

**Response to queries raised in the pre-bid meeting on 07.04.2026 by different agencies regarding the Request for Proposal (RFP) for Selection of Agency for Implementation of Personalised Adaptive Learning (PAL) Solution-GeM bid number GEM/2026/B/7405004 dated 31-03-2026.**

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
1	<p>There is a discrepancy in the number of schools mentioned for hardware supply (754 schools) and software implementation (762 schools). It is unclear whether these refer to different sets of schools or if this is an inconsistency. Kindly clarify the exact number of schools.</p>	<p>There is no inconsistency in the RFP. The difference in the two figures reflects distinct but complementary scopes of supply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hardware (Tablets &amp; Accessories): To be supplied to 754 PM SHRI schools, as these schools require new devices to operationalise the PAL solution.</li> <li>• Software (PAL Licenses): To be provided to 762 PM SHRI schools, as the remaining 8 schools already possess sufficient existing computing devices and therefore require only software licenses, without any fresh hardware procurement.</li> </ul>	
2	<p>The RFP specifies 40–60 licenses per school, which is not aligned with a PAL solution that requires individual student logins for personalized learning. Kindly clarify the basis of this license count</p>	<p>The licenses specified under this RFP are device-based licenses, not user/student-based licenses. The count of 40–60 licenses per school corresponds to the number of devices (tablets and PCs) on which the PAL solution is to be installed and activated at each school, irrespective of the number of individual student logins created on the platform.</p> <p>The following clarifications are accordingly provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• License Type: Each license is tied to a device, not to an individual student account. There is no restriction on the number of student profiles or logins that to be created and operated through a single device license.</li> <li>• Individual Personalisation: Student-level personalisation, adaptive learning pathways, and individual login credentials shall continue to function as required under the RFP, independently of</li> </ul>	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
		<p>the device-license structure.</p>	
3	<p>The RFP requires hybrid (online/offline) deployment but does not define the offline architecture. References to SD card-based deployment are not aligned with PAL requirements of adaptive learning, centralized student data, and real-time analytics. Kindly clarify the intended offline deployment model.</p>	<p>The intended offline deployment model is hereby clarified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Offline Content Delivery via SD Card: The static learning content (videos, practice questions, instructional material, etc.) shall be pre-loaded and delivered via SD card, so as to preserve the internal storage of the tablet for the PAL software application, operating system, and associated system processes. This ensures optimal device performance and avoids storage conflicts.</li> <li>● PAL Software on SD card Memory: The PAL application itself — including the adaptive engine, student login module, and local data capture functionality — shall reside on the SD card memory of the tablet, ensuring the software operates seamlessly even in offline conditions.</li> <li>● Adaptive Learning in Offline Mode: The adaptive learning engine shall function in offline mode by operating on locally cached student performance data. Learning pathways and content recommendations shall continue to adapt based on a student's responses recorded on-device during offline sessions.</li> <li>● Data Sync upon Connectivity: All student interaction data, performance records, and learning analytics captured during offline sessions shall be automatically synchronised with the central server upon the device regaining internet connectivity, thereby ensuring continuity of centralised dashboards and real-time analytics as required under the RFP.</li> </ul>	
4	<p>The RFP requires the bidder to continue providing security and critical software updates beyond the 3-year contract period, without specifying duration, scope, or commercial terms. Kindly clarify the expected duration of such support, whether it is mandatory or optional, and whether any additional cost or AMC mechanism will be</p>	<p>The RFP clauses are self-explanatory</p>	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
	applicable post contract completion.		
