



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)
FOR**

SUPPLY, INSTALLATION, IMPLEMENTATION, INTEGRATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ENTERPRISE DATA LAKEHOUSE SOLUTION

Reference Bid Document

GeM BID NO: GEM/2026/B/7216322 Dated 10/02/2026

ADDENDUM / CORRIGENDUM – III

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
1.	69	Section III, 1.16 – Data Archival	After 7 years, data needs to be purged from the data Archival solution and should be moved to the tapes.	The archival storage retention period shall be measured from the data archival date (i.e., from the date on which the data was moved from the DLH to the archival solution). Upon completion of the archival storage retention period, as specified in Table 8 above, the data needs to be purged from the data archival solution and should be moved to the tapes. This purging process should also include data already present in the Bank's existing MIS and SAS Solution, with retention period calculated from their original archival date.
2	82	Section III, 1.26 – Benchmarking	Benchmarking: The following to be noted in this regard: - Bidder must conduct one consolidated benchmark for DLH covering all the components of the solution from ingestion layer to consumption and visualization layer. Benchmarking exercise should be done on 3rd year workload. The benchmark criteria will be discussed with the selected Bidder. - The extrapolation method of data to attain the 3rd year sizing should be according to the business projection provided in the RFP and the same should be discussed and finalized with the Bank at the time of finalizing the strategy of benchmarking.	Clause Deleted



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
			- The Bank will only provide the production masked data, and the Bidder need to extrapolate the data to attain the third-year sizing provided by the Bank in the RFP. Bidder must assist and provide option to Bank to extract the masked data from the production database. Bidder needs to assist and do the masking of data in the environment from where data need to be extracted. - The benchmarking should be conducted in Bank DR. - The bidder must propose an external benchmarking agency having benchmarking experience in two (2) Scheduled Commercial Banks with at least 1000 branches in India in areas of Data warehouse/ Data Lake/ Data Lakehouse. The external benchmarking agency suggested by the Bidder shall not be binding on the Bank. The Bank will verify their credentials during eligibility evaluation and will have the discretion to go with the Bidder proposed agency or Bank can ask to replace the agency which will have the expertise in carrying out these testing as per the criteria mentioned. Bidder needs to submit the credentials for the agency showcasing the work done by the proposed agency. The Bidder will bear 100% of the costs for the external benchmarking agency. - The Bank and the Bidder shall enter into an agreement with the external benchmarking agency, which will set out, inter alia, the obligations of the external benchmarking agency. This agreement will be signed between Bank, successful Bidder and the external benchmarking agency.	



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
			- Hardware provided by the Bidder will go through a benchmarking test and if it is found that it does not meet the capacity and performance required, then the Bidder shall provide the differential hardware resources at his cost immediately within two months after completion of the benchmark test. - The benchmarking activity should be done by the identified agency as per the criteria mentioned in the RFP. - The testing needs to be done as per the SLA parameters and the response time mentioned in the RFP Section 4.21. However, the Bank at its discretion will provide the bidder with additional KPI which needs to be covered as part of the Benchmarking activity.	
3	82	Section III, 1.26	New clause added.	Benchmarking, External Testing and Data Migration Audit activity: The Bank will directly engage an agency for following activities: 1. Benchmarking of the hardware provided by the bidder 2. External testing for end-to-end UAT of solutions, reports, dashboards, use cases and 3. Data migration audit The Bidder shall provide all necessary support to the external agency on-boarded by bank to facilitate the benchmarking, data migration audit, functional & acceptance testing. In case the hardware provided by the Bidder does not meet the capacity and performance required during



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
				benchmarking activity, then the Bidder shall provide the differential hardware resources at his cost immediately within two months after completion of the benchmark test. Also the clause as per Annexure XIII of the RFP will be applicable With regard to testing and data migration audit, any discrepancies identified in the audit report and any error/ bugs/gaps pointed out by the agency during testing shall be rectified by the Bidder within timelines stipulated by the Bank, at no additional cost to the Bank. In case of any delay in rectification of the observations reported by the agencies for all the above activities within the timeline stipulated by the Bank, the Bank shall be entitled to demand and recover from the successful bidder the liquidated damages, as detailed in RFP under Section III, 4.20 – Liquidated Damages (LD).
4	83 - 85	Section III, 1.27 – Testing	External Testing and Data Migration Audit agency The bidder must propose an external testing and data migration audit agency having Functional testing and Data Migration Audit experience in two (2) Scheduled Commercial Banks with at least 1000 branches in India in areas of Data warehouse/ Data Lake/ Data Lakehouse. The external testing and data migration audit agency suggested by the Bidder shall not be binding on the Bank. The Bank will verify their credentials during eligibility evaluation and will have the discretion to go with the Bidder proposed agency or Bank can ask to replace the agency which will have the expertise in carrying out these testing / audit as per the criteria mentioned. Bidder needs to submit the	Clause Deleted



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
			credentials for the agency showcasing the work done by the proposed agency. The Bidder will bear 100% of the costs for the external testing and data migration audit agency. The external testing and data migration audit agency will be responsible for end-to-end UAT of solutions, reports, dashboards, Use cases, and data migration audit. The testing and data migration audit agency will directly work under the Bank's supervision and will submit all the reports to the Bank directly. The Bank and the Bidder shall enter into an agreement with the external testing and data migration audit agent, which will set out, inter alia, the obligations of the external testing and data migration audit agent. This agreement will be signed between Bank, successful Bidder and the external testing and data migration audit agency. The scope of work of the External Testing and Data Migration Audit agency in various stages of project implementation is defined below. 1. Data Migration Audit Data Migration Audit shall include the following: • Verify financial and non-financial data transferred from Source solutions to new DLH • Data integrity checks: Pre-migration and post-migration data sets should be compared for data integrity issues. Data integrity checks should check the following data parameters: ○ Raw data integrity ○ Business rules	



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
			○ Log tables ○ Configuration/ parameterization table • Identify the critical fields to be validated from the field in source system based on the experience of other migrations • Business rules verification: As per the list of business rules mentioned in the BRD document, the Bidder is expected to verify the computed / derived values. These values will be derived in report form and provided to Bidder. • Configuration / parameterization table should be verified 100% • Verify log tables and highlight various error logs if any, post migration. Data migration audit shall provide an assurance that 100% data have been properly identified and accurately and completely migrated to relevant data fields in the target system by understanding and validating the migration controls, performing independent verification of data migrations and by performing automated tool-based audit of the data. The external agency as part of data migration audit is expected to provide a data migration assurance report and needs to have the relevant qualifications/ certifications required to be able to issue an assurance report. The external agency shall recommend the audit methodology, tools, which is suitable for Bank to perform data migration audit. A detailed reconciliation report including match percentages and documentation of unresolved discrepancies between source and target systems will be submitted by the agency to the Bank.	



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
			A mutually agreed threshold will be defined at the start of the audit process between the external agency and Bank for critical and non-critical field as part of sign off criteria. The Data Migration audit report should cover the following: • Comparison of pre-migration and post-migration data for checking integrity issues • The recon report should cover at least ○ Row count validation ○ Min/ max/ average checks for financial columns ○ Field-by-field comparison • Deliverables of data migration audit should include: ○ Data migration audit strategy ○ Migration process review report ○ Field wise exceptions reports (pre and post) ○ Final compliance report, post migration ○ Data migration assurance certificate 2. Functional & Acceptance Testing The external agency in coordination with Bank and the successful Bidder shall design the testing strategy and shall obtain the sign-off from the Bank on the testing approach and plan. It will be the responsibility of the external testing agency to prepare test data, test plan, test cases, and test strategy for all types of testing. The testing approach and plan submitted by the external testing agency will be reviewed by the bank. The Bank after review may suggest changes for incorporating in the testing methodology. Functional & User Acceptance Testing should consist of the following:	



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
			• Design of suitable testing methodology and testing strategy document • Prepare test cases, test calendars and test data • Development of entry and exit criteria for the testing • Maintain test results against each test case executed • Test scope would include testing the application software's functionality, operational convenience, security, and controls, which would also include the positive and negative cases for each type • Acceptance testing shall broadly cover the testing of the ETL tools, database and BI application tools, reports, dashboard, use cases and all such other applications and tools to verify that the proposed solution conforms with the business and technical requirements and gap analysis report, bandwidth and response time. • Test scope should also ensure conformity to: ○ Technical and Functional Requirements in Appendix I of RFP and addenda/ corrigendum thereafter if any ○ Product demonstration cases prepared by the Bank ○ Gaps pointed out by vendors ○ Interface testing • Testing will be done on LAN as well as WAN environment including HO and few sample branches / offices as desired by Bank. • Test activities should also include the following: ○ Point out and document gaps, errors, bugs during testing and their resolution ○ Re-test the gaps, errors, and bugs after rectification	



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
			- o Assist in Sign – off on the customization and user acceptance test • Deliverables of acceptance testing - o Test strategy document, test cases and their coverage - o Functional testing, and regression test report - o All the traceability matrix and issue log and final resolution	
5	83	Section III, 1.27 – Testing	New clause added .	Bidder to ensure that testing is done on LAN as well as WAN environment including HO and few sample branches / offices as desired by Bank.
6	91	Section III, 1.29.1 Environments	The UAT / SIT servers should be at a minimum of 30% capacity of production environment, based on fifth-year configuration .	The UAT / SIT servers should be at a minimum of 30% capacity of production environment, based on Third-year configuration
7	92	Section III, 1.29.2 - Environment Sizing	Bidder is required to provide staggered hardware depending on the volumetric defined in the RFP and associated software and applications. The initial deployment of hardware and associated software should sustain at least the load for the first three years of the solution as per the SLA. Thus, the warranty and subsequent AMC/ATS of the components will begin as per the phased delivery. After three years, Bank in coordination with the successful Bidder will review the hardware and software utilization and accordingly confirm the supply for next two years.	1. Sizing of Hardware: The Bidder shall propose and size the required hardware and storage infrastructure for the Data Lakehouse solution as per Year-3 volumetric specified in the RFP to sustain the load for first three years. After completion of three (3) years, the Bank, in coordination with the successful bidder, shall review the hardware utilization. For the additional hardware and/or storage required to sustain the load of next two (2) years, the Bank may procure the additional hardware components directly or on mutually agreed terms and conditions with the successful bidder after 3rd year. The proposed hardware and storage infrastructure shall have sufficient provision to expand in terms of compute, memory etc to year 5 volumetric specified in the RFP during the contract period. 2. Sizing of Database systems, OS and Other peripheral software: Database systems, OS and



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
				Other peripheral software required for the functioning of the hardware and storage components should be sized as per Year-5 volumetric specified in the RFP for a period of five (5) years. 3. Sizing of Application / Software like Data Ingestion, Data Governance, Streaming, Analytical Tool, Reporting Tool, Security, masking etc.: Application / Software cost (Data Ingestion, Data Governance, Streaming, Analytical Tool, Reporting Tool, Security, Masking etc.,) should be sized as per Year-5 volumetric specified in the RFP for a period of five (5) years. Warranty and AMC/ATS obligations shall be governed by the provisions specified in Section-III, 3.4.7-Warranty Management of this RFP accordingly bidder needs to fill the AMC and ATS of the supplied components. For the additional hardware that may be procured by the Bank directly to sustain the load of 4th and 5th year, bidder need to do all the required configuration, integration with the existing setup and the subsequent maintenance. Bidder need to quote accordingly.
8	93	Section III, 1.29.2 - Environment Sizing	Bidder must conduct solution benchmark, and benchmarking should be done on 5th year load.	Clause deleted.
9	93	Section III, 1.29.2 - Environment Sizing	In case of additional infrastructure capacity required beyond planned YoY growth, Bidder must supply additional infrastructure to address that requirement, at no additional cost.	In case of additional infrastructure capacity required for mentioned YoY growth, Bidder must supply additional infrastructure to address that requirement, at no additional cost.
10	110	Section III, 2.2 Project Timelines	Bidder is required to provide staggered hardware, associated software and applications depending on	Clause deleted.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
			the volumetric defined in the RFP. The initial deployment of hardware and associated software should sustain at least the load for first 3 years (including the implementation phase) of the solution as per the SLA. Thus, the warranty and subsequent AMC/ATS of the components will begin as per the phased delivery.	
11	112	Section III, 2.4 Acceptance Criteria	S. No. 7 - Bidder has completed the Benchmarking activity, and the report is accepted and signed off by the Bank.	Clause Deleted .
12	114	Section III, 3.3 Licensing	Licenses will be subscribed in phased manner as per Bank's requirements, at its discretion. The initial quantity should suffice for the first 3 years. After 3 years, Bank will review the requirement and accordingly inform the Bidder to do the augmentation. However, in the bill of material Bidder needs to provide the costing per the sizing parameters for contact period. In case licenses are procured mid-year, payment will be made on pro-rata basis to maintain annuity of licenses.	User-based Licenses will be subscribed in phased manner as per Bank's requirements and discretion. In the bill of material bidder needs to provide the costing as per the sizing parameters for contact period. In case licenses are procured mid-year, payment will be made on pro-rata basis to maintain annuity of licenses.
13	141-143	Section III, 4.8 Payment Terms	Table 24: Payment Milestones and Deliverable-Based Disbursement Schedule	Revised Table 24 (Payment Milestones and Deliverable-Based Disbursement Schedule) is enclosed.
14	172	S. No. 1.1 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	Offered Server should be 2U Rack Mountable.	Offered Server should be 2U (or higher) Rack Mountable.
15	172	S. No. 1.2 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	It should have two processors of Latest (N) or N-1 Generation with each processor having minimum 32 cores and minimum 2.2 GHz Clock .	It should have two processors of Latest (N) or N-1 Generation with each processor having minimum 30 cores and minimum 2.2 GHz Clock.
16	172	S. No. 1.3 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	It should have minimum 256GB Dual In-line Memory Modules (DIMMs) scalable to at least 1.0 TB using Double Data Rate-5 (DDR5) or higher.	It should have minimum 64 GB Dual In-line Memory Modules (DIMMs) / Differential DIMMs (DDIMM) scalable to at least 1.0 TB using Double Data Rate-5 (DDR5) or higher.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
17	172	S. No. 1.7 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	It should have 3 ports of USB 2.0 / 3.0 and 1 Dedicated out- of-band remote management ethernet port of min. 1Gbps. It should have Dynamic USB port enable/disable features for all the USB Ports provided in the server.	It should have 2 ports of USB 2.0 / 3.0 and 1 Dedicated out- of-band remote management ethernet port of min. 1Gbps. It should have Dynamic USB port enable/disable features for all the USB Ports provided in the server.
18	172	S. No. 1.7 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	System remote management should have browser based graphical remote console along with Virtual Power button, remote boot using USB/CD/DVD Drive. It should be capable of offering upgrade of software and patches from a remote client using Media/image/folder.	System should support browser-based remote management with graphical console, remote power control, virtual media (USB/CD/DVD or equivalent), remote boot, and capability to perform software/firmware updates from remote clients using media/image or equivalent mechanisms.
19	173	S. No. 1.8 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	It should have Dual Port and dual card and each card 32Gbps dual FC / iSCSI adaptor with two number of multimode LC-LC Cable.	It should have Dual Port on each card 32Gbps dual FC / iSCSI adaptor with two number of multimode LC-LC Cable OR It should have Dual 40 Gbps or higher Ethernet adaptors for software-defined or distributed storage with two number of multimode LC-LC Cable
20	175	S. No. 2.10 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	The proposed storage should be SSD / NVME based and should have Inline deduplication or compression - minimum 5:1 on text/JSON/logs data - must be enabled from Day-1.	The proposed storage should be SSD / NVME based and should have Inline duplication - minimum 5:1 on unstructured /JSON/logs data - must be enabled from Day-1. Compression - minimum 5:1 on all type of data structure, semi structured as well as unstructured data
21	175	S. No. 2.15 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	The proposed solution must comply with FIPS-140, and EAL2 certifications.	The proposed hardware-based storage solution must comply with FIPS-140, and/or EAL2 certifications. Software-defined storage must have AES-256 at rest and TLS 1.2 or higher in transit.
22	175	S. No. 2.22 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	Must support multi-site active-active architecture with global namespace.	Hardware storage must support multi-site active-active architecture with global namespace. For software-defined object storage, multi-site architecture shall be demonstrated through a unified S3-compatible endpoint across all nodes and sites.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
23	176	S. No. 2.31 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	The Storage array offered should be configured with at least 1 TB cache DRAM across all the nodes. The complete cache should be accessible by all the nodes in the storage system. Only write cache must be mirrored. Cache memory should be delivered on DRAM ; any other device or HDD should not be considered as cache.	The Storage solution offered shall be configured with sufficient cache RAM accessible across all nodes in the system to meet the performance thresholds defined in Clause 2.32. Cache memory shall be delivered on RAM ; any other device or HDD shall not be considered as cache.
24	176	S. No. 2.33 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	There should be no single point of failure (NSPOF) within the storage array . Individual component failures (controller, port, cache, disk, enclosure, or any other vendor specific element) should not cause loss of data accessibility, data integrity or a full array failure. All the components should be redundant and hot swappable including power supply, fans, batteries, etc.	There should be no single point of failure (NSPOF) within the storage solution . Individual component failures including disk or any other element should not cause loss of data accessibility or data integrity. All critical components should be redundant including power supply and fans
25	176	S. No. 2.35 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	The object storage system must support QoS controls at the tenant and bucket level, including bandwidth throttling, request rate limiting, and resource isolation to prevent noisy neighbor impact and ensure predictable performance for critical workloads	The hardware object storage system must support QoS controls at the tenant and bucket level, including bandwidth throttling, request rate limiting, and resource isolation to prevent noisy neighbour impact and ensure predictable performance for critical workloads For software-defined object storage, QoS shall be evaluated at the solution level through bucket and tenant access controls, network bandwidth allocation, and compute-layer workload isolation.
26	176	S. No. 2.37 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	The storage should be proposed with hardware controller-based Data at Rest encryption with no performance implications to host IOs. In case this is an optional component then the same should be proposed as a separate line item with solution along with required Hardware and Software with licenses. FIPS140-2 validated.	The hardware storage should have hardware controller-based Data at Rest encryption or in case software defined storage is proposed the data at rest encryption should be done at CPU level each node with no performance implications to host. In case this is an optional component then the same should be proposed as a separate line item with solution along with required Hardware and Software with licenses.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
27	180	S. No. 4.12 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	The software should allow to deploy and export virtual machines, virtual appliances in Open Virtual Machine Format (OVF).	The platform should support the deployment, import, and export of virtual machines and virtual appliances using standardized packaging formats (such as OVF or equivalent), ensuring interoperability and portability across different virtualization environments.
28	181	S. No. 5.1 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	The solution should have the ability to provision, install, manage, and configure multiple Kubernetes clusters and associated master node in either of infrastructure (bare- metal or virtual machines) under a single unified management plane.	The solution should have the ability to provision, install, manage, and configure multiple Kubernetes clusters and associated master node in either of infrastructure (bare-metal or virtual machines) under a single unified management plane. For analytical Kubernetes solutions, a single management plane governing all Data Lakehouse workload layers through namespace isolation shall satisfy this requirement in lieu of managing multiple independent clusters.
29	182	S. No. 5.2 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	The proposed Kubernetes platform should allow managing Kubernetes clusters across diverse environments like On-premises, AWS, Azure and on Bare Metal servers from a single console.	The proposed Kubernetes platform should allow managing Kubernetes clusters across all on premises workload from a single console.
30	182	S. No. 5.10 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	Platform should have capability to perform service export/import between Kubernetes clusters based on load balancer service.	Platform should have capability to perform, intra-cluster namespace routing with integrated load balancer per Clause 5.17
31	182	S. No. 5.12 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	Proposed platform must support Identity Providers like GitHub , LDAP, OIDC and SAML for authentication.	Proposed platform must support Identity Providers like LDAP, OIDC and SAML for authentication.
32	183	S. No. 5.22 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	Platform should provide capability to backup and restore applications in Kubernetes.	Platform or workload should provide capability to backup and restore applications in Kubernetes.
33	183	S. No. 5.23 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	The solution should be capable to scan the container images for vulnerabilities and Malicious contents before deployment and on periodic basis	Clause deleted.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
34	167	Section III, 4.44.10 Right to alter Quantities.	4.44.10 Right to alter Quantities. Bank reserves the right to alter the requirements specified in the RFP. The Bank also reserves the right to delete one or more items from the list of items specified in the RFP. The Bank will inform all Bidders about changes, if any. The Bidder agrees that Bank has +/- 25% limit on the additions or deletions on the items for the period of the contract. Further the Bidder agrees that the prices quoted by the Bidder would be adjusted on prorated basis with such additions or deletions in quantities. The Unit price quoted by the Bidder will be valid for all the items for the contract period, and the Bank reserve the right to procure the additional items within the specified limit as per the unit price mentioned in the bill of material during the contract period.	4.44.10 Right to alter Quantities. Bank reserves the right to alter the requirements specified in the RFP. The Bank also reserves the right to delete one or more items from the list of items specified in the RFP. The Bank will inform all Bidders about changes, if any. The Bidder agrees that Bank has right to +/- 25% limit on the additions or deletions on the items and 1. Increase upto 25% on the items is applicable at the time of placing order with the bidder or till the delivery of the initial order is completed. 2. Decrease upto 25% on the items is applicable at the time of placing order with the bidder. Further the Bidder agrees that the prices quoted by the Bidder would be adjusted on prorated basis with such additions or deletions in quantities. The Unit price quoted by the Bidder will be valid for all the items, and the Bank reserve the right to procure the additional items within the specified limit as per the unit price mentioned in the bill of material.
35	212-253	Appendix – II	Appendix – II Commercial bid	Revised Appendix – II Commercial bid is enclosed
36	300	Annexure-XXV	Annexure-XXV - Component Mapping	Revised Annexure-XXV - Component Mapping is enclosed.
37	306-315	Annexure-XXVIII	ANNEXURE-XXVIII- Proposed Hardware Description Details	Revised ANNEXURE-XXVIII- Proposed Hardware Description Details - is enclosed
38	97	Section III 1.29.6 E. Network and Infrastructure Security	The solution should apply file sanitization technology by stripping files of potentially harmful or malicious content and apply file based DLP feature to identify/flag or alert PII and sensitive content discovered	The solution should apply file sanitization technology by stripping files of potentially harmful or malicious content and apply file based DLP feature to identify/flag or alert PII and sensitive content discovered. The file sanitization is required for the files / semi structure / unstructured data in the motion / coming inside the Lakehouse to do the stripping.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
39	50	Section III 1.4 Target-state Technology Architecture	The proposed deployment of Enterprise Data Lakehouse solution should be seamlessly implemented on prem. The solution deployment must be container-based at BI, Reporting, visualization, advanced analytics and data ingestion layer	The solution deployment must be container-based at analytics layer however containerization at the Reporting and Data Ingestion layers is recommended and may be supported where operationally feasible
40	152	Section III – 4.21.3 Operational Service level, Sr.no 10	Dashboard Page Load Static page Load <500ms Dynamic page Load < 2ms	Dashboard Page Load Static page Load <500ms Dynamic page Load < 5ms
41	60	Section III 1.9 Storage Layer Consumption layer	Data Marts must be built for data residing in DLH based on the requirements of various lines of business in the Bank. These data marts shall be consumed by analytical solutions and reporting tools	Data Marts must be built for data residing in DLH based on the requirements of various lines of business in the Bank. The data marts and ODS should be built within the data Lakehouse storage layer. These data marts shall be consumed by analytical solutions and reporting tools
42	186	Section V Appendix I – Technical Requirements 1.9	The solution should support the creation of schema, curated, and processed layers, including simple Data Marts.	The solution should support the creation of schema, curated, and processed layers, including simple Data Marts. Data Marts should be created within the data Lakehouse database
43	46	Section III 1.3. Current landscape	Bidder may leverage bank's existing licenses under Oracle PULA to meet the technical and functional requirements of the data lakehouse solution. In such case, the bidder must ensure seamless integration and compatibility of the existing licenses with the proposed solution. Bidder is responsible for providing all the required additional tools and related support for fulfilling the scope of the project and the same shall be included in the Commercial Bid (Appendix II).	Bidder may leverage bank's existing licenses under Oracle PULA to meet the technical and functional requirements of the data Lakehouse solution. In such case, the bidder must ensure seamless integration and compatibility of the existing licenses with the proposed solution. Bidder is responsible for providing all the required additional tools and related support for fulfilling the scope of the project and the same shall be included in the Commercial Bid (Appendix II). If the proposed application is based on some other Database / System software not covered in PULA of the bank, then the bidder has to provide the same with cost of such product and related support & maintenance cost built within the overall commercials bid.
44	173	S. No. 1.21 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix	It should be EAL-2 or higher certified for the offered server baseband/IPMI management. However, if	It should be EAL-2 or higher certified or any equivalent for the offered server baseband/IPMI management.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No.	Pg. No	Para No. / Clause ref.	Existing Clause	Revised Clause
		– I: Technical and Functional Requirements	certification is not available at the time of bidding and is into the process of certification, OEM shall submit certificate at the time of delivery.	However, if certification is not available at the time of bidding and is into the process of certification, OEM shall submit certificate at the time of delivery.
45	176	S. No. 2.38 of Infrastructure Requirements under Appendix – I: Technical and Functional Requirements	For File access it must be possible to set quotas at a user or group or file level and should have Microsoft active directory and LDAP integration	The Hardware object storage must have a File access and must be possible to set quotas at a user or group or file level and should have Microsoft active directory and LDAP integration The software defined object storage access the platform must support capacity quotas at namespace and bucket levels and must integrate with Microsoft Active Directory and LDAP for authentication and authorization
46.	93	Section 1.29.3 User Access Sizing Table 15	Table 15: BI User Segmentation and Growth Projections	Revised Table 15: BI User Segmentation and Growth Projections as enclosed
47.	102-108	Section III, 2.1.3 Resource Deployment during implementation stage	Table 19: Minimum Resource Deployment Plan for Implementation Phase	Revised Table 19: Minimum Resource Deployment Plan for Implementation Phase as enclosed

