

**RFP for Selection of Acquirer Bank for FASTag-ANPR based Multi Lane Free Flow (MLFF) User Fee Collection at Nemili (Sriperumbudur) Fee Plaza of Walajapet – Poomalle (NH-48) Toll Road Project**

**Ref No. IHMCL/MLFF-Nemili /2025, Dated: 13.05.2025**

**E-tender Id: 2025\_NHAI\_235144\_1**

**Date: 20.06.2025**

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
1	70	Form-T:13 – Manufacturer's Authorization Form (MAF)	<p>The Bidder is required to submit the MAF for at least the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. RFID Reader &amp; Antenna</li> <li>ii. ANPR Cameras</li> <li>iii. Audit Surveillance Camera</li> <li>iv. Detector-Lidar</li> <li>v. Detector-Radar</li> </ul>	<p>As per clause "(c) The type of equipment mentioned in the RFP are bare minimum. In case the solution designed by Bidder requires additional equipment (eg thermal camera etc) to meet the scope of work and SLA, the same should be provided in the solution without any additional financial implication to IHMCL." We understand that the MAF is also applicable for any additional equipment or solutions proposed by the bidder to meet the scope of work and SLA requirements.</p> <p>Hence, we request you to amend the clause as suggested below to broaden the scope for bidder participation, enabling them to meet the functional requirements and SLA obligations outlined in the RFP.</p> <p>The Bidder is required to submit the MAF for at least the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. RFID Reader &amp; Antenna</li> <li>ii. ANPR Cameras</li> <li>iii. Audit Surveillance Camera</li> <li>iv. Detector-Lidar</li> <li>v. Detector-Radar</li> <li>vi. Thermal Camera</li> </ul>		As per RFP.
2	137	1 Standards and Specification of all MLFF Sub System	<p>(c) The type of equipment mentioned in the RFP are bare minimum. In case the solution designed by Bidder requires additional equipment (eg thermal camera etc) to meet the scope of work and SLA, the same should be provided in the solution without any additional financial implication to IHMCL.</p>	<p>Based on the mentioned clauses, we understand that the bidder is allowed to propose an alternative technical solution, such as LiDAR sensors or thermal sensor to meet the scope of work and SLA, the same should be provided in the solution without any additional financial implication to IHMCL.</p> <p>Kindly confirm whether our understanding is correct and whether such sensor-based solutions (LiDAR/Thermal) would be acceptable under the scope of the RFP.</p>		As per the RFP, the BOQ provided is the minimum requirement. Bidders may propose additional quantities or line items as a per of their proposed solution, for enhanced system performance and SLA parameters adherence.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
3	147	1 Standards and Specification of all MLFF Sub System	1.7 Detector-Radar 10. Refresh time : 24 MS	<p>Advance and latest 4D traffic radar systems currently used in traffic enforcement and monitoring applications operate optimally at refresh intervals of 24 ms, 50 ms, or 75 ms. These radars are capable of delivering accurate vehicle detection, speed measurement, vehicle count etc in full compliance with the required SLAs upto 300 mtr, with single 4D radar can cover upto 4~6 lanes.</p> <p>A refresh rate of 50–75 ms is sufficient for high-speed, real-time traffic monitoring and is widely adopted in certified radar solutions globally. Allowing this flexibility will enable broader OEM participation and encourage the adoption of advanced radar technologies without compromising system performance.</p> <p>Therefore, we request that the clause be amended to allow a refresh time of 24 ms / 50 ms / 75 ms, or better, based on the proposed solution's architecture.</p> <p>Kindly amend it as 1.7 Detector-Radar 10. Refresh time : 24 MS/50 MS/75 MS or better</p>		The specifications provided in the RFP are minimum requirements. Bidders may propose better specifications as part of their proposed solution design.
4	161	2. Functional Requirements of all MLFF Sub System	2.3 ANPR and Application  i. Integration: ANPR technology should be embedded within security cameras (also known as ANPR Cameras) to ensure accurate readings regardless of the shape and color of the license plates.	<p>Considering the heterogeneous traffic conditions in India, embedded ANPR cameras have demonstrated reliable performance primarily under ideal or controlled environments. However, their effectiveness in real-world Indian highway and urban traffic scenarios, particularly in achieving a reading accuracy of up to 99.5% on standard number plates, remains unproven. We understand that bidder is permitted to propose either an embedded ANPR camera solution or a standalone ANPR software-based solution on top of standard cameras, as long as it meets the functional and technical requirements, as well as the overall scope of work and SLA.</p> <p>Kindly confirm if our understanding is correct.</p>		As per RFP.
5	162	2. Functional Requirements of all MLFF Sub System	2.3 ANPR and Application  9. The system support reading accuracy Upto 99.5% of standard number plate vehicles number plates which are visible by human eyes.	<p>We understand that the clause "reading accuracy up to 99.5%" applies specifically to standard number plates as defined under SO 6052(E) dated 06.12.2018, pertaining to the Motor Vehicles (High Security Registration Plates) Order, 2018.</p> <p>Kindly confirm if our understanding is correct.</p>		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
6	163	1 Standards and Specification of all MLFF Sub System	<p>2.4 IR Illuminator</p> <p>The light given off by the illuminator should be set to minimize potential distraction to motorists.</p> <p>a) High power, compact and lightweight b) Up to 75 Hz for traffic bursts and image sequences c) Infrared (invisible) d) Rugged IP66 enclosure e) Long life, low total cost of ownership</p>	<p>To ensure the safety of road users and prevent any visual distraction or harm to motorists, the IR illuminator shall comply with eye safety standards as per IEC 62471. This compliance is essential to ensure that the deployed IR illumination does not pose a risk to drivers, vehicle occupants, or maintenance personnel and adheres to globally accepted safety norms.</p> <p>We request you to amend the clause as suggested below to ensure that the IR illuminator does not pose any risk to drivers or cause distraction to motorists.</p> <p>The light given off by the illuminator should be set to minimize potential distraction to motorists.</p> <p>a) High power, compact and lightweight b) Up to 75 Hz for traffic bursts and image sequences c) Infrared (invisible) d) Rugged IP66 enclosure e) Long life, low total cost of ownership f) Eye safety standards as per IEC 62471.</p>		As per RFP.
7	171	2.11 Indicative Minimum Bill of Quantity (BOQ):	3. Detector -Radar : Nos - 1 - Per lane	<p>Advance and latest 4D traffic radar systems currently used in traffic enforcement and monitoring applications. These radars are capable of delivering accurate vehicle detection, speed measurement, vehicle count etc in full compliance with the required SLAs upto 300 mtr, with single 4D radar can cover upto 4~6 lanes.</p> <p>We understand bidder can propose radar count 1 - Per lane or as per solution.</p>		As per the RFP, the BOQ provided is the minimum requirement. Bidders may propose additional quantities or line items as a per of their proposed solution, for enhanced system performance and SLA parameters adherence.
