

PRE-BID CLARIFICATION
Reply / clarification to the pre-bid queries

Reference:- Clarifications with reference to pre bid meeting dated: 05th January, 2024.

The pre-bid meeting for etender of Scanning/Digitization of Court Records and Establishment/Execution of 2 Paperless Courts (E-Court) in the High Court of Uttarakhand on Turnkey Basis in the High Court of Uttarakhand was held on 05th January, 2024. Based on the queries and deliberation by the High Court in response to the queries, response/clarification supersede the respective clauses mentioned in the tender document, other terms/clauses shall remain unchanged.

Note:-

- (1) This Corrigendum shall now be a part of the main tender document for all purposes.
- (2) The revised date schedule is also being shared through respective eTender Portal i.e. <https://uktenders.gov.in>

SN	Section No	Clause	Reference/ Subject	Clarification Sought	Response of Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakahnd
1	SECTION-II INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS-	6.0 Qualification Criteria	Criteria-2, non performing contracts and litigation.		Criteria-2 be read as Criteria 2A.
2	Annexure - 12 technical evaluation calculation	1: relevant experience of vendor	Sr. No.- I		Experience of three (3) Projects instead of Five(5)
3	Annexure - 12 technical evaluation calculation	1: relevant experience of vendor	Sr. No.- II		each Project one (1) number
4	SECTION-II INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS- Page No 9	6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -1 Technology Competence	Technology Competence – The technology provider should have multi-dimensional contribution experience in the base platform (proposed version), which should be directly verifiable in the code repository on internet, contribution experience should cover development of multiple modules and managing end user experience through	We strongly believe that the current criterion heavily biases only a few select organizations, unfairly sidelining numerous competent companies from participating in this process. There are merely two Indian organizations registered as service providers for DSpace and verifiably so. We possess the competence to seamlessly implement the Document Management System (DMS) in adherence to Supreme Court guidelines. Furthermore, our esteemed technology partner has successfully secured contracts with other High Courts in India, attesting	High Court is not bound to prefer any particular open source DMS software like as mentioned in the clarification sought by bidder. Bidder may quote any software complying the specifications and requirement of this Hon'ble Court. the software must be open source and enough support system from base platform OEM in adherence to Supreme Court guidelines. However, if the bidder itself is not having contribution experience in the

			documentation, walkthrough videos, etc. Necessary details to be provided as per the format provided in the Annexure.	to our capabilities and expertise in this domain. It's imperative to reevaluate this criterion to ensure a fair and inclusive selection process that doesn't unduly favor only a handful of entities. Requesting you to make it "Technology provider should be able to implement DMS on opensource platform and adhere to Supreme Court given SOP."	base platform in the proposed version, in such case the bidder may submit Bid Specific MAF from Base Platform OEM issued prior to last date of bid submission of this RFP.
5	SECTION-II INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS- Page No 9	6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -4	The bidder (or the technology partner, if bidder is collaborating with the technology partner or consortium) should have software development/ Installation and service experience in the system analysis, design, development, and maintenance of proposed DMS and other required solutions to meet the OAIS & ISO 16363 based trusted repository framework requirements. Technology provider must have installation experience for proposed DMS version having at least 1 crore pages and user load of around 15000 plus users directly in Govt./Educational Institutions/Private/Others. Internet URL of quoted instances with copies of orders/certificates should be submitted.	While our solution complies with the outlined requisites, its execution is scheduled within the forthcoming three months. This robust system is engineered to handle a repository of over 100 crores of documents and serve a substantial user base on the public internet. Presently, the evaluation criteria specify experience with a load of 1 crore documents and 15,000 users. We fervently implore reconsideration based on the significant merits of our solution. Despite its pending installation, our system surpasses the mandated scale, warranting substantial acknowledgment in the evaluation process. The DMS should be implemented as per the Supreme court SOP and any company which has been awarded tender on similar lines can be a part of this bidding process.	The clause may be amended as under:- The bidder (or the technology partner, if bidder is collaborating with the technology partner or consortium) should have software development/ Installation and service experience in the system analysis, design, development, implementation, and maintenance of proposed DMS and other required solutions to meet the OAIS & ISO 16363 based trusted repository framework requirements. Technology provider must have installation experience for proposed DMS version having at least 1 crore pages and user load of around 5000 plus users at a time directly in Govt./Educational Institutions/Private/Others. copies of orders/certificates should be submitted.