5	The RFP specifies headphones but does not define detailed technical specifications. Kindly clarify the minimum required specifications to ensure uniform quality and pricing.	The relevant specifications are already provided within the RFP document ( Accessories specification: Point 2, page 13)	
6	The RFP mandates integration with the State's VSK platform but does not define API availability, data formats, timelines, or responsibilities. Kindly clarify these integration details.	<p>Requirements from the state side will be made available to the successful bidder</p> <p>As explicitly noted in Milestone 1.3 (Page 48) of the RFP, VSK integration is qualified with the phrase "if available", indicating that the Go-Live Certificate and associated payment milestone shall not be withheld solely on account of VSK integration being incomplete due to circumstances outside the Bidder's control</p> <p>The RFP clauses are self-explanatory</p>	
7	The RFP requires extending MDM to existing tablets, but the number, specifications, and compatibility of such devices are not defined. Kindly clarify these details.	The details have been mentioned in the RFP page 16: 1.2.2.1 Software compatibility with the following minimum existing Tablet Hardware specs	
8	The RFP defines financial thresholds for "similar project experience" but does not define "similar work." Kindly clarify the eligible scope.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
9	Will the schools provide internet & servers for software and content updates?	<p>The following clarifications are provided regarding internet connectivity and server infrastructure at schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Internet Connectivity: The schools covered under this RFP are already equipped with internet connectivity. Bidders may accordingly plan their deployment architecture, content update mechanisms, and data synchronisation workflows on the basis that internet access is available at the school level. The responsibility for the provision and maintenance of this internet connectivity rests with the State/School administration and does not form part of the Bidder's scope of work under this RFP.</li> <li>● Servers for Software and Content Updates: The Bidder shall be responsible for providing and maintaining all server-side</li> </ul>	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
		<p>infrastructure necessary for hosting the PAL solution, pushing software updates, delivering content updates, and managing centralised data. No server infrastructure shall be provided by the schools or OSEPA for this purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content Update Mechanism: Given that schools have internet connectivity, the Bidder shall utilise the available connectivity to push content and software updates to deployed devices. However, since the RFP mandates a hybrid (online/offline) deployment model, the Bidder must ensure that updates can be efficiently delivered and applied even in conditions of intermittent or low-bandwidth connectivity through SD cards, without disrupting the offline functionality of the PAL solution on deployed devices.</li> <li>Offline Continuity: The availability of the internet at schools does not dilute the Bidder's obligation to maintain full offline functionality of the PAL platform as required under TECH-1, Clause 4A, Page 65 of the RFP. Internet connectivity at schools shall be treated as a facilitating infrastructure for sync and updates, and not as a dependency for core PAL functionality.</li> </ul>	
10	<p>Will content updates and software updates also be pushed via new micro-SD cards, or is over-the-air update expected?</p>	<p>It is clarified that both update mechanisms are expected to be supported and operational under this RFP. The Bidder must ensure that the PAL solution architecture is capable of delivering content and software updates through either mode, as circumstances may require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over-the-Air (OTA) Updates: Where internet connectivity is available at the school, the Bidder shall utilise the existing school-level internet infrastructure to push software updates, security patches, bug fixes, and content updates directly to deployed devices over-the-air. OTA updates shall be the primary and preferred mode of update delivery, ensuring</li> </ul>	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
		<p>timely and efficient deployment of changes across all 762 PM SHRI schools without requiring physical intervention at each location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Micro-SD Card-Based Updates: In circumstances where OTA updates are not feasible — including but not limited to device-level storage constraints, intermittent connectivity, large-volume content updates, or bulk content refresh requirements — the Bidder shall replacement/updated micro-SD cards to the schools with the revised content pre-loaded thereon. This mechanism shall serve as the secondary/supplementary update mode, ensuring that no school is deprived of updated content on account of connectivity or bandwidth limitations.</li> <li>• Hybrid Update Architecture: The Bidder's proposed solution must therefore incorporate a dual-mode update architecture that seamlessly supports both OTA and SD card-based updates, with the system capable of detecting and reconciling content versions across both update channels to avoid duplication, conflicts, or data integrity issues on deployed devices</li> </ul>	
11	<p>Please confirm Offline PAL usage being restricted to devices provided school and Online PAL solution should be access by any personal device. Student usage session in offline should be sync to Online.</p>	<p>The following is hereby confirmed and clarified regarding device-wise access architecture and session synchronisation under this RFP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Devices — Full Hybrid Functionality: The offline and online PAL functionality shall be available exclusively on the devices provided by the Bidder to the schools under this RFP, i.e., the tablets supplied to 754 PM SHRI schools. These school-provided devices shall support the complete PAL experience in both online and offline modes, including adaptive learning pathways, content delivery, assessments, and local data capture, as described under TECH-1, Clause 4A, Page 65 of</li> </ul>	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
		<p>the RFP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Personal Devices — Online Functionality Only: Students accessing the PAL platform from personal devices (smartphones, laptops, desktops, or any other device outside the school-provided hardware) shall be permitted to do so in online mode only, using their individual login credentials. Offline PAL functionality shall not be available on personal devices. Bidders must accordingly ensure that the PAL application or web interface restricts offline capabilities to school-registered and MDM-enrolled devices only, while permitting online-only access to all other authenticated devices.</li> <li>● Session Synchronisation — Offline to Online: All student usage sessions conducted in offline mode on school-provided devices shall be automatically synchronised with the central online platform upon the device regaining internet connectivity. This synchronisation shall capture and upload all relevant session data, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Learning progress and completion status</li> <li>○ Assessment responses, scores, and performance metrics</li> <li>○ Adaptive pathway adjustments triggered during the offline session</li> <li>○ Time-on-task, hint usage, and error patterns</li> <li>○ Any motivational or engagement data recorded during the session</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Data Integrity and Continuity: The synchronisation mechanism must ensure complete data integrity with no loss, duplication, or conflict between offline session data and the central online database. Upon sync, the student's personalised learning trajectory on the online platform must reflect all offline activity seamlessly, ensuring a unified and uninterrupted learning experience regardless of the mode of access.</li> <li>● Cross-Device Learning Continuity:</li> </ul>	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
		Following synchronisation of offline sessions, the student's updated learning pathway and progress must be accessible and accurately reflected when the student subsequently accesses the PAL platform from a personal device in online mode, ensuring full continuity of the personalised adaptive learning experience across all access points	
12	Both Online and Offline PAL should have the same solution or different solution are allowed?	The same solution is to be implemented for both	
13	Does school provide any infrastructure (server and internet) for usage sync.	Internet Connectivity: The schools covered under this RFP are already equipped with internet connectivity. FMS to ensure the syncing happens regularly.	