8	171	2.11 Indicative Minimum Bill of Quantity (BOQ):	4. Detector – LiDAR - Nos - 1 - 1 for 02 lanes or as per solution	<p>We understand bidder is can propose lidar/thermal camera sensor , As per technical specifications for thermal camera sensor are attached in annexure - A</p> <p>4. Detector – LiDAR/Thermal Sensor - Nos - 1 - 1 for 01 lanes or as per solution</p>		As per the RFP, the BOQ provided is the minimum requirement. Bidders may propose additional quantities or line items as a per of their proposed solution, for enhanced system performance and SLA parameters adherence.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
9	19, 20, & 21	3.1 Pre-Qualification Criteria	Cancelled RFPs PQ-3: Relevant Work Experience of Sub-Contractor (SI) The Sub-Contractor (SI) should have successfully implemented Multi- Lane Free Flow tolling systems using RFID/ANPR/DSRC/GNSS, or any combination of these technologies, in at least 200 kilometers (cumulative) toll roads, either in India or abroad, in 10 years preceding the Bid due date. Additionally, the project should have been in operational phase for at least 2 years.	<p>The PQ-3 requirement from the prior version of the RFP for SI eligibility—which mandated prior implementation of MLFF experience using RFID/ANPR/DSRC/GNSS over a minimum of 200 kilometers of toll roads—has been removed. While IHMCL may have removed this requirement to encourage broader participation, we respectfully request that IHMCL consider reintroducing a pre-qualification criterion for System Integrators (SIs) to demonstrate experience in designing, implementing, maintaining, and operating MLFF roadside tolling systems for at least five years.</p> <p>Reintroducing this criterion, or a similar one, would benefit IHMCL by providing a clearer understanding of the SI's qualifications, experience, and proven track record in successfully delivering MLFF User Fee Collection Systems to agencies with comparable programs. Additionally, this approach would result in a more qualified pool of Acquirer Bank/SI teams, ensuring the project's success with minimal risk from inception to completion. It would also help IHMCL achieve its objective of facilitating seamless and cashless toll payments, reducing congestion, and enhancing the overall driving experience on highways.</p>		As per RFP.
10	16	1.2 Key Dates	#4) Last Last date/ time for online submission of bids (i.e., Bid due date)	<p>We have raised several critical questions that could significantly impact our submission. It is vital to receive IHMCL's responses and confirmations on these points before we can proceed with preparing and submitting our bid. Considering this, we kindly request that IHMCL extend the deadlines by four weeks following the publication of their responses on their website.</p> <p>Additionally, we are required to address four RFPs with due dates one week apart. While we acknowledge that these RFPs may have overlapping requirements, each must be meticulously prepared, priced, and submitted individually.</p> <p>The requested additional time is crucial for incorporating clarifications and updates from the pre-bid meeting once they are posted online. This will ensure the preparation of a response that not only fulfills but exceeds IHMCL's expectations.</p>		Refer Corrigendum-3
11	24	4.2 Pre-Bid Meeting	The section in its entirety. General Question	We respectfully request IHMC record the Bidder questions and IHMCL responses in writing and provide these on tenders@ihmcl.com.		No query asked.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
12	137	Schedule C - Standards & Specifications / 1.1 RFID Reader - IP Rating	IP Rating - #15: Parameter: IP Rating Minimum Specifications: IP67	RFP minimum specifications for the RFID reader call for an IP67 rating, which requires the device to remain fully submerged in 5 meters of water. Considering that the gantries are approximately 5 meters above the road, we question the necessity of this requirement. We believe that an IP66 rating, which is sufficient to withstand driving rain during monsoon conditions, would be more appropriate. Notably, the IR illuminators, which are at the same height and equally exposed, have an IP66 rating. We kindly request that you consider revising this minimum specification to IP66.		Refer Corrigendum-3
13	137 138 140 142	Schedule C - Standards & Specifications	<p>Preferred OEMs</p> <p>Table 1.1 RFID Reader / #12 Preferred OEMs / Min Specs: SSI, Tag Master, Kathrein, Zebra</p> <p>Table 1.2 RFID Antenna / #16 Preferred OEMs / Min Specs: SSI, Tag Master, Kathrein, Zebra</p> <p>Table 1.3 Audit Surveillance Cameras / #21 Preferred OEMs / Min Specs: Pelco/Avigilon, Axis, Vivotek, FETCI, Tattile, BOSCH</p> <p>Table 1.4 ANPR / #r / Preferred OEMs / Min Specs: Pelco/Avigilon, Axis, Vivotek, FETCI, BOSCH, Tattile</p>	<p>The change in preferred suppliers for OEM equipment, specifically the omission of "or equivalent" from earlier RFPs, has been noted. Limiting preferred suppliers to a specific list restricts the choices available to the Authority. This raises questions regarding the fairness of the evaluation process, as it may imply that the Authority has already made a decision. Such an approach could discourage other reputable and experienced suppliers from participating in the bidding process.</p> <p>Additionally, it is worth noting that some of the nominated preferred RFID and camera suppliers have primarily provided products for slow-speed, stop-and-go, demarcated lanes, and barrier applications. These suppliers may not have extensive experience in MLFF plaza projects involving high-density, high-speed traffic. Furthermore, some of the preferred suppliers manufacture their products in China. Goods from China would not be available to all vendors due to exclusive relationships and possible import restrictions. Restricting the selection to specific preferred suppliers poses potential risks to performance, which could have implications for the Banks and the Authority in choosing a solution that is truly fit for purpose.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the Authority consider retracting this statement of preference in the RFPs. With the detailed specifications provided for each critical piece of equipment, it would be more appropriate to allow bidders the flexibility to choose equipment that meets the specifications rather than being restricted to certain OEMs</p>		Refer Corrigendum-3

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
14	29	6.1 (2) (i) (b) First Stage: Pre-Qualification/ Eligibility Stage	The Evaluation Committee may, at its discretion, call for additional information from the bidder(s) through email/fax/telephone/meeting or any other mode of communication. Such information must be supplied within the set-out time frame as provided by the Evaluation Committee; otherwise, Evaluation Committee shall make its own reasonable assumptions at the total risk and cost of the bidders and the proposal is liable to be rejected. Seeking clarification cannot be treated as acceptance of the proposal. For verification of information submitted by the bidders, the committee may visit the bidder's offices at its own cost. The bidders shall provide all the necessary documents, samples, and reference information as desired by the Committee. The bidders shall also assist the committee in obtaining relevant information from their references.	To reduce the risk of selection errors and to enable IHMCL to thoroughly evaluate the SI's solution while mitigating performance risks, would IHMCL consider requiring the bidder to provide their solution through no-cost, no-commitment trials, or live demonstrations as part of the technical evaluation process?		As per RFP.
15	30	6.1 (2) (ii) (b) Second Stage: Financial Bid Evaluation	The Financial Bid Evaluation will be based on the lowest revenue share demanded by the bidder in the Financial Bid Form F-1.	<p>This is the first implementation of MLFF across the country, with four projects occurring at the same time. In the event a single Bank is selected as the lowest bidder (L1) for all projects, it could pose significant risks to IHMCL.</p> <p>These risks include potential challenges in managing the simultaneous performance of multiple projects and the likelihood of all projects being subject to the same technical solution risks, as the Bank may employ the same system integrator (SI) for all undertakings.</p> <p>We respectfully request that IHMCL consider revising the final selection criteria to mitigate these risks effectively.</p>		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
16	165	Schedule C - Standards & Specifications - 2.9 (1) MLFF Application Software	.....The application shall be deployed at two key locations: the Gantry/Lanes and the Control Center (CC).....	<p>Neology fully acknowledges the critical importance of the MLFF Application and is committed to meeting the SLA requirement of 99.9% availability for the Control Center and MLFF system. To ensure and even surpass such high availability—crucial to prevent the loss of transactions or events—we recommend hosting the Control Center and other backend MLFF processing systems (excluding those on the gantry) in a cloud environment. This approach provides the necessary redundancy, scalability, and reliability.</p> <p>We note that earlier RFP versions of the requirements for cloud-based computing have been removed. Please confirm whether the use of a cloud—provided it is a MeitY-empaneled cloud provider, with both the cloud and data stored within India—is acceptable to IHMCL as an alternative to on-premises equipment at the Control Center.</p>		The Bill of Quantities (BOQ) provided in the RFP outlines the minimum requirements. Bidders may additionally propose a redundant MeitY-empaneled cloud-based infrastructure—ensuring data residency in India—as part of their solution architecture, provided it meets all functional, availability, and security requirements outlined in the RFP.