6	SECTION-II INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS- Page No 10	6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -5	Authorization – Bidder or technology partner/consortium should be at least in the registered service provider category of the base open source DMS platform used for the Courts or case files management system .Necessary documents confirming provider's status since more than a year should be part of the bid response which may be cross verifiable on the website of proposed DMS platform independently by the High Court's Bid Evaluation committee.	The stipulation mandating service provider registration for over a year with the DMS platform appears unnecessary from the court's perspective. This requirement places equally competent organizations, capable of delivering solutions for government agencies while comprehending the significance and adherence to Supreme Court SOP and guidelines, at an unnecessary disadvantage. It's imperative to reconsider this criterion, shifting the focus towards the ability to implement the DMS solution in line with Supreme Court SOP. The current criteria seem to unduly favor a limited pool of organizations, contravening the principles of fair tendering. Our request is to not make it mandatory to be a partner / service provider of the DMS platform.	If the bidder itself is not having contribution experience in the base platform in the proposed version, in such case the bidder may submit Bid Specific MAF from Base Platform OEM issued prior to last date of bid submission of this RFP.
7	Annexure - 12 Technical Evaluation Criteria Page 74	SN 1 Relevant Ex-perience Of the Vendor Point 1	Experience of Five projects of Digitization of Judi-cial Records (3) (each project 01 numbers)	The stated criterion is excluding numerous deserving companies with limited or no experience in digitizing judicial records, but having significant experience in managing executing digitization projects of larger sizes, from the competition. Request you to change it to only five government projects only.	The clause is for weightage in technical evaluation. It is not a pre- eligibility criteria for participation.
8	Annexure - 12 Technical Evaluation Criteria Page 74	SN 1 Relevant Ex-perience Of the Vendor Point 2	Technology Provider's experience of deploying E- court solution on the proposed DMS version (An- gular, Node, and Java springboot) under at least one High Court and re- structuring and migrating existing data to the proposed E- Court solu- tion.(4) (each project 5 numbers)	We request that it be changed to any origination who can demonstrate the requirement is eligible for the bidding process.	The clause is for weightage in technical evaluation. It is not a pre- eligibility criteria for participation. However, for wider participation, it may be read as under: - Technology Provider's experience of deploying E-court solution on the proposed DMS version (An-gular, Node, and Java springboot) under at least in Supreme Court/any High Court or in any of the Courts Subordinate to High Court and re- structuring and migrating existing data to the proposed E- Court solu- tion.(4) (each project 5 numbers)

9	SECTION-II INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS- Page No 9	6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -1 Technology Competence	Technology Competence – The technology provider should have multi-dimensional contribution experience in the base platform (proposed version), which should be directly verifiable in the code repository on internet, contribution experience should cover development of multiple modules and managing end user experience through documentation, walkthrough videos, etc. Necessary details to be provided as per the format provided in the Annexure.	Request you o please remove this point. We can run the project with any opensource available technology like D-Spcae etc..	Already clarified at sr. No. 4.
10	SECTION-II INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS- Page No 9	6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -4	The bidder (or the technology partner, if bidder is collaborating with the technology partner or consortium) should have software development/ Installation and service experience in the system analysis, design, development, implementation, and maintenance of proposed DMS and other required solutions to meet the OAIS & ISO 16363 based trusted repository framework requirements. Technology provider must have installation experience for proposed DMS version having at least 1 crore pages and user load of around 15000 plus users directly in Govt./Educational Institutions/Private/Others. Internet URL of quoted	We suggested, Instead compulsory for experience of proposed DMS for 1 crore pages and user load of round 15000 user, HC should consider the received work order/work contract from any High court for digitization project and deployment of DMS as per SCI guidelines.	The term be as as under: - Technology Provider's experience of deploying E-court solution on the proposed DMS version (An-gular, Node, and Java springboot) under at least in Supreme Court/any High Court or in any of the Courts Subordinate to High Court and re-structuring and migrating existing data to the proposed E- Court solution.(4) (each project 5 numbers)