Authorized Signatory

Revised Table 15: BI User Segmentation and Growth Projections

User Count	Super Admin	Power Users	Business Users	Mobile Users
Total Users	10	200	20,000	4000
Concurrent Users	8	40	1500	500
YOY Growth	10%	10%	10%	10%

Table 15: BI User Segmentation and Growth Projections



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Revised Table 24: Payment Milestones and Deliverable-Based Disbursement Schedule

Deliverables	% of Payment	STAGES (On completion of the activities)
Hardware, Database systems, OS and Other peripheral software	70%	On delivery of the Hardware and submission of invoice with Proof of Delivery and other documents
	20%	On Successful installation and commissioning of the infrastructure
	10%	On completion of 180 days of successful installation, commissioning and hardening of hardware and sign off by the Bank
Application / Software cost (Data Ingestion, Data Governance, Streaming, Analytical Tool, Reporting Tool, Security, Masking etc.,)	70%	On delivery of Base version of respective Application software and on submission of Invoice and proof of Delivery
	20%	On successful release of customized software to production for respective applications
	10%	On completion of one month after successful release of application to production for respective applications
Installation and Commissioning cost	100%	On Successful installation and commissioning of the infrastructure
Implementation and Customization cost for Application / Software (Data Ingestion, Data Governance, Streaming, Analytical Tool, Reporting Tool, Security, Masking etc.,)	20%	On SRS/ BRD Sign-off of respective module from the Bank
	20%	On installation of Data ingestion, Governance, Analytical and Reporting and Dashboard solution and sign-off by the Bank
	20%	On completion and sign-off of 50% of Reports and Dashboards mentioned in the RFP
	20%	On completion of Data Migration from SAS and MIS system of the Bank
	10%	On completion and sign-off of 100% of Reports and Dashboards mentioned in the RFP
	10%	On completion of 6 months of stabilization period after Go-Live and sign-off by the Bank
Minimum Viable Product (MVP)	100%	On complete implementation and sign-off by Bank of all Use cases mentioned under MVP
Analytical Use Cases and Models	20%	On finalizing functional specifications, data requirements and sign-off by the Bank
	40%	On UAT sign-off of Use cases by the Bank
	30%	On Production Go-Live acceptance and sign-off by the Bank
	10%	On completion of stabilization period of 3 months and user adoption for each use case
Training	100%	On completion of each batch of training as and when completed



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Deliverables	% of Payment	STAGES (On completion of the activities)
AMC / ATS	Annually in advance	AMC/ATS shall commence on completion of the warranty period (3 years for hardware (including necessary system softwares) from commissioning and one year for application software/services from go-live)
Facility Management Services (FMS) Cost	Monthly in arrears	The facilities management costs towards managed services will commence after successful completion of Go-live of the project and sign-off by the Bank. Bidder must note that the managed services should be available for all environments viz., production and non- production.
Data Migration from SAS and MIS system	10%	On submission and Sign-off of the data Migration strategy
	50%	On submission and sign-off of the pre-production Data Migration Report
	40%	On submission and sign-off of the post-production data migration Report
Reports and Dashboards	20%	On finalizing functional specifications, data requirements and sign-off by the Bank
	30%	On UAT sign-off of Use cases by the Bank
	40%	On Production Go-Live acceptance and sign-off by the Bank
	10%	On completion of stabilization period of 3 months and user adoption for each use case

Table 24: Payment Milestones and Deliverable-Based Disbursement Schedule



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Revised Table 19: Minimum Resource Deployment Plan for Implementation Phase

S. No	Role & Responsibility	Location	Resource Criteria	Min. No. of Resources across shift
1	Program Manager - Head the entire program from the Bidder side.	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 10 years or more of relevant experience as Program Manager and should have experience of program managing implementation and operations of Data Warehouse / Data Lake/ Data Lakehouse solution which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more Scheduled Commercial Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate with PMI or Prince2 Certification.	1
2	Banking Domain Expert / Banking Specialist - Manage requirements and functional solution.	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 15 years or more of relevant experience in banking domains covering retail, corporate, loans, treasury, forex etc., Should have worked as a banking domain specialist in one of the Data Warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solutions which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more Scheduled Commercial Banks in India or Financial regulator in India	2
3	Techno Functional-Business Analyst / Functional Lead – Own and map the business requirements including and technical and functional solution.	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 7 years or more of relevant experience in banking Domain covering domains like Retail, Corporate, Loans, Treasury, Forex etc., Should have worked as a Techno Functional specialist in one of the Data Warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solutions which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more Scheduled Commercial Banks in India or Financial regulator in India The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate.	2
4	Data Modeler/ Model Developer – Design, develop and	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 7 years or more of relevant experience in Data modelling and designing of Data Models.	1



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No	Role & Responsibility	Location	Resource Criteria	Min. No. of Resources across shift
	implementation of analytical use cases.		Should have worked as a model developer in one of the Data Warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solutions which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more large Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate and must have certification like Data Modelling Certification (DMC) / Certified Data Management Professional (CDMP) or any other relevant certification.	
5	Reporting lead - Design, develop and implementation of all reporting and dashboard requirements.	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 7 years or more of relevant experience in report or dashboard building and have worked on Power BI / Tableau / Cognos tools or any equivalent business intelligence / visualization tools. Should have worked as a reporting lead in one of the Data Warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solutions which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more large Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate.	2
6	Data Scientist (AI/ML expert) – Own the design and implementation of analytical use cases	Chennai HO	MTech / B. Tech / MSc in Artificial Intelligence / Statistics / Applied Economics. The candidate should have advanced analytics certification. The candidate should have at least 7 years of hands-on experience in design and implementation of Advanced Analytics, AI, and ML use cases with at least 3 years of experience for large banks. The candidate should have an extensive understanding of Advanced Analytics tools and should have hands-on software development and experimentation skills in environments like R / Scala / Python / H2O / MATLAB/ SAS.	2
7	ETL/ELT expert – Design and develop data pipelines and data processing.	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 7 years or more of relevant experience in pipeline creation and batch data acquisition.	2



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No	Role & Responsibility	Location	Resource Criteria	Min. No. of Resources across shift
			Should have worked as a data acquisition expert in one of the Data Warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solutions which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more large Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate.	
8	CDC and Streaming tool expert - Design and develop integration pipeline for real-time data.	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 7 years or more of relevant experience in pipeline creation for real time and streaming data acquisition. Should have worked as a data acquisition expert in one of the Data Warehouse / Data Lake/ Data Lakehouse solutions which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more large Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate.	2
9	Data Governance, Data Lineage, Master Data Management – Design and implement data governance tools including lineage, data quality, data dictionary, etc.,	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 7 years or more of relevant experience in data governance and data management. Should understand data classification and lineage tracking. Should have worked as a data governance expert in one of the Data Warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solutions which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, master data management, data governance, analytical tool, reporting in one or more large Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate.	1
10	Security Specialist – Own entire security aspects of the solution.	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 7 years or more of relevant experience in security aspects of Data Lakehouse. Resources should understand statutory and regulatory compliance rules of security. Should have worked as a security specialist expert in one of the Data Warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solutions which must include component	1



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No	Role & Responsibility	Location	Resource Criteria	Min. No. of Resources across shift
			like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more large Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate and must have certification Information security like CISM/ CISSP.	
11	Infrastructure Lead (Server, DB, Virtualization, Backup etc.) – Own the entire infrastructure of the platform.	Chennai DC	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 10 years or more of relevant experience in infrastructure implementation which should include Server, backup, object storage and private cloud. Should have been worked as an infrastructure lead in one of the Data Warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solutions which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more large Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate.	1
12	Project Management office resource – Plan and manage the day-to-day activities of the project and deliverables.	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 7 years or more of relevant experience in Managing data warehouse / Data Lake/ Data Lakehouse projects. Should have worked as PMO lead in one of the Data Warehouse / Data Lake/ Data Lakehouse solutions which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more large Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate with PMI or Prince2 Certification.	1
13	Quality lead – Own the testing and quality assurance of the solution.	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 7 years or more of relevant experience as Quality Lead. Should have worked in one Data Warehouse / Data Lake/ Data Lakehouse solution project which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more	1



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

S. No	Role & Responsibility	Location	Resource Criteria	Min. No. of Resources across shift
			large Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate with relevant certifications in Software Quality.	
14	Data Lakehouse Architect – Own the design and implementation of the entire solution.	Chennai HO	The proposed resource should have a minimum of 5 years or more of relevant experience as Data Lakehouse Architect and should have experience of designing the end-to-end Data Lakehouse solution which must include component like ETL/ELT, CDC, Master Data management, Data Governance, Analytical Tool, reporting in one or more Scheduled Commercial Banks in India or Financial regulator in India. The candidate should have an extensive understanding of handling Unstructured Data, Big Data Architecture and Platform and should have implemented Big Data Analytics in BFSI industry. The proposed resource must be MBA / Engineering graduate with TOGAF Certification.	1

Table 19: Minimum Resource Deployment Plan for Implementation Phase



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Revised Appendix II - Commercial Bid

(Price bid along with Breakup to be submitted with Technical Bid in a separate envelope)

Date:

To
General Manager,
Indian Bank, Head Office
ACoE Department, 2nd Floor.
66 Rajaji Salai, Chennai - 600001

Dear Sir,

Sub: Request for Proposal for Supply, Installation, Implementation, Integration, and maintenance of Enterprise Data Lakehouse solution.

Ref: Your RFP No. GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026

Price Schedule – Summary of Cost:

We submit hereunder the price details.

S. No	Items	Implementation Period (18 months) And Maintenance and support period (3 years 6 months)					Total Amount for 5 years (excluding GST) (in INR)	Total Amount for 5 years (including GST) (in INR)
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5		
A	Software							
B	Database and peripheral software							
C	Hardware							
D	Installation and Commissioning							
E	Implementation Cost							
F	AMC							
G	ATS							
H	Facility Management Services (FMS) Cost							
I	Training							
J	Other cost							
	Grand Total – TCO (A+B+C+D+E+F+G+H+I+J)							

A. Software Cost:

The shortlisted Bidder has to specify the particulars for the following as per their SOLUTION design to meet the requirements of the scope of work of the RFP. New item may be added for each of the line-item types as required specifying the configuration such that Bank knows the number and types of application licenses needs to be procured.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

B. Database and peripheral software

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

C. Hardware cost:

The shortlisted Bidders should submit the description of the hardware for which the cost is quoted below in the format provided in Annexure XXVIII. Any bid received without sufficient / complete information in Annexure XXVIII is liable for cancellation / rejection.

	Quantity	Rate (INR)	Total Amount excluding GST (INR)	Total Amount including GST (INR)
Cost of Hardware for DC (C1)				
ETL				
CDC				
Streaming data Ingestion				
Data Lakehouse				
Open table				
Operation Data Store				
Orchestration				
Data Quality				



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Metadata Management Application						
Data Governance						
Query federation and IN- Memory Analytics						
Virtual Query Layer						
Data Mining						
Real Time Streaming Analytics						
AI Advance Analytical Solution						
ML/Ops						
Business Intelligence Tool						
Monitoring and Observability						
Data Archival Solution						
Rack						
Structure cabling						
SAN Switch						
Object storage						
Tape Library						
Disk To Disk backup appliance						
Virtualization software						
File Security						
Load Balancer						
Any other (Please specify)						
Total Cost of Hardware for DC (C1)						
Cost of Hardware in DR (C2)						
ETL						
CDC						
Streaming data Ingestion						
Data Lakehouse						



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Open table							
Operation Data Store							
Orchestration							
Data Quality							
Metadata Management Application							
Data Governance							
Query federation and IN- Memory Analytics							
Virtual Query Layer							
Data Mining							
Real Time Streaming Analytics							
AI Advance Analytical Solution							
ML/Ops							
Business Intelligence Tool							
Monitoring and Observability							
Data Archival Solution							
Rack							
Structure cabling							
SAN Switch							
Object storage							
Tape Library							
Virtualization software							
File Security							
Load Balancer							
Any other (Please specify)							
Total Cost of Hardware for DR (C2)							
Cost of Hardware for UAT (C3)							
ETL							

CDC							
Streaming data Ingestion							
Data Lakehouse							
Open table							
Operation Data Store							
Orchestration							
Data Quality							
Metadata Management Application							
Data Governance							
Query federation and IN- Memory Analytics							
Virtual Query layer							
Data Mining							
Real Time Streaming Analytics							
AI Advance Analytical Solution							
ML/Ops							
Business Intelligence Tool							
Monitoring and Observability							
Data Archival Solution							
Rack							
Structure cabling							
SAN Switch							
Object storage							
Virtualization software							
File Security							
Load Balancer							
Any other (Please specify)							
Total Cost of Hardware for UAT (C3)							



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Total Hardware Cost (C= C1+C2+C3)						
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

D. Installation and Commissioning Cost

Implementation Phase (18 months)						
	Description	Bidder Effort in Man days	Rate (INR) for Bidder's Resources	Total Amount (INR) (excluding GST)	Total Amount (INR) (including GST)	
D1. For DC						
	ETL					
	CDC					
	Streaming Data Ingestion					
	Data Lakehouse					
	Open Table					
	Operation Data Store					
	Orchestration					
	Data Quality					
	Metadata Management Application					
	Data Governance					
	Query federation and IN- Memory Analytics					
	Virtual Query Layer					
	Data Mining					
	Real Time streaming analytics					
	AI Advance Analytical Solution					
	ML/Ops					
	Business Intelligence tool					
	Monitoring and Observability					
	Data Archival Solution					
	Rack					

Structure Cabling						
SAN Switch						
Object Storage						
Tape Library						
Disk To Disk backup appliance						
Virtualization software						
File security						
Load balancer						
Any other (Please specify)						
Total for DC (D1)						
D2. For DR						
ETL						
CDC						
Streaming Data Ingestion						
Data Lakehouse						
Open Table						
Operation Data Store						
Orchestration						
Data Quality						
Metadata Management Application						
Data Governance						
Query federation and IN- Memory Analytics						
Virtual Query Layer						
Data Mining						
Real Time streaming analytics						
AI Advance Analytical Solution						
ML/Ops						

Business Intelligence tool							
Monitoring and Observability							
Data Archival Solution							
Rack							
Structure Cabling							
SAN Switch							
Object Storage							
Tape Library							
Virtualization software							
Load balancer							
File Security							
Any other (Please specify)							
Total for DR (D2)							
D3. For UAT							
ETL							
CDC							
Streaming data Ingestion							
Data Lakehouse							
Open table							
Operation Data Store							
Orchestration							
Data Quality							
Metadata Management Application							
Data Governance							
Query federation and IN- Memory Analytics							
Virtual Query Layer							
Data Mining							



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Real Time Streaming Analytics					
AI Advance Analytical Solution					
ML/Ops					
Business Intelligence Tool					
Monitoring and Observability					
Data Archival Solution					
Rack					
Structure Cabling					
SAN Switch					
Object Storage					
Virtualization software					
File Security					
Load balancer					
Any other (Please specify)					
Total For UAT (D3)					
Total Installation and Commissioning Cost (D= D1+D2+D3)					

E. Implementation Cost

Implementation Phase (18 months)					
Implementation Costs	Description	Bidder Effort in Man days	Rate (INR) for Bidder's Resources	Total Amount (INR) (excluding GST)	Total Amount (INR) (including GST)
ETL	Implementation				
CDC	Implementation				
Streaming data Ingestion	Implementation				
Data Upload Utility	Implementation				
Data Lakehouse	Implementation				
Open table	Implementation				



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Operation Data Store	Implementation					
Orchestration	Implementation					
Data Quality	Implementation					
Metadata Management Application	Implementation					
Data Governance	Implementation					
Query federation and IN- Memory Analytics	Implementation					
Virtual Query layer	Implementation					
Data Mining	Implementation					
Real Time Streaming Analytics	Implementation					
AI Advance Analytical Solution	Implementation					
ML/Ops	Implementation					
Business Intelligence Tool	Implementation					
Monitoring and Observability	Implementation					
Data Archival Solution	Implementation					
Backup Solution	Implementation					
Reports	Implementation					
Dashboards	Implementation					
Analytical Use case / Models	Implementation					
Data Migration from SAS and MIS	Implementation					
Any Other (Please specify)	Implementation					
Total						

F. AMC cost

	Implementation Period (18 months) and Maintenance and support period (3 years 6 months)				
	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

H. Facility Management Services (FMS) Cost

[illegible]

I. Training Cost

S No	Training Type	Batches	Number of trainees per batch	Training Duration	Rate per batch (INR)	Total Amount (INR) excluding GST	Total Amount (INR) including GST
1	Top Management / Executive Training	2	20	3 days			
2	Data Acquisition Tool	1	10	1 week			
3	Data Lakehouse	1	10	1 week			
4	AI Advanced Analytical Tool	9	20	1 week			
5	BI Tool	5	10	1 week			
6	Archival Tool	1	10	3 days			



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

7	Change Data Capture and streaming	1	10	3 days	
8	Data Governance including Lineage, Meta Data, Master Data Management	1	10	1 week	
Total Training Cost (I)					

J. Other Component Cost

- The MVP cost includes the cost towards the effort in delivering the Minimum Viable product defined in Section 2.3.1
- Integration and interface cost includes the cost towards Integration and Interface of source / downstream applications as explained in Section 1.6
- 500 Man days Effort Cost refers to Additional Customisation Effort that the Bank may or may not undertake. The shortlisted Bidder has to provide the man-days pro-rata cost for any additional customisation applicable across the contract period.

