TNUS	YNOS							
SI. No.	Clarification point as stated in the tender document	Page / Section	Comment/ Suggestion/ Deviation	SIDBI Response				
1	4.1.f - Structured mentorship, agnostic across sector, size, and area of the startup.	4.1.f		The portal primarly envisages an investor-startup matchmaking portal. The same portal should be capable of other matchmaking capabilities including with mentors, corporates, etc., however, investor-startup matchmaking (investor could be private, public, govt. Schemes, etc.) is the primary objective				
2	4.1.k - Special emphasis on scaling-up – fund raising, creating and sustaining profitable business models and go-to-market strategies	4.1.k	This is to be done offline by the startup founders and investors/mentors. What activities of mentorship to be managed/tracked by this solution?	Clarified as above.				
3	4.2.1.13 - The vendor should ensure that Portal are safe from all malafide activity/ hacking/ defacing attempts. The onus of installing the latest software to achieve this goal will be on the vendor during the entire term of engagement.	4.2.1.13	We'll ensure that the platform is built using best practices and frameworks and have regular tests to mitigate any application specific risks. But complete security monitoring requires a set of tools. Usually these are taken care of by the hosting provider and not by the software provider.	There are guidelines laid down by Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY), prospective bidders are requested to run through handbooks and guidelines as developed by MeitY for the basic requirement.				
4	4.3.xi - Bidder will ensure that the evolved system is certified and is in compliance with the applicable standards. 4.3.xii - The Standard/Certification will be the latest version as at the time of implementation. In case any standard/certification is withdrawn or replaced with a new standard/certification, the bidder has to ensure that the new standard/certification is taken within defined timelines or within 6 months of declaration of such change. Cost relating to compliance with the above standards/certification including documentation and certification fees etc. to be borne by the bidder.	4.3.xi4.3.xii	list of all such certifications which should be done 2. The platform would be updated maybe every 7 or 15 days, so how frequently these certifications should be done? 3. Estimated costs of these certificates if there are	In the interest of SMEs and fair play, SIDBI in this RfP has not catogarically mentioned about any specific certifications. SIDBI's objective is to on-board a technically profitiant solution and the basic requirement/ expectation is again that the the platform/solution is compliant with guidelines put forward by Government of India i.e. MeitY.				
5	4.3.4. Bidder shall provide source code, object code and all other relevant materials, artefacts etc. of all bespoke development to the SIDBI and the SIDBI shall own the IPRs in them.	4.3.4	Is this clause applicable if the solution is whitelabelled?	This clause in the RfP stands removed.				
6	4.3.5. In the case of transition of project by the Bidder, operative licenses of platform shall be transferred to SIDBI/	4.3.5	Is this clause applicable if the solution is whitelabelled?	This clause is revised as, "In the case of transition of project by the Bidder, all the information with respect to this project, gathered and/or stored directly and/or indirectly through the course of the project, should be transferred/ handed over to SIDBI."				
7	4.4.5. The functionality and architecture will be discussed during implementation of the project and separate change request shall be considered by SIDBI. However, it is clarified that SIDBI shall not incur any further cost for the said change request apart from the one quoted in Commercial Bid by the bidder	4.4.5		Any substantial change requests will be agreed upon mutually between SIDBI and the selected vendor.				
8	4.5.3. Bidder will have to submit design specifications of software solution along with the technical bid. Specification of User Interface design and Integration design shall be submitted for reference	4.5.3	We can give architecture diagrams and block diagrams at a macro level. Class or DB design will not be part of the bid. Ul design also can be only a reference wireframe. Since the exact requirements and use cases are not known, this can be a suggested design only	Agreed.				
9	4.7. Implementation time. 2 Months	47	testing and compliance. Additional 1-2 months for UAT.	The objective of having a white-labelled solution is its speed to action/ go-live, otherwise SIDBI would have got this developed grounds-up. It is a very high priority and critical project not just for SIDBI but for the Government, hence, the implementation timeline cannot be modified.				
10	6.2.5. Table B. Technical Experience. It says "hands on experience on software technologies like JAVA, Dotnet, My SQL etc."	6.2.5	We assume that the above tech stack is only indicative and	Yes.				
11	Appendix 1. It says quick fix.		Ideally it must be a quick fix and/or workaround, because a f					
13			Also, such third party tools invovle cost-per-usage. As	It is good to have, not mandatory and bidders have the flexibility to propose as much analytical integration as possible in their response to this RfP.				