14	Sessions need to be tagged with At School & At home. What is the logic to differentiate at school & At Home sessions? All offline usage to be consider At school and online to be considered as At home ?	<p>It is clarified that session tagging as "At School" or "At Home" is a mandatory requirement under this RFP to enable effective program monitoring, usage analytics, and implementation oversight by OSEPA. The following logic is prescribed for session differentiation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Device-Based Tagging as Primary Logic: The primary basis for session tagging shall be the device on which the session is conducted, and not the mode of connectivity (online/offline). Accordingly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All sessions conducted on school-provided, MDM-enrolled devices shall be tagged as "At School" sessions, irrespective of whether the session is conducted in online or offline mode.</li> <li>○ All sessions conducted on personal devices (smartphones, laptops, desktops, or any non-MDM-enrolled device) shall be tagged as "At Home" sessions, as personal devices are restricted to online-only access under this RFP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
15	Since there are very limited projects with hardware, student centric software with individual login and FMS staff, we request to the department to kindly consider bidder's	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
	experience for executing projects that include deployment of hardware, software (content), Training of teachers and deployment of manpower. This would enable larger participation. Further for long terms projects (on going project) we request to the department to kindly consider phase wise completion certificate.		
16	We request to the department to kindly clarify if the content need to be developed in both Odia & English or only Odia.	The following clarifications are provided regarding the language requirements for academic content and software interface under this RFP:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academic Content — Odia Medium Only</li> </ul>	
17	PAL is better suited to higher-education environments and does not align well with the realities of school systems. We would like to propose a structurally sound, pedagogically aligned, and operationally viable model - one that is teacher-led, classroom-anchored, and effective in resource-scarce settings across Odisha.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
18	The first phase of implementation is given as academic year 2025-2026. Kindly clarify if it is 2026-2027?	The implementation year will be in 2026-27	Corrigendum to be issued
19	Could we request the removal of the clause that converts the license to a perpetual and royalty-free arrangement after the third year please?	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
20	Can there be an exemption in this eligibility criteria? The bidder must have received and/or executed work orders for implementation of either their proposed PAL/ LMS solution or an EdTech solution where individual login was provided to students, in at least 100 government schools/institutions in India in atleast 1 of the last 5 financial years (i.e., between FY 2020-21 to 2024-25) and should have similar project experience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One similar project value of ₹ 30 crore or more each</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two similar projects each of ₹15 crore or more each</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three similar projects each of ₹10 crore or more each</li> </ul>	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
21	The bidder must have received and/or executed Work Order of supply of hardware procurement and deployment, hardware support, software deployment (either PAL software or any EdTech	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
	software which has individual student level login) and field management support in the same contract in the last 5 financial years (i.e., between FY 2020-21 to 2024-25). Can there be an exemption in this eligibility criteria?		
22	As an System Integrator, Tablet will be procured from OEMs in order to supply and distribute in schools as per RFP specifications. Therefore there is no difference in supply of OEM Tablets/phones/laptops etc. In view of above, please modify the clause as : "The bidder should have past experience in supply of Tablets/laptops/phones."	The bidder should have past experience in the supply of Tablets/, laptops/phones. criteria to be added	Corrigendum to be issued
23	For teachers training, it is assumed that infrastructure including venue will be provided by Department/school. Please clarify.	Yes, venue to be arranged by the department; however, the bidder is to ensure availability of enough hardware for hands - on training.	