S No	Other Cost parameters	Description	Quantity	Rate (INR) Per MVP/Application/ Man-Day	Total Amount (INR) (excluding GST)	Total Amount (INR) (including GST)
1	MVP cost		1			
2	Integration and Interface Cost for future applications		5			
3	500 Man days Effort cost		500			
	Total Other Component Cost (J)					

General Instructions:

- The shortlisted Bidder is expected to quote the costs for all items required for fully complying with the requirements of the scope of work of the RFP and the corrigendum in the respective sections of the price bid. The prices for the respective sections would be deemed to include all components required to successfully utilise the solution.
- The shortlisted Bidder should quote as per the format of Bill of Material ONLY and a masked replica of the Bill of Material should be enclosed in the technical bid. The masked Bill of Materials which would be submitted as part of the Technical Bill of Material should contain "XX" for ALL the corresponding commercial values. All amounts in the Bill of Material should be in INR only.
- Bank is not responsible for any arithmetic errors in the commercial bid committed by the shortlisted Bidder, however, if there are any computational errors the Bank will evaluate the Bid as per provisions contained under RFP document.
- The shortlisted Bidder has to quote for each line item in the Bill of Material format provided. If any line item is part of the solution proposed in the RFP response, it has to be referenced. If it is not applicable, then the shortlisted Bidder has to mention Not Applicable (NA).
- In case the shortlisted Bidder includes/combines any line item as part of any other line item in the commercial bid, then this has to be clearly mentioned in the description indicating the line item which contains the combination
- The shortlisted Bidder may insert additional line items in the bill of material format provided as applicable based on the solution offered in the respective component formats.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

- The prices quoted by the shortlisted Bidder shall be inclusive of all applicable taxes under the Indian law like customs duty, excise duty, import taxes, freight, forwarding, insurance, delivery, etc. exclusive of only applicable GST which will be paid on actual basis. Any increase in GST will be paid in actuals by the Bank or any new tax introduced by the government will also be paid by the Bank. The entire benefits / advantages, arising out of fall in prices, taxes, duties or any other reason, must be passed on to Bank. The Bank will not pay any out-of-pocket expenses.
- The shortlisted Bidder is expected to specify clearly the type of licences along with the details with respect to quantity, rate, etc., wherever applicable. The license type has to be clearly described in the Description column.
- The bidder should mention the Hardware cost and installation & commission cost in the respective sheet with full breakdown.
- In case of software cost, if subscription licenses are proposed then the subscription license cost needs to be put for every year under Software license cost. The payment of the subscription will be made as per the validity mentioned in the delivered licenses. The payment of the subscription licenses will be made as per the payment terms mentioned in section 4.8.

PRICE STATEMENT:

Bank reserves the right to re-negotiate the price for any of the line items furnished above in case the rates offered are arbitrary and not as per market prices.

Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) for Supply, Installation, Implementation, Integration, and maintenance of Enterprise Data Lakehouse solution for the entire contract period (inclusive of all duties, levies, freight, insurance, warranty, GST etc., is Rs. (in figures) Rupees
..... (in words). (Octroi/ Entry Tax if any, will be reimbursed on submission of original receipts.)

We submit that we shall abide by the details given above and the conditions given in your above tender.

For

Office Seal

Place:

Date:

(Authorised Signatory)

Name:

Designation:

Mobile No:

Business Address:

Telephone No:

E-mail ID:



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Revised Annexure-XXV- Component Mapping

To
 General Manager
 Indian Bank, Head Office,
 ACoE Department, 2nd Floor
 66 Rajaji Salai, Chennai - 600001

Phone: 044-25269703 / 25269701

Dear Sir,

Sub: Request for Proposal (RFP) For Supply, installation, implementation, integration and maintenance of Enterprise data lakehouse solution

Ref: Your RFP No. GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

We _____(Bidder Name & address) have proposed below mentioned component/hardware/software as part of the requirement in the RFP. We confirm that we have not proposed any option in the Bill of material or anywhere in the proposal. We already have back-to-back agreement with the proposed OEMs and submitted MAF for these proposed OEMs. We also confirm that we have taken into consideration 20% of the OEM efforts vs Bidder's effort during implementation phase and 5% of the OEM efforts vs Bidder's effort during maintenance and support phase.

S.NO	Component Name	Proposed OEM	Proposed Solution Name	Proposed Solution version/Make & Model
1	Ingestion tool (Batch, CDC, Streaming)			
2	ETL			
3	Open Table			
4	Operation Data Store			
5	Orchestration			
6	Database at Medallion layer			
7	Meta Data management			
8	Master Data management			
9	Data Governance			
10	Data Quality			
11	Data Lineage and Orchestration			
12	Query Federation and In-memory Analytics			
13	Virtual Query Layer			
14	Data Mining			
15	Real Time Streaming Analytics			



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

16	AI Advance Analytics			
17	ML/Ops			
18	Data Security, Masking, Classification, encryption and privacy			
19	Monitoring and Observability			
20	Server			
21	Backup Solution			
22	Disk to Disk Backup			
23	Object storage			
24	Data Archival			
25	Virtualization software			
26	Visualization software			
27	Tape Library			
28	Structure Cabling			
29	SAN switch			
30	File Security			
31	Load Balancer			

Date: _____

Place: _____

Signature of Authorized Signatory

Name of Signatory:

Designation:

Email ID:

Mobile No:

Telephone No.:

Seal of Company

To
General Manager
Indian Bank, Head Office,
ACoE Department, 2nd Floor,
66 Rajaji Salai, Chennai - 600001
Phone: 044-25269705 / 25269701

Sub: Request for Proposal (RFP) For Supply, installation, integration, and maintenance of Enterprise Data Lakehouse solution

Dear Sir/Madam,

Data Centre Hardware (DC)	DESCRIPTION																		
	Application Tier	Model	Make	Latest Release (Model)	Latest Release (Make)	Cluster type (Active-Active/Active-Passive/Failover to DR/NA)	No. of Cores/ node	No. of RAM/ node	Processor Qty/ Node	Processor Frequency (GHz)	Processor Cache Memory/ Processor (MB)	Hard Disk Quantity	Total Hard Disk Capacity (Raw GB)	Operating System	NIC quantity/ node	NIC Make	Total Cores	Total Memory (GB)	Other Critical Components

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

DESCRIPTION														
Total Production Hardware (A3)														
Total DC-DR Hardware (A1+A2+A3)														

Date: _____

Place: _____

Signature of Authorized Signatory

Name of Signatory:

Designation:

Email ID:

Mobile No:

Telephone No.:

Seal of Company:



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
1	Section I, p.17 (intent: "on-prem with cloud native components"); Section III, 1.4 Target-state Technology Architecture, p.50 (revised by Corrigendum II; S.No 17 — adds "advanced analytics"); Section III, 1.31 (target architecture, p.94 — "cloud-native microservices approach"); Section V, Appendix I — Object Storage / Backup (p.180; "Container Runtime... from a single OEM"); Appendix I — Section 5 Containerisation / Kubernetes (p.181); Appendix I — Item 6.41 Kubernetes deployment (p.185); Appendix I — Item 1.3 Containerisation (p.186)	Mandatory containerisation / Kubernetes requirements across multiple layers and sections	The Bank's stated architectural objective emphasizes a cloud-native approach—i.e., decoupled storage and compute, modular microservices, API-driven services, declarative operations, and cloud portability. However, the current RFP includes multiple clauses mandating containerization / Kubernetes-based deployment, particularly in Appendix I (Infrastructure Requirements), where detailed Kubernetes-specific platform capabilities are prescribed. While containerization is one possible implementation approach, it is not a prerequisite for achieving a cloud-native architecture. There are multiple deployments of modern data platforms amongst PSU and Private Sector banks in the recent years, which are on other deployment architectures (Virtualized / Bare Metal). Accordingly, we request the Bank to remove the mandatory requirement for containerization / Kubernetes from the RFP (including Appendix I – Infrastructure Requirements and related clauses), and instead allow bidders the flexibility to propose the most appropriate deployment architecture. Proposed Clause Wording "The bidder shall propose the deployment topology for each layer that best meets the functional, technical, performance, security, and infrastructure requirements specified in this RFP, in alignment with the Bank's cloud-native objectives and OEM-recommended architecture."
2	8.1 Eligibility Criteria Point – 9 under Bidder Eligibility Criteria	Bidder should have experience of minimum 5 years as on the date of RFP in providing Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse or data analytical service to Scheduled Commercial Banks or Financial regulators in India.	Change Requested: Bidder should have experience of minimum 5 years as on the date of RFP in providing Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse or data analytical service to Scheduled Commercial Banks or Financial regulators or PSUs in India. Justification: in view of larger participation, we are requesting Bank to allow Bidders to submit PSU references in providing Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse or data analytical service
3	8.1 Eligibility Criteria Point – 9 under Bidder Eligibility Criteria		Request the Bank to exclude installation since it is already getting covered in OEM eligibility and not relevant to System Integrator. Request the Bank to increase the duration to 'last 10 years' across the Eligibility & Technical criteria as no large and significant Data Warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solutions has been implemented by Scheduled Commercial Banks or Financial regulator in
			Bank's Reply Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
4	8.1 Eligibility Criteria Point – 10 under Bidder Eligibility Criteria	Bidder should have experience in implementation, integration, installation, maintenance and support of Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Centre production database size of minimum 100 TB (uncompressed), during the last 5 years till the date of release of this RFP in at least ONE of the below 1) Scheduled Commercial Bank in India with minimum 1000 branches and business mix of Rs 3.00 Lakh Crore (or) 2) Financial regulator in India The Data warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solution must include below technologies: 1) Data ingestion (batch, real-time, near real time and DB pull) 2) Data governance, metadata, and master data management 3) Advanced data analytics 4) Business intelligence and reporting tool 5) Storage layer Projects (implementation Phase including report, dashboard and model building) which have not completed to a level of at least 70% will have not completed to a level of at least 70% will not be considered, Percentage completion will be calculated based on the milestone mentioned in the contract and the credential letter submitted by the Bidder showing the milestone completed.	India during the last 5 years period specified owing to COVID19 pandemic especially. Change Requested: Bidder should have experience in implementation, integration, installation, maintenance and support of Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solution with a Data Centre production database size of minimum 100 TB (uncompressed), during the last 5 years till the date of release of this RFP in at least ONE of the below 1) Scheduled Commercial Bank in India with minimum 1000 branches and business mix of Rs 3.00 Lakh Crore (or) 2) Financial regulator in India 3) PSUs The Data warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solution must include below technologies: 1) Data ingestion (batch, real-time, near real time and DB pull) 2) Data governance, data lineage, metadata, and master data management 3) Advanced data analytics 4) Business intelligence and reporting tool 5) Storage layer Projects (implementation Phase including report, dashboard and model building) which have not completed to a level of at least 70% will not be considered, Percentage completion will be calculated based on the milestone mentioned in the contract and the credential letter submitted by the Bidder showing the milestone completed. Justification: in view of larger participation, we are requesting Bank to allow Bidders to submit PSU references for experience in implementation, integration, installation, maintenance and support of Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solution with a Data Centre production database size of minimum 100 TB (uncompressed).
5	Bidder eligibility - point no 10 Supporting Documents	Bidder should submit documentary proof of supply, implementation, integration, installation, maintenance, and support of Data warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse, by providing masked copy of Purchase order / Contract, Completion Certificate (with % completion) or Credential letter on client's letter head providing all the details duly signed and stamped from client. Bidder should submit documentary proof or reference documents for number of branches criteria, database size and business mix and technologies used.	Client email may be submitted along with Purchase order copy of the implementation experience. Bank has the discretion to evaluate and cross verify the authenticity of the documents / proof as deemed necessary evaluation subject to the information are clearly mentioned in the evidences provided.

Bank's Reply

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)				
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification	Bank's Reply
6	Section II, 8.1 Eligibility Criteria — Point 10 Supporting Documents (p.31); and Section II, 8.1 Credential Validation note (p.35)	Internal inconsistency between Point 10 supporting documents (PO + Completion Certificate or Credential Letter) and the Credential Validation note (PO without credential letter is not valid proof)	Point 10 currently allows either (i) masked PO + Completion Certificate (with % completion) or (ii) Credential Letter on client's letterhead. However, the Credential Validation note on p.35 explicitly states that "Purchase orders without accompanying credential letters from the client organization will not be considered as valid proof." The two are inconsistent. Request the Bank to align Point 10 with the Credential Validation note by mandating the Credential Letter from the client—i.e., revise Point 10 supporting documents to require "Credential Letter on client's letterhead, providing all the details duly signed and stamped from client (along with masked copy of Purchase Order / Contract and Completion Certificate with % completion as supporting evidence)" — and remove the "or" alternative.	Bidder needs to submit the masked copy of Purchase order / Contract, Completion Certificate (with % completion). However, the same is not available bidder needs to provide the credentials letter. If all the required information is not available in the Purchase order / Contract, Completion Certificate bidder need to submit the credentials letter with all the required information. This is applicable for both Eligibility and Technical Criteria evaluation
7	8.1 Eligibility Criteria (Sr. No.5 of OEM / Solution provider Eligibility Criteria)	The proposed Data Archival Solution should have been implemented as on RFP release date for Data Warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solution in India in at least one of the below i) Scheduled Commercial Bank having minimum 1000 branches in India (or) ii) Financial Regulators in India Supporting Documents: Bidder should submit documentary proof of by providing masked copy of Purchase order/ Contract with Completion Certificate or Credential letter on client's letter head providing all the details duly signed and stamped from client	Supporting Documents: 1. Whether the UAT signoff can be considered sufficient? Clients hesitate to confirm completion, due to contract complexity. 2. Whether the credential on SI's Letterhead with all details, will be sufficient? Client do not provide credentials direct to OEM.	UAT sign off can be considered. However, Bank in which the same is implemented needs to be the part of the sign off.
8	Section II, 8.1 Eligibility Criteria, Corporate Restructuring clause		Request the Bank to allow submission of credentials and resources from 100% completely owned subsidiaries of the bidding entity registered in India which will help the Bank in leveraging large pool of skilled resources and experience.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum
9	Point — 9 under Revised ANNEXURE-XII – Checklist for the RFP	Eligibility Criteria: Bidder should have experience of minimum 5 years as on the date of RFP in providing Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse or data analytical service to Scheduled Commercial Banks or Financial regulators in India. Supporting Documents: Copy of minimum one purchase order issued or executed that are at least 5 years old, along with certificate/email confirmation of work undertaken from respective	Change Requested: Eligibility Criteria: Bidder should have experience of minimum 5 years as on the date of RFP in providing Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse or data analytical service to Scheduled Commercial Banks or Financial regulators or PSU in India. Supporting Documents: Copy of minimum one purchase order issued or executed that are at least 5 years old, along with certificate/email confirmation of work undertaken from respective	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		confirmation of work undertaken from respective client(s).	client(s). Justification: in view of larger participation, we are requesting Bank to allow Bidders to submit PSU references in providing Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse or data analytical service
10	Point – 10 under Revised ANNEXURE-XII – Checklist for the RFP	Bidder should have experience in implementation, integration, installation, maintenance and support of Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solution with a Data Centre production database size of minimum 100 TB (uncompressed), during the last 5 years till the date of release of this RFP in at least ONE of the below 1) Scheduled Commercial Bank in India with minimum 1000 branches and business mix of Rs 3.00 Lakh Crore (or) 2) Financial regulator in India The Data warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solution must include below technologies: 1) Data ingestion (batch, real-time, near real time and DB pull) 2) Data governance, data lineage, metadata, and master data management 3) Advanced data analytics 4) Business intelligence and reporting tool 5) Storage layer Projects (implementation Phase including report, dashboard and model building) which have not completed to a level of at least 70% will not be considered, Percentage completion will be calculated based on the milestone mentioned in the contract and the credential letter submitted by the Bidder showing the milestone completed.	Change Requested: Bidder should have experience in implementation, integration, installation, maintenance and support of Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solution with a Data Centre production database size of minimum 100 TB (uncompressed), during the last 5 years till the date of release of this RFP in at least ONE of the below 1) Scheduled Commercial Bank in India with minimum 1000 branches and business mix of Rs 3.00 Lakh Crore (or) 2) Financial regulator in India (or) 3) PSUs The Data warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solution must include below technologies: 1) Data ingestion (batch, real-time, near real time and DB pull) 2) Data governance, data lineage, metadata, and master data management 3) Advanced data analytics 4) Business intelligence and reporting tool 5) Storage layer Projects (implementation Phase including report, dashboard and model building) which have not completed to a level of at least 70% will not be considered, Percentage completion will be calculated based on the milestone mentioned in the contract and the credential letter submitted by the Bidder showing the milestone completed. Justification: in view of larger participation, we are requesting Bank to allow Bidders to submit PSU references in providing Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse or data analytical service
11	Bidder Capability Point 1	Bidder should have experience in implementation, integration, installation, maintenance and support of Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solution with a Data Centre production database size of minimum 100 TB (uncompressed), during the last 5 years till the date of release of this RFP in at least one of the below 1) Scheduled Commercial Bank in India with minimum 1000 branches and business mix of Rs 3.00 Lakh Crore (or) 2) Financial regulator in India The Data warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solution must include below technologies: 1)	Request the Bank to kindly consider relaxing the production database size eligibility criterion to 40 TB. Also will request to include reference from NSE, BSE, Central Government organisation like CBDT, GST, Income Tax etc in India
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		Data ingestion (batch, real-time, near real time and DB pull) 2) Data governance, data lineage, metadata, and master data management 3) Advanced data analytics 4) Business intelligence and reporting tool 5) Storage layer Projects (implementation Phase including report, dashboard and model building) which have not completed to a level of at least 70% will not be considered. Percentage completion will be calculated based on the milestone mentioned in the contract and the credential letter submitted by the Bidder showing the milestone completed. Bidder should submit documentary proof by providing masked copy of Purchase order / Contract, Completion Certificate (with % completion) or Credential letter on client's letter head providing all the details duly signed and stamped from client. Additional marks if any one implementation is made in a Public Sector Bank in India	
12	8.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria table 4, Point 1, Bidder Capability Sub Point (i)	Bidder should have experience in implementation, integration, installation, maintenance and support of Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solution with a Data Centre production database size of minimum 100 TB (uncompressed), during the last 5 years till the date of release of this RFP in at least one of the below 1) Scheduled Commercial Bank in India with minimum 1000 branches and business mix of Rs 3.00 Lakh Crore (or) 2) Financial regulator in India The Data warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solution must include below technologies: 1) Data ingestion (batch, real-time, near real time and DB pull) 2) Data governance, data lineage, metadata, and master data management 3) Advanced data analytics 4) Business intelligence and reporting tool 5) Storage layer Projects (implementation Phase including report, dashboard and model building) which have not completed to a level of at least 70% will not be considered. Percentage completion will be calculated based on the milestone mentioned in the contract and the credential	Change Requested: Bidder should have experience in implementation, integration, installation, maintenance and support of Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solution with a Data Centre production database size of minimum 100 TB (uncompressed), during the last 5 years till the date of release of this RFP in at least one of the below 1) Scheduled Commercial Bank in India with minimum 1000 branches and business mix of Rs 3.00 Lakh Crore (or) 2) Financial regulator in India (or) 3) PSU The Data warehouse / Data Lake / Data Lakehouse solution must include below technologies: 1) Data ingestion (batch, real-time, near real time and DB pull) 2) Data governance, data lineage, metadata, and master data management 3) Advanced data analytics 4) Business intelligence and reporting tool 5) Storage layer Projects (implementation Phase including report, dashboard and model building) which have not completed to a level of at least 70% will not be considered. Percentage completion will be calculated based on the milestone mentioned in the contract and the credential letter submitted by the Bidder showing the milestone completed. Bidder should submit documentary proof by providing masked copy of
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		letter submitted by the Bidder showing the milestone completed. Bidder should submit documentary proof by providing masked copy of Purchase order / Contract, Completion Certificate (with % completion) or Credentia letter on client's letter head providing all the details duly signed and stamped from client. Additional marks if any one implementation is made in a Public Sector Bank/ Financial regulator in India Justification: The corrigendum already enlists Financial regulators in India as a reference. Since Financial regulators are public sector entities, we are requesting to allow Additional marks if any one implementation is made in a Financial regulator in India In view of larger participation, we are requesting Bank to allow Bidders to submit PSU references for experience in implementation, integration, installation, maintenance and support of Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solution with a Data Centre production database size of minimum 100 TB (uncompressed).	Purchase order / Contract, Completion Certificate (with % completion) or Credentia letter on client's letter head providing all the details duly signed and stamped from client. Additional marks if any one implementation is made in a Public Sector Bank/ Financial regulator in India Justification: The corrigendum already enlists Financial regulators in India as a reference. Since Financial regulators are public sector entities, we are requesting to allow Additional marks if any one implementation is made in a Financial regulator in India In view of larger participation, we are requesting Bank to allow Bidders to submit PSU references for experience in implementation, integration, installation, maintenance and support of Data warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solution with a Data Centre production database size of minimum 100 TB (uncompressed).
13	8.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria table 4, Point 1, Bidder Capability Sub Point (i)		Request the Bank to increase the duration to 'last 10 years' across the Eligibility & Technical criteria as no large and significant Data Warehouse or Data Lake or Data Lakehouse solutions has been implemented by Scheduled Commercial Banks or Financial regulator in India during the last 5 years period specified owing to COVID19 pandemic especially. Request the Bank to accept confirmation email from Customer as well as proof for successful completion.
14	8.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria table 4, point 5, Adoption of Analytics and Gen AI related innovations. Pg-6 of ADDENDUM / CORRIGENDUM – II	Bidder should possess the following implementation experience during the last 5 years with reference to analytical and advanced analytical capabilities.	Request to relax the criteria to "during the last 7 years" as given in the original RFP Clause.
15	8.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria - Pt. 5, - Adoption of Analytics and Gen AI related innovations	The Bidder should submit certificate or email from client with the copy of Purchase Order / Agreement / Satisfactory Proof to the effect.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum
16	8.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Use cases under implementation will not be considered for evaluation. The Bidder should submit certificate or email from client with the copy of Purchase Order / Agreement / Satisfactory Proof to the effect. The proof should clearly mention details of analytics / Gen AI use cases implemented. On-going projects may be considered. However, the Gen AI / Deep	Yes, Bank has the discretion to evaluate supporting documents / proof as deemed necessary for evaluation subject to information are clearly mentioned in evidences provided . Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)				
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification	Bank's Reply
		Learning and AI use case should have been implemented as on date of bid submission.	should have been implemented as on date of bid submission.	
17	Clause 1.2 + 1.22	Reports and dashboards must be bilingual (English + Hindi) per RBI Master Circular. Will Bank provide Hindi terminology and Rajhasha-approved translations, or is the bidder responsible for translation of all 650 reports + 300 dashboards?	Translation effort and cost significant; quality must be Rajhasha-approved.	It will be the bidder's responsibility. How during UAT phase Bank will provide the sig
18	Clause 1.2 #18	Bank says it will 'help bidder coordinate with existing vendors' but bidder must liaise with TCS BaNCS, debit card, treasury vendors etc. What is the formal SLA for response from these vendors? Will Bank treat any delay as outside bidder's control for SLA purposes?	Multi-vendor coordination risk; major delay vector.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum
19	Clause 1.3 + 1.6	Bank uses CBS (TCS BaNCS). Will TCS BaNCS data dictionary, schema, and DB Link access details be shared at PO?	Critical for ingestion design.	Bank will arrange all the meetings with required vendors, Bank will try to arrange all required information on best effort basis.
20	Clause 1.3	Current pull is from CBS Flash Server via DB Link. Will the bidder receive direct credentials, or must access be brokered through TCS BaNCS team? What is the throttle / window for extraction?	Pull window and bandwidth materially affect ingestion design.	The windows is given in the RFP that all extraction and transformation should be within 3 hr. after EOD. All the required business reports / dashboards scheduled for daily should be generated in the 3 hr window.
21	Clause 1.3 + 1.8	MIS has ~50,000 tables. Is this 50,000 unique tables, or does it include partitions / temp / staging? Realistic count of business-critical tables that must be migrated?	Major sizing variable — could be 5,000 actual business tables vs 50,000.	These are not unique tables, Bank stores daily backup with the nomenclature of the table name suffixed with the date.
22	Clause 1.3	Current ETL is Java programs (vendor-maintained). Will the Java source code be made available to the new bidder, or must the bidder reverse-engineer from data flows?	Reverse-engineering 1,800 reports' source ETL is months of work.	Bank will arrange all the meetings with required vendors, Bank will try to arrange all required information on best effort basis.
23	Multiple	RFP mentions several existing Bank tools: Oracle PULA, SAS 9.4, Power BI (Azure), IBM API Gateway, ITSM (unnamed), SIEM (unnamed), SOC, AD/LDAP, HSM (unnamed), PAM/PIM (unnamed). Can the Bank provide a consolidated list of existing IT estate components the new DLH must integrate with, with product names and versions?	Single most important integration clarification.	The details are provided in the RFP and subsequent corrigendum / pre bid query response dated 05/05/2026. Please be guided accordingly
24	Clause 1.3 (37 models)	37 SAS analytical models exist today. Will Bank provide SAS code (incl. macros), variable lists, dependencies, scoring schedules, business logic documentation for the bidder to convert/migrate to the DLH?	Without SAS code, the migration is reverse-engineering; major effort and risk.	Bank will provide the required information on SAS model