17	108  109	<p>Schedule A: Site of the Project / 1.1.2 Appendix A-1 Index map of Project Highway</p> <p>Schedule B: Scope / 1.a Development of MLFF based tolling facility / (vi)</p>	<p>"See map in Section 1.1.2 Appendix A-1</p> <p>The successful bidder/bank must implement and commence the MLFF system services without disrupting ongoing toll operations or causing any revenue loss to the toll collection agency until the MLFF system goes live."</p>	<p>To ensure smooth traffic flow through the new MLFF gantries without excessive lane changes or convergence of vehicles from multiple lanes into fewer lanes, would IHMCL consider allowing the repositioning of the median and the addition of lane stripings before, under, and beyond each gantry?</p> <p>Maintaining defined, straight, and consistent lanes throughout the MLFF zones—without altering median positions—could optimize the advantages of the MLFF system from both traffic management and revenue perspectives.</p>		As per RFP.
18	108  109	<p>Schedule A: Site of the Project / 1.1.2 Appendix A-1 Index map of Project Highway</p> <p>Schedule B: Scope / 1.a Development of MLFF based tolling facility / (vi)</p>	<p>The successful bidder/bank must implement and commence the MLFF system services without disrupting ongoing toll operations or causing any revenue loss to the toll collection agency until the MLFF system goes live.</p>	<p>Barriers between lanes, as well as the expansion and contraction in the number of lanes, may significantly hinder traffic flow and pose risks to the efficiency of any MLFF toll system.</p> <p>Question a) Is IHMCL considering plans to remove the existing manual toll collection infrastructure from the roads?</p> <p>Question b) If so, when?</p>		As per RFP.
19	128	Schedule - B 12: SLA Table - Implementation Phase	"Parameter: Supply, Installation, Testing and Commissioning (Go Live) Timeline: 05 months from the date of signing of the Contract Agreement."	<p>A five-month timeline for a project that includes design, fabrication, and supporting civil construction work for new gantries, along with system implementation efforts, presents significant risks to the overall success of the project.</p> <p>Would IHMCL be open to considering a longer implementation schedule to mitigate these risks?</p>		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
20	146	Schedule - C - 1.7 Detector - Radar	General question regarding requirement for a Detector Radar in addition to a Detector LiDAR.	<p>Upon review of the RFP document, it appears there is no explicit requirement for overspeed detection or speed enforcement functionalities, such as display-based alerts or issuance of e-challans. It is understood that these functions are managed by the Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) already deployed on the relevant roadways.</p> <p>Can the proposed solution be considered compliant if it performs all Electronic Toll Collection (ETC) functions—including FASTag reading, ANPR image capture, and audit surveillance—at the required operational speeds without relying on a Detector Radar?</p> <p>We respectfully request that the inclusion of Detector Radar be considered optional, allowing flexibility for systems that do not require it to meet the functional requirements outlined in the RFP</p>		As per RFP.
21	161  144	Schedule C.2.3 / ANPR and Application  Schedule C 1.5 / IR Illuminator	<p>"System Parameter Table #6: The system can capture vehicle color and label them as per predefined list of configured system colors. System allows option to search combination if vehicle color with vehicle registration number plate.</p> <p>Parameter #1 Illumination Source / Minimum Specs: High Power IR without any visual distractions to the road user"</p>	<p>External ANPR illumination is restricted to IR lighting only. In the functional requirements for ANPR (page 161), it specifies that the system must capture vehicle color.</p> <p>Would IHMCL permit visible light illumination at night to enable color capture?</p>		As per RFP.
22	20	3.1 Pre-Qualification Criteria / PQ-2 Eligibility of Sub-Contractor (SI)	iii. The Bidder shall ensure that the Sub-Contractor/SI engaged by them is under an exclusive MOU with the acquirer bank and is not associated as Sub-Contractor/SI with any other. Bidder participating in the same tender. For avoidance of doubt, if two or more bids is received having same Sub-Contractor/SI, all such bids shall be treated as non-responsive.	We understand that this arrangement applies to a single project and not across multiple projects. For instance, a systems integrator (SI) can collaborate with one bank for one project but may work with a different bank on another project. Please confirm		The understanding is correct.
23	23	3.2 Conflict of Interest	b) .....The successful bidder shall not accept or engage in any assignment that would conflict with its prior or current obligations to other clients, or that may place it in a position of not being able to carry out the assignment in the best interests of IHMCL.....	We respectfully request that the Authority clarify/elaborate this statement.		As per RFP.
24	81	1.2.6 Scope of Work	4. Cleanliness and Maintenance of Control Center, Plaza Building, Toilets, and Surrounding Areas: The Bidder is responsible for maintaining cleanliness and upkeep of the Control Center, Plaza Building, toilets, and surrounding areas for the entire contract duration.....	Please define/specify surrounding areas to include the size of the areas.		As per RFP.



Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
25	81	1.2.6 Scope of Work / 7 Electricity Power Management	a) Power Supply for MLFF system (Gantry/existing Plaza): The Bidder shall ensure a 24x7 power supply for the Command-and-Control Centre and MLFF field equipment, with the primary source being the Electricity Department. This supply should be supported by UPS systems, renewable energy sources (such as solar power), and a DG set of adequate capacity. The Bidder shall make all necessary arrangements for the electricity needed for the execution of the Works and O&M period for the entire period of the Contract. The raw power will be supplied by NHAI.	Please clarify that the Bidder shall be responsible for power arrangement to the equipment related to: MLFF Field Equipment  Existing Plaza Equipment		As per RFP.
26	81	1.2.6 Scope of Work / 7 Electricity Power Management	a) Power Supply for MLFF system (Gantry/existing Plaza): The Bidder shall ensure a 24x7 power supply for the Command-and-Control Centre and MLFF field equipment, with the primary source being the Electricity Department. This supply should be supported by UPS systems, renewable energy sources (such as solar power), and a DG set of adequate capacity. The Bidder shall make all necessary arrangements for the electricity needed for the execution of the Works and O&M period for the entire period of the Contract. The raw power will be supplied by NHAI.	Question a) Please confirm that the raw power will be supplied and paid for by NHAI.  Question b) Please specify the scope for the bidder of MLFF.		As per RFP.
27	84	1.2.15 Time Schedule	#5 "Go-Live" of MLFF system, subject to successful completion of SAT" / Time Period: 5 months.	We respectfully request that the Go-Live date be considered from the system's commissioning date rather than the SAT, as collections will begin upon commissioning, which may face delays beyond the bidder's control.		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
28	86	1.2.15.3 Parameters to be checked during SAT	#3 ANPR Camera Accuracy / Requirement: The ANPR camera system should read all types of vehicle registration number (VRN) plates with minimum accuracy of 99% under both day and night conditions, without any manual validation/audit.	We respectfully request that "provided the number plates are readable by the naked eye" be added to this clause.		<p>The 99% ANPR accuracy refers to the ANPR system's overall performance, considering recognition from either the front or rear license plate. Number plates that are "humanly not readable" shall be excluded from the total count used for accuracy calculation.</p> <p>A license plate shall be considered "humanly not readable" if its alphanumeric characters cannot be accurately identified by a person with normal vision under standard daylight or lighting conditions, due to factors such as physical damage, obstruction (e.g., mud, dust, stickers), tampering, or any deliberate alteration that renders the plate illegible to the naked eye.</p>
29	90	1.2.17 Payments	b) Under no circumstances shall the percentage revenue share quoted by the Bidder be revised upwards, even if there is an increase in any tax, statutory, or financial liability of the Bidder that was not in existence or prevalent at the time of bid submission	The Bidder's offer considers the current prevailing tax rates. We kindly request the Authority revise this clause to state: "Any increase in the prevailing tax rate shall be accounted for by adjusting the Bidder's percentage revenue share accordingly."		As per RFP.
