

Corrigendum to Tender No. 2025_DOP_891400_1

In reference to Request for Proposal (RFP) for Selection of System Integrator (SI) for Capacity Enhancement of SAN Storage. This is to notify all concerned bidders that after obtaining the approval of the Competent Authority the following amendments have been made to the original tender document published on 26.12.2025 for Tender ID 2025_DOP_891400_1.

Amendment Details:

1. Last Date and Time for submission response on Pre-Bid Queries.
27.01.2026 05:00 PM
Revised Last Date and Time for submission response on Pre-Bid Queries.
28.01.2026 07:00 PM
2. Last Date and Time for submission of Bid
06.02.2026 05:00 PM
Revised Last Date and Time for submission of Bid.
12.02.2026 05:00 PM
3. Date of Opening of Technical Bid
09.02.2026 11:00 AM
Revised Date of Opening of Technical Bid.
16.02.2026 11:00 AM
4. Date of Opening of Commercial Bid
23.02.2026 11:00 AM
Revised Date of Opening of Commercial Bid.
02.03.2026 11:00 AM

Rest of the content of the RFP document remains unchanged.

Pre-bid query response

S. No.	Page No.	Section No.	Clause No.	Actual Clause in the RFP	Clarification Sought /Amendment Requested	Response from DoP
1	47	4.3 Timelines and Payment Milestones	Sr. No. 3	Delivery of Hardware at DC and DRC site: 40% of hardware cost.	We request you to amend the clause as Delivery of Hardware at DC and DRC site: 80% payment of hardware cost.	As per RFP
2	47	4.3	Sr. No. 5	"Acceptance of solution: 3 months after successful migration... Payment Terms: 10% of Hardware..."	Query: The release of the final 10% payment is tied to "3 months after successful migration". This effectively locks working capital for a prolonged period after work completion. Request: We request changing this milestone to "Upon successful Migration and Sign-off of Acceptance Test Procedure (ATP)" to align with standard industry payment terms.	As per RFP
3	47	4.3 Timelines and Payment Milestones	Sr. No. 4	Hardware Upgrade / enhancement, commissioning and Data Migration:40% of hardware value and, 80% of implementation cost and 80% of migration cost	We request you to amend the clause as Hardware Upgrade / enhancement, commissioning and Data Migration: 80% payment of implementation cost and 80% of migration cost	As per RFP
4	158	Annexure 34	Sr. No. 6	"Must support dual ported NVMe TLC SSDs (3.84TB / 7.68TB / 15.36TB) with mixing of drive sizes."	Query: The specification asks for mixing of drive sizes. Request: To ensure optimal RAID performance and sparing, we propose supplying a uniform drive size (e.g., all 7.68TB or all 15.36TB) to meet the 620TB requirement. Please confirm if a homogeneous drive configuration is acceptable.	As per RFP
5	122	61.4	Annexure 14: Manufacturer Authorization Form (MAF)	When resold by M/s _____, these products shall be as per [OEM's] applicable standard end user product warranty / license terms and conditions, notwithstanding, subject to requirements and terms of the RFP.	When resold by M/s _____, these products shall be as per [OEM's] applicable standard end user product warranty/license terms and conditions.	Revised Clause When resold by M/s _____, these products shall be as per [OEM's] applicable standard end user product warranty/license terms and conditions read with product specifications contained in Annexure 34, para 6.34 of the RFP (Technical Compliance Sheet). It is hereby clarified that this authorization letter shall be strictly attributable to the