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			Clarification	Bank's Reply
S. No	Paragraph	Description		
25	Clause 1.3	Power BI is currently hosted on Microsoft Azure. Is the Bank requiring the new DLH solution to be entirely on-prem (i.e., move all Power BI dashboards off Azure), or will Power BI remain on Azure and just connect to the on-prem DLH?	Architecturally very different; affects sizing, security, license counts.	All the implementation will be on prem.
26	1.3 - Current Landscape	Table 5 outlines the current data landscape, highlighting the platforms in use, data volumes, integration methods, and their respective business functions	What is volume of data expected every day? Daily volume in GB for CDC Peak time volume in GB for CDC Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned	The details are provided in the RFP and subsequent corrigendum / pre bid response dated 05/05/2026. Please be guided accordingly
27	Oracle	The Bank has executed a Perpetual Unlimited License Agreement (PULA) with Oracle, covering a comprehensive suite of database and middleware components	What are the related license we need to factor when we can leverage PULA? Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned	Please refer to RFP section 1.3 and subsequent corrigendum dated 05/05/2026
28	1.3 - Current Landscape	Data Governance	Are there any vendors assessments that will be in-scope? i.e. review of existing controls in third party assessment. Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
29	General		How many Java programs have been developed to load data into the MIS database?	Details will be shared with successful bidder
30	General		How many SAS DI ETL jobs are currently in place to load data into the SAS database?	Details will be shared with successful bidder
31	General		Do the existing SAS reports and dashboards fall within the 650-reports & 300 dashboards scope outlined in this RFP?	Yes, your understanding is correct.
32	Section III – 1.4	Kindly confirm that the BI, reporting and visualization layer must be deployed entirely on-premise, co-located with the on-premise data lakehouse, with no dependency on any public-cloud or SaaS-hosted component for core BI functionality.	Minimises query latency through data-locality and keeps all data within the Bank's perimeter, consistent with the on-prem mandate.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum
33	1.4 - Target Architecture	Proposed solution must be cloud ready and require minimum efforts for migration to public, hybrid, and multi cloud environments.	How does the Bank define "cloud-ready"? Should the platform support: (e.g, container portability, cloud object storage compatibility) Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned	The specifications / requirements are mentioned in the Appendix 1 and the scope is mentioned in Section III of the RFP.
34	1.4 - Target Architecture	The solution needs to integrate with monitoring, incident management, logging, helpdesk and 360-degree security prevention and monitoring tools available in the Bank	Can the Bank share the list & versions of these existing tools? Examples needed for integration design: e.g. SIEM, ITSM/helpdesk system, Monitoring systems, Endpoint security tools etc. Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned	The details are already available in the RFP and the subsequent corrigendum dated 05/05/2026. Please be guided accordingly.
35	1.4 - Target Architecture	The platform must support cloud-native functions on hyperscalers such as AWS, Azure, and GCP, if required.	Should the Lakehouse support native integrations with cloud-native warehouse engines (e.g., BigQuery, Synapse), storage APIs (S3/ADLS/GCS), Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned.	The specifications / requirements are mentioned in the Appendix 1 and the scope is mentioned in Section III of the RFP.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
36	RFP: 1.4 Target-state Technology Architecture	The solution deployment must be container-based at BI, Reporting, visualization, analytics and data ingestion layer.	Request to allow VM based approach for BI/Reporting workloads. The below is the rationale. BI & Reporting workloads are stable and predictable, with consistent user concurrency and capacity planned based on yearly growth—not minute-by-minute fluctuations. Introducing containerization at this layer adds unnecessary complexity (orchestration, session management, memory overhead, and operational burden) without delivering meaningful scalability benefits. Further, container restarts can clear in-memory caches, leading to performance degradation. In contrast, VM-based deployment maintains persistent session state and query optimizations, ensuring better performance and simpler capacity planning in high-user environments. Containerization is better suited for the Data Ingestion layer, where workloads are variable and require elastic scaling. Therefore, a VM-based approach for BI & Reporting ensures operational simplicity, predictable performance, and alignment with BFSI requirements.
37	Clause 1.5 + 1.19 (Corr-II #21, #23)	60 analytical use cases in total. 20 indicative in Annexure-XX + 40 will be informed during execution. (a) How long after PO will Bank finalize the 40 list? (b) Will use cases be of similar complexity to the 20 indicative? (c) Can bidder push back if a use case requires data that doesn't exist?	Request to allow VM based approach for BI/Reporting workloads. The below is the rationale. BI & Reporting workloads are stable and predictable, with consistent user concurrency and capacity planned based on yearly growth—not minute-by-minute fluctuations. Introducing containerization at this layer adds unnecessary complexity (orchestration, session management, memory overhead, and operational burden) without delivering meaningful scalability benefits. Further, container restarts can clear in-memory caches, leading to performance degradation. In contrast, VM-based deployment maintains persistent session state and query optimizations, ensuring better performance and simpler capacity planning in high-user environments. Containerization is better suited for the Data Ingestion layer, where workloads are variable and require elastic scaling. Therefore, a VM-based approach for BI & Reporting ensures operational simplicity, predictable performance, and alignment with BFSI requirements.
38	Clause 1.5 + 1.22 (Corr-II #25)	650 reports + 300 dashboards (revised numbers). RFP says 'Bidder needs to do rationalization of reports and dashboards further after getting all report formats and logics.' Can the bidder reduce the scope from 650 with Bank's consent, with no cost impact?	Common to find 30–40% redundancy in legacy reports.
39	Clause 1.5	Bidder needs to liaise with each department + MIS/ACOE team to gather report formats and logic. Are there existing data dictionaries, source-to-target mappings, and report specifications that can be shared at PO, or does the bidder need to reverse-engineer everything?	Reverse engineering 1800 existing reports + 300 dashboards is a 6-9 month effort; significant if no docs.
40	Clause 1.5 (Existing) + Corr-II	RFP says 'Bidder needs to suggest new use cases and models which can be leveraged during implementation.' Are 'new use cases' during the implementation phase by the bidder including any new suggestion from bidder. However any new additional use case a	A total of 60 analytical models to be developed during the implementation phase by the bidder including any new suggestion from bidder. However any new additional use case a

Bank's Reply
 Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

List of use cases will be finalized on mutual acceptance with the successful bidder.

Bank has already done rationalising activities at their end. Even then bank wants to further reduce the number. However 650 reports to be developed during the implementation phase by the bidder.

Bank will arrange all the meetings with required departments. Bank will try to arrange all the required information on best effort basis. However the bidder needs to factor the action as part of their scope as well.

A total of 60 analytical models to be developed during the implementation phase by the bidder including any new suggestion from bidder. However any new additional use case a



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		counted within the 60 total or in addition? Are they at incremental cost?	Bank's Reply from the total number mentioned in the RFP go through the change request process
41	Clause 1.6	List of upcoming systems. What is the expected go-live date of each? Is integration with these systems within bidder's 18-month implementation, or follow-up COs?	The applications are under implementation expected to be completed within 18 months during the implementation phase of the project. In case of any delay in Go Live of the applications, then integration to the proposed DLH solution will be done in later phase.
42	Clause 1.6 + Resources Table 19	Key resource (Banking Domain Expert) needs 10+ years TCS BaNCS hands-on. Will Bank provide CBS data dictionary, schema documentation, and integration support? Will TCS BaNCS team (Bank's vendor) be available for coordination meetings during BRD/SRS phase?	Bank will arrange all the meetings with required vendors, Bank will try to arrange all required information on best effort basis.
43	Clause 1.6	RFP mentions future unstructured sources (social media, CRISIL, IMD, Bloomberg, CCTV footage). Which of these are in-scope from Year 1 vs. future? CCTV footage in particular has very different volumetric / storage / processing implications.	All these external sources are required to be integrated during the implementation phase based on business requirements. For CCTV, bidder need not store whole media.
44	Clause 1.6	RFP lists future applications (CRM, Call Centre, EWS, EFRM, Credit Card) and says 'Bidder must propose a flexible design.' Are integrations to be built at the time of those system go-lives within this contract, or are they out-of-scope until separately ordered?	Yes, these integrations to be built at the time those system go-lives within this contract as per the terms and conditions of the RFP
45	Clause 1.6	External sources (CIBIL, RBI, etc.) — does the Bank have existing API/SFTP feeds the bidder can plug into, or does the bidder need to negotiate access?	Bank will provide the links for the feed. Bidder need not factor the same in Bill of Material.
46	Clause 1.6	File upload portal — RBAC-controlled, maker-checker. Expected concurrent users, daily file count, average/peak file size? Is malware scan to use Bank's existing scanner (which) or bidder-supplied?	Antimalware and Antivirus will be provided to the Bank. However the file stripping and in-scanning utility combined with the specific requirements mentioned in the Appendix I should be provided by the bidder for the files, semi-structured unstructured data coming into the Bank's Lakehouse.
47	1.6 Existing Data sources	There are some future applications in pipeline of implementation or procurement or change of solution (Few such applications are CRM, Call centre, EWS, EFRM and Credit Card application). As the Bank undergoes transformation across various functions,	The systems are under implementation and integration will be done as and when the systems go live as per the terms and conditions of the RFP.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		additional systems may be on-boarded for ingestion into the Data Lakehouse as required. The Bidder must propose a flexible and scalable design that can accommodate integration of future systems beyond those already mentioned in this RFP. These systems must be considered for both, as a source system for data ingestion to DLH and as downstream applications for consumption from DLH.	
48	Data Upload Utility		• Should the portal integrate with Enterprise IAM? If so let us know system
49	Data Upload Utility		• Is there any existing API Gateway/Middleware we need to integrate with?
50	Data Upload Utility		• What is the expected upload response time SLAs?
51	Data Upload Utility		• How many user roles are expected: o Maker, Checker, Admin, Viewer?
52	Data Upload Utility		What is the expected number of files uploaded per day/week/month? What is the average and maximum file size expected (MB/GB)? What is the expected concurrency (number of users uploading simultaneously)?
53	Data Upload Utility		Who are the users to this portal?
54	Data Upload Utility		Is there need of bulk approval/rejection capability?
55	Data Upload Utility		How many level of approvals required ?
56	Data Upload Utility		The file upload requirement can be met through an SFTP-based file push mechanism. Users from source applications can upload their files in the SFTP location, from which they will be ingested into the data lake. Is the bank still expecting a portal-based file upload utility?
57	Clause 1.7.1	≤5% resource utilization impact on production source. How is this measured, and what penalty applies if exceeded? Is the bidder responsible if source app team complains?	Operational risk; needs measurement methodology.
58	Clause 1.7.1 (Corr-II #19) + Annexure-XXI	Corr-II added: '60% batch, 40% real-time/near-real-time.' Can the Bank share the per-source	Affects CDC license cost (per-core typically) and architecture sizing.
			Bank's Reply
			Yes the portal needs to integrate and the details of IAM will be shared with successful bidder.
			Yes. Bank uses IBM API gateway.
			Please be guided by the SLA of the RFP.
			All the required roles like maker, checker, admin, viewer etc. will be required.
			Details will be shared with successful bidder.
			All the business users as well as users from zonal, head office etc. will be using this portal.
			Yes, your understanding is correct as well as versioning and duplication upload check some of the very basic controls which will be required.
			Minimum 2 and maximum 4.
			Please be guided by the RFP scope and mentioned in the RFP.
			The source systems are already under monitoring. If any abnormal increase in reutilization due to the CDC activities reported by the source system will have direct implication on the bidder then bidder needs to fine tune same as a P1 ticket. All the penalties applicable for P1 ticket will be applicable.
			Please refer to ANNEXURE-XXI for Col Extraction Type



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		identification (which sources are real-time/near-real-time) from Annexure-XXI? Bidder needs to size CDC tools accurately (Bank stated 120 Oracle cores).	
59	1.7.1 Strategy and Architecture	Business Understanding	Does the Bank have documented BRDs, FRDs, source-to-target mappings, and existing ETL logic that can be shared with the Bidder? Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned.
60	Data ingestion from multiple modes	Kindly confirm that required interfaces, SFTP, API access, certificates, and connectivity will be provided.	Required for data ingestion setup, Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is confirmed
61	RFP 1.7, p.52: 'unstructured data including CCTV footage': Annexure-XXI: CCTV listed as a source. RFP §1.18, p.76: 'available APIs of Twitter (X) streams, Facebook posts, Google Analytics'	unstructured data including CCTV footage', available APIs of Twitter (X) streams, Facebook posts, Google Analytics'	Request Bank to rationalize this ask as these may not be viable.
62	Section III, 1.7.1 <i>Strategy and Architecture</i> — Point 19 (<i>introduced via Corrigendum II, S.No 19</i>)	"Bidder needs to provision the CDC tools considering 120 cores of Oracle data sources and the number of sources identified for Near real-time data as mentioned in Annexure XXI."	Request the Bank to clarify: (a) whether the 120 cores refers to physical or virtual cores; (b) whether these are Intel x86 or IBM Power cores (CDC tool licensing differs materially); and (c) whether the 120 cores cover all CDC / near-real-time source systems identified in Annexure XXI - Oracle + Non-Oracle, or only the Oracle sources. If only Oracle, request the Bank to share the per-application core / CPU breakup for the remaining CDC / real-time sources to enable accurate CDC-tool sizing and licensing.
63	1.7.3 Batch Data Ingestion	Aadhaar Data Vault	Does the Bank have existing integration APIs and documentation for Aadhaar Data Vault? Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned
64	Clause 1.8	37 SAS models + 8,100 tables + 200 temp tables to migrate. Acceptable target languages: Python (PySpark), R, Scala? Will Bank provide SAS-specific business rule documentation?	Affects skill mix in resource plan.
65	Corrigendum C. Hardware cost:	The price format is asking for Non production pricing for both DC & DR which is contradicting to the statement made in corrigendum on page no 177 as per below: Bidder need not to replicate the Non Production environment at DR location. RFP terms requires the Non Production environment to be provisioned at DR location instead of DC Location.	PI clarify.
66	Object Storage	S3-compatible, multi-protocol object storage • High-throughput, high-density, petabyte-scale storage optimized for analytical workloads •	Do we need fully populated Object storage, we suggest that it should be based on the data type if more data is structured then Block storage will better



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		Full integration with Open Table Formats, enabling reliable, transactional tables over object storage • Accelerated performance for Data Engineering and Data Analytics Workloads using object storage directly	performance and scale and object storage is overkill, please reconsiderPlease provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned
67	Section 1.10 / 1.12.3	Should the metadata catalog and business glossary support semantic relationships (e.g., linking KPIs, reports, data sources, and business terms) to enable contextual search and impact analysis?	Knowledge graph built from: RFP/policy documents, regulatory circulars (RBI, IBA), CBS/CRM data, CRILIC records. Bank staff query in natural language; graph grounds the answers. LLM Graph Builder can auto-construct the knowledge graph from existing documents.
68	Section 1.23 / 1.11	How does the Bank envision identity resolution across disparate systems for Customer 360 (e.g., handling conflicting identifiers, householding, and relationship hierarchies), and is there a preference for graph-based relationship modeling to support real-time linkage and deduplication?	Data Lineage, Deduplication, Golden record creation, meta data management as well as graphical dashboard and analytics are already part of the RFP and specifications of solution has already been defined in Appendix I.
69	Clause 1.12	Bank has DQ Index portal with 25 parameters since FY24-25. What are these parameters, current DQ scores, and which sources are most problematic? Is bidder responsible for fixing source data quality?	Bidder is not responsible to fix the source data, Bidder needs to provide proper alerts notifications (reports and emails) to stakeholders. Bidder also needs to track or improvement and aging of the issues.
70	Section 1.12 / 1.10 / 1.14	What level of granularity is expected for data lineage (column-level vs dataset-level), and does the Bank require lineage to capture relationships across systems, transformations, and business entities in a queryable format?	Lineage will be required at attribute level source to consumption layer with all kind transformation and capturing real time update
71	Section III, 1.13 Logical Data Model — subsection Enterprise Information Model (EIM)	The Bidder must provide an Enterprise Information Model to the Bank.	The RFP explicitly states that the EIM should "metadata and entity relationship focused" serve as a "strategic blueprint for management." It is not prescribing a physical schema. The Bank is asking for conceptual and logical data model that spans banking domains — customer, accounts, loans, products, financial segments — which is equally applicable and necessary in a Lakshmi environment. The bidder is free to propose modern, modular, banking-domain-specific — including a Universal Data Model for metadata — that aligns with open table format



