Corrigendum-V

Request for Proposal (RFP) for
Selection of Agency for Supply, Installation, Testing and Commissioning to upgrade backhaul network for Gujarat Fibre Grid Network Limited, Dept. of Science & Technology, Government of Gujarat

Issued by:
Gujarat Fibre Grid Network Limited
Reference No: GFGNL/GFG/e-file/263/2023/0122-2

03rd March 2025

Issued By:

Gujarat Fibre Grid Network Limited (GFGNL)

A Government of Gujarat Company

Block No: 6, 5th Floor, Udyog Bhavan, Sector-11, Gandhinagar 382010

4. Notice Inviting Proposal and Necessary Instruction

Name of the work	Request for Proposal (RFP) for Selection of Agency for Supply, Installation, Testing and Commissioning to upgrade backhaul network for Gujarat Fibre Grid Network Limited, Dept. of Science & Technology, Government of Gujarat
Proposal due date (last of date of Tender submission)	Tender should be submitted before ~~23/01/2025 07-Feb-2025~~, ~~24/02/2025, 05/03/2025,~~ 10/03/2025, 6:10 PM Bidder shall upload their bids on nprocure.

Additional Note/Clause/Clarification:

1. The time is essence. The potential bidders have been given sufficient opportunity and have also been responded. All potential bidders are advice to prepare participation without further representation to avoid inordinate delay in this mission critical project.
2. Bidder shall provide copy of unpriced agreement with OEM covering scope for entire contract duration to GFGNL before final SI-OEM agreement signing off. The purpose of the assessment is to ensure that the bidder can deliver on their, commitments without causing any service limitations to GFGNL, including during the warranty period and contract period.
3. Active: Active redundancy solution, power conversion system etc. must be consider in total space and power budget by the bidder. Even after opening of financial bid of winner bidder, any deviation in notional space and power will be sufficient reason to reject BID without providing any reason.

Queries response:

