GCC12.1 • “Feature-wise grouping of requirements” in the Functional requirements specifications annexure for feature specific weightage allocation.
7	Section VII, 1.7, page 148, Requirement 1.7.1.2: Timely Implementation of the Software	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> All the Phase 1 features shall be implemented within T + 12 months, wherein “T” refers to the date of signing of the contract.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> If Phase 1 is completed early (e.g., four months), can production deployment proceed earlier?</p>	Refer section 7, Implementation schedule: <i>It is envisaged that all the Phase 1 features would be launched by T + 210 days. The UAT committee will decide on sequencing the launch of the Phase 1 features. For example, the UAT committee can decide to launch the Vendor registration module early as in T + 140 days and launch the remaining Phase 1 features by T + 210 days (i.e., provided security audit of the server infrastructure audit and VAPT of the deployment is successfully</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p>completed). The O & M phase will start after T + 12 months regardless of system-wide Go-live acceptance by the UAT committee.</p> <p>Proposers are welcome to launch the phase 1 features as early as possible (i.e.) subject to launch clearance by the purchaser.</p>
8	Section VII, 1.5.1, page 146	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> the Purchaser decides to set-up a DR, the Proposer shall replicate its existing production set-up configuration onto the DR. The Purchaser will procure the secured data connectivity, server infrastructure and any other software which would be required for the DC-DR replication, as recommended by the Proposer. The Proposer shall include its service charges for setting up the DC-DR replication in its bid price as a part of its Operations and Maintenance (O & M) costs.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> When is the Purchaser expected to decide on Disaster Recovery implementation?</p>	DC-DR replication will be done at the O&M stage.
9	Section IX, GCC 21.3.1, page 275	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The Supplier is required to submit detailed documentation about various aspects of the system such as Deployment Architecture, Configuration Management, Release Notes, Security Architecture, Data backup policy and Disaster Recovery, which the Supplier shall provide. The submission of such documentation is a pre-requisite for Operational Acceptance of the System.</p>	The cited write-up refers to the documentation the proposer needs to be submit “...for Operational Acceptance of the System.”

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<u>Clarification:</u> Is submission of a Disaster Recovery Plan mandatory with the proposal?	
10	Section VII, 4.3, page 163	<u>RFP Text:</u> The acceptance of the system will be done by the UAT committee constituted by the Purchaser within T + 21 days, wherein T refers to the date of signing of Contract. <u>Clarification:</u> What is the expected size of the UAT Committee?	The constitution of the UAT committee and its functioning will be managed by the Department of Public Finance within the timeline specified in the RFP.
11	Section VII, 4.3, page 163	<u>RFP Text:</u> The acceptance of the system will be done by the UAT committee constituted by the Purchaser within T + 21 days, wherein T refers to the date of signing of Contract. <u>Clarification:</u> What will be the quorum and sitting frequency of the UAT Committee?	The constitution of the UAT committee and its functioning will be managed by the Department of Public Finance within the timeline specified in the RFP.
12	Section VII, 4.3, page 163	<u>RFP Text:</u> The acceptance of the system will be done by the UAT committee constituted by the Purchaser within T + 21 days, wherein T refers to the date of signing of Contract. <u>Clarification:</u> Will the Purchaser nominate UAT members within RFP timelines?	The constitution of the UAT committee and its functioning will be managed by the Department of Public Finance within the timeline specified in the RFP. Refer to Section VII, “A. <i>Implementation Schedule</i> ” for further details.
13	Section VIII, GCC 19.5 (v), page 217	<u>RFP Text:</u> resources that the Supplier expects to be provided by the Purchaser and/or actions to be taken by the Purchaser in the next reporting period; <u>Clarification:</u> Will there be SLAs for Purchaser-side deliverables?	Refer to Section VII, “1.7 <i>Service Level Requirements of the Information System</i> ”. Specifically refer to the section “Delay Areas attributed to the purchaser / proposer”.
14	Section VII, 2.4.1.1, “User”, page 156	<u>RFP Text:</u> The Proposer is required to deploy a dedicated Project Manager on-site for the entire Project duration. This resource shall coordinate and facilitate training of identified users about the e-GP software on Train-the-Trainer model. Besides that, the Proposer shall develop	Refer to Section VII, “2.4 Training and Training Materials”

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>detailed user manuals for purchasing officials and suppliers in electronic format and upload it in the e-GP web portal. This manual shall be continuously updated to reflect newly made changes in software. The Proposer need NOT provide printed copies of user manuals. The training environment (i.e., office set-up) for provision of Train-the-Trainer on-site will be provided by the Purchaser. If the Project Manager is required to travel outside his/her base location to provide training, the cost of training and associated per diem will be reimbursed by the Purchaser as per actuals and as per its internal standards. The Proposer may use online conferencing tools to train the trainer on various aspects of the e-GP system.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> What is the expected scope of training programs?</p>	
15	Section VII, 2.4.1.1, "User", page 156	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The Proposer is required to deploy a dedicated Project Manager on-site for the entire Project duration. This resource shall coordinate and facilitate training of identified users about the e-GP software on Train-the-Trainer model. Besides that, the Proposer shall develop detailed user manuals for purchasing officials and suppliers in electronic format and upload it in the e-GP web portal. This manual shall be continuously updated to reflect newly made changes in software. The Proposer need NOT provide printed copies of user manuals. The training environment (i.e., office set-up) for provision of Train-the-Trainer on-site will be provided by the Purchaser. If the Project Manager is required to travel outside his/her</p>	Refer Section VII, "2.4 Training and Training Materials"

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>base location to provide training, the cost of training and associated per diem will be reimbursed by the Purchaser as per actuals and as per its internal standards. The Proposer may use online conferencing tools to train the trainer on various aspects of the e-GP system.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> How many users are expected to be trained?</p>	
16	Section VII, 2.7.2, page 158	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Besides the 2 resources listed above, the Proposer is required to propose a team with diverse skill-sets and personnel required for implementation of the requirements specified in this procurement document. The team proposed by the proposer shall be directly accessible to the purchaser, as and when required, throughout the proposed period.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Is nationwide rollout support required from the SIP?</p>	<p>Refer to section VII, Implementation Schedule: <i>The Purchaser will pilot a software feature in a set of pilot agencies at first and then roll out the feature across all the procuring entities.</i> The proposer is required to implement and manage the e-GP system in compliance with the service levels specified in the procurement document (RFP), as the system gets used by all the procuring entities in Sri Lanka.</p> <p>Refer 4.3.2: <i>Such launch will initially happen to the extent feasible in a limited geographical area and then gradually rolled out to all the procuring entities. The end users will handle live transactions using the launched modules.</i></p>
17	Section VII, 2.7.2, page 158	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Besides the 2 resources listed above, the Proposer is required to propose a team with diverse skill-sets and personnel required for implementation of the requirements specified in this procurement document. The team proposed by the proposer shall be directly accessible to the purchaser, as and when required, throughout the proposed period.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Will rollout be centralized or phased by ministry/sector?</p>	<p>The Government of Sri Lanka will finalize the roll-out procedure at the start of the project implementation.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
18	Section VIII & IX (Conditions of Contract)	<u>Clarification:</u> Kindly provide detailed payment milestones linked to deliverables (e.g., design, development, rollout, acceptance, O&M) and confirm whether any advance payment is applicable.	Refer to the response given to item 6 above in this section.
19	Clause 2	<u>Clarification:</u> Kindly confirm whether phased rollout (pilot to nationwide) is expected within the 52-week timeline.	<p>Refer to section VII, Implementation Schedule: <i>The Purchaser will pilot a software feature in a set of pilot agencies at first and then roll out the feature across all the procuring entities.</i></p> <p>Refer 4.3.2: <i>Such launch will initially happen to the extent feasible in a limited geographical area and then gradually rolled out to all the procuring entities. The end users will handle live transactions using the launched modules.</i></p> <p>The rollout of launched features may occur within the initial 52-week timeline, as decided by the purchaser during the implementation phase.</p>
20	Not Referred	<u>Clarification:</u> Please confirm that the weightage table in the FR Annexure is final and will not be modified during the procurement process, since this directly affects the proportional payment schedule under the Phase 1 (13 features) and Phase 2 (22 features) split.	The weightage table in the FR annexure can be modified by an addendum to the procurement document (RFP) until the bid submission deadline. After that, it will remain unchanged.
21	Section VII, A, Implementation Schedule, page 170	<u>Clarification:</u> The Implementation Schedule places prototype illustration at T+90 days and Phase 1 launch at T+210 days. Given requirements gathering, design, build, prototype iterations, third-party VAPT, and UAT	<p>Refer to section VII, Implementation Schedule</p> <p>Launch and UAT are two separate activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Launch of the phase 1 features: T + 210 days</i> • <i>System-wise Go-live acceptance by the UAT committee: T + 365 days</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>— is this 210-day window negotiable, or fixed regardless of the offered solution?</p>	<p>The purchaser has sought to select a proposer that will customize and deploy a robust e-GP system, that will readily address most of the requirements specified in the procurement document (RFP).</p> <p>In addition, 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"> <i>i. Gaps in software functionality to be addressed before the launch</i> <i>ii. Gaps in software functionality to be implemented subsequently (i.e., after the launch and at no additional cost to the Purchaser).</i> <p>A detailed 3rd party IT security audit study, except for the server infrastructure audit and VAPT, is not a pre-requisite for launch. Instead, it is linked with “Go-live” as explained in 4.3.2 (iv):</p> <p><i>The UAT committee will take a decision on acceptance of the system and announce system-wide “Go-live” based on the following:</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p><i>i. Deliverables submitted by the 3rd party audit agency or such other representative as defined above in (i) &</i></p> <p><i>ii. Launch of the Phase 1 software features and handling of live transactions by the end users in this software.</i></p>
22	Not Referred.	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Delays attributable to the Purchaser are listed. Will the Purchaser commit to a Service Level on its own deliverables with a clear escalation matrix and automatic timeline relief for the SIP?</p>	<p><i>Refer to section 1.7.1.2: A list of delay areas attributed to the Purchaser and in few cases attributed to both the Purchaser and the Proposer are listed in the Table below:</i></p> <p><i>Timelines by which the purchaser is required to provide feedback are specified in the table. As stated, Any delay in compliance to the project timelines is attributed to the Proposer unless and otherwise it is proven that such delay is caused by inaction of the Purchaser.</i></p>
23	Not Referred	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Quarterly O&M payments are prorated to the extent features are authorized for launch. Please clarify the billing mechanism when only some Phase 2 features are live in any given quarter, and whether unused capacity is billable.</p>	<p><i>Refer to section VII, Implementation Schedule: The Quarterly Maintenance Cost is paid proportionately to the extent the features are launched and accepted. Features herein refer to those listed under phase 1 and phase 2.</i></p>
24	Not Referred.	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Exit / Transition Management is scheduled to commence at G + 27 months. Please confirm the knowledge-transfer scope, duration, acceptance criteria, and whether a separate transition-management line item is permitted in the price schedule.</p>	<p><i>Refer ITP 16.2 (a): In addition to the topics described in ITP Clause 16.2 (a), the Preliminary Project Plan must address the following topics: ...</i></p> <p><i>(ix) Transition and Exit Management;</i></p> <p><i>The proposer must include the cost of transition management under the O & M costs line head.</i></p>
25	Not Referred.	<p><u>Clarification:</u> What is the expected size, sitting frequency, and quorum of the UAT Committee? Will the Purchaser nominate UAT members</p>	<p><i>Refer to items 11 and 12, above</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		within the T+21 days deadline contemplated in the Implementation Schedule?	
26	Tender – Change management during Pilot / pre-acceptance	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The tender states that modifications sought by the Purchaser before a feature is accepted may need to be implemented at no additional cost if the requirement is deemed already within scope, even after launch and live usage has started.</p> <p>Kindly confirm that requirements included in scope but not explicitly detailed at field / rule / format level will be finalized through approved BRD/FSD before development. Please also confirm that changes after such sign-off will be treated as change requests unless they are purely defect rectifications.</p>	<p>Refer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section VII; “2.1 System Analysis, Design and Customization/Development” • Section VII; “5.4 Software Change Control” <p>Specifically, the following statement is valid regardless of the UAT status of a feature (i.e., prior to sign-off and after): <i>When a modification sought the Purchaser is not defined in the Functional Requirements, it will be treated as a change in scope.</i> If a change sought – any time during the contract period - is detailed in the functional requirements, the proposer must modify the software within the quoted bid price.</p> <p>Any changes to page layouts, minor modifications to reports included in scope, and page navigation requirements will not be considered changes.</p> <p>Refer to the scenarios provided in section 5.4, of the procurement document (RFP) for an illustration. Refer to item 16, in the second Addendum to the procurement document (RFP) for further details.</p>
27	Tender – Operational Acceptance vs launch vs go-live vs O&M start	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The tender requires Operational Acceptance of Phase 1 within 52 weeks; the schedule shows launch of Phase 1, then go-live acceptance, then O&M. Another clause says</p>	<p>Refer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section VII; “2.1 System Analysis, Design and Customization/Development”