25	As per RFP, EMD of Rs 1.5 Cr. is to be submitted whereas per GEM portal, EMD of Rs 1 Cr. is to be submitted. Please clarify.	EMD, as mentioned in the GeM portal, will be kept intact.	Corrigendum to be issued
26	We suggest ITIL based central helpdesk with tactical team for SOP and FAQ based resolution, which may reduce field travels, associated risks and adequate cost without compromising effective SLA, user experience & Uptime.Can we suggest resources accordingly.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
27	OEM warranty norms void against damage due to accidents or wrong use. In such cases, kindly suggest needful work around process, or insurance coverage.	OEM warranty clauses applicable in this regard, the bidder provides backend insurance coverage for the transit period.	
28	Can department provide existing Curriculum and pedagogy content to understand the pattern and align the main content accordingly with approvals.This will ease the process and help in faster and timely completion.	State to share the Odisha Curriculum Framework and pedagogical details with the selected bidder post bid closing. ,	
29	The RFP mentions Both Online and Offline with appropriate back-sync with portal. The options of either online or Offline will stand?	No, both online and offline functionality are required	
30	IT-FMS support to schools are very specific parameters, Kindly make it as any Govt. /PSU or large enterprise. We understand the implementation is time-bound and support under FMS is governed by SLA parameters.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
31	d. Provide auto-remediation through interactive and gamified content at the right level of difficulty	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
32	e. Offer immediate assistance through hints, solutions, explanations and explanatory videos.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
33	Beyond Performance Adaptivity: The product should dynamically adapt learning pathways based on additional performance indicators, such as skipped questions, and guide in case of repeated occurrence of guessing attempts.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
34	MAF (Manufacturer's Authorisation Form/ Certificate) from the OEM of the PAL OEM, tablet needs to be submitted in the name of the bidder, Bid Number, Date and Contact Details.	MAF (Manufacturer's Authorisation Form/ Certificate) from the tablet OEM & PAL OEM needs to be submitted in the name of the bidder, Bid Number, Date and Contact Details.  <i>Supportive documents to be submitted by the bidder: MAF for PAL OEM to be Tech 19 Annexed below for reference</i>	Corrigendum to be issued
35	The PAL OEM should have implemented PAL Software for a state wide implementation in Govt Schools or for at least 2000 Govt Schools through a single .	The PAL OEM must have prior experience of implementing its PAL software across a state-level project in Government schools or in at least 1000 Government schools under a single government order within the last five years.	Corrigendum to be issued
36	The PAL OEM should have an edtech tulna evaluation report for PAL for anyone subject to ensure quality standards as per National Benchmarks.This will help ensure quality standards in the proposed solution. Additional of this clause will allow quality standard software.	The PAL OEM should have an EdTech Tulna evaluation report for PAL for any one subject to ensure quality standards as per National Benchmarks.	Corrigendum to be issued
37	d. Provide auto-remediation through interactive and gamified content at the right level of difficulty	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
38	e. Offer immediate assistance through hints, solutions, explanations and explanatory videos.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
39	Beyond Performance Adaptivity: The product should dynamically adapt learning pathways based on additional performance indicators, such as skipped questions, and guide in case of repeated occurrence of guessing attempts.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
40	The OEM must have been ranked among the top 5 in at least one of the last three quarters of the previous calendar year. A self-declaration along with relevant supporting documents must be submitted as evidence."	The bidder /OEM (Original Equipment Manufacturer) should have experience in the supply of Tablets/, laptops/phones to schools and Tablet OEM must have been ranked among the top 5 in at least one of the last three quarters of the previous calendar year, according to International Data Corporation (IDC) for India PCD Market, Top 5 companies, Market share.	Corrigendum to be issued

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
41	We request that the average annual turnover criteria be reduced to 50 Cr. to make the tender broad based	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
42	The current eligibility criteria permits any EdTech solution with individual student logins to qualify as similar work experience. Since this tender is specifically for a Personalised and Adaptive Learning (PAL) solution, allowing generic EdTech experience dilutes the intent of the qualification and may result in technically unqualified vendors being considered eligible. We suggest that the experience be restricted to implementation of proposed PAL solution or an Adaptive Learning solution (where the platform dynamically adapts learning pathways based on individual student performance), The current criteria is silent on whether ongoing projects are eligible. Bidders with substantial ongoing PAL deployments should not be excluded solely because the project is not yet fully completed, since PAL are multi year projects. We suggest that Ongoing projects shall also be considered as similar work experience, provided the bidder submits a Certificate from a Chartered Accountant (CA) confirming that at least 50% of the total contract value has been received as of the date of bid submission.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