			instances with copies of orders/certificates should be submitted.		
11	Criteria 2 - Experience and Past Performance:	2	<p>Considering the complexity of work and the current state of data at the High Court, the bidder or technology provider's experience of implementing E-court & DMS solution integrated with CIS (to pull various kind of information as per RFP's specs) should include restructuring existing bookmarked PDFs as per E-court's structure requirement.</p> <p>Hence, E-Court and DMS experience produced to meet experience criteria should include restructuring data from existing bookmarked PDFs as per the E-court's multi-level hierarchy structure and automated migration of atleast 25,000 cases per High Court to the E-Court and DMS (Angular, Node, and Java Springboot based solution) to be used during the E-Court process.</p>	Request to confirm if experience of Technology OEM will be permissible where Technology OEM is not a consortium partner with prime bidder.	Please refer Annexure-2A for the same.
12	Criteria 3 – Performance Capability	2	Required certifications -The bidder shall have ISO 9001:2015, 20000-1:2018, & 27001:2013.	Please specify if all ISO certificates are mandatory for eligibility as ISO 20000 is more detailed in capacity requirements, planning and monitoring which ideally	The clause may be read as under: - The bidder shall have ISO 9001:2015 and 27001:2013.

				should not be mandatory for participation.	However additional certification of ISO 20000-1:2018 shall be given weightage as per annexure-12.
13	SECTION-IV SCOPE OF WORK	page 32	Scope of Work	Please specify the locations where the the physical files will be made available for scanning activity - will it be centralized or decentralized at multiple locations	The pending files are in the respective Judicial Sections. The fresh files are in the Institution Section. The disposed files are in the Record Room. The bidder has to create minimum two setups, one for fresh filing and other for pending and Disposed files.
14	SECTION-IV SCOPE OF WORK	page 32	Scope of Work	Please specify who will be responsible for picking up the physical documents and bringing them to the scanning stations-will this be done by the court team or bidder will be given access to current locations for the pickup and movement?	It will be responsibility of bidder to receive and transport the files to Scanning location (setup) from sections/record room.
15	SECTION-IV SCOPE OF WORK	page 32	Scope of Work	Please specify if page numbering is to be done - via machine or pen/pencil or no pagination is to be done.	It can be done using any method keeping in mind that the original record should not be tempered.
16	SECTION-IV SCOPE OF WORK	page 32	Scope of Work	Please specify the average number of pages per file if possible - tentative value	Approx 100-150.
17	SECTION-IV SCOPE OF WORK	page 32	Scope of Work	Please specify if there is any current system which is capable of the monitoring of the end to end process from the digitization to the final storage in DMS - using workflows - which can be utilized by the bidder OR if the bidder needs to deploy the monitoring system	The bidder needs to deploy such system to monitor the entire activity.
18	SECTION-IV SCOPE OF WORK	page 32	Scope of Work	Please share the details on what modifications/processing needs to be done on the already digital files available in old DMS.	The existing files should be indexed (in case of additional indexing parameters), arranged as per requirement of new DMS and Paperless Courts, compressed (if required to optimize) etc.
19	SECTION-IV SCOPE OF WORK	page 32	Scope of Work	Please share if the bidder will get access of Old DMS or will the bidder get the data dump from the old DMS to work on it.	Both options are available. It will be depending on the bidders requirement so as to provide the requisite solution.

<p>20</p>	<p>SECTION-IV SCOPE OF WORK</p>	<p>page 32</p>	<p>Scope of Work</p>	<p>Please share the number of fields to be captured for indexing. Will the bidder get any support from the officials on identification of these fields?</p>	<p>Initial support to identify indexing parameters will be given. The minimum indexing parameters are as below. However there must be provision for additional meta data fields in the proposed solution-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Case Number: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A unique identifier assigned to each case by the high court. 2. Title of the Case: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A concise and descriptive title summarizing the key aspects of the case. 3. Court bench: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The specific division or bench within the high court handling the case. 4. Case Type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Categorization based on the nature of the case (e.g., civil, criminal, constitutional, administrative). 5. Parties Involved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Names and details of the plaintiff(s), defendant(s), and any other relevant parties. 6. Advocates/Attorneys: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information about legal representatives involved in the case. 7. Date of Filing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The date when the case was officially filed with the high court. 8. Date of Admission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The date on which the case was accepted and admitted by the court. 9. Hearing Dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A record of all scheduled and conducted hearings with corresponding dates. 10. Legal Citations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - References to relevant statutes, legal provisions, and precedents applicable to the case. 11. Case Status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current status of the case, such
------------------	---	----------------	----------------------	---	---