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>O&M starts after 12 months from contract signing, while system-wide go-live acceptance is also tied to that period.</p> <p>Kindly clarify the distinction among prototype approval, launch of features, live transaction handling, Operational Acceptance, system-wide go-live, and start of O&M. Please confirm the exact payment and support obligations attached to each milestone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section VII; Page 172 “System Inventory Table and Associated Payment Terms • Section IX; SCC to the GCC12.1 <p>The write-up in these sections is clear. There is no change in the procurement document (RFP). Relevant excerpts are included below for reference:</p> <p>Refer to Item 17, second addendum to the procurement document (RFP): <i>The functional requirements are conceptually sub-divided into 35 system features, to be implemented in 2 phases:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Phase 1: 12 features</i> 2. <i>Phase 2: 23 features</i> <p>Each feature is assigned a weight in the functional requirements specification, annexed to the procurement document (RFP). Refer to the Table in “Feature-wise grouping of requirements”.</p> <p>Refer to section VII, 2.1: <i>The system implementation and UAT procedures “...will be executed feature-wise or for a group of related features.”</i></p> <p>Refer to the table “Feature wise – User Acceptance Testing Criteria” in the functional</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p>requirements specification annexure for feature-specific acceptance criteria.</p> <p>Refer to section VII, system inventory table and associated payment terms: <i>Software Development & Implementation (SDI) – Payment done individually for all the e-GP system features.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UAT committee authorizes launch of a feature: 70% of P1 • Operational acceptance of a feature: 20% of P1 • <i>Operational Acceptance of the System for the system-wide “Go-live”</i>: 10% of all the accepted P1 features. <p>P1 = Payment due for a Phase 1 feature as per the weightage allocation defined in the functional requirements.</p> <p>Refer to 4.3.2:</p> <p><i>iv. The UAT committee will take a decision on acceptance of the system and announce system-wide “Go-live” based on the following:</i></p> <p><i>i. Deliverables submitted by the 3rd party audit agency or such other representative as defined above in (i) &</i></p> <p><i>ii. Launch of the Phase 1 software features and handling of live transactions by the end users in this software.</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			Refer to the response provided to item 21 above, for further details.
28	Tender – UAT acceptance dependency on live transaction volumes	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> If a feature is not used for 3 months subsequent to its launch, the UAT committee will evaluate compliance of the feature in test environment and confirm acceptance.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Kindly confirm that if the Purchaser is unable to provide adequate users, transactions, external interfaces, or operational readiness for live transaction-based acceptance, the relevant feature will be deemed accepted based on successful UAT in a test / staging environment.</p>	Refer to Section VII: 2.4 Operational Acceptance & Test Scenarios: <i>“If a feature is not used for 3 months subsequent to its launch, the UAT committee will evaluate compliance of the feature in test environment and confirm acceptance”</i>
29	Tender – Cloud hosting and audits	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The implementation schedule includes cloud deployment, cloud audit, application security audit, performance testing, functional compliance, and SLR automation audit by third parties, but responsibilities, empanelment, and acceptance thresholds are not fully defined in the extracted clauses.</p> <p>Kindly confirm which audits are to be conducted by Purchaser-appointed agencies and which by proposer-engaged agencies; who bears the cost; the acceptance thresholds; and whether delays attributable to third-party auditors will entitle the proposer to extension of time.</p>	<p>Refer to Section IX – Special Conditions of Contract, GCC 25:</p> <p><i>The Purchaser may decide to subject the e-GP software to Performance testing as per load handling requirements specified in the Section “Performance Requirements of the Information System”. A 3rd party agency engaged by the Purchaser will conduct this Performance testing....</i></p> <p><i>Section VII, 1.5.2:</i></p> <p><i>15. The Purchaser shall have the system audited using internal resources to ensure that it is adequately protected against risks identified in the latest Top 10 Open Web Application Security Project (OWASP).</i></p> <p>The purchaser will engage and pay the 3rd party audit agency for the IT security audit scope</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p>detailed in the procurement document (RFP). <i>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. Refer to the second addendum for details.</i></p> <p><i>The Proposer must apply system changes required to secure the system in compliance with security best practices.</i></p> <p><i>Any modifications sought by the audit agency for improvement of the system within the scope of work defined in the procurement document shall be implemented by the Proposer for no additional payment.</i></p> <p>Refer to delay areas attributed to the purchaser / proposer, serial number 3: <i>Delay in submission of deliverables by 3rd party audit agency: Purchaser</i></p>

3 Infrastructure and Software Licenses

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section VII, "3.1 Computing Hardware Specifications" (p.162)	<p><u>RFP text:</u> "viii. The proposer is required to select a reputed public cloud service provider, where the e-GP servers will be deployed."</p> <p><u>Clarifications:</u> The RFP requires that the e-GP system be hosted on a public cloud infrastructure selected by the Proposer.</p>	There is no change in the procurement document (RFP).