S. No.	Page No.	Section No.	Clause No.	Actual Clause in the RFP	Clarification Sought /Amendment Requested	Response from DoP
						<OEM> products specifications only and <OEM> shall not undertake any other obligation which is undertaken by the M/s <BIDDER> under the RFP.
6	39	3.32	6	Relevant experience: The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise during the last three years as on bid publishing date.	<p>The clause is restrictive in nature, as it mandates bidders to quote only those solutions which have already been implemented by them using the same proposed OEM. Such a condition may result in the disqualification of otherwise eligible and technically competent bidders whose previously implemented solutions, though of similar or higher capacity, may not be identical to the solution proposed under the present RFP. It is further submitted that, at present, there are multiple enterprise-class SAN storage solutions available in the market which fully meet the functional and technical requirements of this RFP and can be offered at competitive commercial terms. Restricting eligibility to experience with the proposed OEM may limit competition and hinder the objective of obtaining the most suitable solution. In view of the above, it is requested that the clause may kindly be amended as under: Amended Clause:</p> <p>“The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 (two) solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the SAN storage in at least one Government Department / Scheduled Commercial Bank / Public Sector Enterprise during the last three years as on bid publishing date.”</p>	<p>Clarification:</p> <p>This RFP is for capacity enhancement of existing storage DS 8910F, and not for procurement of a new storage solution. Hence no change.</p>
7	42	4.2	The detailed Scope of Work	1. Total 1.24 Peta Bytes (PB) of usable storage without compression, out of which Minimum 620 TB usable capacity at Data Center (DC) and Minimum 620 TB usable capacity to be commissioned at the Disaster Recovery (DR) site. 7. DoP will assist in the handover of existing storage at the proposed location to the bidder for capacity enhancement as per the proposed solution. Existing IBM storages (disks and shelves) of capacity 335 TB at DC and 335 TB at	Pls clarify the address and location of DC and DR	<p>Data Centre address:</p> <p>DAKC (Dhirubhai Ambani Knowledge City) , Kopar Khairane, Navi Mumbai</p> <p>DRC Address: Postal Training Centre, , Mysuru</p>

S. No.	Page No.	Section No.	Clause No.	Actual Clause in the RFP	Clarification Sought /Amendment Requested	Response from DoP
				DR will be utilized at the discretion of the Department.		
8	163	6.38	Annexure 38: Malicious Code certificate from OEM	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>1. We hereby certify that the hardware and the software being offered as part of the contract does not contain any kind of malicious code that would activate procedures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Inhibit the desired and the designed function of the equipment. b) Cause physical damage to the user or his equipment during the operational exploitation of the equipment. c) Tap information regarding network, network users and information stored on the network that is classified and / or relating to National Security, thereby contravening Official Secrets Act 1923. <p>2. There are no Trojans, Viruses, Worms, Spywares or any malicious software on the system and in the software developed.</p> <p>3. Without prejudice to any other rights and remedies available to Department of Posts, we are liable in case of physical damage, loss of information and those relating to copyright and intellectual Property rights (IPRs), caused due to activation of any such malicious code in embedded / shipped software.</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>1. We hereby certify that the <OEM Name> Products being offered by our authorized business partner as part of the contract does not contain any kind of malicious code which has been wilfully installed by <OEM Name> that would intentionally activate procedures to illegally and / or without cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Inhibit the desired and the designed function of the <OEM Name> Products. b) Cause physical damage to the user or his equipment during the operational exploitation of the <OEM Name> Products. c) Tap information regarding network, network users and information stored on the network that is classified and / or relating to National Security, without consent thereby contravening Official Secrets Act 1923. <p>2. When resold by the Bidder, the <OEM Name> Products shall be subject to applicable <OEM Name> standard agreements and the standard applicable end user warranty and licensing terms and conditions ("Documentation").</p> <p>.</p> <p>3. Notwithstanding anything contained herein, <OEM Name> shall not be restricted from including any code that disables, shuts down, freezes, restricts access to, or otherwise activates automated or manual procedures in all or any portion of <OEM Name> Products. Such actions may be triggered upon the occurrence of events such as: Unauthorized access, use, or editing of the <OEM Name> Products, Expiry of the licensing term, Exceeding the threshold of licensed users, Piracy, hacking, or illegal setup, Use of the <OEM Name> Products in violation of the terms and conditions outlined in the Documentation.</p>	<p>Revised Clause</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>1. We hereby certify that the <OEM Name> Products being offered by our authorized business partner as part of the contract does not contain any kind of malicious code <OEM Name> at the time of supply by OEM that would activate procedures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Inhibit the desired and the designed function of the <OEM Name> Products. b) Cause physical damage to the user or his equipment during the operational exploitation of the <OEM Name> Products. c) Tap information regarding network, network users and information stored on the network that is classified and / or relating to National Security, without consent thereby contravening Official Secrets Act 1923. <p>2. We hereby assert that <OEM> shall not be liable in case of any malicious code which is caused by any other factor not solely and directly under the control or supervision of the OEM including any third party virus attack, third party software, or open source components, integration with customer or third party systems, actions undertaken in good faith.</p> <p>3. When resold by the Bidder, the <OEM Name> Products shall be subject to applicable <OEM Name> standard agreements and the standard applicable end user warranty and licensing terms and conditions ("Documentation") & shall be in</p>