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
1	31	12.1 Supply and installation	Perpetual software licenses as per the proposed solution outlined in the Technical Specifications of this RFP.	We request to modify this as follows" Software licenses as per the proposed solution outlined in the technical specifications of the RFP"	Every OEM has a different licensing mechanism. Pls modify as suggested to allow us to qualify and participate.	Perpetual or with update and upgrades during the entire contract period and after the contract period without any condition and additional cost to GFGNL, the software should work without support (Update/Upgrade). Separate undertaking from SI & OEM to be submitted as above.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
2	Corrigendum III - Page no. 10	Sr no. 2 - Clause no. 13.A.6.C	The modular chassis or fixed integrated chassis, both are allowed for wider competition subjected to control plane and data plane redundancy without compromising ask of the RFP.	Clarification - As fixed integrated chassis has control plane and data plane integrated within themselves, it is understood that redundancy for control plane and data plane cannot be achieved, the same is expected in the RFP.	Fixed architectures are able to delivery higher throughput and consume lesser power and space, and as Core locations are in shelters which have controlled atmosphere, we request GFGNL team to allow the bidders to quote either fixed chassis with integrated control and data plane.	This node is very critical. The effect of Node/Core equipment failure would have ripple effect of blackout at beneath 30 Gram Panchayats. Further, it will force traffic diversion of 250 GPs on adjacent nodes. Incidentally, in case this adjacent node may also encounter any failure, then complete district will go down. However, for wider participation and in the interest of technology limitation, the proposal allows for two fixed chassis, each with control plane and data plane, operating in an active-active mode for achieving redundancy.
3	Corrigendum III - Page no. 11	For Type-A: Core Layer Equipment: Minimum 800 Gbps capacity:	For Type-A: Core Layer Equipment: Minimum 800 Gbps capacity: a) 4 ports of 100G or 4 ports of 200G or 2 ports of 400G (Pluggable will be in scope of bidder as per solution design), b) 18 ports of 10G/25G (12 numbers with 40km optical pluggable, 4 numbers with 10km optical pluggable, 2 numbers with 10km electrical pluggable)c) 6	Capacity of router with 25% future growth is around 1000 Gbps based on interfaces asked in the RFP, request you to consider changing the same. Otherwise GFGNL will get Core routers with a under rated throughput with lot of limitations on wire speed traffic flow.	4 x100 = 400; 18 x25 = 450 and 6 x 10= 60 gbps 950 Gbps is the tota throughput , if we consider 80% utilization of the router, Hence throughput of router has to be minimum 1000Gbps	The business and functional minimum requirements of the network is explicit and therefore the box configuration including number of ports and ports capacity is nonnegotiable. For further clarity, the business and functional requirement is explained in visual manner in the Corrigendum-IV including number of ports, purpose of ports and capacity.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
			ports of 1G/10G (Pluggable will be in Variable supply)			
4	Corrigendum III - Page no. 11	For Type-A: Core Layer Equipment: Minimum 800 Gbps capacity:	For Type-A: Core Layer Equipment: Minimum 800 Gbps capacity: a) 4 ports of 100G or 4 ports of 200G or 2 ports of 400G (Pluggable will be in scope of bidder as per solution design),	Request you to remove 400G interface, if you give an option to Bidder / OEM with 4 x 100G or 400G, everyone will choose 4 x 100G. Hence request you to remove this option of 400G.	Request you to define if we need 400G interface or not, if you give an option to Bidder / OEM with 4 x 100G or 400G , then they will always choose 4 x 100G, moreover based on loss analysis of current fiber our last exercise showed us that 400Gbps running has lot of channel failure chances	The business and functional minimum requirements of the network is explicit and therefore the box configuration including number of ports and ports capacity is nonnegotiable. For further clarity, the business and functional requirement is explained in visual manner in the Corrigendum-IV including number of ports, purpose of ports and capacity.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
5	Corrigendum III - Page no. 12	For Type-A: Core Layer Equipment: For Type-B: Aggregation Layer Equipment: Minimum 300 Gbps capacity:	a) 3 ports of 100G (Pluggable will be in scope of bidder as per solution design), b) 16 ports of 10G (10 numbers with 40km optical pluggable, 4 numbers with 10km optical pluggable, 2 numbers with 10km electrical pluggable) c) 6 ports of 1G/10G (Pluggable will be in Variable supply)	Request you to increase the throughput of the box to 520Gbps	Request you to increase the throughput of the box to 520Gbps as the port calculation showcases - 3 x 100G +16 x 10G + 6 x 10G - 466Gbps + 20% for 80% loading - translates to 520Gbps	The business and functional minimum requirements of the network is explicit and therefore the box configuration including number of ports and ports capacity is nonnegotiable. For further clarity, the business and functional requirement is explained in visual manner in the Corrigendum-IV including number of ports, purpose of ports and capacity.
6	Corrigendum III - Page no. 12	13 A	As part of scope, bidder to supply 10Gbps SFP with supporting license and support testing at all delivery locations on Day-1 bandwidth requirement of 3Gbps at Sub-block, DC and 2Gbps at TC.	Could you please clarify the ask, are you asking OEM to load the box with all asked 10G interfaces as per the interface table. IF yes, it will add more cost to bidder on day 1and will not help GFGNL in enabling cost effective solution.		Pls refer Corrigendum-IV >> Visualization for Ports understanding and refer Corrigendum-III >> Annexure VII: Financial Bid Format and refer Corrigendum-III >> Additional Clause:2, 13A
7	Corrigendum III - Page no. 91	13 B 5	At SDC level, ask of E1 interface is optional. For dropping locations, the E1 interface is optional in the equipment. However, on specific ask of some govt. client, for E1 and other interface, then it is mandatory for the bidder to work	TDM interface at high scale aggregation boxes are not a good architecture and are not supported by leading OEM, giving undue advantage to a single OEM. Hence request you to		Bidder may allow to support TDM interface "E1, STM-1/4/16 using CES Interface" by provision of additional relevant box if limitation in specific OEM equipment for wider participation without any cost to GFGNL whenever required.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
			around without any cost to the GFGNL. 300G/400G interfaces are optional at the aggregation sites	consider keeping TDM technology separately if required , Market has small order TDM independent boxes which are much cheaper than asking CES interface in Aggregation routers, also as you are aware even BSNL and TATA are phasing out TDM interfaces as demand is dropping in the market.		