					<p>as pending, ongoing, reserved judgment, or disposed of.</p> <p>12. Orders and Judgments: - A section to track and document any interim orders or final judgments issued by the court.</p> <p>13. Appeals: - Indication of whether the case is subject to any appeals or review processes.</p> <p>14. Case History: - A chronological log of significant events, motions, and rulings throughout the case's lifecycle.</p> <p>15. Legal Issues/Claims: - A summary of the legal issues or claims raised in the case.</p> <p>16. Witnesses: - Details of witnesses involved in the case, including their statements and testimonies.</p> <p>17. Evidence and Exhibits: - An inventory of documents, exhibits, and evidence presented during the proceedings.</p> <p>18. Precedents Cited: - Any legal precedents cited by the parties or the court during the case.</p> <p>19. Court Costs and Fees: - Record of any fees, costs, or penalties associated with the case.</p> <p>20. Case Outcome: - The final resolution or outcome of the case, including any orders for relief, damages, or remedies.</p> <p>Apart from above, the solution must have advanced free text search (open search) facility.</p>
21	SECTION-IV SCOPE OF WORK	page 32	Scope of Work	Please share if there is any multilingual capability required and which languages are to be focused upon.	Multilingual capability shall be required in solution, however as of now English and Hindi/devnagri are primary Languages

22	Criteria 4 Financial Viability	Page 10/11	Clause 3 - (a) The average coefficient of Current ratio (Current Assets / Current Liabilities): Greater than 1	For the companies that are heavy on Investment, maintaining the Current ratio at 1 would be a constraint. For Iron mountain India Pvt Ltd, we are in a significant growth phase of the business and our business model operates on our long-term growth ambitions with heavy capex investment including extensive capex funding. We are growing annually with an average increase of storage/ New space space by 2.2- 2.4Mn Cubic feet.	The clause shall be read as under: The average coefficient of Current ratio (Current Assets / Current Liabilities): Greater than 2/3 (0.66)
23	42. PAYMENT AND PENALTY	Pg no 28	42 (a) (i) Successful completion of the pilot shall be the prerequisite for going ahead with the remaining contract and any payment for this contract will be released only on successful completion of pilot. ii. Payment shall be processed in full on receipt of the Supply, installation, and working satisfactory reports as referred in Clause-5 (Scope of work) and PBG Clause of RFP.	a) Need Clarification whether the payment of Pilot project will be based on digitization of documents or it will include the supply, installation of hardware. b) Also we request to change the payment on monthly basis.	The payment will be based on per page cost (work done) submitted by firm on quarterly basis after successful completion of pilot.
24	VI BOQ COMMERCIAL BID FORMAT	Pg. No 34	Commercial Bid Format point no (i) expected volume 1Cr pages.	Need bifurcation on Number of Pages per location.	As of now, there is only one location of Files i.e. High Court Campus.
25	Section No.VII Specifications	Pg No 35	LIST OF HARDWARE FOR PAPERLESS/ECOURT SOLUTION	(a)Need clarification whether we have to provide the same specifications of Hardware and Qty in how many Location. (b)provide the location details for installation of hardware for E -court solution.	Minimum hardware quantity and count has been mentioned in the RFP. However to full fill the requirement of paperless court, the bidder may need to install additional hardware in the scope of this bid, for which no additional payment will be given to bidder. As it's a turnkey based project, hence it will be responsibility of bidder to provide entire end to end solution with all the required hardware for scanning/digitization /paperless court.
26	2 Submission Bid	pg no 5	Bidder has to select the payment option as "offline"	We request Honorable High Court to provide the Online payment option for	As on date facility of online Tender fee/EMD is not available. Bidder has