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>We kindly request that this requirement be removed, as it may limit competition and increase the total cost of ownership. Alternative hosting models, such as deployment in ISO 27001-certified Tier III data centres operated by the Proposer, should be allowed, provided that all security, availability, and performance requirements of the RFP are fully met.</p>	
2	<p>Section VII, “1.4.2 Infrastructure, Deployment and License / Support requirements” (p.144)</p>	<p>Support for open-source software <u>RFP text:</u> “The proposer shall purchase 9 * 6 support for open-source software for a period of 4 years, as applicable” <u>Clarification:</u> Our understanding is that 9*6 means 9 hours over 6 days. If our understanding is correct, please clarify which 9 hours are meant and which 6 days.</p>	<p>9 * 6 may be read as 9 hours a day and 6 days a week. It can also be read as on-site support within the next business day.</p>
3	<p>Page 143, Annexure 2, Section 1.4.2</p>	<p><u>RFP text:</u> The solution will be centrally hosted on a cloud platform provided by the Proposer based on the IT requirements provided by the proposer. <u>Clarification:</u> With respect to hosting, we want to check if Primary DC and Secondary DC can be hosted in Singapore. We are Saas provider and host our solutions with MS Azure in Singapore.</p>	<p>Refer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3.1, page 162 (xiv): <i>A dedicated account must be created in the cloud for the e-GP implementation of Sri Lanka. The Proposer shall provide administrator access of the e-GP specific cloud account to a resource designated by the Purchaser. This resource can view the Bill of Materials purchased from the cloud service provider and must have full rights to manage the resource allocation, deploy and manage the e-GP software application.</i> • Section 3.1, page 162 (viii): <i>The proposer is required to select a reputed</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<i>public cloud service provider, where the e-GP servers will be deployed.</i>
4	Page 144, Infrastructure, Deployment and License / Support requirements	<p><u>RFP text:</u> 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 proposer should have accounted for all the license costs in its proposal price. The proposer shall purchase 9 * 6 support for open-source software for a period of 4 years, as applicable.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Our understanding it is going to be enterprise license for modules in scope with no cap on users and suppliers. Request your confirmation on this point.</p>	Refer: <i>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>
5	Section VII, D.3.1 (viii), page 162	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The proposer is required to select a reputed public cloud service provider, where the e-GP servers will be deployed.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Must the solution be hosted in Sri Lanka?</p>	There are no geographical restrictions on hosting the solution.
6	Section VII, D.3.1 (viii), page 162	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The proposer is required to select a reputed public cloud service provider, where the e-GP servers will be deployed.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Is hosting on a public cloud outside Sri Lanka permitted?</p>	There are no geographical restrictions on hosting the solution.
7	Section VII, D.3.1 (viii), page 162	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The proposer is required to select a reputed public cloud service provider, where the e-GP servers will be deployed. The production, pre-production and training environments shall</p>	Yes. Refer to section VII, 3.1: <i>(ix) The Proposer shall quote the cloud infrastructure rental costs as published in the</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>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.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Must cloud pricing be publicly advertised and verifiable?</p>	<p><i>web portal of a reputed public cloud service provider</i></p>
8	Section VII, D.3.1 (viii), page 162	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The proposer is required to select a reputed public cloud service provider, where the e-GP servers will be deployed. 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.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Can negotiated or enterprise cloud pricing be used?</p>	<p>Refer to Section 7, “3.1 Computing Hardware Specifications”, item (ix). In addition, refer (xiv) <i>A dedicated account must be created in the cloud for the e-GP implementation of Sri Lanka. The Proposer shall provide administrator access of the e-GP specific cloud account to a resource designated by the Purchaser. This resource can view the Bill of Materials purchased from the cloud service provider and must have full rights to manage the resource allocation, deploy and manage the e-GP software application.</i></p>
9	Section VII, D.3.1, “Computing Hardware Specifications”, page 161	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The performance requirements are specified in Sections 1.6.3 “Load and Performance SLR” and 1.6.2.2. “Page Loading Time”. The Proposer is required to provide the sizing details required for the cloud infrastructure to the CSP specifically considering the following:</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> When Lanka Government Cloud becomes available, will migration be mandatory?</p>	<p>If the purchaser decides to relocate the e-GP set-up to Sri Lanka, the cost of such relocation will be paid for by the purchaser as a variation order.</p>
10	Section VII, D.3.1, “Computing Hardware Specifications”, page 161	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The performance requirements are specified in Sections 1.6.3 “Load and Performance SLR” and 1.6.2.2. “Page Loading Time”. The Proposer is required to provide the sizing details required for the cloud</p>	<p>If the purchaser decides to relocate the e-GP set-up to Sri Lanka, the cost of such relocation will be paid for by the purchaser as a variation order.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		infrastructure to the CSP specifically considering the following: <u>Clarification:</u> Who bears the cost of migration to Lanka Government Cloud?	
11	Section VII, D.3.1 (xiv), page 162	<u>RFP Text:</u> A dedicated account must be created in the cloud for the e-GP implementation of Sri Lanka. The Proposer shall provide administrator access of the e-GP specific cloud account to a resource designated by the Purchaser. This resource can view the Bill of Materials purchased from the cloud service provider and must have full rights to manage the resource allocation, deploy and manage the e-GP software application. <u>Clarification:</u> Who owns and controls the cloud subscription?	Refer; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section IV; “3.5 Server-Side Infrastructure (SSI)” notes section. • Section VII, “3.1 Computing Hardware Specifications” It is explicitly clarified that the proposer will buy the cloud subscription in the purchaser’s name. The referenced clause clearly explains the control requirements. Super administrator access shall be provided to a government of Sri Lanka designated representative.
12	Section VII, D.3.1 (xiv), page 162	<u>RFP Text:</u> A dedicated account must be created in the cloud for the e-GP implementation of Sri Lanka. The Proposer shall provide administrator access of the e-GP specific cloud account to a resource designated by the Purchaser. This resource can view the Bill of Materials purchased from the cloud service provider and must have full rights to manage the resource allocation, deploy and manage the e-GP software application. <u>Clarification:</u> Who will act as super-administrator of the system?	It is explicitly clarified that the proposer will buy the cloud subscription in the purchaser’s name. The referenced clause clearly explains the control requirements. Super administrator access shall be provided to a government of Sri Lanka designated representative.
13	Section VII, 1.4.2 “Infrastructure, Deployment and License	<u>RFP Text:</u> The solution will be centrally hosted on a cloud platform provided by the Proposer based on the IT requirements provided by the proposer.	Refer Section VII, “3.1 Computing Hardware Specifications”;

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Requirements”, page 144	<u>Clarification:</u> Can a SaaS / multi-tenant solution be proposed?	<p>(xiv) <i>A dedicated account must be created in the cloud for the e-GP implementation of Sri Lanka.</i></p> <p>A SaaS / multi-tenant e-GP solution is not acceptable to the purchaser.</p> <p>Refer to the second addendum for details.</p>
14	Section VII, 1.4.2 “Infrastructure, Deployment and License Requirements”, page 144	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The solution will be centrally hosted on a cloud platform provided by the Proposer based on the IT requirements provided by the proposer.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Is a dedicated cloud deployment mandatory?</p>	<p>Refer Section VII, “3.1 Computing Hardware Specifications”; item (xiv):</p> <p><i>A dedicated account must be created in the cloud for the e-GP implementation of Sri Lanka. The Proposer shall provide administrator access of the e-GP specific cloud account to a resource designated by the Purchaser. This resource can view the Bill of Materials purchased from the cloud service provider and must have full rights to manage the resource allocation, deploy and manage the e-GP software application.</i></p>
15	Section II, ITP 17.9, page 50	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The prices quoted by the Proposer shall not be subject to adjustment during the performance of the Contract.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> How will cloud cost escalation be handled given no price-adjustment clauses?</p>	<p>Refer;</p> <p>Section VII, “3.1 Computing Hardware Specifications”; item (xii).</p> <p><i>Ordering and Payment Process for the Cloud Items: 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</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			Refer to Section IV; “3.5 Server-Side Infrastructure (SSI)”, notes (j): <i>The payment for such invoices will be made within 4 weeks of the invoice receipt date.</i>
16	ITP 15.2, Page 12	<u>Clarification:</u> Kindly confirm whether the SIP is responsible for provisioning and managing the complete hosting infrastructure or whether infrastructure will be provided by the Purchaser.	Refer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section VII, “3.1 Computing Hardware Specifications” • Section IV; “3.5 Server-Side Infrastructure (SSI)”, notes
17	ITP 5.2, Page 12	<u>Clarification:</u> Is public cloud hosting permitted? If yes, are there any data localization requirements mandating hosting within Sri Lanka?	Refer to the response provided to items 5 and 6 above for the data localization requirements. Regarding public cloud hosting, refer to section VII, 3.1. Specifically viii: <i>The proposer is required to select a reputed public cloud service provider , where the e-GP servers will be deployed.</i>
18	Section VII, 1.4.2, “Infrastructure, Deployment and License / Support requirements”, page 143	<u>Clarification:</u> Section 1.4.2 mandates centralised cloud hosting provided by the Proposer. Is there a mandated jurisdiction for data residency (Sri Lanka onshore vs. regional)? Is the Lanka Government Cloud (LGC) acceptable or must hyperscaler infrastructure be used?	Refer to the response provided to items 5 and 6 above for the data localization requirements.
19	Section VII, 1.4.2, Infrastructure, Deployment and License / Support requirements,	<u>Clarification:</u> Section 1.4.2(1) requires the SIP to host on a cloud platform "based on the IT requirements provided by the proposer," and PDS ITP 17.9 prohibits price adjustment during contract performance. Given the contract horizon of up to 7 years, please clarify how cloud-side cost increases (FX movement, vendor list-price changes, regulatory or data-residency reclassifications) are to be absorbed without breaching the no-adjustment principle.	Refer; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section IV; “3.5 Server-Side Infrastructure (SSI)” • Section VII, “3.1 Computing Hardware Specifications” Specifically, refer to the response provided to item 15 above.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
20	Section VII, 1.5.1, Data Archival and Backup,	<u>Clarification:</u> Section 1.5.1(6) states that the SIP "shall include its service charges for setting up the DC-DR replication in its bid price as a part of its Operations & Maintenance (O&M) costs," while DC-DR is contingent on the Purchaser's decision. Please clarify the expected window within the contract during which the Purchaser will exercise the DR decision (so that proposers can size the embedded service charges on a defensible basis)	The Purchaser will exercise the DR decision at its discretion during the O&M phase. Section VII, 1.5.1: <i>The Purchaser will procure the secured data connectivity, server infrastructure and any other software which would be required for the DC-DR replication, as recommended by the Proposer.</i>
21	Section VII, 1.5.1, Data Archival and Backup	<u>Clarification:</u> Section 1.5.1(6) states that the SIP "shall include its service charges for setting up the DC-DR replication in its bid price as a part of its Operations & Maintenance (O&M) costs," while DC-DR is contingent on the Purchaser's decision. Please clarify whether a Disaster Recovery Plan is required to be submitted with the Proposal as a sub-plan, given that PDS ITP 16.2(viii) lists it among the Implementation Plans	Refer Section III, Evaluation and Qualification criteria, (3) (9). <i>Approach proposed to back-up the data (refer section 1.5.1 "Data archival and backup".</i> In its technical proposal, the bidders are advised to propose a preliminary DR plan. Bidders are advised to prepare their technical proposal addressing the evaluation and qualification criteria.
22	Other Queries	<u>Clarification:</u> Kindly confirm whether the e-GP system is to be hosted on Government-owned cloud infrastructure or proposer-managed cloud. Please also clarify the preferred cloud environment (e.g., national data center / approved cloud providers), hosting responsibility, and cost ownership.	Refer to Section VII, "3.1 Computing Hardware Specifications". Specifically refer viii: <i>The proposer is required to select a reputed public cloud service provider, where the e-GP servers will be deployed.</i>
23	Other Queries	<u>Clarification:</u> Kindly confirm the data residency requirements for the e-GP system. Specifically, whether all application and database hosting must be within Sri Lanka, and whether use of international cloud infrastructure is permitted under defined compliance conditions.	There are no geographical restrictions on hosting the solution.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
24	Other Queries	<p>The RFP specifies that there shall be no license restrictions for procurement processing by the Government of Sri Lanka. Kindly clarify the intended IPR and licensing model, specifically:</p> <p>(a) whether ownership of the software/IP is to be transferred to the Government, or retained by the proposer;</p> <p>(b) whether the requirement implies an enterprise-wide perpetual license without transaction or user limits;</p> <p>(c) whether source code escrow or transfer is required as part of the contract.</p>	<p>Refer Section IX, GCC 16.1 (a)</p> <p><i>The system 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 proposer should have accounted for all the license costs in its proposal price. There shall be no restrictions on deploying the solution in the infrastructure provided by any public cloud service providers.</i></p> <p>The intellectual property rights of the pre-existing e-GP product will be retained by the proposer. The purchaser does not seek transfer of source code under this contract.</p> <p>Refer to the second addendum for details.</p>
25	Tender – No license restrictions for the Government of Sri Lanka	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The evaluation criteria require that there shall be no license restrictions for procurement processed by the Government of Sri Lanka.</p> <p>Kindly clarify the intended commercial meaning of "no license restrictions," specifically whether it implies unlimited number of users, procuring entities, transactions, documents, storage growth, and procurement events for the full contract term.</p>	<p>Refer Section IX, GCC 16.1 (a)</p> <p><i>The system 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 proposer should have accounted for all the license costs in its proposal price. There shall be no restrictions on deploying the solution in the infrastructure provided by any public cloud service providers.</i></p>