S. No.	Page No.	Section No.	Clause No.	Actual Clause in the RFP	Clarification Sought /Amendment Requested	Response from DoP
						consonance with the terms of RFP. In event of contradiction terms of RFP shall prevail.
9	48	4.4	Sr. No. 1	"Penalty: 1% of the undelivered Product Cost for every week delay... Maximum Penalty: 10% of Product cost"	Query: The clause states penalty is on "undelivered Product Cost" but the maximum cap is on the total "Product cost". Request: Please clarify if the maximum penalty is capped at 10% of the Contract Value or 10% of the Undelivered portion? We request limiting the cap to 10% of the Undelivered/Unperformed portion of the contract.	Please refer clause 4.4. "Penalties due to delay in services " of the RFP.
10	39	3.32 Minimum Eligibility Criteria	6. Relevant experience:	The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise during the last three years as on bid publishing date.	These are complex implementations and are therefore carried out directly by the OEM. For such enterprise-class hardware, the OEM provides warranty and post-warranty support. Hence, we request you to change this clause from bidder to Bidder/OEM.	Revised Clause Relevant experience: The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise / Public Listed Company during the last five years as on bid publishing date.
11	39	3.32 Minimum Eligibility Criteria	Clause 6	The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise during the last three years as on bid publishing date	We request you to amend the clause as "The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise/ Public Listed Company during the last three years as on bid publishing date	Revised Clause Relevant experience: The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise / Public Listed Company during the last five years as on bid publishing date.
12	39	3.32	Minimum Eligibitliy Crriteria Sr. No. 6	6. Relevant experience: The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector	Regarding the Experience criteria, we request an amendment to align with GFR 2017 and CVC guidelines to prevent the exclusion of otherwise competent agencies. Current guidelines recommend a tiered experience threshold (30/40/60% of estimated cost) over the last seven years to ensure a level playing field. We believe that adopting the CVC-prescribed 3-2-1 formula for similar works will encourage wider participation and result in	Revised Clause Relevant experience: The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise / Public Listed

S. No.	Page No.	Section No.	Clause No.	Actual Clause in the RFP	Clarification Sought /Amendment Requested	Response from DoP
				Enterprise during the last three years as on bid publishing date.	more competitive pricing for the Authority. We further suggest that the definition of 'Similar Work' be narrowed to the specific technical nature of this project to ensure quality without being unnecessarily restrictive.	Company during the last five years as on bid publishing date.
13	39	3.32	Minimum Eligibility Criteria Sr. No. 6	6. Relevant experience: The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise during the last three years as on bid publishing date.	<p>At the outset, we respectfully submit that as per the General Financial Rules (GFR) 2017 version Updated up to 31.07.2024, the Manual for Procurement of Goods and Services – Second Edition, the overarching principles of public procurement, qualification criteria such as turnover and past experience are required to be reasonable, relevant to the subject procurement, proportionate to the estimated cost, and non-restrictive, so as to ensure fair competition.</p> <p>We observe that the relevant Experience criterion currently specified in the tender appears to be on the higher side and does not align with the above-mentioned provisions of GFR and the Procurement Manuals, which clearly discourage the stipulation of unnecessarily restrictive financial qualification conditions that may limit participation without commensurate risk mitigation.</p> <p>In this regard, we would like to draw your kind attention to the recommendations of the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC), which are widely adopted across Government and PSU procurements, wherein the eligibility criteria relating to Past Experience are recommended to be structured as under:</p> <p>Past Experience of Similar Works Experience of having successfully completed similar works during the last seven (5) years, ending on the last day of the month previous to the one in which Tenders are invited, should be any one of the following:</p> <p>Three (3) similar completed works, each costing not less than 40% of the estimated cost;</p>	<p>Revised Clause</p> <p>Relevant experience: The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise / Public Listed Company during the last five years as on bid publishing date.</p>