			to pay the tender fee / EMD as applicable and enter details of the instrument.	Tender Fee / EMD.	to submit Tender Fee/EMD in original before last date/time of bid submission.
27	Section-II	6. Qualification Criteria: Criteria 2	Experience and Past Performance: Similar Experience: Bidder or technology partner/consortium must have Completed or substantially (work of in which at least 80% have been paid) completed of similar works during last 5 years (2018-2023) should be either of the following: - Two similar completed works each costing not less than the amount equal to Rs. 2.25 Crore; or 1.5 Crore pages OR One similar completed work costing not less than the amount equal to Rs. 4.0 Crore or 3 Crore pages Necessary confirmation issued confirming the above experience should be attached. The Bidder must have executed any digitalization project covering multiple locations.	Hope it includes Scanning & Digitization Project involving Implementation of DMS across locations. Please clarify?	Yes. However, it is clarified that multiple locations may be considered if these are part of one project.
28	Section-II	6. Qualification Criteria: Criteria 2	Considering the complexity of work and the current state of data at the High Court, the bidder or technology provider's experience of implementing E-court & DMS solution integrated with CIS (to pull various kind of information as per RFP's specs) should include restructuring existing bookmarked PDFs as per E-court's structure requirement. Hence, E-Court	With this condition only the parties who have eCourt experience would be able to participate. We suggest to relax to increase participation and healthy competition.	This criteria shall be supplemented by the following proviso- The experience of migration of existing data is for weightage in technical evaluation. It will not be considered as a pre-eligibility criteria for participation.

			and DMS experience produced to meet experience criteria should include restructuring data from existing bookmarked PDFs as per the E-court's multi-level hierarchy structure and automated migration of atleast 25,000 cases per High Court to the E-Court and DMS (Angular, Node, and Java Springboot based solution) to be used during the E-Court process.		
29	Section-II	6. Qualification Criteria: Criteria 3	The technology provider should have multi-dimensional contribution experience in the base platform (proposed version), which should be directly verifiable in the code repository on internet, contribution experience should cover development of multiple modules and managing end user experience through documentation, walkthrough videos, etc. Necessary details to be provided as per the format provided in the Annexure.	Please clarify whether the User Manual would be sufficient to prove the contribution as it is not possible to keep the source code on internet.	No. The bidder may submit Bid Specific MAF from Base Platform OEM issued prior to last date of bid submission of this RFP.
30	Section-II	6. Qualification Criteria: Criteria 3	The bidder (or the technology partner, if bidder is collaborating with the technology partner or consortium) should have software development/ Installation and service experience in the system analysis, design, development, implementation, and maintenance of proposed DMS and other required	Hope CMMI Certificate would be sufficient to prove the capability.	Tender term shall prevail. The CMMI Certificate shall be considered only for weightage.

			solutions to meet the OAIS & ISO 16363 based trusted repository framework requirements. Technology provider must have installation experience for proposed DMS version having at least 1 crore pages and user load of around 15000 plus users directly in Govt./Educational Institutions/Private/Others. Internet URL of quoted instances with copies of orders/certificates should be submitted.		
31	Section-II	6. Qualification Criteria: Criteria 2	The experience should not include migrating the data from the older version of the DMS to the newer version, or the experience of migrating the data to the older version(s) of the DMS. Experience of any other application or the previous version of the proposed DMS will not be considered.	Please Clarify which certificate is required to be attached.	Being a limited scope/opportunity of migration, the term may be relaxed and amended as under: - The bidder must have capability to migrate data from the older version of the DMS to the newer proposed version in a efficient manner as desired by this Hon'ble Court.
32	Section-II	6. Qualification Criteria: Criteria 3	Performance Capability - Required certifications -The bidder shall have ISO 9001:2015, 20000-1:2018, & 27001:2013.	Hope the participant would be given marks as per the availability and does not restrict participation. Please clarify.	Already clarified at serial no-12.
33	Section-II	6. Qualification Criteria: Criteria 3	Authorization – Bidder or technology partner/consortium should be at least in the registered service provider category of the base open source DMS platform used for the Courts or case files management system .Necessary documents confirming provider's status since more than a year should be part of the bid response which may	Please Clarify if we are the self OEM a declaration by the authorized signatory would full fill the criteria.	Yes