4 Service Level Requirements

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	<p>Section VII, “1.7.2.1 Availability of the System” (p.150)</p> <p>Section VII, “1.7.2.2 Page Loading Time” (p.150-151)</p>	<p>Business hours for system availability and page loading time</p> <p>RFP text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Definition of business hours is 07:00 hours – 24:00 hours on all days of the week. The Proposer is required do all scheduled maintenance between 00:01 hours and 06:59 hours.” • “Definition of business hours is 07:00 hours – 24:00 hours on all days of the week. The Proposer is required do all scheduled maintenance between 00:01 hours and 06:59 hours” <p><u>Clarification:</u> Business hours from 07.00 – 24.00 are very unusual and prevent optimal execution of routine maintenance operations and regular bookkeeping jobs running after office hours. In addition, any scheduled or urgent maintenance tasks are normally carried out after office hours if it is necessary to shut down the system (e.g. for urgent application of security patches).</p> <p>Please define a 12-hour interval as business hours, e.g., 07.00 – 19.00 or 08.00 – 20.00.</p>	<p>No change. Read also page 150, requirement 1.7.2.1: 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.</p>
2	<p>Section VII, “1.7.2.5 Load and Performance SLR” (p.152-153):</p>	<p>Application help features</p> <p><u>RFP text:</u> “2. Capacity of the application and database servers: 15,000 transactions per hour. A transaction in the Purchaser’s context for load simulation purpose shall refer to i) Workflow transactions (ii) Tender publication and (ii)</p>	<p>A user action (e.g., approving a tender) taken within the workflow will be considered a transaction in this context.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>Online bid submission. These 3 transaction types shall be combined in the ratio of 25:25:50 respectively for load and performance testing purposes”</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> We kindly request clarification on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What exactly is meant by a “workflow transaction” in this context, in particular whether individual user actions recorded within the system are considered as distinct workflow transactions. 	
3	Section VII, 1.7, “Service Level Requirements”, page 147, Requirement 1.7.2.1: Availability of the System	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Definition of business hours is 0700 hours – 2400 hours on all days of the week.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> What constitutes “business hours” for SLA calculation?</p>	For SLR calculation, definition of business hours is 0700 hours – 2400 hours on all days of the week.
4	Section VII, 1.7, “Service Level Requirements”, page 147, Requirement 1.7.2.1: Availability of the System	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The Proposer is required do all scheduled maintenance between 0001 hours and 0659 hours. 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.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Are scheduled maintenance windows excluded from SLA availability?</p>	<i>The Proposer shall take concurrence of the purchaser if scheduled maintenance is to be done during business hours. During such maintenance work, the SLR automation tool implemented to compute page loading time shall be shut down.</i>
5	Section VIII, GCC 38, “Force Majeure”, page 244	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> “Force Majeure” shall mean any event beyond the reasonable control of the Purchaser or of the Supplier, as the case may be, and which is unavoidable notwithstanding the reasonable care of the party affected and shall include, without limitation, the following:</p>	<p>Refer to section VIII, GCC 38.5:</p> <p><i>No delay or nonperformance by either party to this Contract caused by the occurrence of any event of Force Majeure shall:</i></p> <p><i>(a) constitute a default or breach of the Contract;</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p><u>Clarification:</u> Are force-majeure events excluded from SLA calculations?</p>	<p><i>(b) (subject to GCC Clauses 35.2, 38.3, and 38.4) give rise to any claim for damages or additional cost or expense occasioned by the delay or nonperformance, if, and to the extent that, such delay or nonperformance is caused by the occurrence of an event of Force Majeure.</i></p> <p>Subject to the definitions in GCC 38, non-performance due to Force Majeure events will be excluded from SLA calculation.</p>
6	<p>Section VII, 1.7.1, “Service Level Requirements prior to Go-Live”, page 147</p>	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The service levels the Proposer is required to comply with are detailed in this section. Also, penalties for non-compliances associated with the different Service Level Requirements (SLR) are defined herein. The SLR are broadly categorized under 3 headings: <u>Clarification:</u> What reference network/location is used for performance SLAs?</p>	<p>Section VII – Purchaser’s requirements, 1.7, iii: <i>Purchaser reserves the right to verify compliance of the system to the specified Load and Performance SLR as a pre-requisite for acceptance of the pilot phase. Such verification will be done in the production set-up or a similar set-up identified by the Purchaser.</i></p> <p>Requirement 1.7.2.2: Page loading time: 4) <i>The Proposer shall implement the SLR automation tool such that it constantly submits requests to load a designate page at regular intervals as agreed between the Proposer and the Purchaser during SLR automation. Such a tool shall be deployed in a server within the data center and behind the firewall such that the network latency is kept at the very minimum.</i></p>
7	<p>Section VII, 5.2, “Technical Support, page 165</p>	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Provision of telephonic helpdesk is NOT in scope of the Proposer. However, the Proposer shall provide L2 and L3 support remotely via email. If necessary, the e-GP</p>	<p>The purchaser will provide Level 1 support.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>Section of the Purchaser will contact L2 support executives either over the Phone or using WhatsApp or MS Teams or such technology. Also, the Purchaser will consult with the Proposer to evaluate whether certain aspects of the L2 support can be handled on-site by the resources engaged by it. The scope of work of the Proposer for provision of technical support will be negotiated and agreed upon during contract signing.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Who provides Level-1 (L1) support?</p>	
8	Section VII, 5.2, "Technical Support, page 165	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Provision of telephonic helpdesk is NOT in scope of the Proposer. However, the Proposer shall provide L2 and L3 support remotely via email. If necessary, the e-GP Section of the Purchaser will contact L2 support executives either over the Phone or using WhatsApp or MS Teams or such technology. Also, the Purchaser will consult with the Proposer to evaluate whether certain aspects of the L2 support can be handled on-site by the resources engaged by it. The scope of work of the Proposer for provision of technical support will be negotiated and agreed upon during contract signing.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Who is responsible for Level-2 and Level-3 support?</p>	The proposer shall provide Level-2 and Level-3 support and build systems to ensure timely issue resolution in compliance with the service level requirements specified in the procurement document (RFP).
9	Section VII, 1.5.1 "Data Archival, Backup and Disaster Recovery", page 146	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> If the Purchaser decides to set-up a DR, the Proposer shall replicate its existing production set-up configuration onto the DR. The Purchaser will procure the secured data connectivity, server infrastructure and any other software which would be required for the DC-</p>	Section VII, 1.5.1: <i>The Purchaser will procure the secured data connectivity, server infrastructure and any other software which would be required for the DC-DR replication, as recommended by the Proposer.</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>DR replication, as recommended by the Proposer. The Proposer shall include its service charges for setting up the DC-DR replication in its bid price as a part of its Operations and Maintenance (O & M) costs.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Who will provide the Disaster Recovery infrastructure?</p>	<p>The requirement appears clear.</p>
10	<p>Section VII, 1.5.1 “Data Archival, Backup and Disaster Recovery”, page 146</p>	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> If the Purchaser decides to set-up a DR, the Proposer shall replicate its existing production set-up configuration onto the DR. The Purchaser will procure the secured data connectivity, server infrastructure and any other software which would be required for the DC-DR replication, as recommended by the Proposer. The Proposer shall include its service charges for setting up the DC-DR replication in its bid price as a part of its Operations and Maintenance (O & M) costs.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Will the DR site be located inside or outside Sri Lanka?</p>	<p>It will be decided at the time of DR implementation.</p>
11	<p>Section VII, 1.7.2.5, “Load and Performance SLR”, page 152</p>	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Please provide expected number of users, concurrent users, and annual transaction on volumes.</p>	<p>Refer. The system must be designed to handle the load specified in section VII, 1.7.2.5, “Load and Performance SLR”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concurrent connects to application server: 1000 • Capacity of the application and database servers: 15000 transactions per hour.
12	<p>ITP 16.2; Page 52</p>	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Kindly specify expected RPO/RTO requirements and whether DR infrastructure must be located within Sri Lanka.</p>	<p>Refer Section VII, 1.5.1, “Data Archival and Backup”. Specifically, <i>Back-up at regular intervals the e-GP application data and system logs such that Recovery Point Objective (RPO) does not exceed 30 Minutes. For database, the</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<i>RPO should be much lesser at less than 5 minutes.</i>
13	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> The "Availability >97% during business hours" SLR — please clarify the definition of business hours and whether scheduled maintenance windows and force-majeure events are excluded from the calculation.	Refer to the response given to the items 3, 4, and 5 above.
14	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> For the page-loading-time SLR, what is the reference network and reference location from which compliance will be measured (Data Centre LAN, public internet from Colombo, or another point)?	Refer to 1.7.2.2: Page loading time 4) <i>The Proposer shall implement the SLR automation tool such that it constantly submits requests to load a designate page at regular intervals as agreed between the Proposer and the Purchaser during SLR automation. Such a tool shall be deployed in a server within the data center and behind the firewall such that the network latency is kept at the very minimum.</i>