30	92	1.2.20 Change of Scope	b) Variation in number of MLFF gantry location with respect to those mentioned in the Schedule-B. For avoidance of doubt, any variation in quantity(ies) of equipment, support system, OFC, Civil/Mechanical Works, Software/Hardware etc. of MLFF Components whose locations are mentioned in Schedule-B, or any software/App upgradation works mentioned in Schedule-C shall not constitute any Change of Scope.	<p>If a bidder incurs additional capital expenditure (CAPEX) due to the installation of a gantry not specified in the Schedule B location, it will fall outside the defined scope. In such cases, to ensure the bidder is fairly reimbursed for the unexpected costs related to the extra CAPEX, we kindly request the following considerations:</p> <p>The Authority treat this as a Scope change, AND</p> <p>Adjust the revenue share percentage accordingly.</p>		As per RFP.
31	102	1.2.36 (a) Handing Over and Taking Over	a) After the expiration of the Maintenance Period stipulated in the Contract Agreement and any extensions thereof, the Bidder shall hand over the gantries in a good, workable, and painted condition as per the conditions outlined in the RFP.	Please confirm that ownership of the entire equipment will be transferred to the Authority at the conclusion of the contract.		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
32	112	Schedule B Scope / 2. Operations & Maintenance of the MLFF based Tolling System / 4. Performance Monitoring	d) STQC and CERT-In Certification: The Bidder shall be required to carry out STQC certification of its MLFF software within 6 months from the date of completion SAT. Further the Bidder shall be required to conduct CERT-In certification of its MLFF software every year post Go-Live of the MLFF.	Obtaining STQC certifications generally requires a full year to complete. Therefore, we respectfully request the Authority to amend the requirement to state: "The Bidder shall be required to carry out STQC certification of its MLFF software within 12 months from the date of completion SAT."		As per RFP.
33	128	10. Service Level Agreement / SLA Table / Implementation Phase	"#1) Supply, Installation, Testing and Commissioning, (Go-Live) Timelines: 05 months from the date of signing of the Contract Agreement Basis of Measurement: Signing of Contract Agreement Penalties: .....The maximum penalty during development and installation shall not be more than Rs. 1 Cr. Furthermore, IHMCL may terminate the contract."	Please confirm the maximum penalty during the O&M period.		As per RFP.
34	171	2.11 Indicative Minimum Bill of Quantity (BOQ) / Development Phase #7	#7 Redundant Internet Connectivity (1 Gbps)	Please clarify whether this setup consists of one optical fiber link and one wireless link serving as redundancy for each other.		Refer Corrigendum-3
35	86	"1.2.16.3 Parameters to be checked during Site Acceptance Testing (SAT) / Table #2	"#2 Vehicle Classification Accuracy Evaluation of the MLFF system's ability to correctly classify all tollable vehicles passing through the gantry as per the vehicle classification norms defined in the RFP under clause Schedule B, Clause 10, SL no. 8. The classification of the vehicles shall be as per NH Fee (Determination of Rates and Collection) Rules, 2008 shall be taken into consideration for the evaluation of this requirements, which is as below:  The vehicle classification accuracy shall be validated through the TMS report of the plaza. IHMCL may also validate the same with an independent system.	The AVC system may face challenges in accurately classifying vehicles based on AXLE measurements, as the AXLE sensors are not being used in accordance with the RFP. Please provide clarification.		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
36	110  171	Schedule B – Scope / B. 1.c Control Center          Schedule C - Standards & Specs / 2.11 Indicative Minimum BOQ / Control Room Equipment	MLFF based sensors / smart devices on field and integrating, analyzing data shall be received from these field devices / sensors at a Control Center (CC).....  ii. CC shall have 3 major functional areas namely Command and control with monitoring, manual validation and audit of transactions with low accuracy and generation of cases for issuance of e-Notice to toll violators with all data and evidence.  That section in its entirety.	We understand that IHMCL requires both manpower and critical CC equipment, including servers and video monitoring systems, to be stationed at the Control Centre, which we assume will be located within the existing Plaza Buildings. However, we observed that, for some publicly funded plazas, either there are no Plaza Buildings or the current ones are temporary structures such as containers.  We respectfully request IHMCL to clarify whether it intends to construct new buildings where none currently exist or to renovate and make suitable those locations with inadequate facilities, bearing the costs of such modifications and ensuring they are available to the bidder in time to meet the proposed schedule.		Bidders shall use the existing and proposed future facilities available at the toll plaza.  Bidders can setup the control centre at remote location for support services like audit, validation etc. subject to approval of IHMCL.
37	19	3.1. PRE-QUALIFICATION CRITERIA		No reference is made to any Relevant Work Experience of Sub-Contractor. This allows any provider of IT System to participate in. It could compromise the quality of the solution provided and create unnecessary competition		As per RFP.
38	20	3.1. PRE-QUALIFICATION CRITERIA PQ- 2 – iv.	In case the Sub-Contractor is a firm incorporated abroad, it may associate with firm(s) incorporated in India for assistance in implementation, operations and other allied works required for MLFF Tolling.	Possible association between a foreign SI and local company(ies) is mentioned in the PQ criteria. We understand that such association has not to be declared in the MoU neither in any other document to be submitted. Please confirm		The understanding is correct. However, upon award of work the Successful bidder shall be required to submit the details of such association.
39	20	3.1. PRE-QUALIFICATION CRITERIA PQ- 2 – iv.	In case the Sub-Contractor is a firm incorporated abroad, it may associate with firm(s) incorporated in India for assistance in implementation, operations and other allied works required for MLFF Tolling.	Possible association between a foreign SI and local company(ies) is mentioned in the PQ criteria. We understand that such association can be either a legal entity or an association through MoU between the parties Please confirm		The understanding is correct. However, upon award of work the Successful bidder shall be required to submit the details of such association.
40	22	3.1.1. – f)	OEM for all active components should give a declaration that products or technology quoted are neither end-of-sale nor end-of-life as on the date of installation and commissioning and are not end-of-support till the successful completion of O&M period of the project.	The normal obsolescence of IT equipment is around 5 years, even less, such type of declarations will not be obtained by OEMs Please revise		As per RFP.
41	23	3.2 c) 6.	While providing services to IHMCL for this assignment, the Bidder shall not take up any assignment that by its nature will result in conflict with the present assignment;	Please clarify what do you mean with “assignment that by its nature will result in conflict with the present assignment”		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
42	25	4.1 Site visit	Before the pre-bid meeting date, bidders are strongly advised and encouraged to conduct site visits,	The timing of the procedure severely hinders the execution of site visits before the pre-bid meeting date. We strongly suggest postponing the bid due date and allow more time for site visits.		As per RFP.
43	31	6.5. – c)	The Performance security shall be increased by additional 50% of amount mentioned at 6.5(a), in form of Bank Guarantee in case, the Clean Transaction amount in any financial year increases by 50% of Clean Transaction amount collected in next financial year corresponding to the Bid due date.	The increase in the Performance security is foreseen in the year N in case the Clean Transaction amount of the year N is 50% more than the Clean Transaction Amount of the year N-1. Please confirm		Refer Corrigendum-3
44	48	Form T-3	.... to do in our name and on our behalf, all such acts, deeds and things as are necessary or required in connection with or incidental to submission of our Bid for selection as the Bidder for “RFP for Selection of Acquirer Bank for FASTag-ANPR based Multi Lane Free Flow (MLFF) User Fee Collection at Nemili (Sriperumbudur) Fee Plaza of Walajapet – Poomalle (NH-48) Toll Road Project” proposed by Indian Highways Management Company Limited, including but not limited to signing and submission of all applications, bid(s) and other documents and writings ....	As per the PQ-2, the Subcontractor shall provide the Form T-3 to grant power of attorney to an authorized signatory. The Form T-3, as is, is construed for the authorized signatory of the Bidder (a Bank) and provides also power to sign and submit the bid as well as power to do any subsequent act (i.e. sign the Contract Agreement) that is not required to the authorised signatory of the Subcontractor  Please provide a specific Form for the power of attorney of the Authorised Signatory of the Subcontractor		The Sub-Contractor is required to provide Power of Attorney of the Authorized Signatory for signing the MOU with bidder/bank as per Form T-3.