			be cross verifiable on the website of proposed DMS platform independently by the High Court's Bid Evaluation committee.		
34	Section-II	Clarification on Tender Document, point 4.2	All queries on the Tender Document should be received on or before as prescribed in Section I of this tender document. The High Court shall hold a pre-bid conference (PBC) as per the date mentioned under Section I. Queries not submitted within this deadline or not in the given format may not be taken up at the PBC. High Court of Uttarakhand may choose decide to do a virtual PBC in case of contingencies and information regarding the same will be published on the portal/website.	Looking at the tough travel conditions we would request to share Virtual PBC link.	Already accepted.
35	SECTION-II INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS- Page No 9	6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -1 Technology Competence	Technology Competence – The technology provider should have multi-dimensional contribution experience in the base platform (proposed version), which should be directly verifiable in the code repository on internet, contribution experience should cover development of multiple modules and managing end user experience through documentation, walkthrough videos, etc. Necessary details to be provided as per the format provided in the Annexure.	Please follow the SPO shared by the Supreme court of India and make it generic so need to have fare competition	The High Court has considered the SPO as SOP (Standard Operating Procedure) issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and same has been already incorporated in the RFP.

36	SECTION-II INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS- Page No 9	6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -4	The bidder (or the technology partner, if bidder is collaborating with the technology partner or consortium) should have software development/ Installation and service experience in the system analysis, design, development, implementation, and maintenance of proposed DMS and other required solutions to meet the OAIS & ISO 16363 based trusted repository framework requirements. Technology provider must have installation experience for proposed DMS version having at least 1 crore pages and user load of around 15000 plus users directly in Govt./Educational Institutions/Private/Others. Internet URL of quoted instances with copies of orders/certificates should be submitted.	Please follow the SPO shared by the Supreme court of India and make it generic so need to have fare competition	Already clarified at Sr. No. -35.
37	SECTION-II INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS- Page No 10	6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -5	Authorization – Bidder or technology partner/consortium should be at least in the registered service provider category of the base open source DMS platform used for the Courts or case files management system .Necessary documents confirming provider's status since more than a year should be part of the bid response which may be cross verifiable on the website of proposed DMS platform independently by	Many partner don't have own DMS so please do not make it mandatory	If the bidder itself is not having contribution experience in the base platform in the proposed version, in such case the bidder may submit Bid Specific MAF from Base Platform OEM issued prior to last date of bid submission of this RFP.

			the High Court's Bid Evaluation committee.		
38	Annexure - 12 Technical Evaluation Criteria Page 74	SN 1 Relevant Ex-perience Of the Vendor Point 1	Experience of Five projects of Digitization of Judicial Records (3) (each project 01 numbers)	kindly make this to any govt project not only HC	Being specific nature of work and due to various running projects of digitization in other states, weightage is being given to the vendor in technical evaluation. The Judicial Record includes Hon'ble Supreme Court, High Court and all the Courts subordinate to High Court.
39	Annexure - 12 Technical Evaluation Criteria Page 74	SN 1 Relevant Ex-perience Of the Vendor Point 2	Technology Provider's experience of deploying E-court solution on the proposed DMS version (Angular, Node, and Java springboot) under at least one High Court and restructuring and migrating existing data to the proposed E- Court solution.(4) (each project 5 numbers)	each company has its own process to create application so make it generic	The firm may develop application using its own process, however it must be open source, adhering SOP of Hon'ble eCommitte, complaining all the activities mentioned in the RFP and must have bid specific MAF from base platform OEM.