5 Technical Requirements

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section VII, "2.2.2 Application Help Features" (p.156) Section VII, "2.6 Documentation Requirements" (p.157):	<u>RFP text:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "System must have an on-line context sensitive help which is well organized, indexed, and searchable. On-line help must be accessible from within the application in a selected language and downloadable as a '.pdf' file in all two languages." • "2.6.1.1. End-User Documents: The Proposer is required to prepare user manual in English in .pdf format and as a presentation. This manual should be 	Section VII, 2.2.2 (a), page 156 stands revised as follows: <i>"System must have an on-line context sensitive help which is well organized, indexed, and searchable. On-line help must be accessible from within the application in English and downloadable as a '.pdf' file in English."</i> Refer to the second addendum for details

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>continuously updated to reflect changes made to the software. Translation of user manual to other languages is OUT OF SCOPE”</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Reference 1 requires that the on-line help be downloadable as a '.pdf' file in two languages, while reference 2 states that user documentation shall be provided in English only and that translation to other languages is out of scope.</p> <p>Please clarify whether documentation and on-line help are required in more than one language, and if so, specify the additional language.</p>	
2	Section VII, “2.5 Data Conversion and Migration” (p.157):	<p>Data conversion and Migration</p> <p><u>RFP text:</u> “The Proposer would be required to migrate data to the extent it is defined in the Functional Requirements Specification.”</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Annex 2 states that data migration shall be performed to the extent defined in the Functional Requirements Specification. However, no explicit data migration requirements are identified in Annex 3 – Functional Requirements Specification. Please clarify the expected scope and level of data migration from existing systems, including the types of data to be migrated and indicative data volumes.</p>	<p>Data migration (i.e., from external IT systems to Sri Lanka’s e-GP) is presently not envisaged. Any data migration requirements that arise during project implementation will be handled through a variation order.</p> <p>Refer to the second addendum for details</p>
3	Section VII, 1.4.4, page 146	<u>RFP text:</u> Integrate Google analytics and Google Webmasters utilities in the web portal to	Purchaser will provide the necessary documentation and authorization required to

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>track number of users visiting the site and record the extent to which the portal pages are crawled.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Purchaser will be procuring the google analytics for this integration. Pls confirm.</p>	<p>integrate the e-GP system with Google analytics and webmasters. The proposer must integrate the e-GP system with Google analytics and Google Webmasters at its cost.</p>
4	<p>Section VII, 2.3, “System Integration (to other existing systems)”, page 156</p>	<p><u>RFP text:</u> The e-GP system needs to be integrated with Banks, Integrated Treasury Management Information System, CIDA, e-ROC, NMRA, NPC etc. Refer to the functional requirements annexed with this document for further details.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Please provide the detailed list of banks requiring integration and confirm whether integrations are limited to the systems explicitly listed (ITMIS, CIDA, e-ROC, NMRA, NPC), or if additional system integrations are anticipated under the project scope as proper resources and costing to be allocated with the submission.</p>	<p>At this stage, we are unable to confirm the total number of banks that will require integration under the project. The integrations currently identified and within scope are limited to CIDA, e-ROC, and ITMIS.</p>
5	<p>Section VII, 1.4.3, “Email and SMS Requirements”, page 144</p>	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> 1. The system shall have the provision to send e-mails as a result of certain pre-defined set of actions (e.g. send password activation link in case of forgot password).</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Please clarify the functional and security requirements expected for the email server to be proposed by the bidder, including expected mail volumes, availability, retention, anti-spam/anti-phishing controls, authentication standards, encryption.</p>	<p>Refer Section VII, Purchaser’s requirements:</p> <p>(vi) The Proposer is required to select a cloud e-mail service provider and send automated emails to the e-GP system users via API calls. The operational cost of sending emails will be borne by the Purchaser.</p> <p>Expected mail volumes for email cannot be estimated at this stage, as they are dependent on the number of procuring entities and vendors onboarded.</p> <p>Detailed function and technical requirements for the email service provider will be shared during</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			the project implementation. <i>The service charges incurred for sending the mails shall be borne by the Purchaser.</i>
6	Section 10, 10.4, "PKI Server", page 79	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> <i>Until the infrastructure for issuing digital signature certificates is in place in Sri Lanka, the e-GP vendor is required to set up a Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) server to meet the e-GP system's digital signature requirements.</i></p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Please clarify the scope for the PKI implementation in the e-GP system.</p>	Refer to the first addendum 1 to the RFP.
7	Section 10, 10.4, "PKI Server", page 79	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> <i>Until the infrastructure for issuing digital signature certificates is in place in Sri Lanka, the e-GP vendor is required to set up a Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) server to meet the e-GP system's digital signature requirements.</i></p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Until the national digital signature certificate comes into force, should the system support system generated symmetric key process?</p>	Refer to the first addendum to the RFP.
8	Section 10, 10.4, "PKI Server", page 79	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> <i>Until the infrastructure for issuing digital signature certificates is in place in Sri Lanka, the e-GP vendor is required to set up a Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) server to meet the e-GP system's digital signature requirements.</i></p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Is the PKI solution required only for Phase 1, or for the full contract duration of four (04) years plus the subsequent three (03) year post-warranty service period?</p>	PKI server is a phase 2 requirement. After a work order is issued for PKI server implementation, the proposer must implement and maintain it until the end of the O & M phase (i.e., until the post warranty period). Proposers are welcome to implement either proprietary or open source PKI servers.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
9	Section 10, 10.4, "PKI Server", page 79	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> written confirmation that the Proposer accepts responsibility for the successful integration and inter-operability of all components of the Information System as required by the request for proposals documents;</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Can we know the exact list of components (frozen) that need to be integrated into the system as to need to provide the resources and to complete the costing?</p>	Refer to the functional and technical requirements specified in the procurement document (RFP) and its annexure for all components to be integrated.
10	Section IV, "Technical Responsiveness Checklist (Format)" page 112	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Proposer's technical reasons supporting compliance</p> <p>Proposer's cross references to supporting information in Technical Proposal:</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Tech. Require. No.</p> <p>Please provide more details on which section to be filled in the checklist</p>	Refer to section VII: Purchaser's requirements for details.
11	Section VII, 2.6.12, "Documentation Requirements", page 157	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Data Centre – Disaster Recovery replication; as and when the purchaser informs its DR readiness</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Please confirm if the e-GP vendor is required to quote the BoM and costing for setting up the DR infra.</p>	Refer to item 9, section 4 in the second pre-proposal clarifications to the procurement document (RFP) for details.
12		<u>Clarification:</u> Is the requirement strictly for a COTS solution?	The purchaser has sought to select a proposer that will customize and deploy a ready e-GP system satisfying the qualification criteria, that will readily address most of the requirements specified in the procurement document (RFP).
13		<u>Clarification:</u> Is bespoke development allowed?	The proposed e-GP system must be configured or customized (this could involve bespoke development) to comply with the functional and

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			technical requirements specified in the procurement document (RFP) and the functional requirements annexure.
14		<u>Clarification:</u> Is contract performance management included in scope?	Refer to the functional requirements annexure for the list of e-GP system functionality. The implementation of post-award procedures is presently not included in the scope.
15	Section VII, 2.4, "Detailed Technical Evaluation Criteria", page 64, 3. Approach & Methodology, 2	<u>RFP Text:</u> Mobile friendly (not mobile APP) nature of the e-GP system <u>Clarification:</u> Is a mobile application required?	The development of a mobile App (e.g., an Android app) is not within the scope. However, <i>20. All web pages should be designed as mobile friendly and should render seamlessly in a smart phone (page 143)</i> <i>2.2.1.1. System must use open standards, must be browser independent and mobile responsive. (page 155)</i>
16	Section VII, 2.2.1, "Other Standards to be observed - User-Friendliness of the GUI", page 64,	<u>RFP Text:</u> System must use open standards, must be browser independent and mobile responsive. <u>Clarification:</u> Is a responsive web application sufficient?	The software must render seamlessly across devices, and it should adjust its layout, content, and functionality to fit the screen size, resolution, and orientation of the device.
17	Section VII, 3.0, "General; Technical Requirements", page 159, 3.0.1 Language Support	<u>RFP Text:</u> The e-GP system should be UNICODE compliant. However, it is adequate if the system displays the menu and has the provision to accept and display inputted text in English language. <u>Clarification:</u> Are Sinhala and Tamil interfaces mandatory at go-live?	The implementation of Sinhala and Tamil interfaces is not envisaged in the procurement document (RFP).
18	Not Referred	<u>Clarification:</u> Are additional local regulatory formats required?	The question is not clear
19	Section VII, 2.4, "Detailed Technical Evaluation Criteria",	<u>RFP Text:</u> Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) capabilities of the e-GP system.	Refer to the first Addendum to the procurement document (RFP)