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
			Bank's Reply principles. The data structures must be provided to work in BFSI enterprises. Please be guided by the RFP.
72	Section III, 1.15 Data Security and Privacy Management — sub-part E Network and Infrastructure Security, Point 6; and Section V, Appendix I – Technical & Functional Requirements, File Security, Item 6.2	"The solution should apply file sanitization technology by stripping files of potentially harmful or malicious content and apply file based DLP feature to identify/flag or alert PII and sensitive content discovered."	DLP and malicious-content / file-sanitization are enterprise-wide security capabilities that are typically deployed and operated as bank-wide platforms — and the Bank already has an enterprise DLP (Forcepoint), with which the proposed solution will integrate (Appendix I, Item 4.12, p.189). Embedding a separate file-sanitization and file-based DLP capability inside the Data Lakehouse solution will (a) duplicate enterprise tooling, (b) create policy and governance fragmentation versus the Bank's enterprise DLP, and (c) add a substantial cost element to the bid, which is avoidable. Request the Bank to remove the DLP and file-sanitization product requirements from the bidder's scope — specifically delete Section 1.15 sub-part E Point 6 (p.97) and Appendix I Item 6.2 (p.183). The proposed solution will continue to integrate with the Bank's enterprise DLP (Forcepoint) as already required under Appendix I, Item 4.12 — sufficient to enforce the Bank's enterprise data-loss-prevention policy across the Lakehouse environment.
73	Clause 1.15, 1.27	UAT/SIT environments require representative data. Will Bank provide anonymized/masked production data, or does bidder need to generate synthetic data? Per DPDP, real customer data in non-prod is risky.	Bidder needs to generate the masked anonymized data based on the production data
74	1.15 Security	Security Integration	The details are already available in the RFP the subsequent corrigendum dated 05/05/2026. Please be guided accordingly.
75	Clause 1.16	What are the retention periods by data category (transactions, audit logs, customer data, marketing data)? Is RBI 8/10-year retention the baseline, or are there longer periods?	Please refer to RFP section III clause 1.16.
76	Section III, 1.16 Data Archival (p.69); Section V, Appendix I — Tape Library, Item 7 and sub-items (p.185); Section V, Appendix II — Commercial Bid, Tape Library line item under DC Hardware (p.231)	Tape and Tape Library supply for archival post Year 7	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
			storage-environment dependencies that degrade reliability if held idle; (c) the cost is loaded into the bid for capacity that will not be exercised until well into the FMS phase. Request the Bank to adopt a "buy-later" / staggered approach — i.e., the tape library and tape media to be procured fresh at / near the time of first archival cut-over (Year 7), similar to the approach commonly adopted by other large PSU banks. Specifically request: (i) revision of Section 1.16 to remove upfront tape / tape library supply; (ii) removal of the Tape Library technical specifications from the Day-1 supply scope in Appendix I, Item 7; and (iii) removal of the Tape Library line item from the Day-1 DC Hardware cost block in Appendix II Commercial Bid (p.231).
77	1.17: Backup Solution and Restoration	Backup Solution and Restoration	What is the size of FE data to be back up and what is the retention period. Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned
78	Clause 1.17 + 4.21 Operations	Daily backup must run; backup failure penalty Rs.1L/instance. What's the RPO/RTO and retention required for backup (e.g., 30-day rolling + 7-year archived)?	Backup capacity sizing depends entirely on this.
79	Clause 1.18 (Corr-II #31)	Query federation across multiple databases — what is the list of databases to federate (Oracle, MongoDB, Db2, Hadoop, etc.)? Is the Bank's IBM API Gateway acting as a federation layer, or just an API gateway?	Federation architecture differs materially based on this.
80	Clause 1.19 (Corr-II #24)	Corr-II strengthened wording: 'All data, models and associated logs must reside in Bank DC/DR.' Does this preclude any use of cloud-based LLM APIs (e.g., calling OpenAI/Anthropic/Gemini)? Must all LLMs be on-prem (e.g., Llama, IBM Granite, Mistral self-hosted)?	Fundamental architecture decision for GenAI use cases.
81	Section 1.19 / 1.20	What is the expected size of fraud/AML investigation graphs (e.g., number of nodes and edges per case, depth of traversal required)?	GraphRAG: combine Neo4j knowledge graph traversal with vector similarity search. LLMs receive both semantic context (vector) and structured relational facts (graph) — dramatically improving accuracy and auditability.
82	Section 1.19 / GenAI Scoring Criteria	Is the Bank exploring integration of LLMs with enterprise data (e.g., RAG architectures), and would there be a requirement for a structured knowledge layer to improve explainability and contextual reasoning?	LLM are not part of the current scope.

Please refer to section 1.16 and 1.17.

Please refer to RFP section III clause 1.17.

Please refer to ANNEXURE-XXI column database type. Bank API gateway will access only API gateway and not the Query federation

All the implementation will be on prem.

Details will be shared with successful bidder



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)				
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification	Bank's Reply
83	Section 1.19	Out of the 80 analytical use cases planned, how many are expected to involve: Network analysis Pathfinding Entity relationship modeling Recommendation engines		Details will be shared with successful bidder.
84	1.19 AI and Advanced Analytical Solution		Please share the AI/ML Use Cases that bank wants to implement.	Sample use cases are already defined in RFP. Other use case details will be shared in the successful bidder.
85	1.19 AI and Advanced Analytical Solution		Please share the Machine Learning Model details. Which Model are we planning to use ?	Sample use cases are already defined in RFP. Other use case details will be shared in the successful bidder.
86	1.19 AI and Advanced Analytical Solution	All data and models must reside in Bank's DC/DR, including GenAI outputs and logs.	For GenAI, what are the required LLM governance controls (prompt logging, safety filters, red-teaming, hallucination checks, PHI/PII leak prevention)? Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned	Implementation of GEN AI is not in the scope of this RFP.
87	Section III, 1.22 Reporting — <i>Regulatory Reports</i> (sub-section, p.76) and Items 22 & 23 (p.78); Section V, Appendix I – Technical & Functional Requirements, Item 8.10 <i>Regulatory & Compliance Reporting</i> (p.213)	Regulatory reporting scope — coverage of CIMS, ADF, EBR, ADEPT submissions; XBRL/XML/CSV export; integration with RBI's SADP portal; "support XBRL conversion and enable direct upload to regulatory portals".	Regulatory submission to RBI / other regulators is typically operated by the Bank through a dedicated enterprise regulatory reporting platform (e.g., IRIS / Polaris IRIS-style tools) which handles XBRL/EBR/ADF/CIMS templates, taxonomy versions, validation, sign-off workflow, and direct submission to RBI portals (SADP, etc.). Embedding this submission-tooling capability inside the Data Lakehouse will duplicate the Bank's existing regulatory reporting platform and create dual-source / version-control issues at submission time. Request the Bank to confirm: (a) the Data Lakehouse scope is limited to generating and provisioning the underlying data / required fields for regulatory reports which will be provided to the downstream regulatory reporting platform.	The scope of the RFP is to generate the reports in the various formats suitable to submit Regulatory reports. However wherever requirement for direct submission of data to portal is raised, data lakehouse should be able to generate and provide underlying data to regulatory reporting platform.
88	Section 1.22	Are there regulatory or internal reporting requirements that involve tracing relationships across entities (e.g., connected exposures, related-party transactions), and what is the expected scale?		Yes. Relevant details will be shared with successful bidder.
89	Clause 1.23	Customer 360 must span CBS, lending, deposits, cards, treasury, digital. Is there an existing Customer Master / MDM at the bank to extend, or is this greenfield? What's the expected golden record completeness % (e.g., 95% match accuracy)?	MDM build is itself a 6-9 month effort with very different sizing.	Bank does not have any MDM in place.
90	Clause 1.24	What is the Bank's existing monitoring stack (e.g., ServiceNow ITSM, Splunk SIEM, Nagios,	Affects integration effort and licenses.	Bidder needs to integrate with all the required monitoring and security tools.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
91	Section III, 1.26 Benchmarking; Section III, 1.27 Testing (Data Migration Audit and Functional & Acceptance Testing); Section V, Appendix II – Commercial Bid, Other Component Cost (Item 1: External Agency Cost)	BMC TrueSight)? Are integrations to all these mandatory, or is the bidder free to propose its own stack? External Agency requirement for Benchmarking, Data Migration Audit, and Functional & Acceptance Testing — including the corresponding line item under Other Component Cost in the Commercial Bid.	External testing, benchmarking, and migration-audit agencies need to be independent of the SI for objectivity and audit defensibility. The current construct — where the bidder proposes the agency, signs a tripartite agreement with it, and bears 100% of its cost — creates a structural conflict of interest where the agency that audits the bidder is contracted and paid by the bidder. In other PSU contracts, these agencies have been contracted by the respective PSU banks themselves. Similarly, request the Bank to remove this requirement from the bidder's scope and instead independently empanel and contract these agencies directly. Bidder will fully support the agencies with required artifacts, environments, test data, coordination and remediation. Specifically, request deletion of: (a) Section 1.26 (p.82) — bullets starting "The bidder must propose an external benchmarking agency..."; "The Bank and the Bidder shall enter into an agreement with the external benchmarking agency..."; "The Bidder will bear 100% of the costs for the external benchmarking agency", and the related Corrigendum II S.No 26 addition; (b) Section 1.27 (p.83–85) — the entire "External Testing and Data Migration Audit agency" sub-section including the requirement to propose the agency, the tripartite agreement clause, and "The Bidder will bear 100% of the costs for the external testing and data migration audit agency"; (c) Section V, Appendix II, Other Component Cost, Item 1 "External Agency Cost" — sub-items (a) Benchmarking Cost, (b) Data Migration Audit Cost, (c) Functional and Acceptance Testing Cost — and the associated bullet "The external agency cost includes the cost of engagement of external testing agency to perform Data Migration Audit, Benchmarking and testing as defined in Section 1.26".
92	1.26	Bidder must conduct one consolidated benchmark for DLH covering all the components of the solution from ingestion layer to consumption and visualization layer.	We request the Bank to remove and exclude benchmarking from the scope of this RFP. Such benchmarking exercises are generally synthetic in nature. Additionally, leading OEM platforms sw/hw
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		Benchmarking exercise should be done on 3rd year workload.	proposed under this RFP are supported by globally validated reference architectures and have been successfully deployed in large banking environments. Further, benchmarking exercises, if needed, are typically conducted prior to the bid evaluation process.
93	RFP Clause 1.26	Benchmarking Test: The extrapolation method of data to attain the 3rd year sizing should be according to the business projection provided in the RFP and the same should be discussed and finalized with the Bank at the time of finalizing the strategy of benchmarking.	1. PI share the infrastructure benchmarking parameters which are not provided. The data volume is already mentioned in storage sizing. The query mix criteria will mutually discussed during the benchmark strategy finalization. The pass/fail criteria will be governed by the SLA mentioned in the RFP. Run will happen if any criteria is failed. If failure is due to hardware sizing, then bid will need to augment the same and then re-run will happen.
94	RFP Clause 1.26	The bidder must propose an external benchmarking agency having benchmarking experience in two (2) Scheduled Commercial Banks with at least 1000 branches in India in areas of Data warehouse/ Data Lake/ Data Lakehouse.	Request bank to relax the clause ,modified clause is: The bidder must propose an external benchmarking agency having benchmarking experience in one Scheduled Banks with at least 200 branches in India in areas of Data warehouse/ Data Lake/ Data Lakehouse/ETL. Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
95	Clause 1.27	Functional & Acceptance Testing and Data Migration Audit will be done by an external agency. Will Bank engage and pay this agency separately, or does the bidder need to factor cost? Is there a defined SLA between this agency and the bidder for sign-off turnaround?	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.
96	1.27, 1.29 and all other places in the RFP	Re-sale	The Parties agree as below: - All Goods including any hardware, software or 3rd party material required for successful completion of the project will be provided to Bank on a resale basis. Bidder and Bank shall execute a resale agreement in the form and format provided with Bidder's proposal. - All terms and conditions corresponding to the Goods or hardware, software or 3rd party material (such as delivery, inspection, audit, performance, SLA, penalties, warranties, liabilities, solution uptime, functional guarantee etc.) in the RFP shall not apply to Bidder and shall be dealt under the relevant documentation (EULA, Licensing term) between the OEM and Bank. For the purpose of clarity, Bidder shall have no liability (including SLA, solution uptime, resolution time for 3rd party materials etc.) arising out of failure of any Goods or 3rd party material (including hardware/software).



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)				
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification	Bank's Reply
97	Clause 1.28 + Table 24	Training is paid 100% per batch. What is the expected number of batches, participants per batch, training locations, training duration per batch, and target audience (admins, developers, business users)?	Bidder cannot price 'Training' line without batch count.	Please refer to RFP section III clause 1.28.
98	Clause 1.29 + 4.13	Contract is 5 years + extendable 2 years. If extended, what growth rate (15-20% YoY) should bidder assume for Year-6 and Year-7 hardware?	Long-term commercial planning.	Growth rate will be mutually discussed with vendor.
99	Section III, 1.29 Technical requirements (Hardware, Software, volumetric etc.) Active Active DC DR	The RFP specifies that the DC-DR setup should operate in an Active-Active mode; however, it also mentions an RTO of 2 hours and an RPO of 30 minutes. In most implementations we have observed, a defined RTO and RPO are typically associated with an Active-Passive configuration. Requesting clarification on the expected architecture and recovery requirements, as the current expectation appears contradictory and may also not be cost effective. Additionally, in an Active-Active DC-DR setup, there could still be a minimal synchronization lag between the two sites (for example, around 5 minutes). We assume the Bank would be agreeable to such a configuration.		The Active – Active criteria refer here that Database and the application installed on DR will not be in standby mode, the data will be in mount mode with read only permissions so that the same can be utilized. The queries which are running on the DR will not run on and there is clear segregation mentioned in last corrigendum. The data is not stale as long running queries will not run on continuous modify data so instead of blocking the resources at DC the ideal resources at will be utilized to get the required result this not only enhance the performance at DC also bank will have adequate ROI from the investment.
100	Clause 1.29.1	UAT/SIT must be at DR location. Is this physically at the same Mumbai DR data centre, sharing infrastructure, or a separate UAT-dedicated rack?	Affects DC space, power, cabling requirements.	UAT rack will be different than the production rack.
101	Section III, 1.29.1 Environments	The DC and DR should be designed in Active-Active configuration mode so that all the ad-hoc and long running queries, and model training needs are automatically redirected to the DR environment based on the user access	Basis the prebid queries & corrigendum clarification bank has asked for active DR for processing read only queries with a lag of 60 minutes. We would like to clarify that the bank is only looking for active DR for lakehouse data & business reporting on continuous basis with lag not more than 60 mins. We would request the Bank to note the following : Active-Active DR doubles the cost of licenses compared to Active Passive. This is not useful for the Bank as the program gets delivered and usage of it evolves. What we recommend is Bank considers this : (1) Keep the current ask as active-passive DR with provision in solution to become active-active later (2) Once the program is fully delivered and usage reaches optimal level, bank at its discretion can purchase additional	The Active – Active criteria refer here that Database and the application installed on DR will not be in standby mode, the data will be in mount mode with read only permissions so that the same can be utilized. The queries which are running on the DR will not run on and there is clear segregation mentioned in last corrigendum. The data is not stale as long running queries will not run on continuous modifying data. So instead of blocking the resources at DC the ideal resources at DR will be utilized to get the required result. This will not only enhance the performance at DC but also bank will have adequate ROI from the DR investment.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification Bank's Reply
102	RFP Pg. 91, Section III, 1.29.1 Environments Corrigendum II, S.No. 828,	Bidder needs to design the DC and DR in Active where in all the workload from reporting Dashboard and Models will be running from the DC only. All the modification and read, write operations will be running from the DC only. Only the ad-hoc read only queries which will be running from the BI console or for Analytics purpose churning a large data set should automatically be pointed towards DR by the workload orchestration tools. The RTO and RPO is already defined for DC and DR and for this long running queries. Lag of 60 mins is accepted.	Bidder needs to design the DC and DR in Active where in all the workload from reporting Dashboard and Models will be running from the DC only. All the modification and read, write operations will be running from the DC only. Only the ad-hoc read only queries which will be running from the Analytics purpose churning a large data set should automatically be pointed towards DR by the workload orchestration tools. The RTO and RPO is already defined for DC and DR and for this long running queries. Lag of 30 mins is accepted.
103	1.29.1 Environments	HA in UAT/SIT	HA is not required for Non Production environment and the same is also mentioned in the RFP. Please be guided by RFP section 1.29.1 and subsequent corrigendum.
104	Section III, 1.29.2 Environment Sizing, Table 14a (Production) and Table 14b (DR) — Year 5 Structured + Unstructured = 870 TB uncompressed usable per environment (p.92); Section V, Appendix I — Object Storage, Item 2.4 — 400 TB uncompressed usable scalable to 2 PB (p.174)	Reconciliation between Table 14 sizing (870 TB) and Appendix I §2.4 object storage minimum (400 TB)	These are the minimum specifications which bidder has to comply for the hardware. storage sizing mentioned in section 1.29.1 needs to be provisioned as part of overall sizing.
105	Clause 1.29.2 Table 14	Sizing shows 305 TB Year-1 → 870 TB Year-5 for production. (a) Is bidder responsible for storage of all 5 years day-1, or only Year-1 storage with phased upgrade? (b) Compute scaling — same staggered?	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
106	Clause 1.29.2	RFP gives storage volumetrics but no compute sizing (CPU cores, RAM). 'Each query may access entire data volume' — what's the expected concurrent query workload? Will Bank share representative workload patterns?	Please be guided by the storage specifications mentioned in the Appendix I.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
107	Clause 1.29.2	Benchmark to be done on 3rd-year load. Specify benchmark scenario: (a) Data volume to load before benchmark; (b) Query mix and concurrent user profile; (c) Pass/fail criteria; (d) Re-run conditions if fail.	Benchmark failure can trigger penalties; clarity needed.
108	RFP Section III, 1.29.2 Environment Sizing	Bidder is required to provide staggered hardware depending on the volumetric defined in the RFP and associated software and applications. The initial deployment of hardware and associated software should sustain at least the load for the first three years of the solution as per the SLA. Thus, the warranty and subsequent AMC/ATS of the components will begin as per the phased delivery. After three years, Bank in coordination with the successful Bidder will review the hardware and software utilization and accordingly confirm the supply for next two years.	PI suggest no OEM is agreeing to provide staggered deliveries. The workload sizing is done based on the year on year growth factor asked by the bank to size the infrastructure in such a manner that the resource utilization (CPU, Memory, Storage space) should not go beyond 80% during business hours. 2. The delivery of materials needs to be considered in single LOT for the entire proposed BOM & BOQ and cannot be staggered year on year.
109	Section 1.29.2	Out of the projected structured data growth (e-g., 870 TB by Year 5), what proportion is expected to represent highly connected or relationship-driven data?	Details will be shared with successful bidder
110		The Bidder must do sizing of the hardware (at the DC, DR, and UAT) based on the volumes mentioned in the RFP. DC and DR must be in active-active mode.	Yes. Please refer to RFP section 1.29.2.
111	RFP Section III, 1.29.2 Environment Sizing. Commercial, Corrigendum Revised Appendix II Commercial bid format	Bidder is required to provide staggered hardware depending on the volumetric defined in the RFP and associated software and applications. The initial deployment of hardware and associated software should sustain at least the load for the first three years of the solution as per the SLA. Thus, the warranty and subsequent AMC/ATS of the components will begin as per the phased delivery. After three years, Bank in coordination with the successful Bidder will review the hardware and software utilization and accordingly confirm the supply for next two years.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