8	Corrigendum III - Page no. 215	Clause 228	Amended Clause is: "The OEM & Bidder shall provide a Comprehensive Onsite Warranty with upfront replacement for the entire lifecycle of the contract or a minimum of 10 years, whichever is longer, starting from the go-live date. This clause is purposed for the OEM to declare in the MAF and it is non-negotiable condition. It is good reason to drop the bid. However to make go-live process smoother, BharatNet Phase-II and BharatNet Phase-III	"The OEM & Bidder shall provide a Comprehensive Onsite Warranty with upfront replacement for the entire lifecycle of the contract or a minimum of 7 years, whichever is longer, starting from the date of bid submission. This clause is purposed for the OEM to declare in the MAF and it is non-negotiable condition. It is good	Justification for change is: in the original bid document on page 41 Point 17 and Page 26 / Point 6 mentioned the support for 7 years from the OEM can be provided - rest of the support will be provided by bidder by way of spare provisioning Also Go Live date is dynamic and can be extended for stretched period post awarding the contract to bidders due to various unknown factors hence request to change this term to "From the date of bid	1) In case of EOS/EOL for at least 7 Years by specific OEM and above, For remaining duration of 10 years, SI must ensure service availability by housing spares, additional equipment, new equipment wherever needed. 2) As per RFP and Corrigendum, Comprehensive onsite warranty will be starting from Go-Live date.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
			separate Go-Live will be considered as 90% of scope of the work of respective phase with valid reasons for pending sites."	reason to drop the bid. However to make go-live process smoother, BharatNet Phase-II and BharatNet Phase-III separate Go-Live will be considered as 90% of scope of the work of respective phase with valid reasons for pending sites."	submission" instead of "from the date of Go Live"	
9	11	13A	For Type-A: Core Layer Equipment: Minimum 800 Gbps capacity: a) 4 ports of 100G or 4 ports of 200G or 2 ports of 400G (Pluggable will be in scope of bidder as per solution design), b) 18 ports of 10G/25G (12 numbers with 40km optical pluggable, 4 numbers with 10km optical pluggable, 2 numbers with 10km electrical pluggable) c) 6 ports of 1G/10G (Pluggable will be in Variable supply)	Since the routers are going to be higher capacity with multiple 400G, 100G interfaces to meet both requirements: capacity and protection clauses (2 CNO, 3 CNO, 4 CNO), requesting 1G interfaces would put the chassis to underutilization. Moreover there is no OLT which is on 1G in GFGNL. Kindly make 1G requirement as optional and as per field requirement on specific ask of some govt. client.	For Type-A: Core Layer Equipment: Minimum 800 Gbps capacity: a) 4 ports of 100G or 4 ports of 200G or 2 ports of 400G (Pluggable will be in scope of bidder as per solution design), b) 18 ports of 10G/25G (12 numbers with 40km optical pluggable, 4 numbers with 10km optical pluggable, 2 numbers with 10km electrical pluggable) c) 6 ports of 10G (Pluggable will be in Variable supply) and 1G optional as per field requirement on specific ask of some govt. client.	The business and functional minimum requirements of the network is explicit and therefore the box configuration including number of ports and ports capacity is nonnegotiable. For further clarity, the business and functional requirement is explained in visual manner in the Corrigendum-IV including number of ports, purpose of ports and capacity.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
10	51	13 (B)(5)	FE/GE,10G,25G,100G,200G,300G,400G and E1, STM-1/4/16 using CES Interface At SDC level, ask of E1 interface is optional. For dropping locations, the E1 interface is optional in the equipment. However, on specific ask of some govt. client, for E1 and other interface, then it is mandatory for the bidder to work around without any cost to the GFGNL. 300G/400G interfaces are optional at the aggregation sites	Kindly also make STM-1/4/16 as optional and as per field requirement on specific ask of some govt. client.	FE/GE,10G,25G,100G,200G,300G,400G and E1, STM-1/4/16 using CES Interface At SDC level, ask of E1 interface is optional. For dropping locations, the E1,STM-1/4/16 interface is optional in the equipment. However, on specific ask of some govt. client, for E1 and other interface, then it is mandatory for the bidder to work around without any cost to the GFGNL. 300G/400G interfaces are optional at the aggregation sites.	Bidder may allow to support TDM interface "E1, STM-1/4/16 using CES Interface" by provision of additional relevant box if limitation in specific OEM equipment for wider participation without any cost to GFGNL whenever required.
11	39	13 (A)(5)	All the supplied equipment must be capable to support minimum 2CNO (Three Path protection) with 100G/200G line interfaces. Bidder must ensure minimum 50% of sites to be provided minimum 2CNO with all requisite hardware/software requirements at Day-1, with capability to support 3CNO (Four path Protection), 4CNO (Five	For deterministic and predictable behavior of network during both: normal conditions and fiber outage conditions, atleast for Core Routers (Type-A), the proposed routers must be equipped with multiple line-interfaces supporting 100/200/400G capacity on Day-1	All the supplied equipment must be capable to support minimum 2CNO (Three Path protection) with 100G/200G line interfaces. Bidder must ensure minimum 50% of sites to be provided minimum 2CNO with all requisite hardware/software requirements at Day-1, with capability to support 3CNO (Four path Protection), 4CNO (Five Path protection) depending on number of fiber route and with <50ms switch over time.	The business and functional minimum requirements of the network is explicit and therefore the box configuration including number of ports and ports capacity is nonnegotiable. For further clarity, the business and functional requirement is explained in visual manner in the Corrigendum-IV including minimum number of ports, purpose of ports and minimum capacity.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
			Path protection) depending on number of fiber route and with <50ms switch over time.	such that the traffic carrying line-interfaces and protection interfaces (reserved for CNO) must be considered separately from Day-1. Traffic carrying line-interfaces must not be considered as protection interfaces for complying to RFP CNO conditions. Eg: For 800G ring traffic, two 400G interfaces as primary + two 400G interfaces as secondary + two 400G interfaces as tertiary must be available on the router Day-1 for planning min 2 CNO conditions.	Traffic carrying line-interfaces must not be considered as protection interfaces for complying to RFP CNO conditions.	Line interface port number and capacity shall be as per traffic engineering, covering all Fiber path / nCNO condition.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
12	51	13 (B)(2)	MTCTE, NCCS	For wider participation	MTCTE / NCCS	The mandatory certificates as per the telecom regulations within India are to be provided whichever are applicable on the date of issue of RFP. However, if any OEM has problem in providing the reference certificates as per ask of the RFP, then the OEM may provide letter of undertaking along with evidence of application to designated institution for wider participation. However, applicable certificates, any amendments or issuance of compliance / guidelines are to be met before installation in our network. The above is non-negotiable condition for claiming any payments.
13	12	13A	For Type-B: Aggregation Layer Equipment: Minimum 300 Gbps capacity: a) 3 ports of 100G (Pluggable will be in scope of bidder as per solution design), b) 16 ports of 10G (10 numbers with 40km optical pluggable, 4 numbers with 10km optical pluggable, 2 numbers with 10km electrical pluggable)	Out of 660 routers, 330 routers are with 2 x CNO. For rest 330 routers where 2 x CNO is not required, kindly make 3 x 100G as optional.	For Type-B: Aggregation Layer Equipment: Minimum 300 Gbps capacity: a) 3 ports of 100G (Pluggable will be in scope of bidder as per solution design) for 2 x CNO (330 sites), for rest 330 sites, 2 ports of 100G minimum. b) 16 ports of 10G (10 numbers with 40km optical pluggable, 4 numbers with 10km optical pluggable, 2 numbers with 10km electrical pluggable)	The business and functional minimum requirements of the network is explicit and therefore the box configuration including number of ports and ports capacity is nonnegotiable. For further clarity, the business and functional requirement is explained in visual manner in the Corrigendum-IV including minimum number of ports, purpose of ports and minimum capacity.