43	<p>The bidder must have received and/or executed Work Order of supply of hardware procurement and deployment, hardware support, software deployment (either PAL software or any EdTech software which has individual student level login) and field management support in the same contract in the last 5 financial years (i.e., between FY 2020-21 to 2024-25).</p> <p>As above, we would request that experience be restricted to PAL solutions.</p>	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
44	We request that the RFP explicitly allow AI-enabled line narration / read-aloud support in both Odia and English across lessons, questions, hints, solutions, and feedback. This will improve accessibility, pronunciation support, comprehension, and self-paced learning for students.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
45	Bidders should provide an AI doubt solver in Odia and English to offer contextual doubt resolution, hints, stepwise explanations, and remedial support for students in both in-school and at-home usage scenarios, subject	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
46	We request that structured offline worksheets aligned to learner level, chapter progression, and remediation pathway be explicitly permitted as part of the PAL implementation. Such worksheets can support continuity of learning during low-connectivity periods and classroom reinforcement.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
47	While the subject scope is Mathematics and Science, we request that bidders be allowed to provide language learning-support features to improve subject comprehension, such as pronunciation assistance, technical-term narration, vocabulary scaffolds without changing the core subject scope.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
48	We request that the RFP explicitly recognize 3D simulations, concept visualisations, and other interactive bilingual digital content in Odia and English as permissible and desirable components of the PAL solution, especially for improving conceptual understanding in Science and Mathematics.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
49	Bidders should provide an AI-based learning companion in Odia and English to motivate students, provide reminders, guide revision, nudge regular usage, and support learners through their personalized pathway.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
50	The RFP requires the bidder to be incorporated under the Companies Act 2013 and in operation for the last 5 financial years. Clarification sought: (a) Will a company incorporated prior to 2013 under the Companies Act 1956 and subsequently recognised under the 2013 Act be eligible? (b) Should any year in which operations were active but revenues were nil (e.g. due to COVID) be counted as a valid year of operation?	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
51	Requiring all three components – hardware supply, software deployment, and FMS – under a single contract is an unduly restrictive criterion. Many specialist PAL software companies operate through partnerships or sub-contracting arrangements for hardware and FMS, and may not have a single integrated contract. This reduces competition and may favour large system integrators over specialist PAL providers. Suggestion: Allow experience across separate contracts or sub-contracts to	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
	be combined to meet this criterion, with each component demonstrated through respective work orders.		
52	The 'Make in India' requirement is mentioned for the product broadly. Clarification sought: (a) Does this apply to both hardware (tablets) and software (PAL solution)? (b) For software, what constitutes 'Make in India' – is it sufficient if the software is developed by an Indian entity with servers hosted in India? (c) Will products with valid Make in India certification from DPIIT or similar government authority be accepted? Please provide clear criteria to avoid ambiguity at the evaluation stage.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
53	<p>Requiring all three certifications simultaneously (ISO 27001, ISO 9001, and CMMI 3) is an unusually stringent combination, particularly CMMI Level 3, which is rarely held by EdTech companies focused on product development. This may restrict competition without improving the quality of the PAL solution. Suggestion: (a) Make CMMI Level 3 optional or provide an equivalent alternative (such as an independent third-party security/quality audit), OR (b) Require at least any two of the three certifications. Additionally, clarify if certifications of the OEM (PAL software developer) are acceptable in lieu of the bidder's own certifications.</p> <p>CMMI Level 3 certification is a process maturity standard designed primarily for IT services and system integration companies, not for product development organizations. Leading PAL and EdTech product companies globally — including those with proven large-scale government deployments — operate on agile development methodologies that are structurally incompatible with CMMI's process documentation requirements. Mandating CMMI Level 3 effectively disqualifies specialist PAL product companies and restricts the field to large IT services firms who may have no PAL domain expertise whatsoever. Suggestion: Replace CMMI Level 3 with a functionally equivalent alternative such as: (a) ISO 27001 (data security — already required), (b) a third-party product quality or EdTech evaluation certification such as Tulna.</p>	The bidder/oem should have any of the following certificates, such as ISO 27001, ISO 9001, CMMI 3 or Higher Level.	Corrigendum to be issued
54	The RFP requires a single bidder to supply both hardware (tablets for 754 schools) and PAL software (for 762 schools), which are distinct domains requiring different expertise. Prohibiting JV/Consortium arrangements may	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
	significantly reduce competition and force artificial bundling. Suggestion: Allow a two-party consortium (one hardware specialist + one PAL software specialist) with clearly defined roles, lead bidder designation, and joint and several liability. This will improve quality of both components while maintaining accountability.		