Bank's Reply
 The data volume is already mentioned in storage sizing. The query mix criteria will mutually discussed during the benchmark strategy finalization. The pass/fail criteria will be governed by the SLA mentioned in the RFP. Re-Run will happen if any criteria is failed. If failure is due to hardware sizing, then bidder need to augment the same and then re-run happen.
 Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
112	RFP Section III, 1.29.2 Environment Sizing	In case of additional infrastructure capacity required beyond planned YoY growth, Bidder must supply additional infrastructure to address that requirement, at no additional cost.	Bidder will perform services only in accordance with the written and agreed scope between parties. If there is any change in scope Bidder submits that the bid response including commercials will undergo changes pursuant to the said Amendments / Corrigendum / Addendum through the Change Control Process. Hence we request bank to remove this clause.
113	Section III, 1.29.3	Kindly define the term "concurrent users" precisely — specifically, whether it denotes (i) peak logged-in sessions, or (ii) simultaneous active requests being processed by the rendering engine at the same instant.	The two measures differ by a wide margin and determine the entire sizing basis of the platform.
114	Clause 1.29.5	Query response time SLA. What is the expected data volume per query response (KB/MB)? Affects WAN bandwidth from DC/DR to branches.	WAN sizing dependency.
115	Point E	Network and Infrastructure Security - Functional & Acceptance Testing: Testing should be done on LAN as well as WAN environment including HO, CO, FGMO, ZO and branches as desired by Bank.	Request Bank to provide following •What is the proposed connectivity model with the existing network (L2 extension or L3 routing)? • What are the expected peak and average throughput requirements between the existing network and the Data Lake? • What is the expected latency between the existing network and the Data Lake network? • What is the High Availability (HA) design of the existing network that will connect to the Data Lake? • Please share the port interface types and optics details of the existing network devices that will connect to the Data Lake network. • How will the Data Lake network integrate with the existing bank network? • Please provide the network connectivity details of the bank-side network devices, along with the current network topology, if available
116	Clause 1.30	Bank may ask demo of cloud-native functions on AWS/Azure/GCP. Is this a feature demo (e.g., 'this works on cloud too') or a working cloud deployment (PoC)?	Demo prep effort.
117	Clause 1.32	Bank's existing ITSM tool (likely ServiceNow or BMC Remedy) — what specific integrations are required (incident creation, change request, problem mgmt, CMDB)?	Standard integration but scope matters for effort estimation.
118	Section III, 1.33 Escrow (p.99); Section III, 4.8 Payment Terms; Table 24 — Escrow milestone (p.143); Section III, 4.29 Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) (p.156); Section V, Appendix II —	Escrow Arrangements (clause, payment milestone, and Commercial Bid line item)	OEMs do not and cannot deposit their proprietary product source code in escrow as part of a customer engagement — this is standard across all OEMs and reflected in their licensing terms. All custom code and
			Bank's Reply Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum. Concurrent users are users who have logged the application and being active at any particular time. Please be guided by the RFP subsequent corrigendum. Query response is at DC and DR and not branch level. All the design related details will be arranged by the successful bidder. The demo is to validate the sanity of the cloud ready deployment. All the modules of the ITSM will be integrated with the proposed Data Lakehouse. Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
	Commercial Bid, Other Component Cost, Item 2 Escrow Cost and the related descriptive bullet (p.252)		configuration developed under this engagement is the Bank's IP and will reside with the Bank, with full control, in the Bank's data center. Request the Bank to remove the escrow requirement and all associated references — specifically: (a) Section 1.33 Escrow in its entirety (p.99); (b) the Escrow line and "100% cost needs to be paid by the Bidder" milestone in Table 24 Payment Terms (p.143); (c) escrow references in Section 4.29 IPR (p.156); and (d) the "Escrow Cost" line item (Item 2) under Other Component Cost in Appendix II Commercial Bid, along with the descriptive bullet "The escrow cost includes the cost of engagement of escrow agency to perform escrow mechanism as defined in Section 1.33" (p.252)
119	Clause 1.33 + 4.8	100% escrow cost is on bidder, annually in advance. What is the scope of escrow — only bidder's customizations, or full DLH solution + all OEM SW? Acceptable escrow agents (NSDL, NIXI, others)?	Escrow cost varies; full-solution escrow is impossible for OEM products.
120	RFP §1.33, p.99–100	Source Code Escrow — Release Criteria and IP Transfer Ambiguity. Bidder bears 100% escrow cost; Bank reserves right to reject escrow agent; 'non-exclusive basis' IP transfer; release criteria not defined	request bank to rationalize this . All configurations and codes developed for deliverables in this program shall be given to the Bank.
121	Clause 2.1.2	PMO resource must not be part of implementation/execution teams — dedicated to governance/coordination. Is this 1 FTE per Table 22 or scalable based on project complexity?	Standard PMO sizing question.
122	Table 19: Minimum Resource Deployment Plan for Implementation Phase	The Bidder must provide the CVs as per the format given in Annexure-XXVII.	Please confirm whether the bidder is required to submit CVs for all 20 named resources (covering all 14 roles) at the time of RFP submission. As per standard industry practice, we request the Bank to allow bidders to submit only key resource profiles at the time of the RFP response. The bidder will ensure that, at the time of project implementation, equivalent and suitably qualified resources will be deployed in line with the requirements specified in Table 19.
123	Section III, 2.1.3 Table 19 (Corrigendum II, S.No 34) and Section III, 3.5.1 Table 23 (Corrigendum II, S.No 45)	Resource deployment requirements for implementation and FMS phases.	Request the Bank to allow deployment of Mumbai-based resources, that best fit the requirement criteria, with onsite presence at Bank's premises for key milestones, UAT, and go-live as required.
			As per the requirement of the RFP subsequent corrigendum section III, 2.1.3 Table 19 (Corrigendum II, S.No 34) and Section 3.5.1 Table 23 (Corrigendum II, S.No 45) Bidder need to deploy the resources as per locations mentioned.
			Please refer to RFP section III clause 1 Escrow is only for the customized code.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Minimum requirement on PMO resources already mentioned in the RFP. Bidder can take any number over and above as per the scope and criticality of the scope.
			Yes. Bidder needs to submit the CV of the resources mentioned in the RFP.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)				
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification	Bank's Reply
124		Names of core team members must be provided in the RFP response. The members must be proposed for a minimum period of 15 months or till end of implementation whichever comes earlier	Request Bank to relax the clause ,allowing bidder to submit Indicative resource profile at time of RFP submission. The bidder will ensure that, at the time of project implementation, equivalent and suitably qualified resources will be deployed in line with the requirements specified in Table 19.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
125		6. Named Resources should be present during the technical presentations.	We request the Bank to kindly confirm whether it is mandatory for all proposed resources across all roles to be present during the technical presentation. We request the Bank to consider allowing participation of only key resources during the technical presentation stage.	Bidder needs to make sure that minimum bid mentioned key resources should be available during presentation Program Manager Lakehouse Architect Banking Domain Expert ETL/ELT expert Security Specialist Infrastructure Lead.
126	Commercial and Sizing Requirements for BI Platform	The RFP sizing and commercial evaluation appear to be based on a core-based licensing model for the BI platform. Request the Bank to clarify whether bidders may alternatively propose: 1. A user-based licensing model for the on-premises BI solution; or 2. A combination of user-based and core-based licensing, provided that the proposed solution fully complies with all technical, functional, performance, concurrency, scalability, security, and availability requirements specified in the RFP.	These suggestions are offered solely to help the Bank arrive at an accurate, defensible and cost-effective sizing and to ensure that all bids are prepared on a common and realistic basis. We remain happy to walk the Bank's technical team through the concurrency model and the supporting benchmarks at the pre-bid meeting or at any other time convenient to the Bank.	Please be guided by the RFP section 3.3 the subsequent corrigendum.
127	3.4.10	Implement all statutory or regulatory changes mandated by the Government of India (GOI), Reserve Bank of India (RBI), or any other competent authority at no additional cost to the Bank. All the Statutory, regulatory changes required need to be done at no additional cost by the bidder during the contract period. All other clauses in the RFP that specify work to be performed at no additional cost to the Bank.	The Parties agree that standards/requirements as on date will be ensured within cost estimated basis requirements stated under RFP, however, if during contract period there is change in regulatory framework or change in requirements and/or scope from the Bank or otherwise and due to which solution needs updating, Bidder submits that the bid response including commercials will undergo changes pursuant to the said Amendments / Corrigendum / Addendum through the Change Control Process. Hence we request bank to remove this clause.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.
128	3.5.6 Role of Data Scientist	Monitor model performance over time and refrain as needed	For ML in production, what are required drift monitoring metrics (data drift, concept drift, stability index) and retraining triggers? Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned	Please be guided by the RFP Section III and subsequent corrigendum and Appendix I.
129	Section III. 3.6 Service Level Agreement (SLA)	3.6 Service Level Agreement (SLA) The Bidder shall be required to sign Service Level Agreement (SLA) covering all terms and conditions of this RFP and Purchase Order within 30 days from the date of acceptance of	we are required to sign SLA after being awarded, but have no visibility of what that would look like. Request the bank to get more clarity on the same	SLA will be as per the clause mentioned in RFP and subsequent corrigendum. There will not be any addition / deletion / modification.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		purchase order. SLA format will be shared with the Successful Bidder along with Purchase order.	Bank's Reply
130	Section III, 3.6 Service Level Agreement (SLA)	3.6 Service Level Agreement (SLA) The Bidder shall be required to sign Service Level Agreement (SLA) covering all terms and conditions of this RFP and Purchase Order within 30 days from the date of acceptance of purchase order. SLA format will be shared with the Successful Bidder along with Purchase order.	Applicable SLAs are a key input in to our solution and staffing. We would request Bank to make explicit the SLAs rather than formulate it at time of release of the purchase order.
131	4.2	Data Protection	The Parties agree that since Bidder is required to process Bank's personal data under this contract, as a global practice and to effectively ensure protection of our client's personal data, Parties agree to enter into data Protection Schedule along with security protocols to process Bank's personal Data as per the terms of such Data Protection Schedule. This is also required as per DPDP Act. Template Data Protection Schedule attached herewith for reference purposes
132	Section III, 4.6 Period of Validity of Bids	"Bids should remain valid for 180 days after the last date for submission of bid... Bank may seek extension of bid validity period, if required. Bidder needs to extend the bid without any additional cost to Bank."	OEM commercial offers held by the bidder are valid only for the bid validity period quoted to the OEM, and refresh of these quotes typically results in price increases beyond the original proposed window. Request the Bank to revise the clause so that any extension of bid validity is by mutual agreement, and the bidder reserves the right to revise commercials to the extent of any OEM / third-party / FX cost increase incurred during the extended validity period.
133	RFP Clause 4.6	Bids should remain valid for 180 days after the last date for submission of bid prescribed by the Bank. A bid valid for a shorter period shall be rejected by the Bank as non-responsive. Bank may seek extension of bid validity period, if required. Bidder needs to extend the bid without any additional cost to Bank.	PI suggest no OEM is agreeing to provide 180 days validity, requesting bank to consider minimum bid validity period in two phases: Phase 1: Till technical evaluation. Phase 2: Before Commercial bid opening.
134	RFP Clause 4.6	Bids should remain valid for 180 days after the last date for submission of bid prescribed by the Bank. A bid valid for a shorter period shall be rejected by the Bank as non-responsive. Bank may seek extension of bid validity period, if required. Bidder needs to extend the bid without any additional cost to Bank.	We have discussed with multiple OEMs and due to supply chain/dollar fluctuations/geo political dynamics, OEMs are not also not able to confirm bid validity of 180 days, requesting bank to consider minimum bid validity period of 60 days.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
135	RFP Section III, 4.8 Payment Terms	Hardware, Database systems, OS and Other peripheral software - 70% - On delivery of the Hardware and submission of invoice with Proof of Delivery and other documents - 10% - On Successful installation and benchmarking of the infrastructure. 20% -On completion of 180 days of successful installation, commissioning and hardening of hardware and sign off by the Bank	Change to: Hardware, Database systems, OS and Other peripheral software - 90% - On delivery of the Hardware and submission of invoice with Proof of Delivery and other documents - 10% - On Successful installation and benchmarking of the infrastructure.
136	RFP Section III, 4.8 Payment Terms	Incremental Hardware, Database systems, OS and Other peripheral software (after 3 years) - 70% On delivery of the Hardware and submission of invoice with Proof of Delivery and other documents, - 10% On Successful installation and commissioning of the infrastructure. 20% - On completion of 90 days of installation and deployment of hardware and sign off by the Bank	Pl suggest no OEM is agreeing to provide staggered deliveries as they cannot give the future price.
137	Section III, 4.8 Payment Terms, Table 24 (Corrigendum II, S.No 47 and S.No 48)	Payment milestones linking software license payouts to implementation deliverables (reports, dashboards, models, go-live).	Software licenses are procured upfront from OEMs on back-to-back commercial terms and full payment is due to OEMs at the time of supply, independent of downstream implementation progress. Linking software payment milestones to implementation deliverables creates a significant working capital and cash-flow burden. Request the Bank to de-link software milestones from implementation milestones. Hence we request bank to modify the payment terms as follows for - Application / Software cost (Data Ingestion, Data Governance, Streaming, Analytical Tool, Reporting Tool, Security, Masking etc.,) 1. 60% - On delivery of Base version of respective Application software and on submission of Invoice and proof of Delivery 2. 10% - On successful completion of current state assessment, gap analysis and system specification definition for respective applications within 14 weeks of purchase of order signing. 3. 10% - On UAT sign off for respective applications within 18 weeks of purchase of order signing. 4. 15% - On successful release of customized software to production for respective applications within 18 weeks of purchase of order signing. 5. 5% - On completion of one month after successful release of application to production for respective applications within 22 weeks of purchase of order signing.
			Bank's Reply Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
138	Section III, 4.8 Payment Terms	Hw and Sw Payment terms	We request the Bank to delink Benchmarking activity for HW and Software payments. We request Bank to release HW payments
139	Section III, 4.8 Payment Terms	Hw and Sw Payment terms	We request the Bank to consider following payment terms : We request Bank to release HW /SW payments as below: 1) HW : 70% on Delivery , 20% on Installation of HW and 10% against advanced bank guarantee 2) Sw : 70% on Delivery, 20% on Installation of SW and 10% against advanced bank guarantee 3) HW AMC : Annually in advance 4) SW ATS : Annually in advance Delink Benchmarking activity from HW/SW payments
140	RFP Clause 4.10	Throughout the lifecycle of the project, resources shall be available onsite on all days. The successful Bidder shall be the principal employer of the employees, agents, contractors , etc., engaged by them and shall be liable for all the acts, deeds, matters or things of such people whether the same is within the scope of power or outside the scope of power, vested under the contract.	Going by this statement can we use the sub contract resources and take the complete responsibility. Pl clarify.
141	RFP 4.20, §4.21, Corr.#53	Penalty Accumulation can exceed Cap Simultaneously	We would request the bank to rationalize penalties , avoid cascading penalties and have a single unified cap. Currently monthly penalty cap is 10% of monthly payout (revised from 15%), but LD cap is separately 10% of contract value. Multiple simultaneous SLA breaches can trigger penalties from uptime, operational SLA, backup, DR, and LD concurrently. No netting mechanism defined. Since bank is a equal partner in the project deliverable to happen on time, we would request the Bank to construct penalties in spirit of the success of the overall program.
142	4.21.3 Operational Service level	13 Model / Use case Management Model Management tool proposed as part of overall solution	We propose that SLAs for the solution be aligned with industry best practices, focusing on operational metrics, service responsiveness, and engineering deliverables, rather than binding commitments on absolute business outcomes or model performance metrics. Specifically: SLAs should not be tied to business KPIs such as loan conversion rates or revenue outcomes, as these are influenced by multiple external factors beyond the bidder's control. Similarly, absolute model accuracy metrics (e.g., Accuracy, Recall, F1-score) in production should not be mandated as SLA commitments, as model
			Bank's Reply Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP section 4.14.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
			performance can be affected by real-world changes (e.g., economic shifts, regulatory changes, or behavioral variations). The bidder can commit to: 1. Robust model development methodology 2. Appropriate algorithm selection 3. Scalable and reliable engineering pipelines In addition, SLAs related to model performance, retraining, or drift management may be impacted if upstream data from the Bank's source systems is incomplete, delayed, or corrupted. Hence, such SLAs should be conditional on data quality and availability. We recommend that SLAs be defined around the following measurable and controllable parameters: 1. Model Development Timeline 2. Time to Production Deployment 3. UAT Defect Resolution Time 4. Model/API Endpoint Availability (Uptime) 5. Retraining Turnaround Time (TAT) upon drift detection
143	Corrigendum2	Dashboard Page Load: Static page Load <500ms Dynamic page Load < 2ms (Solely attributable to the application)	Considering the limited inputs on the layout, design and data modelling aspects, we request to relax this clause to have static page loading in less than 2000ms, Dynamic page in less than 5 ms
144		1. The RFP and latest Corrigendum from Indian Bank states that the DC and DR are to be configured in an Active-Active mode; however, it also specifies that all dashboards, models, and all read/write and modification workloads will operate only from the DC, while only ad hoc, long running, read only analytical queries may be redirected to the DR. A data replication lag of up to 60 minutes is permitted for such workloads.	In this context, we seek clarification on the following: • Given that all transactional, reporting, and model execution workloads are restricted to the DC, and the DR serves only read only analytical queries with an accepted replication lag, please clarify how this setup qualifies as Active-Active, as the DR does not appear to process real time or write workloads. • With a potential data lag of up to 60 minutes at the DR, ad hoc analytical queries executed at the DR may yield results different from those at the DC, which could impact data consistency and decision making for the Bank.
145	Revised Table 27 pg30 of Corrigendum 2	Operational Service Level Metrics and Penalty Framework - Data Quality	What is the Definition of Data Quality here? The System will Standardize the incoming data to enrich the data and system does not generate data by itself, the Sources will be responsible for the data quality. Request this metric/SLA to be dropped from the Operational Metric.
146	4.24	Limitation of Liability	We request the bank to amend the Limitation of Liability clause to read as below: • Service Provider's aggregate liability under the contract shall be at actual and limited to a maximum of the contract value. For the
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			The Active – Active requirements refers that the Database and the application instance on the DR will not be in standby mode instead the database will be in mount mode with only permission. The queries which are run on the DR will not run on DC and there is a segregation mentioned in the last corrigendum. The lag of 30 mins will be accepted.
			The data quality scope is defined in the RFP. The rules will be created and tracked for quality measurement. The proposed solution needs to send the reminder and track the quality improvement. The SLA is applicable only to any deviation from the scope of Quality as mentioned in RFP Section III Appendix I.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
147	4.25	Indemnity	purpose for the section, contract value at any given point of time means the aggregate value of the purchase orders placed by bank on the Vendor that gave rise to claim, under this tender. • This limit shall not apply to third party claims for a. IP infringement indemnity b. Bodily injury (including death) and damage to real property and tangible property caused by vendor's gross negligence. c. If a third party asserts a claim against bank that a vendor product acquired under the agreement infringes a patent or copy right, vendor should defend bank against that claim and pay amounts finally awarded by a court against bank or included in a settlement approved by vendor. • Request Clause to be added: In no event, shall either party be liable for indirect, special, incidental, punitive, exemplary or consequential damages arising out of or in connection with the Contract entered between the Parties We request the bank to amend the Indemnity clause to read as follows: If at the time of the supplying, installing the platform/ software in terms of the present contract/ purchase order or subsequently it appears at any point of time that an infringement has occurred of any patents, trademarks or other rights claimed by any third party in India or abroad, then in respect of all costs, charges, expenses, losses and other damages which the Bank may suffer on account of such claim, the Bidder shall indemnify the Bank and keep it indemnified on that behalf. In case of data breach solely and directly attributable to the Bidder in view of the Bank (which is final and binding), the Bidder should indemnify Bank for all its acts and omissions. Clause to be removed: Any penalty imposed on Bank by regulatory / statutory bodies related to data security on cloud due to reasons stated in forgoing para, will be passed on to the Bidder. Bidder will perform services only in accordance with the written and agreed scope between parties. If there is any change in scope Bidder submits that the bid response including commercials will undergo changes pursuant to the said Amendments / Corrigendum / Addendum through the Change Control Process. Hence we request bank to remove this clause.
148	4.44.10	The Bidder agrees that Bank has +/- 25% limit on the additions or deletions on the items for the period of the contract. Further the Bidder agrees that the prices quoted by the Bidder would be adjusted on prorata basis with such additions or deletions in quantities. The Unit price quoted by the Bidder will be valid for all the items for the contract period, and the Bank reserve the right	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		to procure the additional items within the specified limit as per the unit price mentioned in the bill of material during the contract period.	
149	Section 4.44.10	Right to alter Quantities. The Bidder agrees that Bank has +/- 25% limit on the additions or deletions on the items for the period of the contract. Further the Bidder agrees that the prices quoted by the Bidder would be adjusted on prorata basis with such additions or deletions in quantities.	We request that the +/- 25% right to alter scope and quantities clause be deleted, as it introduces significant commercial and delivery uncertainty for bidders—particularly for projects involving integrated hardware, software, and long-term support commitments. Please refer to point 2 on OEM future price commitment. OEMs can only provide firm prices for upfront supply and will not commit for additional procurement at same price over the duration of project.
150	1.1	Offered Server should be 2U Rack Mountable.	Suggested clause: Offered Server should be 2U (or higher) Rack Mountable.
151	1.2	It should have two processors of Latest (N) or N-1 Generation with each processor having minimum 32 cores and minimum 2.2 GHz Clock	Suggested clause: It should have two processors of Latest (N) or N-1 Generation with each processor having minimum 8 cores and minimum 2.2 GHz Clock Restricting strictly to 2U form factor limits evaluation of enterprise-class platforms suited for large data warehousing workloads.
152	1.3	It should have minimum 256GB Dual In-line Memory Modules (DIMMs) scalable to at least 1.0 TB using Double Data Rate-5 (DDR5) or higher.	Suggested clause: It should have minimum 32GB Dual In-line Memory Modules (DIMMs)/Differential DIMMs (DDIMM) scalable to at least 1.0 TB using Double Data Rate-5 (DDR5) or higher. Processors using higher clock speeds will have lesser cores per processor. Restricting them will limit evaluation of enterprise-class processors. Processors having higher multi threads usually have lesser cores per processor
153	1.4	It should support at least 8 hot-swappable SSD / NVMe drives. It should be configured with 4 drives of minimum 600 GB each Hot Plug Small FormFactor SAS drives at RAID 1 from Day-1.	Suggested clause: It should support at least 8 hot-swappable SAS/NVMe SSD drives. It should be configured with 4 drives of minimum 600 GB each Hot Plug Small FormFactor SAS/NVMe SSD drives at RAID 1 (hardware RAID or OS mirroring or Software RAID) from Day-1.
154	1.5	It should have PCIe 4.0 and/or higher RAID controller which support atleast 8 SSD / NVME and HDDs, that Supports RAID 0,1, 5, 6. Solution to be configured to use RAID-6 or Equivalent architecture with SDS/HCI from Day-1.	Request to have this clause as an alternative to 1.4. Both 1.4 and 1.5 cannot be satisfied simultaneously. NVMe drives are attached to the PCIe interface directly and do not have a dedicated hardware RAID engine similar to SAS controllers, therefore, RAID for NVMe is only supported through the operating system software
155		6. With reference to the Object Storage requirements mentioned in Infrastructure	With reference to the Object Storage requirements mentioned in Infrastructure Requirements – Appendix