14	Broad framework. Point 2.7. The portal should have implementate was in the portal. g) A chat solution to initiate chat messa			Yes.				
15	g,	4.2. Investors	ag. etc product rullor	Yes, while, portal is not expected to be engaged in deal				
	4.2. Investors. The portal will enable an end-to-end fund manag		Do people need to enter details of funds and disbursement	closure but final result/ information need to be inputted.				
Lifera	У							
SI. No.	Clarification point as stated in the tender document	Page / Section		SIDBI Response				
1	The motive of this platform is to provide a system that would be sustainable for the next few years. The expectation is that the system should sustain at least 10 years from Go-Live	of a Sustainable, Scalable solution	requirements to incorporate more digital touchpoints without much hassle. We also propose the platform to have Perpetual Subscriptions and no Vendor lock-in.	We leave this to best of understanding of bidders, SIDBI's basic requirement/ expectations are clear.				
2	The vendor should have knowledge of modern CMS tools like Webflow, Drupal, WordPress, Strapi, etc.	2. Broad framework of the portal	for Digital Experience Platform (formerly Gartner Report on Web Content Management)	Given that we expect this to be a world class platform with users from all over, this requirement is good to have, however, not mandatory.				
3	Suggestion	3. Key modules of the portal	Based on our experience, we would suggest to include low code Form builders so that any kind of Forms for startups registration, feedbacks, application to services, etc can be created on a drag and drop basis. This will also enable departmental users to create/ modify forms without any technical dependency.	SIDBI's basic requirement/ expectations are clear. Bidders are free to propose any additional services and appropriately factor in the same in their responses to the RfP.				

4	Suggestion	3. Key modules of the portal	We believe the Digital Platform will also need Digital Asset Management capabilities and a Document repository as well. Hence, we suggest to include the same as it will add vale in terms of in-system document previews, version management, asset tagging, etc	SIDBI's basic requirement/ expectations are clear. Bidders are free to propose any additional services and appropriately factor in the same in their responses to the RfP.			
5	3.14 Search Engine: The portal should have a strong in-built search engine to assist users in finding and recommending the right set of information.	3. Key modules of the portal	We suggest to include an Enterprise Search Engine to bring additional features such as full-text and fuxxy searches, multilingual searches, search result personalization, etc	SIDBI's basic requirement/ expectations are clear. Bidders are free to propose any additional services and appropriately factor in the same in their responses to the RtP.			
6	Suggestion	the portal		SIDBI's basic requirement/ expectations are clear. Bidders are free to propose any additional services and appropriately factor in the same in their responses to the RfP.			
7	The scope is to onboard a digital partner to provide a white label solution with capabilities and installation in SIDBI's own environment (100% on premise).	Key Features Envisaged as part of the Digital Solution	environment.	Will be discussed with the selected bidder.			
8	General Query	General Query	Please suggest an estimated user concurrency per second on peak usage.	It is subjective/too-early to ascertain this.			
IAN							
1	General Query	General Query	As mentioned on the call that SIDBI is looking for and taking the approach of a white label solution that will help build on top of existing solutions in the envisaged timeline instead of building the solution from ground up which needless to say is going to be difficult to achieve in 2 months and will have associated risks. However, a white label solution will inherently mean that the IPR is held and is critical for the solution provider. Thus the approach of going with white labelled solution while is correct, the associated ask for IPR seems to be a bit contradictory. Can you please advise if the ask for IPR by SIDBI for this project can be dropped? Having said this, the need for a "golden parachute" in case the IPR owner decides to shutdown the business or product is respected and can be looked at.	Yes, the IPR may vest with the solution provider.			
2	General Query	General Query	Will a consortium style bid be acceptable? IAN being a pioneer brings decade and half experience of early stage investing and partnership with a solution provider along with SIDBI, DPIIT and Startup India's vision can be a formidable combination. If this is acceptable, and if successful in our bid, we will work towards one prime legal entity for contracting so that accountability is simple- from SIDBI's point of view. Please confirm if the above approach will be acceptable.	Consortium and JVs are permitted, however, all the requirement of the RfP (including eligibility criteria and technical response) should be fulfilled by the lead bidder and also, the lead bidder will be solely responsible for execution/ delivery of the project.			