55	The RFP states 40-60 licenses per school but the BOM (TECH-15) shows 22,240 tablet licenses + 15,240 PC licenses = 37,480 total licenses for 762 schools, averaging approximately 49 per school. However, enrollment is assumed at ~400 students per school in Grades 6-10. Clarification sought: (a) Is the license count per school based on concurrent device usage or total student enrollment? (b) If 400 students share 40-60 licenses, what is the expected student rotation/usage model? (c) Will payment be based on licensed devices or active student users?	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
56	Content alignment to Odisha State Curriculum (Odia medium, Grades 6-10, Math & Science) followed by SCERT/BSE vetting and approval is a multi-step process involving government bodies with their own timelines. Binding the bidder to a T+45 day deadline for content approval without accounting for government agency response time is unreasonable. Suggestion: The content approval timeline should be split into two parts: (a) Bidder's content submission: T+30 days, and (b) Client/SCERT approval: within 15 days of submission. Penalty for content delays should apply only for the bidder's submission deadline, not for government approval timelines.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
57	The uptime requirement is stated as 99.5% during school hours (as per SLA section), but the penalty trigger is marked 'to be finalised by the Client'. This ambiguity makes it impossible for bidders to price the risk of penalties accurately. Clarification: (a) Please define 'school hours' explicitly (e.g., 8 AM to 5 PM on school working days). (b) Confirm that the 99.5% uptime SLA and associated penalties (INR 500/day beyond 1-day excess downtime/month) are final. (c) Does the uptime SLA apply to offline mode as well, or only to cloud-based/online features?	a) School time varies according to the weather seasons b) Yes c) Both, offline mode as well as to cloud-based/online features	
58	30% of the PAL Software Licensing Cost for Year 1 is subject to 'satisfactory performance during the preceding quarter as evaluated by OSEPA'. This is a large deferred payment with	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
	<p>subjective evaluation criteria. (a) What are the specific, measurable KPIs that define 'satisfactory performance' for this milestone? (b) What is the dispute resolution mechanism if the bidder disagrees with OSEPA's performance assessment? Suggestion: The performance benchmarks for this payment milestone should be clearly defined and made objective (e.g., minimum X% student active usage, Y% uptime, Z% schools onboarded) and included as a schedule to the contract.</p>		
59	<p>The definition of an 'active license' (20 minutes/week, 3 sessions/month, 4 weeks/quarter) as the basis for pro-rata payment is noted. However: (a) What happens during school vacations and exam periods when students don't use the platform – will these weeks count against the 4-week threshold? (b) Will 'at-home' usage (as enabled under Sec 1, Cl 5) count towards the active usage threshold? (c) The RFP allows the Client to reduce license payment based on these thresholds, but there is no corresponding provision for the bidder to benefit if usage exceeds the thresholds (e.g., bonus or incentive payment). Suggestion: Exclude school vacation weeks and examination periods from the active usage calculation, and confirm that home learning data contributes to the threshold.</p>	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
60	<p>The SLA framework has multiple parallel penalty streams (per-ticket, per-day, invoice deductions), which can theoretically accumulate to amounts far exceeding 10% of annual project cost. (a)a. (b) The penalty for 'Grievance redressal reporting' states 'invoice withheld if not submitted' – this is a full invoice hold for an administrative reporting lapse. This is disproportionate. Suggestion: Replace the 'invoice withheld' clause with a specific financial penalty (e.g., 0.5% of quarterly invoice per week of delay). (c) Please specify the appeal/dispute mechanism for penalty imposition.</p>	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
61	<p>Clarification sought: (a) In what instrument should the EMD be submitted – Bank Guarantee, Demand Draft, or both? The RFP says 'from any scheduled commercial bank' but does not specify the instrument type. (b) Is an EMD in the form of a Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) acceptable? (c) The RFP does not specify the tenure of the EMD – please clarify the validity period required. (d) Will the EMD be released for unsuccessful bidders automatically, or does it require a formal request?</p>	<p>The bidder must furnish, as part of the technical proposal, an Earnest Money Deposit(EMD) amounting to ₹1,00,00,000/- in form of Demand Draft/Banker's cheque issued in favour of "State Project Director, OSEPA", payable at Bhubaneswar. The Bidder can also submit the EMD in form Bank Gaurantee from any scheduled commercial bank with validity upto 30th November, 2026.</p>	Corrigendum to be issued

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