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

As part of the corrigendum it has already been mentioned clearly that object storage can be



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		Requirements – Appendix 1 of the Corrigendum dated 5 May 2026, we request the Bank to consider including software defined object storage as part of the technical and functional requirements compliance criteria. Software based object storage solutions are cost effective, performant, scalable, and are widely adopted as industry best practice for modern Data Platform and Lakehouse implementations. In this context, we request the Bank to confirm that bidders may choose the object storage approach—either software based or hardware based—based on their proposed solution architecture, performance characteristics, and commercial considerations, while meeting the overall functional and operational requirements outlined in the RFP.	1 of the Corrigendum dated 5 May 2026, we request the Bank to consider including software defined object storage as part of the technical and functional requirements compliance criteria. Software based object storage solutions are cost effective, performant, scalable, and cloud compatible, and are widely adopted as industry best practice for modern Data Platform and Lakehouse implementations. In this context, we request the Bank to confirm that bidders may choose the object storage approach—either software based or hardware based—based on their proposed solution architecture, performance characteristics, and commercial considerations, while meeting the overall functional and operational requirements outlined in the RFP.
156		7. Hardware/Infra - These Infrastructure requirements (1–6 Appendix I) carry a 100% pass/fail gate. Any "No" on any one of them means the entire bid is rejected before scoring even begins.	The BoQ mandates a 'SAN Switch' as a hardware line item across DC and DR. SAN switches are required for Fibre Channel or iSCSI block storage architectures. A distributed, software-defined object storage solution operating over standard IP/Ethernet has no architectural dependency on a SAN switch. Multiple addendum respondents noted that Appendix I storage specs apply only to block storage, not to object/distributed storage (Q1283, Q1284). We request: (a) The 'SAN Switch' BoQ line item be made optional for bidders proposing software-defined or distributed storage that operates over standard IP networking, (b) That bidders be permitted to price this line at zero and document the reason, and (c) The Appendix I storage specifications referencing SAN-style components (DRAM cache, RAID-6, hot spare per 30 drives, controller utilization) be explicitly scoped to block storage architectures only.
157			Infrastructure Requirement 1.8 mandates a Dual Port 32Gbps FC/iSCSI Host Bus Adaptor on every server. FC HBAs are required exclusively for Fibre Channel SAN-attached storage. A software-defined, distributed object storage architecture communicates over standard IP/Ethernet and has no FC HBA on any node. As this is a 100% pass/fail infrastructure requirement, answering 'No' to 1.8 — even for a fully capable
			hardware based or software based, bidder choose as per the criteria fit in their architecture. Kindly refer to the revised specification of object storage in the corrigendum.
			As per the last corrigendum Point 2.5, the Switch required is defined based on the proposed architecture. So bidder can choose the Supply accordingly.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
			software-defined storage solution — results in immediate bid rejection. We request 1.8 be amended to: 'Servers must be equipped with either (a) Dual 32Gbps FC/iSCSI adaptors for SAN-attached storage, OR (b) Dual 25GbE or higher Ethernet adaptors for software-defined or distributed storage — selected based on the proposed storage architecture.' This makes the requirement technology-neutral and consistent with the corrigendum's amendment of 2.5 for SAN switches.
158	1.6	It should have Dual port on each card with 25Gbps SFP28 dual Ethernet adaptor fully populated with 25G Transceivers and multimode LC-LC Cable.	Suggested clause: It should have Dual port on each card with 25Gbps SFP28 dual Ethernet adaptor fully populated with 25G Transceivers Cable to be included as part of data center work, and not as part of Servers
159	1.7	It should have 3 ports of USB 2.0 / 3.0 and 1 Dedicated out- of-band remote management ethernet port of min. 1Gbps. It should have Dynamic USB port enable/disable features for all the USB Ports provided in the server.	Suggested clause: It should have 2 ports of USB 2.0 / 3.0 and 1 Dedicated out- of-band remote management ethernet port of min. 1Gbps. It should have Dynamic USB port enable/disable features for all the USB Ports provided in the server.
160	1.8	It should have Dual Port and dual card and each card 32Gbps dual FC / iSCSI adaptor with two number of multimode LC-LC Cable.	Suggested clause: It should have Dual Port and dual card and each card 32Gbps dual FC / iSCSI adaptor Cable to be included as part of data center work, and not as part of Servers
161	1.10	It should support heterogeneous OS and Virtualization platforms including: i) Canonical Ubuntu Server LTS ii) Microsoft Windows Server iii) Red Hat Enterprise Linux iv) SUSE Linux Enterprise Server v) VMware vi) HCI vii) Nutanix	Suggested clause: It should support heterogeneous OS such as the below and virtualization platforms appropriate to the underlying processor architecture i) Canonical Ubuntu Server LTS ii) Microsoft Windows Server iii) Red Hat Enterprise Linux iv) SUSE Linux Enterprise Server v) VMware vi) HCI vii) Nutanix viii) AIX ix) IBMi x) RHOSP
162	1.12	System remote management should have browser based graphical remote console along with Virtual Power button, remote boot using USB/CD/DVD Drive. It should be capable of offering upgrade of software and patches from a remote client using Media/image/folder	Suggested clause: System should support browser-based remote management with graphical console, remote power control, virtual media (USB/CD/DVD or equivalent), remote boot, and capability to perform software/firmware updates from remote clients using media/image or equivalent mechanisms
163	Revised Appendix I - Infrastructure Requirements - Rack Servers	It should be EAL-2 or higher certified for the offered server baseband/IPMI management. However, if certification is not available at the time of bidding and is into the process of certification, OEM shall submit certificate at the time of delivery.	The OEM servers are not EAL-2 or higher certified. Request you to please remove the clause.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)				
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification	Bank's Reply
164	Revised Appendix I – Infrastructure Requirements – Rack Servers	iii) FIPS 140-2 validation	OEM server is supporting FIPS-certified components, but there is no FIPS certification available at server level. Request you to please update RFP clause accordingly.	FIPS 140-2 validation shall apply to cryptographic modules used in the solution, including encryption provided through storage, disks, memory, firmware, network key-management components, when applicable. Please be guided by the RFP the subsequent corrigendum.
165	Section V, Appendix I — Object Storage, Items 2.1, 2.9, 2.15, 2.16, 2.20, 2.22, 2.23, 2.25, 2.28, 2.30, 2.31, 2.34, 2.35, 2.36, 2.38	Object Storage requirements	The listed requirements are inherently tied to hardware-based / appliance object storage and are not architecturally applicable to a software-defined object storage solution — which the RFP itself envisages under Item 2.2 ("software-defined, node-based, hardware OEM agnostic"). Mandating these uniformly is not logically applicable to software-defined object-storage offerings. Request the Bank to revise these specific requirements under Section V, Appendix I as: "Mandatory for hardware-based / appliance object storage solutions; Not Applicable for software-defined object storage solutions" with bidders to comply with the equivalent functional / performance outcomes via the architecture they propose.	The provision for the software storage already been made in the specific clause. Kindly refer to the RFP and subsequent corrigendum
166	2.1, 2.9, 2.15, 2.16, 2.20, 2.22, 2.23, 2.25, 2.28, 2.30, 2.31, 2.34, 2.35, 2.36, 2.38	Object Storage	Many of these requirements are only applicable for hardware based object storage solution and may not be applicable for Software based object storage. Can this be made mandatory only for HW based cloud object storage and optional for software based object storage	The provision for the software storage already been made in the specific clause. Kindly refer to the RFP and subsequent corrigendum
167	2.1		Appendix I 2.10 mandates inline deduplication of minimum 5:1 on text/JSON/logs data from Day-1. While a 5:1 ratio is achievable for log files and unstructured text, it is not achievable for structured banking transactional data stored in columnar formats (Parquet, ORC, Apache Iceberg tables). High-cardinality banking data — containing unique transaction IDs, account numbers, timestamps, and monetary amounts — achieves inline deduplication ratios of 1.2:1 to 2:1 at best. The space efficiency of a Lakehouse for structured data is achieved through columnar encoding and compression (which reduces 1 TB of raw data to ~200 GB), not through deduplication. These are different techniques achieving similar storage efficiency outcomes. As 2.10 is a 100% mandatory pass/fail requirement, a 5:1 deduplication guarantee on Lakehouse table data is	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
168	Section V, Appendix I — Server, Items 1.4 & 1.5 (p.172); Object Storage, Items 2.10 & 2.20 (p.175)	NVMe drives / NVMe-based object storage / NVMe caching	technically possible but will add to resource and cost. We request: (a) The 5:1 ratio be restricted to unstructured text/log data only, (b) Structured columnar table data be excluded from the deduplication ratio requirement, and (c) Combined space reduction ratio (deduplication + compression + columnar encoding) be accepted as the compliance metric for Lakehouse table storage. NVMe delivers meaningful benefit for the metadata / cache tier but is not necessary for bulk data storage in a Lakehouse workload, and enforcing it across the stack will substantially inflate cost without proportionate/meaningful performance gain. Request the Bank to make all NVMe references optional — i.e., bidder to propose NVMe where it is architecturally justified. Specifically: Items 1.4, 1.5, 2.10 to be revised from "SSD / NVMe" to "SSD / NVMe as per OEM-recommended architecture to meet performance requirements"; Item 2.20 ("NVMe caching must be supported") to be revised to "should be supported where required to meet IOPS requirements". As part of the corrigendum we have already given the option between SSD/ NVME. Kindly refer to previous corrigendum dated 05/05/2026.
169	2.9 Object Storage solution	The proposed solution must support Kubernetes integration through CSI and COSI APIs.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
170	Requirement No. 2.15	Product-level FIPS-140 and EAL2 certifications shall apply to hardware-defined storage solutions.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
171	Requirement Number 2.22	Must support multi-site active-active architecture with global namespace.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
172	Revised Appendix I – Infrastructure Requirements – Object Storage	The proposed storage should be SSD / NVME based and should have Inline deduplication or	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		compression - minimum 5:1 on text/JSON/logs data - must be enabled from Day-1.	capabilities from Day 1. Rationale : Inline compression and deduplication is mostly supported on Block and File storage and not applicable to objectstorage.
173	Revised Appendix I - Infrastructure Requirements - Object Storage	The proposed solution must comply with FIPS-140, and EAL2 certifications.	Please change to : The proposed solution must comply with FIPS-140 certifications.
174			• 2.37 requires hardware controller-based Data at Rest encryption that is FIPS 140-2 validated. Traditional SAN storage arrays achieve this through a dedicated encryption ASIC on the storage controller. A distributed object storage cluster has no centralised storage controller — each node independently encrypts data using the CPU's built-in AES hardware instructions (AES-NI), which carry no performance overhead. The outcome — encrypted data at rest, FIPS 140-2 validated — is identical. Only the implementation differs. Can the Bank confirm that 2.37 compliance is determined by the functional outcome — data at rest is encrypted with no performance impact, using a FIPS 140-2 validated mechanism — and not by whether a centralised hardware storage controller is present? A distributed object storage system where each node encrypts independently using CPU-level AES hardware with a FIPS 140-2 validated cryptographic module should be considered compliant.
175	Appendix-I + 1.9 (Corr-II #20)	Storage must support 'Open Table Format' — is Apache Iceberg, Delta Lake, or Apache Hudi each acceptable? Or is the Bank specifically requiring Iceberg (which is industry-trending and OEM-neutral)?	Big OEM decision: Cloudera & Snowflake favour Iceberg; Databricks favours Delta.
176	Requirement No. 2.33	The Storage array offered should be configured with at least 1 TB cache DRAM across all the nodes. The complete cache should be accessible by all the nodes in the storage system. Only write cache must be mirrored. Cache memory should be delivered on DRAM; any other device or HDD should not be considered as cache. For software-defined object storage, the bidder shall specify aggregate RAM across all storage nodes sufficient to meet the performance thresholds defined in Clause 2.32.	Suggestion to be considered. Request to add : For software-defined object storage, the bidder shall specify aggregate RAM across all storage nodes sufficient to meet the performance thresholds defined in Clause 2.32.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Bidder needs to provide the solution as per specification mentioned in the RFP appendix.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
177	Requirement No: 2.33	There should be no single point of failure (NSPOF) within the storage array. Individual component failures (controller, port, cache, disk, enclosure, or any other vendor specific element) should not cause loss of data accessibility, data integrity or a full array failure. All the components should be redundant and hot swappable including power supply, fans, batteries, etc. For software-defined object storage, NSPOF shall be demonstrated at the cluster level through Erasure Coding. The solution shall continue serving read and write operations upon failure of any single node, disk, or network component. The bidder shall specify EC configuration, simultaneous node fault tolerance, and rebuild time. Storage-array-controller-level redundancy requirements do not apply.	Suggestion to be considered Request to Add: For software-defined object storage, NSPOF shall be demonstrated at the cluster level through Erasure Coding. The solution shall continue serving read and write operations upon failure of any single node, disk, or network component. The bidder shall specify EC configuration, simultaneous node fault tolerance, and rebuild time. Storage-array-controller-level redundancy requirements do not apply.
178	Requirement No: 2.37	The object storage system must support QoS controls at the tenant and bucket level, including bandwidth throttling, request rate limiting, and resource isolation to prevent noisy neighbor impact and ensure predictable performance for critical workloads. For software-defined object storage, QoS shall be evaluated at the solution level through: (a) per-bucket and per-tenant access controls (b) network-level allocation between workload classes; and (c) compute-layer admission control preventing noisy-neighbour impact on critical workloads.	Suggestion to be considered Request to add: For software-defined object storage, QoS shall be evaluated at the solution level through: (a) per-bucket and per-tenant access controls (b) network-level bandwidth allocation between workload classes; and (c) compute-layer admission control preventing noisy-neighbour impact on critical workloads
179	Revised Appendix I - Infrastructure Requirements - Object Storage	The Storage array offered should be configured with at least 1 TB cache DRAM across all the nodes. The complete cache should be accessible by all the nodes in the storage system. Only write cache must be mirrored. Cache memory should be delivered on DRAM; any other device or HDD should not be considered as cache.	Please remove the clause as it is only valid for traditional controller based storage arrays. Our array is a scale-out S3 object storage platform, not a traditional dual-controller storage array. It does not implement a centralized 1 TB DRAM cache that is globally shared across all nodes, nor a classic mirrored write cache. Instead, it uses a distributed architecture where each node contributes its own CPU and memory for request processing, and data is protected via append-only writes with erasure coding / replication rather than DRAM write-back caching.
180	Revised Appendix I - Infrastructure Requirements - Object Storage	The object storage system must support QoS controls at the tenant and bucket level, including bandwidth throttling, request rate limiting, and	Please change to - The object storage system must support performance management at bucket/tenant level. Rationale : QoS is more typical of block & File
			Bank's Reply Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)				
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification	Bank's Reply
181	Revised Appendix I – Infrastructure Requirements - Object Storage	resource isolation to prevent noisy neighbor impact and ensure predictable performance for critical workloads For File access it must be possible to set quotas at a user or group or file level and should have Microsoft active directory and LDAP integration.	arrays but, not seen as a requirement for objectstorage. Please change to - For object storage access, the platform must support capacity quotas at namespace and bucket levels and must integrate with Microsoft Active Directory and LDAP for authentication and authorization.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum
182	Tech Specification	The proposed disk-based backup solution shall provide high availability by ensuring continuous access to backup and recovery services in the event of component, node, or disk failure. The solution shall support clustered or redundant configurations for backup servers, resilient disk-based repositories, and catalogue protection mechanisms, and shall be deployable on both traditional 3-tier and hyper-converged infrastructure (HCI) environments.	What is retention policy for keeping backup in Disk, and we understand that it has to be sized separately from server and storage perspective)Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned	Please refer to section 1.16 and 1.17. Yes, same needs to be sized separately from server and storage perspective
183	Appendix I, Item 3.9 (Backup Solution)	"Proposed D2D backup target solution should have the capability of Replication at DR Site."	Request Bank to confirm whether the intent is Replication (D2D appliance at DC replicates to a peer D2D appliance at DR). This will require additional D2D target + replication licenses at DR, adding to the cost. or Restoration at DR Site (recovery capability only, no additional D2D appliance at DR) - this is the practice adopted by other PSU / Private sector banks.	Bidders must propose a backup solution having native replication capability between DC-to-DC, with configurable replication schedules workload/tenant group.
184	Revised Appendix I –3 Backup software-3.8	Efficient backup from primary and object storage; backup to tape; single management console	Please change to - Efficient backup from primary and file storage and single management console Rationale : PPDM won't backup data from object storage and it won't tape out backup data	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
185	Revised Appendix I –3 Backup software-3.14	Backup server supported on Windows and Linux; licenses for unlimited VMs, containers, and databases	Please change to : Backup server supported on Windows and Linux; licenses will align to total front end TBs irrespective of total VMs, containers and databases	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
186	Revised Appendix I –3 Backup software-3.19	No restriction on number of VMs/containers/capacity backed up	Please change to - No restriction on number of VMs/containers/databases backed up with in the limit of obtained capacity license	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
187	Revised Appendix I –3 Backup software-3.23	De-duplication; policy-based movement from disk to tape; restore directly to production	Please change to - policy-based movement from disk to object; restore directly to production Rationale : PPDM doesn't support any tape out hence for long term retention / offsite requirements data must be replicated/tiered to object storage. Object storage can be leveraged either from on prem or from cloud service providers	Please be guided by the RFP as Disk to hardware is already mentioned in the RFP.
188	Backup	Backup	In a typical Data Lakehouse architecture, data is inherently stored with multiple copies (replicas) and is	Backup needs to be done for the file uploads as well as all type of data (Structure, s



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
			Bank's Reply structured and unstructured) at Silver and Gold layer.
189	4. Virtualisation	The software should allow to deploy and export virtual machines, virtual appliances in Open Virtual Machine Format (OVF).	also available at the DR site as part of the resiliency and high availability design. In this context, we seek guidance from the Bank on the backup strategy expected for the proposed solution. From an industry best practice perspective, backups are typically limited to curated and business ready data, such as the Gold Layer used for reporting and regulatory purposes that are not archived. Kindly confirm if this approach is acceptable to the Bank.
190	4. Virtualisation	The management software should provide means to perform quick, as-needed deployment of additional hypervisor hosts.	The ask is specific to vendor terminology. the ask should be in generic for other bidders to participate.
191	4. Virtualisation	The software should allow reliable and nondisruptive migrations for Physical/ Virtual machines running Windows or Linux (any flavour) based operating systems from hypervisors like VMware,KVM and Hyper V to proposed virtual environment	We request to remove Hypervisor wording from the ask, the requirement should be slightly open for other bidders to be able to bid.
192	4. Virtualisation	Proposed solution should have all native and built in capabilities like Compute Virtualization, Software Defined Networking, Automation, Container Runtime, and Load Balancer from a single OEM	Can you please remove Hyper-V from the ask, the requirement should be slightly open for other bidders to be able to bid.
193	4.14	The software should allow reliable and nondisruptive migrations for Physical/ Virtual machines running Windows or Linux (any flavour) based operating systems from hypervisors like VMware,KVM and Hyper V to proposed virtual environment	Kindly remove Load Balancer word from the requirement, the requirement should be slightly open for other bidders to be able to bid.
194	4.17	The software should support for increasing capacity by adding CPU, Memory or any other devices to virtual machines on an as needed basis without any disruption in working VMs running Windows and Linux operating system.	The solution should support migration of physical/virtual workloads to the target virtual environment, with operating system support aligned to the underlying processor architecture — e.g., Windows/Linux for x86-based platforms, and AIX, IBM i, and Linux for Power-based platforms — using native and/or integrated migration tools, with planned cutover as applicable.
195	Point 5, Containerization	The solution should have the ability to provision, install, manage, and configure multiple Kubernetes clusters and associated master node in any infrastructure (bare-metal or virtual	The solution should support for increasing capacity by adding CPU, Memory or any other devices to virtual machines on an as needed basis without any disruption in working VMs running Windows or Linux operating system. The bank prefers core data lakehouse platform components to be containerised for. We request that Bidder can suitably decide for other tools such as CDC, BI to prioritise performance ,scalability and functionality in their choice of containerise/ bare