<table>
<tr><th>Sr No</th><th>Page No</th><th>Clause / Sub-clause</th><th>Content of RFP Requiring Clarification</th><th>Clarification Sought</th><th>Justification</th><th>GFGNL Remarks/Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>c) 6 ports of 1G/10G (Pluggable will be in Variable supply)</td><td></td><td>c) 6 ports of 1G/10G (Pluggable will be in Variable supply)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>14</td><td>51</td><td>13 (B)</td><td>New Clause:
Coherent optics must support following Back-to-Back OSNR to meet connectivity Requirement for 400G SFP as given in table. And for 100G QSFP28 ZR OSNR should be better than 17 db:
<table><tr><th>S. No.</th><th>Line Rate</th><th>Modulation</th><th>Baud Rate</th><th>Back-to-Back OSNR (Min)</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>100G</td><td>DP-QPSK orequivalent</td><td>~30GBd</td><td>13.5dB</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>200G</td><td>DP-QPSK orequivalent</td><td>~60GBd</td><td>15.5dB</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>300G</td><td>8-QAM or equivalent</td><td>~60GBd</td><td>20dB</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>400G</td><td>16-QAM orequivalent</td><td>~60GBd</td><td>23.5dB</td></tr></table></td><td>As per industry standards to ensure seamless interop between Backhaul Routers, NOC Routers, Ph-3 routers.</td><td>New Clause:
Coherent optics must support following Back-to-Back OSNR to meet connectivity Requirement for 400G SFP as given in table. And for 100G QSFP28 ZR OSNR should be better than 17 db:
<table><tr><th>S. No.</th><th>Line Rate</th><th>Modulation</th><th>Baud Rate</th><th>Back-to-Back OSNR (Min)</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>100G</td><td>DP-QPSK orequivalent</td><td>~30GBd</td><td>13.5dB</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>200G</td><td>DP-QPSK orequivalent</td><td>~60GBd</td><td>15.5dB</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>300G</td><td>8-QAM or equivalent</td><td>~60GBd</td><td>20dB</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>400G</td><td>16-QAM orequivalent</td><td>~60GBd</td><td>23.5dB</td></tr></table></td><td>The scope of this RFP is new deployment, and that is purposed for wider competition and more participations. However, this new deployment of transport network must adhere open interfaces and interoperability and compatibility with edge/access network elements. This is basically to ensure seamless flow of traffic generated from access layer traversing through sub-block level new equipment and transport level new equipment for running the Government intranet/internet, district level breakout of traffic for better customer experience and to meet efficient service orientation.</td></tr>
<tr><td>15</td><td>12</td><td>13A</td><td>Bidder may refer further technical specification in the BSNL BID Ref “Tender No. MM/BNO&M/BN-</td><td>For wider participation, and since it is an EPC</td><td>Bidder may refer further technical specification in the BSNL BID Ref “Tender No. MM/BNO&M/BN-III/T-</td><td>Bidder may refer technical specification in the BSNL BID Ref “Tender No. MM/BNO&M/BN-III/T-</td></tr>
</table>