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	page 64, 3. Approach & Methodology, 3	<p>Whether PKI is already implemented and used in the e-GP system</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Is there an existing national PKI infrastructure in Sri Lanka?</p>	.
20	Section VII, 2.4, "Detailed Technical Evaluation Criteria", page 64, 3. Approach & Methodology	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) capabilities of the e-GP system.</p> <p>Whether PKI is already implemented and used in the e-GP system</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Must the system integrate with LankaSign or national CA?</p>	Refer to the first Addendum to the RFP.
21	Section VII, 1.5.2, "Security Requirements", 14, page 147	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The system should handle application data securely in line with the standards specified in ISO 27001. Compliance certification to ISO 27001 is NOT in scope of the Proposer. However, should the Purchaser conduct such an audit at its expenditure, the Proposer shall made requisite changes to the software and associated processes to ensure compliance as a part of the quoted bid price.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Who bears the cost of digital certificates?</p>	<p>There is an inconsistency between the clarification sought and the cited procurement document (RFP) text. Nevertheless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The purchaser shall NOT pay for digital certificates generated by the PKI server installed by the proposer. b) The purchasers and suppliers using the e-GP system will buy nationally recognized CA certificates directly from the authorized channels. <p>Refer to the second addendum for details.</p>
22	Section VII, 1.5.2, "Security Requirements", 14, page 147	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The system should handle application data securely in line with the standards specified in ISO 27001. Compliance certification to ISO 27001 is NOT in scope of the Proposer. However, should the Purchaser conduct such an audit at its expenditure, the Proposer shall made requisite changes to the software and associated processes to ensure compliance as a part of the quoted bid price.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Is ISO 27001 certification mandatory?</p>	The RFP text is clear as it is.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
23	Not Referred	<u>Clarification:</u> Is there a cap on remediation effort after audits?	Refer to section 2.6, page 157: <i>Any modifications sought by the audit agency for improvement of the system within the scope of work defined in the procurement (bidding) document shall be implemented by the Proposer for no additional payment.</i> In addition, refer to item 18, addendum 2.
24	Section VII, 4.3.2 (i), page 164	<u>RFP Text:</u> A 3rd party audit agency or such other representative engaged by the Purchaser will conduct a detailed study and submit a set of deliverables, which will form as key inputs for acceptance of the system by the UAT committee: <u>Clarification:</u> Who will conduct VAPT and security audits?	A third-party IT security auditor appointed by the Government. In addition, refer to item 18, second addendum to the RFP.
25	Section VII, 2.5, “Data Conversion and Migration”, page 157	<u>RFP Text:</u> The Proposer would be required to migrate data to the extent it is defined in the Functional Requirements Specification. <u>Clarification:</u> What data volume is expected to be migrated?	Refer Section 5; Item 2 on Clarifications
26	Section VII, 2.5, “Data Conversion and Migration”, page 157	<u>RFP Text:</u> The Proposer would be required to migrate data to the extent it is defined in the Functional Requirements Specification. <u>Clarification:</u> What data formats will be provided?	Refer to Section 5; Item 2 on Clarifications
27	Section VII, 2.5, “Data Conversion and Migration”, page 157	<u>RFP Text:</u> The Proposer would be required to migrate data to the extent it is defined in the Functional Requirements Specification. <u>Clarification:</u> What is the cut-off date for historical data migration?	Refer to Section 5; Item 2 on Clarifications

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
28	ITP 16.2; Page 19	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The Proposer would be required to migrate data to the extent it is defined in the Functional Requirements Specification.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Who is responsible for data cleansing?</p>	Refer to Section 5; Item 2 on Clarifications
29	ITP 16.2; Page 19	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Kindly provide the list of external systems for integration and the availability of APIs/documentation.</p>	Refer to Section 9 on “Functional Requirement Specification”
30	Section VII, 1.4.1, “General requirements”, page 142	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> 8. Have in-built Application Programming Interfaces (API) to provide e-GP system data to other external applications.</p> <p>9. Have the facility to extract data from external applications using API either real-time or on batch mode and have them updated in the e-GP system database.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Will APIs be provided or must bidders design them?</p>	The proposer must use an in-built API, design a new API, import external IT system data or implement any such method to make the integration happen.
31	Section VII	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The Proposer would be required to migrate data to the extent it is defined in the Functional Requirements Specification.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Kindly clarify scope of data migration, including data volume, formats, and responsibilities es between SIP and Purchaser.</p>	Refer to Section 5; Item 2 on Clarifications
32	Not Referred	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Section 2.5 states data migration is required "to the extent defined in the Functional Requirements Specification." Please specify the legacy systems, data volumes, formats, and cut-off dates that the SIP will be required to migrate.</p>	Refer to Section 5, Item 2 on Clarifications
33	Not Referred.	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Integrations are listed with Banks, ITMIS, CIDA, e-ROC, NMRA and NPC. Are the APIs of these external systems already</p>	The readiness of the APIs for integration with external IT systems is unknown. The proposer will not be penalized for any delay in integration

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		exposed and documented, or will the SIP need to coordinate parallel development with each agency? Who will own the risk of delays caused by integrating agencies?	due to the external IT system owner's lack of readiness. Refer to the second addendum for details.
34	Not Referred	<u>Clarification:</u> Bulk email and SMS service charges are stated to be borne by the Purchaser. Please confirm the expected monthly volumes (email and SMS) and the number of SMS types beyond the 30 already in scope, so that integration sizing is realistic.	Expected monthly volumes for email and SMS cannot be estimated at this stage, as they are dependent on the number of procuring entities and vendors onboarded. Any SMS types beyond the 30 in scope will be handled through a variation order.
35	Section VII, 4.3.2	<u>Clarification:</u> Has the third-party audit agency responsible for VAPT, performance testing, and functional compliance been appointed? Please share its mandate, the audit standards applied, and the expected turnaround times.	The third-party audit agency is yet to be appointed.
36	Section VII, 1.5.2 (14), "Security Requirements", page 147	<u>Clarification:</u> ISO 27001 certification of the system is stated to be "not in scope" of the Proposer, but compliance changes following a Purchaser-led audit are. Is there a cap on remediation effort, or is this an open-ended commitment of the SIP?	Certainly NOT. e-GP is a mission critical software designed to process procurement worth millions of USD. It is expected that the e-GP product will be robust in-built with the best security features. <i>The Proposer shall (promptly) 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>
37	Section VII, 3.08, Digital Signature, page 160, i) Signing function	<u>RFP Text:</u> The key-pair is certified by a valid Certification Authority recognized by the e-GP system. <u>Clarification:</u> Please clarify the Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) and Digital Signature ecosystem — will the Purchaser provide a Certifying Authority, or must the SIP integrate with the Sri Lanka national CA / Lanka Sign? Which root certificates are recognized?	Refer to the first Addendum to the RFP. Specifically, the system will recognize and read certificates issued by the PKI server and by the National CA / Lanka Sign. The usage pattern of PKI server generated certificates and Lanka Sign 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

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			certificates for digital signing. Refer to the second addendum for details.
38	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> Given that the system is described as the "proposer's e-GP product" being customized, please clarify the IP ownership and licensing regime: rights to source code, source-code escrow arrangements, perpetual license terms, and ownership of customizations.	Refer; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 8; "15. Copyright", "16. Software License Agreements", "17. Confidential Information" • Section 9; "D. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY."
39	FRS / Tender – External integrations and future integrations	<u>Clarification:</u> The FRS already includes core integrations and separately says the bidder must account for 5 additional external IT system integrations, with requirements similar to business registration integration, priced in the bid. Kindly provide the list of all external systems in scope, interface type (API / batch/web service), data ownership, security model, and sandbox availability. Please also confirm whether any integration not specifically described in the procurement document will be treated as a change request.	The following requirement has been deleted: <i>The e-GP implementation agency shall account for the data retrieval using either batch uploads or web services from 5 additional external IT Systems. The requirements for these integrations will be similar to those of the Business registration integration. The e-GP implementation agency shall account for the cost of these integrations in its bid price.</i> Refer to the second addendum for details