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)				
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification	Bank's Reply
196	Requirement 5.1	machines) in any combination under a single unified management plane. The solution should have the ability to provision, install, manage, and configure multiple Kubernetes clusters and associated master node in either of infrastructure (bare-metal or virtual machines) under a single unified management plane. For analytical Kubernetes solutions, the unified management plane shall provision, manage and govern all Data Lakehouse workload layers — Engineering, Warehouse, and AI/ML — across their respective Kubernetes runtime environments from a single console. Workload-level isolation between services shall be demonstrated through dedicated namespace management, resource governance, and lifecycle operations managed from the same unified plane, in lieu of managing multiple independent general-purpose Kubernetes clusters.	metal/virtualization option. Request the bank to confirm the same Amendments for Kubernetes: A general-purpose Kubernetes platform manages infrastructure that is part of hardware compliance. An analytical Kubernetes platform manages the outcomes—the Data Lakehouse workload layers are the product, Kubernetes is the engine under the hood. We are trying to avoid providing additional hardware based Kubernetes because it will add another layer of cost. Suggestion to be considered	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
197		In the latest Corrigendum Appendix 1 Infrastructure requirements SI No 5.15 specifies that the proposed Kubernetes platform should be capable of supporting modern AI workloads, including providing secure and stable access to CPUs and GPUs, with all necessary drivers and configurations in place.	In this regard, we seek clarification on the following: • Kindly confirm whether the Bank expects GPU infrastructure to be provisioned as part of the initial scope, or if the requirement is limited to ensuring that the Kubernetes and Data Platform is GPU ready, with GPUs being enabled or added in a later phase.	The requirement is the proposed Kubernetes platform and data platform should support GPU ready when GPU is added in the later phase
198	Requirement 5.2	The proposed Kubernetes platform should allow managing Kubernetes clusters across diverse environments like On-premises, AWS, Azure and on Bare Metal servers from a single console.	Suggestion to be considered: For analytical Kubernetes solutions deployed on-premises as per the infrastructure scope defined in Section III, the proposed solution shall manage all Kubernetes workloads within the on-premises infrastructure from a single unified management console. Integration with public cloud environments (AWS, Azure) shall be evaluated for the technical and functional capability to run the same Data Lakehouse workload layers — Engineering, Warehouse, and AI/ML — portably across on-premises and cloud environments from the same platform.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
199	Requirement 5.10	Platform should have capability to perform service export/import between Kubernetes clusters based on load balancer service.	Suggestion to be considered: . For analytical Kubernetes solutions, service routing capability shall be evaluated in the context of Data Lakehouse workload layers — Engineering, Warehouse, and AI/ML. The platform shall demonstrate traffic	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
200	Requirement 5.12	Proposed platform must support Identity Providers like GitHub, LDAP, OIDC and SAML for authentication.	management and service accessibility across workload namespaces through integrated load balancer and ingress controls as defined in Clause 5.17. Cross-cluster federation shall not be a mandatory requirement where all Data Lakehouse workload layers are governed within a single unified Kubernetes runtime. Suggestion to be considered Request to Add: For on-premises analytical Kubernetes deployments, identity provider support shall be evaluated against the Bank's enterprise identity infrastructure. Compliance shall be demonstrated through support for LDAP, SAML 2.0, and OIDC. GitHub as an identity provider is a developer workflow pattern; compliance against GitHub integration shall be evaluated as a functional capability for developer-facing Data Engineering and AI workload interfaces, and shall not be a mandatory pass/fail criterion for the platform authentication layer.
201	5. Containerisation/K8s	The proposed Kubernetes platform should have a broader support for multiple Operating Systems like Rocky Linux, Ubuntu, RHEL and Amazon Linux.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum. Please remove specific OS names. The clause may be modified to "The proposed Kubernetes platform should offer broad compatibility across a diverse range of Kubernetes-optimized host OS, Secure, Immutable and Hardened OS OR any other Enterprise grade Linux distributions". Native hardened and Secure OS platforms are purpose-built and optimized specifically for Kubernetes environments. Reduced attack surface due to minimal OS footprint, removal of unnecessary packages/services, and integrated security controls such as SELinux and immutable architecture. When specific OS are included, the security posture gets separated from the Kubernetes provider, where Security of Kubernetes and specific OS will be handled separately. This loophole can be exploited by attackers and the security of Container itself will be at risk. Native Secure OS will eliminate the need for maintaining separate validation, certification, patching, and support matrices for different OS variants. Ensures tighter integration and lifecycle alignment between Kubernetes, container runtime, OS kernel, and platform updates. Improves platform stability, consistency, and reliability through standardized node configurations and validated software stacks. Reduces operational complexity versus managing heterogeneous OSs like Rocky Linux, Ubuntu, RHEL,



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
			and Amazon Linux, better supports Infrastructure-as-Code.
202	5.15	The proposed Kubernetes platform should be designed to handle the demands of modern AI workloads. It should provide secure and stable access to GPUs and CPUs, with all necessary drivers properly configured.	The proposed Kubernetes platform should be designed to handle the demands of modern AI workloads. It should provide secure and stable access to GPUs/AI Accelerators and CPUs, with all necessary drivers properly configured.
203	5.20	The proposed Kubernetes platform should have a broader support for multiple Operating Systems like Rocky Linux, Ubuntu, RHEL and Amazon Linux.	The proposed Kubernetes platform should have a broader support for multiple Operating Systems like Rocky Linux, Ubuntu, RHEL and Amazon Linux, appropriate to the processor architecture
204	Requirement 5.22	Platform should provide capability to backup and restore applications in Kubernetes.	Suggestion to be considered: For analytical Kubernetes deployments, backup and restore capability shall be evaluated in the context of Data Lakehouse workload layers — Engineering, Warehouse, and AI. The platform shall demonstrate application-consistent backup and point-in-time restore of workload configurations, metadata, and persistent state targeting the platform's native storage layer. Native embedding of the backup tooling within the Kubernetes distribution itself shall not be a mandatory requirement, provided backup and restore is demonstrated as an integrated, operational capability at go-live.
205	Requirement 5.23	The solution should be capable to scan the container images for vulnerabilities and malicious contents before deployment and on periodic basis.	Suggestion to be considered: For analytical Kubernetes solutions, container image security shall be evaluated through integration with an OCI-compliant container registry as required under Clause 5.4. The platform shall demonstrate that vulnerability scanning is enforced as a mandatory gate prior to image admission into the Data Lakehouse workload environment, and is executed on a configurable periodic schedule post-deployment. Native embedding of the scanning engine within the Kubernetes distribution itself shall not be a mandatory requirement, provided registry-integrated scanning is demonstrated as operational at go-live.
206	File Security	The solution shall support use of SSO	Which SSO Bank has to integrate Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned
207	Point 6	File security	Request Bank to provide following File volumetrics: File types being processed •File type distribution (e.g., x% archives, x% business documents, x% images, etc.) •Estimated number of files processed per bidder
			The details are already available in the RFP the subsequent corrigendum dated 05/05/2026 Please be guided accordingly.
			All file types like pdf, excel, word etc. as well as all semi and unstructured data will be processed. All other details will be shared with successful bidder

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.

The details are already available in the RFP the subsequent corrigendum dated 05/05/2026 Please be guided accordingly.

All file types like pdf, excel, word etc. as well as all semi and unstructured data will be processed. All other details will be shared with successful bidder



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
			hour/minute •File count and size of files during pick hour. •Average file size
208		File Security	Kindly confirm whether the solution expects files to be uploaded from external sources (e.g., customers, partners, third-party integrations). If yes, please provide the following volumetric details to aid in accurate solution sizing and design: Approximate number of users who will utilize the file upload facility Average number of files expected to be uploaded per day Average and maximum file size (in MB/GB) Any expected peak volumes (daily/hourly spikes) Types of files expected (documents, images, archives, etc.) And if it is for internal users, can we leverage Bank's existing DLP solution to achieve it?
209	Section V, Appendix I, S.No. 6. File Security	The solution should be able to process the entire storage volume, new files only, or be able to specify files and folders.CDR Pre bid Clarification - We need to have clean Data lakehouse system and therefore a solution is required to ensure data lakehouse is scanned and sanitized without manual intervention	We understand that no files are directly uploaded into the Data Warehouse by any external agency. All data ingestion to Data Lakehouse (DLH) , by internal system/users only. Key security assumptions and controls are as follows: Internal Data Ingestion: Files uploaded into the Data Lakehouse are performed only by authorized internal bank users through controlled internal systems. Pre-existing Security Controls: All such files are already subject to Bank's enterprise security framework, including: - Anti-Virus (AV) scanning - Enterprise Data Loss Prevention (DLP) controls External Data Sources (if applicable): In scenarios where data is sourced from public cloud systems (e.g., CRM, call center platforms etc): - All connections are secure and encrypted - Data transfer follows approved secure communication protocols - Files continue to be scanned and validated by Cloud service Provider as well as by the Bank's internal security systems before ingestion into DLH The Data Lakehouse receives only validated, sanitized, and trusted data, ensuring no direct exposure to unverified or external content. Request: We request the Bank to kindly review this requirement in light of the existing DLP and AV capabilities. In case the Bank still mandates this requirement, we request further clarification on Specific use cases bank is looking at this will help in proposing a more aligned and value-driven solution.
210	Tape Library	The Offered Automated Tape Library should be supplied with minimum 4 x latest generation of	When we have D2D back up do we still need tape library, it's additional cost to Bank also if lyes how many
			Files will be uploaded from Bank and third party (Bank's vendors) is required. The details will be shared with successful bidder.
			Antimalware and Antivirus will be provided by the Bank. However the file stripping and scanning utility combined with the specific mentioned in the Appendix I should be provided by the bidder for the files, structure and unstructured data coming into data Lakehouse The files will be uploaded to the Bank as well as Third party (bank's vendors)
			Please refer to section 1.16 and Appendix I for the corrigendum.

Bank's Reply



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)				
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification	Bank's Reply
211	4.3	LTO FC Tape drives and further scalable to 16 x latest generation LTO FC Tape Drives. Data Masking & Tokenization	tapes we need to provision? Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is clarified Is there an enterprise tokenization capability to leverage?	The data masking and tokenization specifications are mentioned in the Appendix 1. Bidder needs to propose solution accordingly.
212	4.3	Tokenization	Kindly confirm whether an enterprise-grade tokenization solution is available with bank can be leveraged or expected to be implemented. If yes, please provide details on: 1) Approximate number of data elements/fields to be tokenized 2) Types of sensitive data (e.g., PII, financial data, authentication data) will be tokenized 3) Expected data volumes, including total number of tokens and daily/peak transaction volumes We will also request to include a mention, "The bidder must ensure that OEM Professional Services are directly engaged to oversee the design, implementation, and validation of their respective solutions".	The data masking and tokenization specifications are mentioned in the RFP Appendix 1 bidder needs to propose the solution accordingly. Data masking and tokenization needs to apply on all the PII data, all the data marked confidential as per the policy as well as on data for which the data masking / tokenization strategy finalized during the Rules creation.
213	Appendix II Commercial Bid			OEM roles and responsibilities are already mentioned in the RFP.
214	Appendix II	Year 2 (for 9 months) Software ATS for 9 months	General OEMs provide ATS for 12 month minimum. Request Bank to standardize ATS in multiple of 12 months.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.
215	Appendix II Commercial Bid - Price Breakup: A. Software Cost:	Price Breakup: A. Software Cost:	No Price Breakup is asked for Containers/Kubernetes Platform and Operating System (OS). Justification: The ask is for the complete solution to work on Container based technology. In the Price Breakup table there is no separate line item for Container tech, & OS price breakup is taken separately. This will protect the Bank from any Community based platforms being quoted that may not have support & lifecycle management. This may become very big risky from stability & security perspective. In the commercial template Bank has asked for Man days rate and resource count. As this is turnkey project we request the bank to remove mandays effort details. OEMs are not in a position to give a price commitment for future purchase beyond very short term (days). This situation is aggravated by the prevailing geopolitical and currency volatility. We request bank to ask for supply for all the necessary Hardware and Software upfront for either 3 or 5 years. As per the Industry no OEMs are not committing to a price of	Bidder needs to provide the layer v Database, OS and Containers/Kubernetes in the section Database & peripheral software in the Appendix II.
216	Appendix II	Table D. OEM Effort in Man days Rate in INR for OEM's resources		Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.
217	Appendix II	Bank will procure additional hardware and software after 3 years		Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent Corrigendum.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
			Bank's Reply
218	Annex XXIII	Sizing Adequacy Letter	supply after 3 years. We request Bank to consider upfront supply of software and hardware for 5 years. Due to supply chain/dollar fluctuations/geo political dynamics OEMs are not confirming to price commitment 3 years later. OEMs are not also not able to confirm bid validity of 180 days. We request bank to reduce Bid validity to 90 days. The Parties agree that any sizing requirements are dependent on information's shared by Client under RFP and accordingly Bidder will do sizing. Any additional sizing requirements during delivery due to increased requirements by Bank must be mutually discussed and agreed under Change Request mechanism at an additional cost to be borne and paid by Client. The Parties also agree that any penalties in relation to sizing requirement shall be deleted.
219	Revised Table 19	Most of the Resources should have worked in one or more Scheduled Commercial Banks in India having more than 1000 branches or Financial regulator in India.	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
220	Schedule of Events / Bid Submission Timelines (Corrigendum II) — Last Date of Submission / Closing Date	Bid submission deadline	Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
221	Corrigendum SI No 955	As per Banks Reply below regarding warranty start date: This clause is for the hardware and software which will be provisioned in the 4th and 5th year. As per the warranty terms hardware will have 3 years warranty after go live. Bidder needs to just maintain the AMC terms of those Hardware and software.	The total contract period is of 5 years warranty includes the implementation warranty and /ATS.
222			The data is not stale as the long running queries will not run on the continuous modifying data. The intent is to use the ideal resources at Data offload the workload of running adhoc / long running queries for analytical model execution. This will improve the performance at DC.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
223		2. Please clarify the Bank's expectations with respect to ADF/CIMS reporting:	• Does the Bank currently have an existing ADF/CIMS reporting solution in place? • If so, please confirm whether the proposed solution is expected to integrate with the existing ADF/CIMS platform, or if it is to be replaced. • If no such solution currently exists, please clarify whether the Bank expects the System Integrator (SI) to provide an ADF/CIMS reporting solution, either as part of the proposed scope or through a third party ADF vendor.
224		3. In a typical Data Lakehouse architecture, data is inherently stored with multiple copies (replicas) and is also available at the DR site as part of the resiliency and high availability design. In this context, we seek guidance from the Bank on the backup strategy expected for the proposed solution.	Specifically, we request clarification on the following: Does the Bank still mandate a separate backup mechanism in addition to the inherent replication within the Lakehouse platform and the DC-DR setup? • If so, kindly specify which data layers are required to be backed up (Bronze, Silver, Gold).
225			Please be guided by the Backup mechanism mentioned in the RFP. Backup needs to be done for the file uploaded as well as all type of data (Structured and unstructured) at Silver and Gold layer.
226			GPU infrastructure is not part of the RFP.
227			Backup needs to be done for the file uploaded as well as all type of data (Structure, structured and unstructured) at Silver and Gold layer.
228			GPU infrastructure is not part of the RFP.
229			Please be guided by the RFP and subsequent corrigendum.
			Yes your understanding is correct.
			The expectation from the scope of the RFP is very clear that the proposed end to end solution should support GPU whenever it is introduced by the Bank in the later phases. Bidder needs to consider any GPU infrastructure as part of the scope.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		Bank's Reply	
230			GPU enablement for the Kubernetes and AI/ML platform. The revised 2.32 requires: "storage must deliver ≥10 GB/s GET throughput, ≥20,000 S3 operations per second, average GET latency ≤10ms, average object size between 32MB–256MB." Two clarifications are needed: (i) Are these targets measured at the cluster aggregate level — i.e., the combined throughput and ops/sec of all storage nodes in the cluster — or at the per-node level? A 10-node cluster delivering 1 GB/s per node achieves 10 GB/s aggregate, which meets the target at cluster level but not per-node. (ii) The spec defines "average object size between 32MB–256MB." DLH workloads include Iceberg metadata files, Parquet footers, manifest files, and small control objects that are typically 4KB–1MB in size, alongside the large data files (32MB–256MB Parquet parts). Are the ≥20,000 S3 ops/sec and ≤10ms latency targets evaluated only against the 32MB–256MB object profile, or also against the mixed small-object metadata workloads that accompany Iceberg table operations? The distinction matters significantly for cluster sizing and certification benchmarks.
231	Recent PSU Bank	Graph - o Enable the storage, processing, and querying of graph-structured data for use cases like network analysis, relationship modelling, and recommendation systems. - o Support efficient traversal, pathfinding, and graph algorithms for large- scale datasets. - o Key-value store to manage graph data with adjacency lists. - o Metadata management and lineage tracking for graph data. - o Distributed graph processing and analytics. - o Graph database for scalable and transactional graph queries. - o Underlying storage for scalability and fault tolerance of graph data. - Native Graph - o Enable the storage, processing, and querying of graph-structured data for use cases like network analysis, relationship modelling, and recommendation systems. - o Support efficient traversal, pathfinding, and graph algorithms for large-scale datasets. - o support connections to be stored as pointers and not computed at query	The data lake house should be designed storing all type of data (Structured, Structure and unstructured). The solution should also be capable of reading all the graph PDF, Voice file etc. and link the same with Lakehouse governed database with multi engine running on the same database to do the analytics



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)			
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification
		time. o Metadata management and lineage tracking for graph data. o Distributed graph processing and analytics. o Graph database for scalable and transactional graph queries. o Underlying storage for scalability and fault tolerance of graph data. General- Cyber	
232	General- Cyber		Should we perform compliance assessment (to applicable regulations and standards) of the solution as part of the 5 year Maintenance and support period? Please provide which section of the RFP/Corrigendum it is mentioned
233	Additional Clause request		It is suggested that each software component including Application, OS, Virtual Machines (VM), Containers, Database should be Enterprise grade with each having well defined support SLA/subscription, Lifecycle management where End of Sale/End of Life information provided to Bank. Justification: Support, Lifecycle & Security is very important for any solution that are proposed to Banks.
234	268, S. No. 1405	The underlying infrastructure should be rack server on top of the same bidder can use HCI or VM deployment	Is Bank allow bidder to suggest the hardware (IBM Power) for the end to end solution?
235	305, S. no. 1663	Bank is already having the Monitoring system deployed, bidder needs to integrate with the same	Is the proposed solution will use the existing monitoring system or Should bidder to propose the Observability stack for DLH?
236	3.1 Scope of work Clause 1.34 Clause 1.40	Should the platform be extensible for fraud, AML, and network-based anomaly detection use cases requiring relationship-centric analytics?	Leading banks in the country are adapting to this already.
237	General		Considering the complexity & size of the RFP and post Pre-bid responses, finalization of proposed solution with multiple OEMs will require a considerable amount of time. Also, we have to go through a lot of legal & commercial reviews within the firm before submission. Hence, we request the Bank to allow us 4 weeks of time for Proposal Submission until 8th June 2026.
238	Table 15 (Corr-II)	4,000 mobile users (revised up from 2,000). 500 concurrent. Are mobile users a subset of business users (20,000) or additional? Does mobile have separate authentication/MDM requirements?	Affects mobile platform sizing. Mobile users are subset of the total user. Mobile user authentication is governed by the separate MDM.



Ref: RFP No. [GEM/2026/B/7216322](#)

Response to pre-bid queries for RFP (GEM/2026/B/7216322 dated 10/02/2026)				
S. No	Paragraph	Description	Clarification	Bank's Reply
239	Table 15 + Table 16 (Corr-II)	BI: 2,000 concurrent business users (revised from 6,000), 40 power, 8 super admin. Are these peak concurrent or sustained, and over what window (peak hour, peak minute)?	Sizing methodology depends on this.	These are peak concurrent user, how please refer to corrigendum for rev concurrent users.
240		4. The latest Corrigendum from Indian Bank indicates a requirement for GPU / accelerator support as part of the proposed AI/ML platform, implying that the solution should be capable of leveraging GPUs whenever required by the Bank. However, GPUs have not been explicitly factored into the current capacity sizing or BOQ.	In this context, we seek clarification on the following: Kindly confirm whether the expectation is that the bidder need not necessarily supply GPUs upfront, but must ensure that the proposed AI/ML platform is GPU ready and can seamlessly leverage GPUs if and when the Bank provisions or enables them in the future.	Yes your understanding is correct
241	Section II, 8.1 OEM Eligibility	As per the clause it is mentioned that the OEM can bid through multiple partner / Bidder. However if the OEM is bidding directly then the OEM cannot bid through any partner/bidder.	IBM operates through two distinct business units: IBM Consulting and IBM Technology. IBM Consulting primarily implements projects, leveraging both IBM and third party products, while IBM Technology is responsible for the sale of IBM software and hardware products, often enabling delivery through system integrators, including IBM Consulting. In this context, we request the Bank to clarify that, under the referenced clause, IBM India Pvt. Ltd. will be treated as the OEM for IBM Products, and that multiple system integrators (including IBM Consulting) may independently submit solutions based on IBM Technology products in response to this RFP issued by the Bank.	Please be guided by the CVC guideline <i>"Either the Bidder on behalf of the Principal OEM or the Principal/ OEM themselves can participate in the bid, but both cannot simultaneously for the same solution."</i>