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
			III/T-791/2024 issued on 15.02.2024	based RFP, kindly relax the clause.	791/2024 issued on 15.02.2024 OR as per solution requirement.	791/2024 issued on 15.02.2024", equivalence specification/compliance shall be allowed as explicitly mentioned in RFP, Corrigendum-III and IV responses. The solution shall be aligned with Phase-III (Amended BharatNet Program) requirement.
16	117	Revised Eligibility Criteria/ SN 92	OEM should have supplied minimum 300 numbers of Quoted technology solution equipment for at least two different customers or 500 numbers of Quoted technology solution equipment for at least one customer in last 3 years as on date of bid submission.	We request that "quoted technology" be explicitly defined as an "IP/MPLS router with grey or colored Optics" for OEM experience, which may be equipped with either grey optics or integrated coherent optics. We have not delivered IP MPLS with integrated coherent optics so far despite the fact that we have IPMPLS Routers with colored Optics with us for many years. Hence putting qualification of "Supplying IP MPLS with integrated coherent optics" is restricting	"IP MPLS with integrated coherent optics" is not a standalone technology but an enhancement of IP MPLS transport networks. The core technology remains IP MPLS, with routers supporting both traditional connectivity via grey optics and integrated coherent optics embedded in the router's interface. We further emphasize that fundamental role of IP/MPLS routers in modern networking and their application is beyond hardware specifications. IP/MPLS routers leverage protocols such as OSPF, IS-IS, RSVP-TE, LDP, and FRR to create a robust IP/MPLS stack, enabling efficient routing, switching, rerouting, and traffic engineering. For application purposes, IP/MPLS routers are available	We are asking technology "IP-MPLS with Integrated Coherent Optical features (IP-MPLS over DWDM) / Routed Optical Network (RON)" which is enhanced version in conventional technology for building transport network over long distance with combination of IP-MPLS features and DWDM techniques for optimum use of scarce fiber core resources and hence, proven product experience has been sought to de-risk the statewide network. Earlier, we sought two customer base, then we reduced to one customer base of quoted solution technology as per your request.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
				our participation in the bid. We have submitted our request earlier and justified that "IP MPLS with Coherent Optics" and "IP MPLS Routers "are one and the same technology but it is clear from Corrigendum that you are in disagreement. Hence we request you to amend this restrictive qualification criteria to enable participation of a domestic manufacturer like us.	with various port options, including grey and coherent ports. However, the core functionality of an IP/MPLS router remains its protocols, independent of the type of pluggable optics used. The same IP/MPLS router can be equipped with either grey or coherent pluggable without impacting the underlying IP/MPLS protocols. It is important to highlight that when discussing IP/MPLS technology, the choice of pluggable optics does not alter the functionality or efficiency of the IP/MPLS router. The essence of an IP/MPLS router lies in its protocol-driven architecture rather than the type of pluggable optics employed. This principle is also outlined in TEC GR 48050:2024 for IP/MPLS technology.	
17	-	9.0 (h) of Corrigendum III	The provisions of the Public Procurement (Preference to Make in India) Order 2017 dated June 15, 2017 (or subsequent revisions, if any) by Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion, GoI shall apply to this tender to	We thank you for considering points to Make in India OEMs in the evaluation matrix. However, mere "2 marks" being awarded to domestic OEMs is in contrast to the 20% purchase preference	The State of Gujarat has already adopted the Make in India policy in its procurement guidelines. Giving marks in line with the 20% Purchase Preference as mandated in Make in India policy" will go a long way in the promotion of the domestic manufacturers in India.	This is repetitive nature query, refer clause 9 (h) in the RFP in consonance with the clause 3.1b in the Policy related to inadequate local competition. GFGNL is not limiting Make in India OEMs in anticipation of possessing quoted technology. Moreover, two extra marks