40	Section II	<p>Instruction to bidder 6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -1 Technology Competence</p>	<p>Technology Competence – The technology provider should have multi-dimensional contribution experience in the base platform (proposed version), which should be directly verifiable in the code repository on internet, contribution experience should cover development of multiple modules and managing end user experience through documentation, walkthrough videos, etc. Necessary details to be provided as per the format provided in the Annexure.</p>	<p>Open Source philosophy is entirely opposite of this type of restrictively as asked in the qualification. Use of Opensource platform is a valid requirement, and there are a number of competent companies who can successfully implement, customize, operate and maintain such open source software, but asking a bidder to be contributor to the Opensource is highly restrictive. Imagine this same as saying that Linux is an Open source, but Linux can be proposed only by the contributors to linux source code. this is highly restrictive. please remove the clause.</p> <p>Should be allowed to participate irrespective of technology partner or scanning partner both not registered or source code contributor on any Open Source DMS platform. As have got proven capability to install and execute such solutions.</p>	Already clarified at Sr. No. 4
41	Section II	<p>Instruction to bidder 6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -4</p>	<p>The bidder (or the technology partner, if bidder is collaborating with the technology partner or consortium) should have software development/ Installation and service experience in the system analysis, design, development, implementation, and maintenance of proposed DMS and other required solutions to meet the OAIS & ISO 16363 based trusted repository framework requirements. Technology provider must have installation experience for proposed DMS version having at least 1 crore pages and user load of around</p>	<p>15000 users. This clause is highly restrictive and it appears favouring only one or two providers in the country. How many direct users with login credentials are expected for this installation, (not including public internet users) the asked number of users appears not in line with the requirement and appears favouring only one vendor.</p> <p>Should be allowed to participate irrespective of technology partner or scanning partner both not registered on any Open Source DMS platform. Please remove the criteria of 1 crore pages and 15000 users and allow partners who have been even awarded such tender.</p>	Already clarified at Point No-5.

			15000 plus users directly in Govt./Educational Institutions/Private/Others. Internet URL of quoted instances with copies of orders/certificates should be submitted.		
42	Section II	Instruction to bidder 6.0 Qualification Criteria Criteria 3 – Performance Capability Point no -5	Authorization – Bidder or technology partner/consortium should be at least in the registered service provider category of the base open source DMS platform used for the Courts or case files management system .Necessary documents confirming provider's status since more than a year should be part of the bid response which may be cross verifiable on the website of proposed DMS platform independently by the High Court's Bid Evaluation committee.	This is restrictive and points to only 2 specific vendors. Our request is to remove this condition. not make it mandatory to be a partner / service provider of the DMS platform.	Already clarified at point no-4.
43	Annexure 12	Technical evaluation SN 1 Relevant Experience Of the Vendor Point 1	Experience of Five projects of Digitization of Judicial Records (3) (each project 01 numbers)	Request you to change it to only five government projects only.	Already clarified at Sr. No.-7
44	Annexure 12	Technical evaluation SN 1 Relevant Ex-perience Of the Vendor Point 2	Technology Provider's experience of deploying E-court solution on the proposed DMS version (Angular, Node, and Java springboot) under at least one High Court and restructuring and migrating existing data to the proposed E- Court solu-	We request that it be changed to any organisation who can demonstrate the requirement is eligible for the bidding process.	Being specific nature of work and due to various running projects of digitization in other states, weightage is being given to the vendor in technical evaluation. The Judicial Record includes Hon'ble Supreme Court, High Court and all the Courts subordinate to High Court.

			tion.(4) (each project 5 numbers)		
45	Qualification Criteria	Qualification Criteria 2 - Experience and Past Performance. Point 1 section 2	Considering the complexity of work and the current state of data at the High Court, the bidder or technology provider's experience of implementing E-court & DMS solution integrated with CIS (to pull various kind of information as per RFP's specs) should include restructuring existing bookmarked PDFs as per E-court's structure requirement. Hence, E-Court and DMS experience produced to meet experience criteria should include restructuring data from existing bookmarked PDFs as per the E-court's multi-level hierarchy structure and automated migration of atleast 25,000 cases per High Court to the E-Court and DMS (Angular, Node, and Java Springboot based solution) to be used during the E-Court process.	The PDF conversion experience asked for is very rare, but once the tender awarded to us, we can ensure this is done	This criteria shall be supplemented by the following proviso- The experience of migration of existing data is for weightage in technical evaluation. It will not be considered as a pre-eligibility criteria for participation.
46	Annexure - 12	Technical evaluation SN 3: Principal Technical Staff	Competence and hands-on experience of the Team Leader/Project Manager in execution and coordination of E-Court solution and CIS integration – Maximum 25 Marks depending in experience	We think too much weightage is given to single person in marking system. We suggest this should be removed and marks should be given for organizations ability to deliver.	Tender term shall prevail.
47				A significant part of the tender is based on use of knowledge graphs, AI, ML, SparQL, Protégé, OWL and semantic engineering. Please make it necessary that the provider has experience of atleast two projects using these	The specification of required DMS already includes such requirement.