6 General

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Section VII, "2.7 Requirements of the Proposer's Technical Team" (p.158)	Qualification requirements of project manager <u>RFP text:</u> "1. Project Manager: a. During the Pilot phase: ii. Work experience: At least 2 years of work experience in development or deployment of the proposers' e-GP system."	No change.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p><u>Clarification:</u> We kindly request that this requirement be removed, as this prohibits engagement of experienced local experts and may restrict competition. This requirement might be replaced by the obligation of the owner of the solution to train the project manager on the proposer’s e-GP system.</p>	
2	Section VII, paragraph 2.7.3 (p.158-159)	<p>Designated work area of expertise</p> <p><u>RFP text:</u> “ i. Junior development resource: Minimum 2 years of work experience in the “designated work area of expertise” and</p> <p>“ii. Senior development resource: Minimum 3 years of work experience in the “designated work area of expertise””</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Please clarify what is the “designated work area of expertise” other than work experience in software development using the technological base of the offered system.</p>	<p>A ‘<i>designated work area of expertise</i>’ means the specific professional domain in which a person is officially recognized as having specialized knowledge or skill.”.</p> <p>Refer to the addendum for further details.</p>
3	Section VII, D. Technology Specifications – Supply & Install Items (p.159):	<p><u>RFP text:</u> “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 trail on email / SMS dispatch will be maintained by the system.”</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Who will bear the SMS costs? The Purchaser or the Proposer? There is no provision in the price forms as regards the number of SMS.</p>	<p>Refer Section VII, page 144, 1.4.3, (4) “<i>The purchaser shall select the SMS service provider and pay for the service charges incurred for sending the SMS.</i>”</p>
4	Section C, 2.4.1, page 156	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> 2.4.1 The proposer MUST provide the following Training Services and Materials. The cost of the user and technical training shall be included in the proposal price within the</p>	<p>Refer 2.4.1 “<i>The Proposer is required to deploy a dedicated Project Manager on-site for the entire Project duration. This resource shall coordinate and facilitate training of identified</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>Software Development & Implementation costs & the Operations and Maintenance (warranty) costs quoted by the proposer.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Please confirm the expected training scope, including number of users, locations, batches, language requirements, duration.</p>	<p><i>users about the e-GP software on Train-the-Trainer model.</i> Training must be conducted for the L1 support team, e-GP PIU staff and the UAT committee members. <i>The Proposer may use online conferencing tools to train the trainer on various aspects of the e-GP system. Software deployment and server administration training are in scope as well.</i> The Software will have to be demonstrated in detail for the purchaser to identify roles and responsibilities, rights and privileges, and system and server admin tasks such as user management. Refer 2.4.1.2 for further details.</p>
5	Section C, 2.4.1, page 156	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> 2.4.1 The proposer MUST provide the following Training Services and Materials. The cost of the user and technical training shall be included in the proposal price within the Software Development & Implementation costs & the Operations and Maintenance (warranty) costs quoted by the proposer.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Whether remote / web-based training can be provided to users / vendors?</p>	The proposer can provide remote and web-based training
6	Section IV, "Pricing", page 118	<p><u>Clarification:</u> As per the main understanding main currency is LKR. But it has mentioned that we should provide local currency price & the foreign currency price in the price table.</p>	Refer to Section 1; "18. Currencies of Proposal and Payment"
7	Section IV, "PERSONNEL CAPABILITIES- KEY PERSONNEL", page 95	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Expected time schedule for this position: [insert the expected time schedule for this position (e.g. attach high level Gantt chart</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Is that ok if we build a single Gantt chart including all the team members and add the reference to that document in this space?</p>	Kindly fill out the form required in the procurement document (RFP). The Gantt chart may be included as an additional input.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
8	General	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Kindly confirm the correct address to be used in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declaration Letters • Letter of Intent (LOI) • Cover Letter • Manufacturer Authorization • Any other applicable documents <p>If we do not receive confirmation, we will proceed with using the address provided in the Bid as follows:</p> <p>Chairman, Ministry Procurement Committee, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Room Number 109, 1st Floor, The Secretariat, Colombo, Sri Lanka.</p>	<p><i>The Purchaser is:</i></p> <p><i>Director General, Department of Public Finance, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development.</i></p> <p><i>Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development,</i></p> <p><i>Room Number 112,</i></p> <p><i>1st Floor, The Secretariat,</i></p> <p><i>Colombo, Sri Lanka.</i></p> <p>Refer to the second addendum for details</p>
9	Section IV, "Form of Proposal Security (Bank Guarantee)", page 113	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Beneficiary: Director General, Department of Public Finance.</p> <p>The bank will request the full address for the bid bond process; please advise on the full address, or we will use the address below. Please confirm</p> <p>Director General, Department of Public Finance, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Room Number 109,</p>	<p>Refer to section 6, item 8, above</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
10	Section I, 11.5, page 17	<p>1st Floor, The Secretariat,</p> <p><u>RFP Text:</u> In addition to the requirements under ITP 11.2, Proposals submitted by a JV shall include in the Technical Part a copy of the Joint Venture Agreement entered into by all members indicating at least the parts of the Information System to be executed by the respective members. Alternatively, a letter of intent to execute a Joint Venture Agreement in the event of a successful Proposal shall be signed by all members and submitted with the Proposal, together with a copy of the proposed Agreement indicating at least the parts of the Information System to be executed by the respective members.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Is case where the proposal will be submitted by a JV, should the Letter of Intent to execute the Joint Venture Agreement be sufficient?</p>	<p>Refer: Section 1; 4.1 “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.”</p>
11	Section I, 11.5, page 17	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> In addition to the requirements under ITP 11.2, Proposals submitted by a JV shall include in the Technical Part a copy of the Joint Venture Agreement entered into by all members indicating at least the parts of the Information System to be executed by the respective members. Alternatively, a letter of intent to execute a Joint Venture Agreement in the event of a successful Proposal shall be signed by all members and submitted with the Proposal, together with a copy of the proposed Agreement indicating at least the parts of the Information System to be executed by the respective members.</p>	<p>The procurement document (RFP) does not prescribe any particular role separation for the JV members.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p><u>Clarification:</u> What parts of the Information system should be mapped against the respective members in the Letter of Intent?</p>	
12	Section I, 16.4, page 20	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> For major items of the Information System as listed by the Purchaser in Section III, Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, which the Proposer intends to purchase or subcontract, the Proposer shall give details of the name and nationality of the proposed subcontractors, including manufacturers, for each of those items. In addition, the Proposer shall include in its Proposal information establishing compliance with the requirements specified by the Purchaser for these items. Quoted rates and prices will be deemed to apply to whichever subcontractor is appointed, and no adjustment of the rates and prices will be permitted.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Will the Cloud Service Provider CSP considered as sub-contractor?</p>	Refer to item 10, second addendum for the list of activities which the proposer may subcontract.
13	Section VII, 2.3, "System Integration (to other existing systems)", page 156	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The e-GP system needs to be integrated with Banks, Integrated Treasury Management Information System, CIDA, e-ROC, NMRA, NPC etc. Refer to the functional requirements annexed with this document for further details.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> What existing e-procurement/financial systems exist?</p>	The data required for the integration will be provided in a machine readable format.
14	Section VII, 1.3, "Architectural Requirements to be met by the Information System", page 137	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> 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.</p>	Refer to Section VII, Implementation Schedule, page 169: <i>The Purchaser will pilot a software feature in a set of pilot agencies at first and then roll out the feature across all the procuring entities.</i> The e-GP secretariat in consultation

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<u>Clarification:</u> How many procurement entities are in scope initially?	with the Ministry of Finance will finalize the roll-out plan during the implementation phase.
15		<u>Clarification:</u> During the session, the "Summary View" slide indicated a revision to the deadline for clarifications, moving the date from May 18, 2026, to May 5, 2026. Could you please confirm if May 5 is indeed the correct final deadline for the submission of written questions?	The deadline for submitting written clarifications has been extended. Prospective bidders are welcome to submit written clarifications until the deadline is announced.
16	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> Expected no. of departments / procuring entities to be onboarded on the portal	Refer to section 6, item 14 on clarifications.
17	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> Kindly elaborate on the standard/commonly used item if used by the Sri Lanka.	The question is not clear.
18	ITP 16.2; Page 19	<u>Clarification:</u> Please specify expected number of users, locations, and languages for training delivery.	Refer to item 4, section 6 in this document.
19	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> Currency mix: can the proposal price be quoted in multiple currencies (USD for the foreign portion and LKR for local) given the 4–7 year horizon and FX volatility?	Refer to Section 6, item 6 on clarifications.
d21	Section VII, 2.7.1, Requirements of the Proposer's Technical Team; 1. Project Manager	<u>RFP Text:</u> At least 2 years of work experience in development or deployment of the proposers' e-GP system. <u>Clarification:</u> The Project Manager qualification requires "at least 2 years of work experience in development or deployment of the proposers' e-GP system." For SIPs whose product is being packaged for the first time in Sri Lanka, will equivalent e-procurement deployment experience on comparable platforms qualify?	Refer 1.4.2, section III, Qualification and Evaluation criteria: <i>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).</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
22	Section VII, 2.7.1, Requirements of the Proposer's Technical Team; Project Manager	<u>Clarification:</u> Is the Project Manager required to be permanently on-site in Colombo for the full 48 months, or is a hybrid model (with a local deputy on-site) acceptable during the O&M phase?	<i>Refer Section VII, 2.4.1.1, Training and Training Materials: "The Proposer is required to deploy a dedicated Project Manager on-site for the entire Project duration." <u>The qualification requirements for the Project Manager during the pilot phase and the operations and maintenance phase differ. Refer to section 2.7.1 for details.</u></i>
23	Section III, Qualification Requirements,	<u>RFP Text:</u> Subcontracting of end-to-end implementation of the core solution is not allowed in this contract. <u>Clarification:</u> Sub-contracting of "end-to-end implementation of the core solution" is not allowed. Please confirm whether sub-contracting for hosting, SMS gateway, training delivery, and L1 helpdesk is permitted, and whether disclosure rules apply.	Sub-contracting for ancillary services is permitted, subject to prior disclosure and approval by the Purchaser as required under GCC Clause 20.3. Refer to Item 10 in the second addendum to the procurement document (RFP). The L1 helpdesk is within the purchaser's scope. Refer 1.4.3, Section VII, Purchaser's requirements: <i>The purchaser shall select the SMS service provider and pay for the service charges incurred for sending the SMS.</i>
24	Section II; ITP 7.6	<u>Clarification:</u> ITP 7.6 confirms that the Minutes of the Pre-Proposal Meeting will be transmitted to all Proposers, and that any modifications to the RFP arising from the meeting will be issued via Addendum (ITP 8). Please confirm the latest date by which the final Addendum will be circulated relative to the 1 June 2026 submission deadline.	The purchaser will extend the bid submission deadline if warranted.
25	Not Referred.	<u>Clarification:</u> Will a physical site visit to the existing PROMISE / Treasury IT environment be facilitated for SIPs that wish to inspect the current infrastructure and operating environment?	Proposers are advised to schedule a site visit by emailing kavindu.p@eqp.gov.lk . Refer to the second addendum for details.

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
26	Tender – Phase 1 vs Phase 2 implementation	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The tender says Phase 1 will be implemented during the pilot phase, Phase 2 during O&M, but also says the Purchaser may seek one or more Phase 2 features during the Pilot Phase, with payment based on feature weightage.</p> <p>Kindly confirm whether all Phase 2 features are optional and will be commissioned only through separate work orders. If the Purchaser requests any Phase 2 feature during the Pilot Phase, please confirm that timeline, dependencies, and milestone dates will be mutually revised accordingly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the Phase 2 features will be implemented basis the work order issued by the Purchaser. The purchaser and proposer will mutually agree on the revised timeline if the purchaser seeks to implement one or more 2 features during the pilot phase.

7 Functional Requirements

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
1	Page 68, 9.2.2 ITMIS Purchase Order Creation, Functional Requirements Specifications	What would be the system to create a Purchase Order for the suppliers? ITMIS or e-GP?	<p>Refer</p> <p>After the vendor selection is finalized and prior to contract award, the following key data fields will be passed from the e-GP system to ITMIS, seeking confirmation on fund availability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Procuring office ID (automatically identified based on user credentials) b) Contract award amount ... <p>The ITMIS system will respond to the request with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A Purchase Order (PO) reference confirming that the fund commitment is successful (or) ...