45	68	Form T:12	Name: (insert complete name of person signing the Bid Securing Declaration)  Duly authorized to sign the bid for an on behalf of (insert complete name of Bidder)	As per the PQ-4 the Sub-Contractor has to sign the Undertaking for non blacklisting.  As per our understanding the: Name shall be the one of the authorised signatory of the Sub-Contractor that shall not sign the bid on behalf of the Bidder.  Please amend the Form T-12 accordingly for the Sub-Contractor		Refer Corrigendum-3
46	69	Form-T:13	We, [Insert Full Legal Name of Manufacturer/OEM], a company duly organized and existing under the laws of [Insert Country], having our principal manufacturing facilities at [Insert Complete Address of Manufacturer's Factories], do hereby authorize [Insert Full Legal Name of the Bidder], having its registered office at [Insert Bidder's Full Address], to submit a Bid and conclude the Contract with you against the above-mentioned RFP for the supply of the following goods manufactured by us:	It is required that each manufacturer of specific equipment “authorizes the Bidder” to submit the bid.  It sounds uncommon that a manufacturer authorizes anyone to bid for a tender.  What a Manufacturer can undertake is to provide the equipment to the bidder for the Project implementation duration  Please revise		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
47	73	Form F-2 Note 2&3	<p>2. The Grand Total in Form F-2 must not exceed the Estimated Amount of ₹5 crore. If the Grand Total in Form F-2 exceeds ₹5 crore, the depreciated cost will be calculated based on the ceiling limit of ₹5 crore, as per clause 1.2.35.2(ii)(b) of the RFP.</p> <p>3. Form F-2 is solely for calculating the Depreciated Cost according to Clause 1.2.35 of the General Conditions of Contract in the RFP. The L-1 Bidder will be selected based on the quoted cost in Form F-1.</p>	<p>We understand that the limit of 5 Cr is only for IHMCL internal accounting reason and for Termination consequences. it is not limiting the actual amount of the Equipment Cost to be considered by the bidder.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>		As per RFP.
48	76	1.1.2. Appendices	<p>Appendix B Letter of Acceptance submitted by the Bidder</p> <p>Appendix C Letter of Acceptance submitted by the Bidder</p>	<p>It is understood that Appendix B shall be the Letter of Award issued by the Authority</p> <p>Please confirm</p>		Refer Corrigendum-3
49	78	1.2.2.1 g)	references to a ("day" or "business day") shall be construed as a reference to all days of the year.	<p>The reference to "business day" shall be in accordance to the definition 32. "Working Days" at page 11 of the RFP</p> <p>Please confirm and amend accordingly</p>		Refer Corrigendum-3
50	83	1.2.11. Commencement of Services	The Bidder shall commence the services from the date of signing of Contract Agreement with IHMCL or receipt of Commencement notice from IHMCL whichever is earlier.	<p>Commencement notice is never mentioned in the RFP and the Contract.</p> <p>Therefore, the work can only begin after the the signature of the Contract Agreement</p> <p>Please delete reference to Commencement notice.</p>		Refer Corrigendum-3
51	83	1.2.12. Duration and Extension of Contract	Any additional implementation work awarded within the original Contract Period of 5 year and 5 months period will be incorporated into the implementation and O&M phases in such a way that the total original Contract duration does not exceed the initial 5 years and 5 months, unless an extension is granted by IHMCL	Please clarify what do you intend with "additional implementation work"		As per RFP.
52	92	1.2.21 b)	Variation in number of MLFF gantry location with respect to those mentioned in the Schedule-B.	Is the "variation in number of MLFF gantry location" to be considered as a Change of Scope or not?		Refer Corrigendum-3
53	98	1.2.30 iv.	If the Force Majeure period occurs within 365 days (1 year) of Go-Live, there shall be no extension of the Contract Period.	<p>The extension of Contract Period shall be granted also in case Force Majeure Events, that bring to the strong reduction of traffic, occur during the first year of Operation. Any event affecting the traffic in the first year of operation has the maximum impact on the return of the project. It is recommended that IHMCL fixes the threshold of reduced traffic in the first year using the traffic data available.</p> <p>Please amend accordingly</p>		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
54	98	1.2.30.4 Illustration of Force Majeure Event	<p>Step 4: Consequences &amp; Compensation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assuming the Go-live Feb 15, 2024 and assume Revenue Share on March 1, 2024 (corresponding day of the previous year) was ₹10 lakh. Applying a 5% escalation, the threshold for March 1, 2025 would be ₹10.5 lakh.</li> <li>Due to the Force Majeure event, the actual Revenue Share on March 1, 2025 drops to ₹5 lakh, which is below 50% of ₹10.5 lakh (i.e., ₹5.25 lakh). This marks the commencement of the Force Majeure Period.</li> <li>Over the next few days, revenue share remains below ₹5.25 lakh for each calendar day.</li> <li>On March 10, 2025, the revenue share reaches ₹8 lakh, which is above 50% of the corresponding escalated revenue share. This marks the cessation of the Force Majeure Period.</li> <li>The total duration of the Force Majeure Period is March 1, 2025, to March 10, 2025 (10 days), which exceeds the 7-day minimum requirement.</li> <li>Since the Force Majeure Period lasted more than 7 calendar days and falls beyond 365 days of Go-Live, the Contract Period is likely to be extended by 10 days.</li> </ul>	<p>While the illustration of the mechanism is pretty clear we would like to bring your attention to the fact that making the comparison on a day to day way can lead to underestimate the impact of the Force Majeure event.</p> <p>For example: in case the revenue share level after 5 days from the start of the Force Majeure event goes over the threshold and the day after goes again below the threshold for 5 days and this alternance is repeated, the impact of the Force Majeure event is evident whilst the compensation for it, using the mechanics illustrated, is zero.</p> <p>We suggest using seven days moving average amount of revenue share to compare with the seven days average level of the previous year plus 5%</p>		As per RFP.
55	101	1.2.34 (b)	Notwithstanding the above, IHMCL at its sole discretion may terminate the Contract Agreement any time by giving 30 days prior notice without assigning any reason	<p>Termination with no reason is not fair</p> <p>Please revise it</p>		As per RFP.
56	102	1.2.35 2. i	<p>Upon Termination on account of Clause 1.2.34 (b), the Authority shall make Termination Payment as under:</p> <p>i. During (5 Months Development period) + O&amp;M Period (60 months):</p> <p>I. Depreciated value of the equipment(s) and shall take into possession the installed equipment(s). In such a case the depreciating cost of the equipment shall be calculated as below:</p> <p>a) The depreciation value of the indicated equipment in Form F-2 of the financial bid shall be reduced by 33.33% every year to the rate mentioned for the respective items, subject to the provision of Note 3 of Form F-2.</p> <p>on account of Termination of this Agreement and any other payment</p>	<p>We understand that the depreciation period will start after the start of operation of the MLFF tolling system and that in case of Termination during the course of the year the depreciation will be calculated proportionally.</p> <p>I.e. if the termination is after 18 months from the start of operation the Termination Payment in case i. During (5 Months Development period) + O&amp;M Period (60 months) is the total indicated in Form F-2 reduced by (33.33% + 16.66%) = 50%.</p> <p>In case the termination is before the end of the first five (5) months the Termination Payment will be equal to the total indicated in Form F-2.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>		Refer Corrigendum-3

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
57	105	1.2.42.	4. The bidder must ensure that no end of support products exist at time of transition.	<p>This is in contrast with the Form T-5 Undertaking from the Bidder – clause 4) that states “That the OEM(s) for all active components will give a declaration that products or technology quoted are neither end of- sale nor end-of-life as on the date of installation and commissioning and are not end-of-support till the successful completion of O&amp;M period of the project”</p> <p>So if the Bidder undertakes that no products will be end of support at the completion of the O&amp;M period it cannot ensure that at the time of transition no products will be at the end of support.</p> <p>Please revise</p>		As per RFP.