S. No.	Page No.	Section No.	Clause No.	Actual Clause in the RFP	Clarification Sought /Amendment Requested	Response from DoP
					<p>OR</p> <p>Two (2) similar completed works, each costing not less than 50% of the estimated cost;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>One (1) similar completed work, costing not less than 80% of the estimated cost.</p> <p>"Definition of Similar Work"</p> <p>The definition of "similar work" should be clearly specified in the tender document in line with the nature and scope of the project. In addition, criteria relating to satisfactory performance of works, availability of key personnel, organizational capability(Liquidated Assets) may be incorporated as per project requirements.</p> <p>In view of the above, we respectfully request the Competent Authority to kindly review and amend the Relevant Experience criterion in the tender document in line with the GFR 2017 version upto Updated up to 31.07.2024, Manual for Procurement of Goods and Services (Second Edition), and CVC guidelines, so as to promote wider participation, enhance competition, and ensure value for money without compromising on quality or delivery.</p>	
14	39	3.32 Minimum Eligibility Criteria	Clause 6	The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise during the last three years as on bid publishing date	<p>We request you to amend the clause as "The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise/Public Listed Company during the last three years as on bid publishing date</p>	<p>Revised Clause</p> <p>Relevant experience: The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise / Public Listed Company during the last five years as on bid publishing date.</p>
15	39	3.32 Minimum	Clause 6	The bidder should have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of	The bidder should have supplied and migrated 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in 1 Government Department/	<p>Revised Clause</p> <p>Relevant experience: The bidder should</p>

S. No.	Page No.	Section No.	Clause No.	Actual Clause in the RFP	Clarification Sought /Amendment Requested	Response from DoP
		Eligibility Criteria		storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise during the last three years as on bid publishing date.	scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise during the last 5 years as on bid publishing date.	have supplied and migrated at least 2 solutions for 1 (one) Peta Byte (or above) each of storage of the proposed OEM SAN storage in at least one Government Department/ scheduled commercial bank / Public Sector Enterprise / Public Listed Company during the last five years as on bid publishing date.
16	38	3.32 Minimum Eligibility Criteria	2. Turnover:	2. The bidder/s who are Startups / MSEs shall have a minimum average turnover of at least INR 60 Cr. (Sixty Crore Rupees) during the last three financial years (i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25) and shall have been profitable in each of these years.	2. The bidder/s who are Startups / MSEs shall have a minimum average turnover of at least INR 50 Cr. (Fifty Crore Rupees) during the last three financial years (i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25) and shall have been profitable in each of these years. Hence, we request you to amend the average turnover to at least 50 Cr.	Revised Clause: Turnover: 1. The Bidder shall have a minimum average turnover of at least INR 60 Cr. (Sixty Crore Rupees) during the last three financial years (i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25) and shall have been profitable in each of these years.
17	38	3.32	Minimum Eligibility Criteria Sr. No. 2	Turnover: 1. The Bidder shall have a minimum average turnover of at least INR 73 Cr. (Seventy Three Crore Rupees) during the last three financial years (i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25) and shall have been profitable in each of these years. 2. The bidder/s who are Startups / MSEs shall have a minimum average turnover of at least INR 60 Cr. (Sixty Crore Rupees) during the last three financial years (i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25) and shall have been profitable in each of these years.	We request a review of the Minimum Average Annual Turnover criterion, as the current requirement appears restrictive and exceeds the benchmarks set by GFR 2017 and the Manual for Procurement of Goods and Services. To align with CVC guidelines, which suggest a turnover requirement of 30% of the estimated project cost, we propose an amendment to the financial eligibility criteria. This will prevent the exclusion of capable bidders and foster a more competitive bidding environment, ensuring the best outcome for the project.	2. The bidder/s who are Startups / MSEs shall have a minimum average turnover of at least INR 50 Cr. (Fifty Crore Rupees) during the last three financial years (i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25) and shall have been profitable in each of these years.
18	38	3.32	Minimum Eligibility Criteria Sr. No. 2 (Turnover:)	1. The Bidder shall have a minimum average turnover of at least INR 73 Cr. (Seventy Three Crore Rupees) during the last three financial years (i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25) and shall have been profitable in each of these years. 2. The bidder/s who are Startups / MSEs shall have a minimum average turnover of at least INR 60 Cr. (Sixty	At the outset, we respectfully submit that as per the General Financial Rules (GFR) 2017 version Updated up to 31.07.2024, the Manual for Procurement of Goods and Services – Second Edition, the overarching principles of public procurement, qualification criteria such as turnover and past experience are required to be reasonable, relevant to the subject procurement, proportionate to the estimated cost, and non-restrictive, so as to ensure fair competition.	