62	<p>(a) The PBG must be from a bank 'situated in Bhubaneswar'. For national/private sector banks, branches are widely available. However, requiring specifically a Bhubaneswar branch is restrictive. Clarification: Will a PBG issued by a scheduled commercial bank from any city, but in favour of 'State Project Director, OSEPA, Bhubaneswar' be acceptable? (b) The contract has 3-year base period with potential 4th and 5th year extension. Will a fresh PBG be required for extended years? (c) The PBG must be valid for 3 months beyond the entire contract period – please confirm the exact end date of the contract period for PBG calculation.</p>	<p>The RFP clauses are self-explanatory</p>	
63	<p>The IPR clause states that ownership vests with 'respective parties', but this is ambiguous when the bidder's pre-existing PAL platform is customised for Odisha. (a) Does the Client claim IPR over: (i) Pre-existing PAL platform features, OR (ii) Only Odisha-specific customisations (e.g., Odia language content, SCERT-aligned assessments)? (b) The 'perpetual and royalty-free' license clause (Sec 1, Cl 2) after Year 3 – does this apply to the full platform or only to customised components? Suggestion: Clearly define 'pre-existing IP' vs 'project-specific IP' with ownership terms for each.</p>	<p>Pre-existing IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) will be with the vendor, project-specific to be with OSEPA</p>	
64	<p>The 15-minute auto-logout policy for inactive sessions is noted. (a) Will the system reset the timer during video playback (where students are watching content but not clicking)? Students watching a 20-minute video To be decided auto-logged out mid-session. (b) Will 'at-home' access also have the same 15-minute inactivity rule? (c) How will the system differentiate between genuine inactivity and slow content rendering on low-bandwidth connections? Clarification requested to ensure this policy does not unfairly reduce usage metrics and payment.</p>	<p>a)no b) Yes,For bidder to come up with an effective solution to ensure fair usage tracking</p>	
65	<p>Creating new student accounts within 7 working days depends on timely receipt of student enrollment data from the school. (a) What is the SLA for schools/district authorities to share new enrollment data with the bidder? (b) Will the 7-day clock start from the date the school notifies the bidder, or from the student's official enrollment date? Suggestion: Define a joint SLA where the school provides enrollment data within 3 working days, and the bidder creates accounts within 4 working days (total 7 days end-to-end). Penalty should apply only for the bidder's portion.</p>	<p>a) from the date of receiving the data from the school</p>	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
66	<p>The requirement that all FMS staff must have previously worked in Odisha is overly restrictive and may prevent qualified professionals from outside the state from contributing to this program. Given that Odisha has 30 districts and the program covers 762 schools, this constraint may make it difficult to recruit adequate numbers. Suggestion: The Odisha work experience requirement should apply to (a) the State-level Program Manager, and (b) at least 50% of District-level FMS staff. For remaining FMS staff, prior experience in any state government EdTech program should be acceptable, combined with a mandatory Odisha-language (Odia) orientation.</p>	<p>The RFP clauses are self-explanatory</p>	
67	<p>(a) With 30 districts and up to 762 schools, the ratio of 1 FMS per 15 schools implies approximately 51 FMS staff (as shown in TECH-15 BOM). However, some districts may have more schools than others. Will the Client provide a district-wise school distribution so bidders can accurately plan and price FMS deployment? (b) The BOM (TECH-15) shows 51 field coordinators for 3 years – is this a minimum, or is the bidder free to propose a higher number? (c) Clarify: are the 5 helpdesk staff (central) counted separately from the 51 FMS staff?</p>	<p>The RFP clauses are self-explanatory</p>	
68	<p>(a) Should the cloud infrastructure be hosted on Indian servers (MeitY-empanelled cloud providers) in compliance with the data localisation norms? (b) Will the bidder be permitted to use commercial cloud providers (AWS, Azure, GCP) with data stored in Indian data centres, or is a government cloud (NIC/MeghRaj) mandatory? (c) Who bears the cost of cloud infrastructure – is it built into the PAL licensing cost? The financial bid template (TECH-15) does not show a separate line item for cloud/hosting costs. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Any secure commercial Cloud service provider hosted in India, the cost of cloud infrastructure will be a part of the software licence cost, no additional cost will be billed to the state.</p>	
69	<p>The total licensed user base across all 762 schools is approximately 37,480 licenses (tablets + PCs). Requiring infrastructure for 500,000 concurrent users is 13x the actual scale. (a) Is the 500,000 concurrent user requirement aspirational (future-proofing) or a contractual obligation? (b) Will the evaluation committee test for 500,000 concurrent users during technical evaluation? (c) If this is a contractual obligation, the infrastructure cost to support this scale must be factored in pricing. Clarification will help bidders price accurately.</p>	<p>The agency shall ensure that the platform can handle a load of at least 2,50,000 concurrent users without performance degradation, conducting stress testing to simulate peak usage scenarios and confirming that response times remain under 3 seconds for all user interactions.</p>	<p>Corrigendum to be issued</p>