58	123	SCHEDULE-B 8.d.	This RFP describes functional requirements envisaged by IHMCL. In addition, the minimum technical specifications have been prescribed in this document, wherever indispensable. The bidder/bank is responsible for the design of complete project and the system architecture to deliver state-of-the-art solution to IHMCL fully complying to the functional requirement specified in the RFP and site conditions.	<p>It is understood that the bidder can propose alternative solutions that are fully compliant with the functional requirements specified in the RFP, even if they do not match the described equipment one-to-one.</p> <p>Please confirm</p>		As per RFP.
59	125	SCHEDULE-B 8.s.	Future integration with advanced technologies: The Bidder's solution should include API based integration with future tolling technologies like GNSS and NHAI Applications like Raj Marg Yatra etc. or Advance Traffic Management System(ATMS), any other similar system at no extra cost	<p>It is understood that API to interact with the MLFF system shall be provided by the Bidder. Future systems can use such API to interact and integrate the MLFF system. No integration with future system will be required to the Bidder</p> <p>Please confirm</p>		As per RFP.
60	129	Schedule B 10. 7 Vehicle Count (for Tollable only)	For any missing count of any vehicle in the accuracy, a penalty of Rs 100000 shall be applicable Per day.	<p>It is understood that whichever is the number of missing vehicle, below the limit of 99% and above 98%, the amount of the penalty remain fix at 1lakh</p> <p>Please confirm</p>		As per RFP.
61	130	Schedule B 10. 8 Vehicle Classification (for Tollable only)	For any missing Classification of any vehicle in the accuracy, a penalty of Rs 100000 shall be applicable per day	<p>It is understood that whichever is the number of missing classification, below the limit of 99% and above 98%, the amount of the penalty remain fix at 1lakh</p> <p>Please confirm</p>		As per RFP.
62	20	PQ-2: Subcontractors Qualification	The Subcontractor should be a reputed subcontractor.”	The term “reputed subcontractor” lacks clarity and does not mandate prior experience in MLFF. Given the project's technical sensitivity and pioneering nature in India, would IHMCL consider amending this to require at least one similar MLFF project experience globally for the subcontractor?		As per RFP.



Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
63	109	Schedule B – MLFF Development Scope	MLFF solution scope not directly linked with qualification criteria	Given the complexity of MLFF solution deployment (including ANPR, RFID, and integration with CCH/NPCI), how will IHMCL ensure that only qualified and experienced subcontractors handle system delivery? Could minimum technical qualification for subcontractors be specified?		As per RFP.
64		PQ Criteria – General	No clear technical eligibility for MLFF subcontractor	Why does the RFP not demand any minimum MLFF-specific experience from subcontractors, especially considering this is one of the first full-scale MLFF implementations in India requiring precision and accuracy?		As per RFP.
65	109-112	Schedule B – General Conditions	No mention of subcontractor role verification	Will IHMCL evaluate and approve subcontractor capabilities during the technical evaluation phase, especially for MLFF equipment integration and operations?		As per RFP.
66		Qualification Criteria	No linkage between international experience and MLFF delivery	Why is international experience asked under PQ but not used as a filter or weightage during technical scoring, especially when the project's success depends on global best practices in MLFF?		As per RFP.
67		Qualification Criteria	Absence of minimum qualification for subcontractors	Is it standard practice in India to avoid any minimum eligibility requirement for subcontractors in a technically complex and first-of-its-kind infrastructure project like MLFF implementation? Would the Authority consider re-evaluating this approach to safeguard delivery quality?		As per RFP.
68	112	Operations & Maintenance 2	STQC and CERT-In Certification: The Bidder shall be required to carry out STQC certification of its MLFF software within 6 months from the date of completion SAT. Further the Bidder shall be required to conduct CERT-In certification of its MLFF software every year post Go-Live of the MLFF	As per the STQC guidelines issued by MeitY dated 6th March 2024, camera hardware must be STQC certified. However, the current tender specifies that STQC certification is applicable only to the software, with a compliance timeline of six months from the date of SAT. This clause appears to favour specific CCTV OEMs and poses challenges for other Indian OEMs who already have STQC-certified hardware models suitable for highway requirements. We respectfully request that this clause be amended to require bidders to quote STQC-certified CCTV cameras (hardware) at the time of bidding, ensuring a level playing field for all compliant Indian manufacturers.		As per RFP.
69	139	Schedule - C Standards & Specifications	1.3 Audit Surveillance Camera 3. IR Effective Range 150M (Overview)	In the overview section, the IR range has been specified as 150 meters. However, under the functional requirements for the Audit Surveillance Camera, it is mentioned that video and images of vehicles should be clear up to a range of 30 meters at night. This inconsistency is misleading and creates confusion for other CCTV OEMs. We kindly request that the IR range requirement be revised from 150 meters to 50 meters. This amendment will enable other Indian OEMs, including those with STQC-certified models, to participate in the tender process. It will also support IHMCL in selecting reputed Indian CCTV manufacturers, thereby encouraging fair competition and promoting indigenous solutions.		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
70	140	1.3 Audit Surveillance Camera and  1.4 Automatic Number Plate Recognition Systems	21 Preferred OEMs Pelco/Avigilon, Axis, Vivotek, FETCI, Tattile, BOSCH  r Preferred OEMs Pelco/Avigilon, Axis, Vivotek, FETCI, BOSCH, Tattile	In the RFP, a specific OEMs name has been mentioned for Audit Surveillance and ANPR cameras, which is creating challenges for Indian CCTV OEMs. Under the Make in India policy, several CCTV manufacturers have established production facilities within the country. However, IHMCL appears to be considering foreign OEMs that do not possess the necessary certifications as per Indian government regulations. We respectfully request you to kindly include our brand in the list of approved makes. This will enable us to contribute to IHMCL's prestigious projects and further support the Government of India's vision of promoting indigenous manufacturing.		Refer Corrigendum-3
71	16	Part-I, Section 1.2	Key Dates: Last date for online submission of bids is 03/06/2025 up to 05:00 PM IST.	Given the complexity of the project and the need for site visits and coordination with sub-contractors, can IHMCL consider extending the bid submission deadline by 10-15 days to ensure comprehensive bid preparation?		Refer Corrigendum-3
72	20	Part-I, Section 3.1, PQ-2 (iii)	The Bidder shall ensure that the Sub-Contractor/SI engaged by them is under an exclusive MOU with the acquirer bank and is not associated as Sub-Contractor/SI with any other Bidder participating in the same tender.	Can IHMCL clarify whether the exclusivity requirement applies only to this specific RFP or extends to other ongoing/future MLFF tenders issued by IHMCL/NHAI? Additionally, is there a mechanism to verify the exclusivity of the Sub-Contractor during bid evaluation?		The exclusivity of the Sub-Contractor/SI, as stated in the RFP, pertains only to the specific RFP in reference and does not extend to other ongoing or future MLFF tenders.
73	122	Schedule B, Section 8	MLFF Project: Detailed roles and responsibilities for the implementation and maintenance of the MLFF system.	The RFP mentions integration with the VAHAN database (Page 166). Can IHMCL clarify whether the API for VAHAN integration is same which is provided by NPCI or will it be separately provided by IHMCL/NIC, and if so, will there be any associated costs or prerequisites for accessing the API?		As per RFP.
74	170-173	Schedule C, Section 2.11	Indicative Minimum Bill of Quantity (BOQ): Lists quantities such as 1 RFID Antenna per lane, 2 ANPR Cameras per lane, etc.	The BOQ is indicative. Can IHMCL confirm whether bidders are allowed to propose lower/higher quantities or alternative configurations to enhance system performance, and if so, how will such deviations be evaluated during the technical bid assessment?		As per the RFP, the BOQ provided is the minimum requirement. Bidders may propose additional quantities or line items as a per of their proposed solution, for enhanced system performance and SLA parameters adherence.