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
			the extent feasible. However, the participation is open to all i.e. Class-I, ClassII and to Non-local suppliers including foreign suppliers.	being given by the "Gazette Make in India Policy of the Government of India". We once again urge you to reconsider the points in line with the 20% purchase preference mandated in Make in India Policy to promote domestic manufacturers.		provisioned for Make in India Products.
18	118	Revised Eligibility Criteria/OEM Experience	Make In India quoted technology product = 2 Marks			
19	38	S.N 26	Electrical, Colored C/DWDM, Tunable, Coherent, non-colored, Compact SFP (CSFP), SFP+, QSFP28, CFP2, CFP, and bidirectional CSFP/SFPs/ SFP+s	Most respectfully, there is no use case of this in Bharat net-III. This is an old technology and very few OEMs are having this as a legacy. Lastly, we do not have this in our products. We request you to remove this requirement in line with this also it is not asked in TEC GR.	CWDM is now considered an obsolete technology, with DWDM being the industry standard. CWDM is not supported in modern routers and may only benefit OEMs that continue to support outdated CWDM and electrical interfaces. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, there are no legacy CWDM interfaces in the current GFGNL network. As a result, CWDM technology has no applicable use case in the existing network, nor is it expected to be relevant in future deployments, given that CWDM is now considered obsolete. Therefore, we respectfully request GFGNL to either	CWDM is already optional. In absence of limitation in particular box, bidder can meet the functionality though external device/interface without any additional cost to GFGNL whenever required.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
					remove the clause in question or make it optional.	
20	3	Sr. 5	OEM should have supplied minimum 300 numbers of Quoted technology solution equipment for atleast two different customers or 500 numbers of Quoted technology solution equipment for atleast one customer in last 3 years as on date of bid submission.	As per Corrigendum-III Sr. 5, the solution based and as per tender requirement any OEM has to provide mix of two technology which is MPLS and DWDM or converged technology . To meet the experience certificate requirement please allow to be submitted for any of the technology mentioned.		We are asking technology "IP-MPLS with Integrated Coherent Optical features (IP-MPLS over DWDM) / Routed Optical Network (RON)" which is enhanced version in conventional technology for building transport network over long distance with combination of IP-MPLS features and DWDM techniques for optimum use of scarce fiber core resources and hence, proven product experience has been sought to de-risk the statewide network.
21	51	Sr. 1	ITU-T Recommendation, ETSI and IETF Standards, Latest TEC-GR for Quoted technology solution equipment	Section B S. no 1 As per tender requirement each OEM has to meet the TEC GR compliance which includes many legacy technology and modular chassis based clauses. Since tender allows pizza box solution so modular based TEC clauses to be nullified and		Quoted solution technology equipment should meet the compliance as per RFP clause 13.B.1. TEC GR specification compliance relevant to supply product shall be applicable. Further refer S. No. 12 response as stated above.