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
2	Page 68, 9.2.2 ITMIS Purchase Order Creation, Functional Requirements Specifications	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The understanding that the contract will be created in e-GP system after creation of the Purchase Order. Is both PO and Contract will be issued to the supplier?</p> <p>Does the Contract has the legal clauses which needs to be redlining and negotiated with the suppliers along with the legal team?</p>	Refer to the “Award of Contract (Base)” in the functional requirement specification for a detailed explanation of the relevant system functionality.
3	Page 70, 9.5 Payment Gateway, “Functional Requirements Specifications”	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Is there an existing payment gateway service provider with whom need to integrate?</p>	Yes
4	Section VII, 1.3.1, “Single Sign on Authentication Layer”, page 138	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Single Sign On (SSO) will facilitate seamless user navigation across multiple application modules and avoids multiple logins. User will enter a URL in the web browser to access a resource that is protected by SSO. SSO layer will determine that the user has attempted to access a protected resource and will prompt the user for credentials. Single sign on solution would validate the user credentials with its user registry or LDAP (Light Weight Directory Access Protocol). User credentials would be validated against the defined security policies for authorization.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Does SSO refer to multiple application modules within e-GP application? Or does it refer to different applications used by government departments on LDAP?</p>	SSO refers to multiple application modules within e-GP
7	Functional Requirements Specifications, 2.1.M, page 18	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> 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>	Refer Section 2 – User Management of the FRS, S/Nos K and L

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p><u>Clarification:</u> Is there multi-factor authentication MFA based log-in required? Like password + Mobile OTP</p>	
8	<p>Functional Requirements Specifications, 2.1.L, page 20</p>	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Vendors need to pay a vendor registration fee using online or offline mechanisms. The fee to be paid by the vendor will be computed by the system as defined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nationality: Sri Lankan or Foreign • Registration type: New or Renewal <p>For Sri Lankan vendors, the system will compute the registration fees payable in Sri Lankan Rupees (e.g., 5,000 LKR). For foreign vendors, the registration fee is payable in USD (e.g., USD 100). The fees for new registration and renewal will change, and these values need to be configurable.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Who will be the beneficiary of the Vendor Registration fees collected from the Vendors by payment gateway?</p>	<p>The Department of Public Finance is currently designated as the beneficiary of the vendor registration fees.</p>
9	<p>Functional Requirements Specifications, 8.7.A, page 65</p>	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The system must natively support the different procurement procedures by managing the submission of multiple digital envelopes</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> This module is classified as Phase 2. However, this is a standard tender requirement and should be included in Phase 1</p>	<p>Refer to the first Addendum to the RFP</p>
10	<p>Functional Requirements Specifications, 10.3.A, "Symmetric Key-</p>	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The system will generate a hash value of the content to be signed. This hash will be encrypted with a "key" sent to the users' email address or phone number.</p>	<p>The symmetric key will be system generated.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	Based Signature”, page 79	<u>Clarification:</u> Please confirm whether the Symmetric Key will be system generated.	
11	Functional Requirements Specifications, 10.3.A, “Symmetric Key-Based Signature”, page 79	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The system will generate a hash value of the content to be signed. This hash will be encrypted with a “key” sent to the users’ email address or phone number.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Please confirm if requirement is related to document signing of the tender documents uploaded to eGP by both Vendors and Buyer Users</p>	All key activities undertaken online in the e-GP system by vendors and buyers will be signed. Refer to the first Addendum to the RFP
12	Functional Requirements Specifications, 10.4, “PKI Server”, page 79	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Until the infrastructure for issuing digital signature certificates is in place in Sri Lanka, the e-GP vendor is required to set up a Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) server to meet the e-GP system’s digital signature requirements.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Please confirm if the e-GP vendor is required to setup up the PKI server in Phase 2</p>	Refer to the first Addendum to the RFP
13	Section VII, 2.3, “System Integration (to other existing systems)”, page 156	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> The e-GP system needs to be integrated with Banks, Integrated Treasury Management Information System, CIDA, e-ROC, NMRA, NPC etc. Refer to the functional requirements annexed with this document for further details.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Which external systems must be integrated at go-live?</p>	<p>Refer to “<i>Feature-wise Grouping of Requirements</i>” on page 6 of the FRS. Look at only the phase one features. Specifically,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Feature 20: CIDA b) Feature 21: ITMIS c) Feature 25: Payment gateway
14	Section VII, 1.3, “Architectural Requirements to be met by the Information System”, page 137	<u>RFP Text:</u> 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	The envisaged e-GP platform is a unified system designed to handle the procurement of goods, works, consulting and non consulting services. Refer to 4.1 (f), functional requirements annexure: <i>Both one-envelope and two-envelope selection can be used to procure</i>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
		<p>including the Ministries, Departments, Local Government and Public Sector Enterprises.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Will one platform cover goods, works, and medicines?</p>	<p><i>goods, works, consultancy services, and non-consultancy services.</i></p>
15	FRS – Key Procurement Institutions, visibility across hierarchy	<p><u>Clarification:</u> By default, higher offices cannot view procurements of lower nodes, but during implementation, the Government may decide to allow such visibility, and the vendor must enable it at no additional cost.</p> <p>From a standard governance and operational standpoint, users at higher hierarchical levels typically require visibility into activities at lower nodes for monitoring, control, and administrative purposes. Additionally, approval workflows often require actions to flow from lower nodes to higher authorities, which inherently necessitates such visibility.</p> <p>The current clause appears to contradict standard organizational workflow practices and creates ambiguity in defining the access control model. It also introduces a risk of scope expansion during implementation (e.g., redesign of role hierarchy, access control, and approval workflows) without commercial consideration.</p> <p>Kindly clarify whether, as part of the base scope, users mapped to higher hierarchical levels are expected to have visibility into procurements and activities of lower nodes for monitoring, reporting, and approval workflow purposes.</p>	<p>There is no change in the procurement document (RFP). The system should provide visibility, if required by the government, during implementation. The statement referred to pertains to visibility (i.e., view and NOT edit access).</p>
16	FRS – Vendor Registration Submission (additional	<p><u>RFP Text:</u> Vendor registration fields vary by vendor type; additional data fields may be advised during implementation, and</p>	<p>Refer to line 16, second addendum for details.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
	fields / mandatory vs optional fields)	<p>mandatory/optional fields will also be decided during implementation. The same clause also says additional fields are to be implemented at no additional charge.</p> <p><u>Clarification:</u> Kindly confirm that the complete vendor registration data model, field validations, mandatory/optional fields, and workflow will be finalized during requirements sign-off. Please confirm that any additions after such sign-off will be treated as change requests.</p>	
17	FRS – Supplier database publication	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The FRS requires publication of the vendor database for public viewing, but later says whether the supplier database will be published online, procuring-entity-wise, will be decided during implementation.</p> <p>Kindly clarify whether vendor registration fee payment is to be supported only through the integrated online payment gateway, or whether offline/manual payment modes are also in scope, including reconciliation and approval workflow.</p>	The system should have the provision. During the project implementation, the purchaser will decide whether to publish the supplier database.
18	FRS – Supplier database publication	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The FRS requires publication of the vendor database for public viewing, but later says whether the supplier database will be published online procuring-entity-wise will be decided during implementation.</p> <p>Kindly confirm the intended public visibility model for the supplier/vendor database at go-live, including which fields are public, whether publication is mandatory, and whether entity-wise publication is required.</p>	<p>The following statement stands deleted: <i>Also, the purchaser may require publication of the supplier databases, procuring entity-wise.</i> The list of data fields to be made public will be communicated during the project implementation phase (i.e., if the purchaser decides to publish the vendor database).</p> <p>Refer to the first addendum for details.</p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
19	FRS – Bid opening minutes / public access	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The bid opening minutes are to be visible to bidders, committee members, and possibly any interested party in the web portal, as decided during implementation.</p> <p>Kindly confirm whether bid opening minutes are to be publicly visible on the web portal at go-live, and if yes, please specify the exact fields to be disclosed publicly.</p>	<p>Refer 6.1 (E) in the functional requirements: <i>The list of variables included in the auto-generated bid opening minutes may change over time, and this should be implemented in the system as a configurable feature.</i></p>
20	FRS – Bid evaluation inside vs outside system	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The FRS says the committee secretary will record evaluation online, but also explicitly states that the evaluation committee is assumed to undertake evaluation outside the e-GP system, after which results are updated online. At the same time, the FRS also prescribes structured online evaluation stages and data capture.</p> <p>Kindly confirm whether bid evaluation is expected to be fully performed within the system using online evaluation workflows and criteria-level recording, or whether the system is only required to capture and publish evaluation outcomes prepared offline.</p>	<p>The purchaser requires online evaluation workflows and criteria-level recording, as in section 6.2 of the functional requirements. Refer specifically 6.2 (I), (N), (P) for further details on recording the results online.</p>
21	FRS – Evaluation data from supplier profile / external systems	<p><u>Clarification:</u> During evaluation, bidder profile fields and external-system data will be visible, but the exact data fields are to be finalized during implementation.</p> <p>Kindly confirm the minimum mandatory dataset to be shown during bid evaluation from vendor profiles and external systems, and whether these will be frozen before development sign-off.</p>	<p>During the project implementation phase, the purchaser will finalize the extent to which evaluation data will be visible to the various stakeholders associated with the procurement. <i>The Purchaser will accept a functional requirement as a change when there is no reference to the functional requirement in the procurement document. If a change sought – any time during the contract period - is detailed in the functional requirements, the provider</i></p>

Item	Section of RFP	Clarification	Response
			<p><i>must modify the software within the quoted bid price.</i></p> <p>Refer to the second addendum for details.</p>
22	FRS – Public portal and web portal scope	<p><u>Clarification:</u> Several functional areas require public portal visibility, including vendor listings, blacklist data, procurement notices, bid status, and possibly bid opening minutes. The exact exposure model is not uniformly frozen.</p> <p>Kindly confirm the complete public portal scope at go-live, including datasets to be publicly visible, search and filter requirements, language support expectations, and whether the same portal is expected to support OCDS publication.</p>	OCDS and public procurement visibility are two separate requirements, both of which must be implemented under this contract.
23	ITP 4.2 (f); Page 42 (Annex 3)	<p><u>Clarification:</u> The point related to evaluation is stating - In procurement with a BEC, the bid evaluation will be conducted by the BEC (i.e., the BEC secretary will record the evaluation online in the e- GP system). But in our proposed e-GP the provision to evaluate the bids is available online inbuilt in the system, how you envisaged that feature.</p>	You may propose to offer this functionality as an addition (i.e., above and beyond). The proposer must address the requirement specified in the procurement document (RFP).