75	128	Schedule B, Section 10	Service Level Agreement: Details penalties for non-compliance with uptime, accuracy, and other performance metrics.	Can IHMCL provide the detailed methodology or formula for calculating penalties (e.g., for equipment downtime, ANPR accuracy below 99.5%) to help bidders assess financial implications during the project planning phase?		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
76	150-151	Schedule C, Section 1.11	Firewall: Specifies minimum performance metrics (e.g., 5 Gbps throughput, 1 Gbps IPS throughput).	Can IHMCL clarify whether the firewall solution must be from a single OEM or if a combination of hardware and software from different OEMs is acceptable, provided the specified performance metrics are met?		As per RFP. The bidder may propose a firewall solution comprising hardware and software, provided the integrated solution meets all specified performance metrics and complies with the functional and security requirements outlined in the RFP.
77	167-169	Schedule C, Section 2.10	Web-Portal: Requires real-time data visualization, customizable reports, and integration with the e-Notice module.	Can IHMCL specify the expected volume of concurrent users for the web-portal and any specific security standards that the portal must adhere to?		The web portal shall be designed to accommodate concurrent access by concerned officials at PIUs, ROs, NHAI HQ, and IHMCL, in addition to the internal users of the bidder. It should incorporate appropriate access control mechanisms, role-based access, and must be scalable to support future enhancements and evolving operational requirements.
78	166	Schedule C, Section 2.9 (7)	Integration with VAHAN database to retrieve Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW) based on VRN or VIN.	Can IHMCL confirm the availability and reliability of the VAHAN database API, and whether any downtime or access restrictions might impact real-time toll processing?		The indicative process flow diagram for transaction processing as well as E-notice generation is already provided in the RFP. Detailed Technical Specification Document for barrier-less tolling shall be provided to Successful bidder during implementation phase.
79	118	Schedule B, Section 8 (E-Notice Module)	E-Notice Module: The MLFF system shall include an e-Notice module for generating notices for vehicles crossing the Gantry/Lanes under violation category (e.g., without FASTag, invalid FASTag). The module requires integration with NIC e-Notice and NETC systems for processing.	Given that the e-Notice module requires integration with the NETC system, which involves coordination with approximately 40+ Issuer Banks, can IHMCL clarify whether delays in go-live due to the lack of readiness of Issuer Banks for e-Notice implementation will be exempted from the 5-month implementation timeline? Specifically, if Issuer Banks are not equipped to process e-Notices as per the NETC system requirements, will such delays be considered outside the Successful Bidder's control, and will an extension to the go-live timeline be granted without penalties?		No extension of timelines shall be granted on account of non-readiness of Issuer Banks. E-Notices module is primarily concern with Acquirer bank, NPCI and VAHAN (NIC).
80	120	Clause 3	E-Notice Process Flow:	What shall be done in case E-Notices are generated on Exemption vehicles if they doesn't have FASTag.		Refer Corrigendum-3
81	120	Clause 3	E-Notice Process Flow:	How to handle Exemptions of Ambulances, Local Police and other possible exemptions which is currently handled manually at plaza end. As in if vehicle is having Active FASTag then in MLFF amount shall be debited.		Refer Corrigendum-3

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
82	121	Clause 4	Process flow for Grievance Mechanism:	There shall be API for revoking E-Notices if Plaza finds that E-Notice is wrongly generated, also in scenario if user highlight wrong E-Notice directly to plaza. This shall help in reducing user escalations and inconvenience		As per RFP.
83	120	Clause 3	E-Notice Process Flow:	What shall be SLA for E-Notice if Vahan is down?		As per RFP.
84	119	Clause 2	Tag transaction flow by MLFF entity / Acquirer Bank:	If there is a discrepancy between Mapper Class & Vahan Class, the Acquirer can generate an E-Notice based on the Vahan class		As per RFP.
85	119	Clause 2	Tag transaction flow by MLFF entity / Acquirer Bank:	DebitAdjustment for the reprocessed transactions should be extended to one extra day considering that transactions can be processed after 24 hrs basis ReqBalanceCheck		Detailed Technical Specification Document for barrier-less tolling shall be provided to Successful bidder during implementation phase.
86	121	Clause 4	Process flow for Grievance Mechanism:	Automated Grievance Handling via API: Dispute resolution should happen via API integration, removing dependency on manual work on NIC portal		As per RFP.
87	20	PQ 2 - Eligibility of Sub-Contractor (SI)	The bidder shall get the MLFF system work done through a reputed Sub-Contractor	Are we saying that the subcontractor can be from any field and its not mandatory to be from MLFF? Considering this is first MLFF project in India, so only MLFF experienced SI should be allowed to participate.		As per RFP.
88	19	PQ 1 – Entity	A) The bidder must be either i. A Scheduled Bank in the list of Agency Banks as notified by RBI as on Bid due date. OR, ii. A Payments Bank as notified by RBI as on BID due date.	As per RFP any bank can participate with this Bid irrespective of NETC Certified. Ideally there should be some capping on no of Toll Plaza which should be live with NETC FASTag services. So that only certified and experienced bank should be allowed to bid in this RFP		As per RFP.
89	20	PQ 2 - Eligibility of Sub-Contractor (SI)	The bidder shall get the MLFF system work done through a reputed Sub-Contractor	Qualification of Subcontractor should be related to MLFF (at-least one similar project anywhere across the globe)		As per RFP.
90	20	PQ 2 - Eligibility of Sub-Contractor (SI)	For Bidder & Sub-Contractor a) MOU Agreement signed between Bidder and Sub-Contractor (SI) specifying roles and responsibilities of both parties to be included along with technical bid as per format provided in Form T-10.	All Credibility is only of bank whether the Subcontractor performs or not perform as only Bank will be at risk. So, To reduce the risk of banks, We suggest the following:  The Banks should be allowed to have 2-3 MoUs so that we can use same or atleast the best of 3 with us and after getting the project can go with the best one of those 3 selected.		As per RFP.
91	20	PQ 2 - Eligibility of Sub-Contractor (SI),	iii, The Bidder shall ensure that the Sub-Contractor/SI engaged by them is under an exclusive MOU with the acquirer bank and is not associated as Sub- Contractor/SI with any other Bidder participating in the same tender. For avoidance of doubt, if two or more bids is received having same Sub- Contractor/SI, all such bids shall be treated as non- responsive.	To reduce the risk of banks, We suggest the following:  In case you do not agree with the above two, please allow the banks to quote directly and after getting the project allow them to select their preferred bidder		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
92	110	Schedule B, Section - 1, C	c) The Bidder shall develop: MLFF based tolling facility by installing new Gantries on main carriageway of the road (minimum 02 (01 Main & 01 redundant)) for each direction (LHS & RHS) for MLFF based tolling within approx. 200m of existing fee plaza.	There should be flexibility to select the most suitable place for installation of Gantry, as there are chances that to cover 3 lanes of highway we might have to install gantry before 300-400 meter from existing toll plaza		Refer Corrigendum-3.  The exact positioning of the gantries may be finalized by the Bank, in consultation with IHMCL, to optimize system performance and implementation feasibility.
93	110	Schedule B, Section - 1, C	c) The Bidder shall develop: MLFF based tolling facility by installing new Gantries on main carriageway of the road (minimum 02 (01 Main & 01 redundant)) for each direction (LHS & RHS) for MLFF based tolling within approx. 200m of existing fee plaza.	What should be the exact gap we need to keep between Main Gantry and Redundant Gantry kindly confirm. As Ideally we should keep minimum 50-100 meter gap between two gantries.		Refer Corrigendum-3
94	170	Schedule C, Section 2.11	2.11 Indicative Minimum Bill of Quantity (BOQ):	If ANPR cameras which is used on Gantry can provide vehicle classification. So can only use ANPR and not install Radar and Lidar for vehicle classification		As per the RFP, the BOQ provided is the minimum requirement. Bidders may propose additional quantities or line items as a per of their proposed solution, for enhanced system performance and SLA parameters adherence.