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
				alternate solution to be allowed for the legacy technology clause's .		
22	34	12.5	Maximum Rectification Time / Maximum Extended Time for Down Time (PE)-8:00AM to 10:00PM: 2 hrs	Can the rectification time be relaxed?		It is already clarified in corrigendum
23	35	12.5	It shall be replaced by equivalent new equipment by the successful bidder at no cost to the purchaser within 7 days (if nonservice impacting) or 48 hours if service impacting.	Can this be reequipment be relaxed?		As per RFP

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
24	Corr IV 27	96	GNSS or equivalent is allowed	GNSS is a mechanism by which accurate timing is received directly from satellite , there is no alternative to this mechanism, request you to include alternative satellite based clock delivery mechanism	GNSS is mandatory for supporting 4G / 5G and upcoming future technologies, as GFGNL will us its infrastructure to be leased by Service providers, support of Clocking is mandatory all major OEMs support this functionality and it does not add additional cost to GFGNL	Yes, as per clarification sought subjected to performance and the functionality is not compromised

Sr No	Page No	Clause / Sub-clause	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Clarification Sought	Justification	GFGNL Remarks/Response
25	3	Port understanding	Core layer number of ports and Aggregation layer number of ports	We understand that the core and aggregation equipment should work at wire speed and line rate for the defined interfaces active simultaneously, request GFGNL to confirm the same	Request GFGNL to clarify that all the interfaces asked in the port table should be working simultaneously at wire speed without any blocking architecture in the proposed network equipment	The business and functional minimum requirements of the network is explicit and therefore the box configuration including number of ports and ports capacity is non-negotiable. For further clarity, the business and functional requirement is explained in visual manner in the Corrigendum-IV including minimum number of ports, purpose of ports and minimum capacity. Moreover, Bid nature is EPC based, Bidder may design solution equipment to meet objectivity and functionality of the RFP.

==========End Of Document==========