S. No.	Page No.	Section No.	Clause No.	Actual Clause in the RFP	Clarification Sought /Amendment Requested	Response from DoP
				Crore Rupees) during the last three financial years (i.e., 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25) and shall have been profitable in each of these years.	<p>We observe that the annual turnover criterion currently specified in the tender appears to be on the higher side and does not align with the above-mentioned provisions of GFR and the Procurement Manuals, which clearly discourage the stipulation of unnecessarily restrictive financial qualification conditions that may limit participation without commensurate risk mitigation.</p> <p>In this regard, we would like to draw your kind attention to the recommendations of the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC), which are widely adopted across Government and PSU procurements, wherein the eligibility criteria relating to Average Annual Turnover recommended to be structured as under:</p> <p>Average Annual Financial Turnover during the last three (3) financial years, ending 31st March of the previous financial year, should be at least 30% of the estimated cost of the project.</p> <p>In view of the above, we respectfully request the Competent Authority to kindly review and amend the Minimum Average Annual Turnover criterion in the tender document in line with the GFR 2017 version upto Updated up to 31.07.2024, Manual for Procurement of Goods and Services (Second Edition), and CVC guidelines, so as to promote wider participation, enhance competition, and ensure value for money without compromising on quality or delivery.</p>	
19	39	3.32 Minimum Eligibility Criteria	8. Support Centre:	Bidder should have its own support centre in Mumbai and Bengaluru for onsite, Telephonic and Remote Assistance Services.	<p>Bidder should have its own support centre in Mumbai and Bengaluru for onsite, Telephonic and Remote Assistance Services. If the bidder does not have its own support centre in Mumbai and Bengaluru, then the bidder shall submit a self-declaration signed by authorized signatory, certifying that the bidder shall open an office in Bengaluru within 90 days of the receipt of the PO/WO.</p> <p>Alternatively, since OEM provides warranty and post-</p>	<p>Revised Clause</p> <p>Support Centre: Bidder/OEM should have its own support centre in Mumbai and Bengaluru for onsite, Telephonic and Remote Assistance Services.</p>

S. No.	Page No.	Section No.	Clause No.	Actual Clause in the RFP	Clarification Sought /Amendment Requested	Response from DoP
					warranty support, we request you to change this clause from bidder to Bidder/OEM.	
20	39	3.32	Minimum Eligibility Criteria Sr. No. 8	8. Support Centre: Bidder should have its own support centre in Mumbai and Bengaluru for onsite, Telephonic and Remote Assistance Services. Bidder to submit an undertaking with address and details of the support centre including the number of people at each location for support.	We request the amendment of Clause 8, as the mandate for support centers in Mumbai and Bengaluru limits participation and contravenes GFR 2017 guidelines regarding open competition. Modern storage procurement standards focus on centralized support frameworks backed by onsite response commitments. We suggest replacing the location-specific requirement with an SLA-driven model (e.g., 24x7 support with 4-hour onsite response). This ensures the Authority receives high-quality, timely maintenance regardless of the bidder's administrative office locations, fostering a more competitive and costeffective bidding process.	
21	39	3.32	Minimum Eligibility Criteria Sr. No. 8	8. Support Centre: Bidder should have its own support centre in Mumbai and Bengaluru for onsite, Telephonic and Remote Assistance Services. Bidder to submit an undertaking with address and details of the support centre including the number of people at each location for support	<p>Clause 8 requires the bidder to have its own support centre in Mumbai and Bengaluru. It is submitted that mandating support centres at specific locations is restrictive and not aligned with GFR 2017 and the Manual for Procurement of Goods, which emphasize non-restrictive, outcome-based procurement.</p> <p>For storage systems, data availability and service quality are better ensured through uptime and SLA commitments rather than location-specific support centres. Centralized support models with defined response/resolution SLAs are standard in Government IT Storage procurements.</p> <p>Request: Kindly amend the Clause 8 to specify minimum storage uptime and SLA-based support (24x7, defined response and onsite timelines) instead of mandatory support centre locations, to ensure fair competition and compliance with GFR</p>	
22	Page No.39	Sr.No.8	3.32 Minimum Eligibility Criteria	Support Centre: Bidder should have its own support centre in Mumbai and Bengaluru for onsite, Telephonic and Remote Assistance Services.	<p>Bidder to submit an undertaking with address and details of the support centre including the number of people at each location for support.</p> <p>We request the authority amend the clause as "Bidder to submit declaration form after L1 within 15 days we will establish the support center."</p>	