				technologies.	
48	Section V	5	List of Hardware for paperless Ecourt- 50TB usable (SSD based) unified storage with protection and recovery solutions	Need more details on the point mentioned regarding the Unified storage, we require specification details	The minimum required specifications are already mentioned.
49	Annexure 12	1)i.	Relevant experience	Please consider the past exp for PSU's /Govt as well	Already clarified in foregoing paragraph.
50	Annexure 12	2)iii.	Scope of Services	Please consider the past exp for PSU's /Govt as well	
51	Annexure 12	3)i.	Principal Technical Staff	Please consider the past exp for PSU's /Govt as well	
52	Annexure 12	3)ii.	Principal Technical Staff	Please consider the past exp for PSU's /Govt as well	
53	Page 35		Supply, installation, and commissioning of Wacom Cintiq Pro (minimum 24 inches) Creative Pen Display (4k, touch with stylus/ interactive pen, with Stand that supports adjustable tilt, lift, and rotation, , SDK for signature, SDK for Ink) with CPU for viewing/running E-Court Solution in the Court for Hon'ble Bench and suitable interactive devices for Advocates/Bench Secretary	Suggest addition of Adjustable tilt, lift and rotation stand which enables ergonomic handling, helps in removal of any overhead light reflection. Software development Kit for digital ink helps in capture of notes in 3rd party application, Software development kit for signature helps capturing of digital signature in 3rd party application.	Accepted. The term be now read as under:- Supply, installation, and commissioning of Wacom Cintiq Pro (minimum 24 inches) Creative Pen Display (4k, touch with stylus/ interactive pen, with Stand that supports adjustable tilt, lift, and rotation, , SDK for signature, SDK for Ink) with CPU for viewing/running E-Court Solution in the Court for Hon'ble Bench and suitable interactive devices for Advocates/Bench Secretary
54	Page 35 annexure - C	Memory: 16 GB DDR4-3200 MHz Ram (1 X 16 GB)	Memory: 16 GB DDR4-3200 MHz Ram (1 X 16 GB)	In case of shared intel graphic 4 GB would be used by Graphic card so remaining 4 GB is insufficient for running window 10/11, suggest increase to 16 GB	Accepted. The clause be read as under:- Memory: 16 GB DDR4-3200 MHz Ram (1 X 16 GB)
55			Hard Disk Drive: minimum 512 GB SSD	SSD speed is higher than SATA, suggest minimum 512 SSD	We have already mentioned that the storage type shall be SSD. It may be read as under:- Hard Disk Drive: minimum 512 GB SSD

56			Graphics: Intel® UHD Graphics supporting resolution 3840 x 2160	Suggest resolution of 3840 x 2160 to be supported by graphic card.	Accepted. Graphics: Intel® UHD Graphics supporting resolution 3840 x 2160
57			Ports: 2 USB 2.0, USB 3.0 Type-A; 1 audio- in; 1 audio-out; 1 RJ-45; HP Serial Port Adapter	Serial port supported interface is EOL, suggest remove.	Accepted. The clause be read as under:- Ports: 2 USB 2.0, USB 3.0 Type-A; 1 audio- in; 1 audio-out; 1 RJ-45;
58			Video Connectors 1 VGA; 1 HDMI, 1 USB-C	Suggest addition of USB C helps with single cable connectivity, less clutter.	Accepted. The clause be read as under:- Video Connectors 1 VGA; 1 HDMI, 1 Type C
59		Pen and touch display for advocate and court master view	13" (13.3" active area) FHD resolution 1920X1080, Brightness 320 cd/m ² , battery free stylus, Finger Touch input, Windows, Chrome, Android OS support, Encryption AES256/RSA2048, stand (Portrait/Landscape) SDK for signature.	Portrait view helps in perfect view of legal-size paper by advocates, require less scrolling, do not block view between Judge and advocate, helps in capturing of digital signature as consent of true copy submission approved by Judge	The Pen and touch display for advocate and court master view shall of minimum 17".
60		3 in 1 adaptor display adaptor	Powered USB-C / HDMI 3-in-1 adaptor with 3 units 10-meter HDMI cable	For connecting display between advocate and court master.	Being as turnkey project, it would be responsibility of bidder to provide all the required items/accessories etc, for implementation of paperless court.

Sd/-

Registrar General
High Court of uttarakhand.