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
70	<p>The Change Request clause (CI F.I) states that 'all changes within the defined scope are binding without additional cost'. However, the scope itself is broadly defined and includes open-ended provisions such as 'Client may modify dashboard requirements from time to time' and 'OSEPA reserves the right to modify frequency or format of reports'. These open-ended provisions, if classified as 'within scope', could result in significant uncompensated development effort. Suggestion: (a) Define a clear list of what constitutes 'within scope' vs 'change request' in an annexure. (b) Specify a cap on the number or cost of 'within-scope' modifications per year without additional compensation.</p>	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
71	<p>The provision that the license becomes 'perpetual and royalty-free' after Year 3 and 'all deliverables become the Client's property' has significant implications. (a) Does 'all deliverables' include the PAL software source code and algorithms, or only the Odia-language content and customisations? (b) If the software becomes the Client's property, who will provide ongoing security updates and maintenance post Year 3 (CI 3 mentions only 'security and critical software updates', not content updates)? (c) The perpetual license is 'designated only within the state of Odisha' (Sec 2, CI 18) – does this mean OSEPA can deploy the software in non-project schools within Odisha at no cost after Year 3?</p>	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
72	<p>The Client reserves the right to add schools at the same unit price throughout the contract period. (a) Is there a cap on the maximum number of additional schools that can be added? (b) Will additional schools require deployment within the same SLA timeline as the original schools, or will a fresh timeline be agreed? (c) The BOM (TECH-15) shows 9,048 tablets for 754 schools. If additional schools are added, will the original bidder be required to supply tablets as well at the same unit price, even if hardware prices have increased due to market conditions?</p>	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
73	<p>The Exit Management clause requires 6 months of post-contract support (3 months shadow + 3 months secondary) at no additional cost. This is a significant commitment that should be factored into pricing. (a) Is this 6-month exit support period included within the 3-year contract period, or is it additional? (b) During exit support, will the bidder's FMS staff be required to continue school visits? (c) Does the</p>	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	

Sl. No	Representations/queries	Response	Remarks
	6-month exit support obligation apply even if the Client terminates the contract early for reasons other than the bidder's breach?		
74	(a) The RFP designates the Commissioner-cum-Secretary, S&ME Department as the 'final authority' to resolve disputes. For a commercial contract of this scale, this is unusual – typically, disputes are resolved through an independent arbitrator or arbitration panel. Suggestion: Include a formal arbitration clause under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 as an alternative/escalation to administrative resolution. (b) Clarify whether the dispute resolution clause applies to penalty imposition as well, or only to contractual performance disputes.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
75	(a) Installing software via micro SD cards is an unusual deployment method and introduces security and maintenance risks (cards can be easily removed or swapped). Will an alternative deployment method (e.g., OTA push via MDM) be accepted for tablets? (b) If a micro SD card fails or is lost, the RFP states the bidder must replace it – however, who is responsible for the cost if the card is damaged due to student mishandling vs technical failure? (c) The micro SD specification (32GB, Class 10) To be decided insufficient for an offline-capable adaptive learning platform with multimedia content. Suggestion: Increase minimum specification to 64GB for adequate content capacity.	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	
76	The data breach reporting timelines (preliminary report within 72 hours, full RCA within 7 days) are tighter than what is typically required under the DPDP Act 2023, which prescribes a 72-hour notification to the DPBI. (a) Please confirm these timelines are in addition to, and not a substitute for, statutory DPDP Act obligations. (b) What is the financial penalty for breach of the data breach reporting SLA? The SLA framework does not appear to specify this. (c) Will OSEPA indemnify the bidder against third-party claims arising from data breaches caused by the Client's own infrastructure (e.g., VSK integration vulnerabilities)?	All safeguards are in addition to the DPDP Act.	
77	Tablets specification change	The RFP clauses are self-explanatory	