S. No.	Page No.	Section No.	Clause No.	Actual Clause in the RFP	Clarification Sought /Amendment Requested	Response from DoP
23	158	Annexure 34	Sr. No. 11 (NAS Gateway)	Must support unified Block & File protocols (FC, iSCSI, NVMe-oF, NFS, CIFS). In absence of native file, redundant NAS gateway must be provided.	Query: IF NAS feature is required -The proposed OEM (IBM) uses "IBM Storage Scale" software running on server nodes to provide File protocols. Request: Please clarify if the hardware for these NAS Gateway nodes must be from the Same OEM (IBM Power Servers) or if Tier-1 x86 Servers (e.g., Lenovo/Dell/HPE) are acceptable?	Serial Number 11 in Annexure 34 is deleted.
24	158	6.34	Annexure 34: Technical Compliance Sheet	Must support unified Block & File protocols (FC, iSCSI, NVMe-oF, NFS, CIFS). In absence of native file, redundant NAS gateway must be provided	Request you to remove this clause as this RFP is for upgrade of existing IBM DS8910F Storage which is pure SAN Storage and only disk will be added in existing Storage	
25	158	6.34	Annexure 34: Technical Compliance Sheet	Must support inline compression & deduplication	Request you to remove this clause as this RFP is for upgrade of existing IBM DS8910F Storage which don't support compression and deduplication.	Serial Number 12 in Annexure 34 is deleted.
26	44	4.2.1	Sr. No. 6	"Storage solution should provide the native capability to replicate data of existing storage between DC and DR without using any additional Hardware and software."	Query: The existing DC and DR sites may currently lack the necessary bandwidth or licenses for native replication of the enhanced capacity. Request: Please confirm if the DoP has existing unused licenses for Global Mirror/Metro Mirror for the additional 620TB capacity, or if the Bidder must supply replication licenses for the entire capacity (Existing + New)?	The bidder must supply replication licenses for the enhanced capacity
27	175	Annexure 50	Sr. No. 7	"Buy Back of DS 8870 on AS IS – Where Is basis (C7)"	Query: The Commercial Format (Annexure 50) only includes a line item for the Buyback of the old DS 8870. However, the RFP text elsewhere implies optional buyback scenarios for the upgraded DS 8910F in future years. Request: Please clarify if the bidder needs to quote for the future buyback of the DS 8910F now? If yes, please provide a separate line item in the Commercial Format to ensure L1 parity.	The understanding regarding the buyback scenario for DS 8870 in determining the bid price submitted by the bidder is correct. Also, the buyback price for DS8910F is to be quoted separately in the commercial bid.
28	13	3.4.4	Purchase Preference Policies of the Government	1. Class I Local Suppliers under Public Procurement (Preference to Make in India) Order 2017" (MII) of Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade, (DPIIT - Public Procurement Section) as revised from time to time.	Request to Remove the MII clause as the RFP has the propitiatory buying of IBM storage and origin of product is not from INDIA.	This is a standard clause as per GoI instructions