95	171	Schedule C, Section 2.11	2.11 Indicative Minimum Bill of Quantity (BOQ): Sr. No B-6- Control Room: Firewall with all licenses Sr. No C-9- Firewall at CC (Control Centre)	Firewall is mentioned twice, can we consider this as one.		As per RFP.
96	171	Schedule C, Section 2.11	2.11 Indicative Minimum Bill of Quantity (BOQ):	Can we add/remove no of hardware's depending the project requirement for successful implementation		As per the RFP, the BOQ provided is the minimum requirement. Bidders may propose additional quantities or line items as a per of their proposed solution, for enhanced system performance and SLA parameters adherence.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
97	110	c) The Bidder shall develop:	MLFF based tolling facility by installing new Gantries on main carriageway of the road (minimum 02 (01 Main & 01 redundant)) for each direction (LHS & RHS) for MLFF based tolling within approx. 200m of existing fee plaza.	<p>Lane Marking Concern: Due to the layout of the current toll plaza, certain sections of the roadway are currently unmarked. Would it be possible to implement proper lane markings to enhance driving safety and ensure smoother traffic flow?</p> <p>Roadside Protection Facilities for MLFF Gantry: In addition to the lane marking requirements, the bidder proposes to install appropriate roadside protection measures to safeguard the MLFF gantry. Are there specific standards or regulations applicable to Indian highways for such protective installations—for example, reinforced concrete New Jersey barriers, metal guardrails, or PU flexible delineator posts?</p>		The Bidder shall coordinate with Authority for lane marking and traffic safety enhancements as required. For roadside protection of MLFF gantries, bidders shall follow applicable IRC guidelines and MoRTH standards.
98	108	Index map of Project Highway	Index map of Project Highway	Without affecting the existing toll operations (a certain distance must be maintained), the selection of the gantry location may impact existing U-turn points and result in previously toll-exempt residents becoming subject to toll charges.		<p>Refer Corrigendum-3.</p> <p>The exact positioning of the gantries may be finalized by the Bank, in consultation with IHMCL, to optimize system performance and implementation feasibility.</p>
99	172	BOQ : B. Control Room Equipment	MLFF Local Server(HA mode) Qty.=2	Does it mean 2 servers for HA, or 4 servers as 2 sets of HA?		Qty 2 no. servers for HA mode. Additionally, the bidder may also choose MeitY empanelled cloud service provider for redundancy.
100	171	BOQ : B. Control Room Equipment	Redundant Internet Connectivity (1 Gbps) Qty.=2	Can you please clarify what is meant by 'Redundant Internet Connectivity (1 Gbps), Qty = 2'		Refer Corrigendum-3
101	85	Go-Live	For avoidance of doubt, "Go-Live" shall be considered successful only after acceptance of SAT.	After the SAT is passed, how will the transition be carried out in terms of personnel, facilities, operations, and schedule? How long after the SAT will the system go live?		The transition to operations shall be seamless as per the roll out and operationalisation plan submitted by the bidder in consultation with NHA1 & IHMCL.
102	86	1.2.16.3. Parameters to be checked during Site Acceptance Testing (SAT)	Vehicle count accuracy	Since the gantry is required to be built within 200 meters of the toll plaza, during the Site Acceptance Test (SAT), if both the RFID readers and antennas on the gantry and the toll plaza are activated simultaneously, they may interfere with each other.		<p>Refer Corrigendum-3.</p> <p>The exact positioning of the gantries may be finalized by the Bank, in consultation with IHMCL, to optimize system performance and implementation feasibility.</p>

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
103	86	1.2.16.3. Parameters to be checked during Site Acceptance Testing (SAT)	Vehicle classification accuracy	Does the classification rate include cross check with Vahan database?		As per RFP
104	87	1.2.16.3. Parameters to be checked during Site Acceptance Testing (SAT)	ANPR Camera Accuracy	<p>Does the 99% refer to the system as a whole (i.e., either front or rear plate recognized counts), or to each individual camera?</p> <p>Plates that are not recognizable by the human eye should be excluded.</p> <p>Non-standard license plates (e.g. handwriting) should be excluded.</p>		<p>The 99% ANPR accuracy refers to the ANPR system's overall performance, considering recognition from either the front or rear license plate. Number plates that are "humanly not readable" shall be excluded from the total count used for accuracy calculation.</p> <p>A license plate shall be considered "humanly not readable" if its alphanumeric characters cannot be accurately identified by a person with normal vision under standard daylight or lighting conditions, due to factors such as physical damage, obstruction (e.g., mud, dust, stickers), tampering, or any deliberate alteration that renders the plate illegible to the naked eye.</p>
105	87	1.2.16.3. Parameters to be checked during Site Acceptance Testing (SAT)	API integration with NPCI for ETC transaction processing	For the period of SAT, how is the integration testing with NPCI conducted before the launch of current toll plaza ETC or future MLFF? Does NPCI provide the testing environment.		Testing shall be conducted under UAT environment. Details shall be shared with successful bidder during implementation phase. Indicative process flow diagrams are already provided in the RFP.
106	171	BOQ – B. Control Room Equipment (Redundant Internet Connectivity)	Redundant Internet Connectivity (1 Gbps) Qty = 2 (OFC + Wireless)	Please confirm if this means (1) one link via OFC and one via wireless, or (2) two redundant links, each supporting both OFC and wireless fallback. Also, are there any minimum SLAs required for uptime?	Lack of clarity may affect cost estimation and provisioning.	Refer Corrigendum-3
107	128	10. Service Level Agreement	Penalty shall be calculated on a daily/weekly/monthly basis depending upon the SLA parameter...	Can IHMCL specify a cap on cumulative penalties (e.g., 10% of monthly invoices)? Are penalty disputes appealable or subject to arbitration under the Contract Agreement?	Helps protect bidder from open-ended financial liability.	As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
108	24	4.1 Site Visit	Bidders shall not hold the Authority responsible or liable for inconsistencies between Contract Agreement and actual site conditions.	Will IHMCL consider issuing a site visit certificate confirming baseline status and utilities available to avoid later disputes on readiness of infrastructure?	Helps mitigate liability due to lack of access or civil preparation delays.	As per RFP.
109	110	Schedule B 1.c)	MLFF based tolling facility by installing new Gantries on main carriageway of the road (minimum 02 (01 Main & 01 redundant)) for each direction (LHS & RHS) for MLFF based tolling within approx. 200m of existing fee plaza.	WE understand that the indication of having gantries within 200m of the existing toll plaza is not mandatory.  The localisation of the gantries, not far from the toll plaza, shall be defined by the System Integrator to optimize cost and effectiveness of the system implementation and operation.  Please confirm		Refer Corrigendum-3.  The exact positioning of the gantries may be finalized by the Bank, in consultation with IHMCL, to optimize system performance and implementation feasibility.
110	110	Schedule B Note i.	The bidder shall be required to submit detailed design drawings including design calculations of gantries which should be approved from any of the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT)/ National Institute of Technology (NIT).	The detailed design drawings are part of the deliveries to be submitted after the award of the tender and the signature of contract  Please confirm		Design drawings are required to be submitted post award of Contract.
111	110	Schedule – B 1. Development of the MLFF based tolling facility. a) About the MLFF based Tolling Project	vi. The successful bidder/bank must implement and commence the MLFF system services without disrupting ongoing toll operations or causing any revenue loss to the toll collection agency until the MLFF system goes live. Additionally, the bidder must ensure the proper migration of all databases from the existing TMS before transitioning to the new MLFF system. The bidder must also ensure that the existing equipment and electrical appliances currently used by toll agencies/SIs are taken over for use only after the MLFF system goes live, following a proper handover and takeover process without disrupting current toll operations.	We request that the Authority mandate the current toll operator to provide verified, export-ready data in a mutually agreed format and define a cut-off date for historical data freeze.	Justification : Given the stringent implementation timeline of 5 months, it becomes imperative that the existing toll operator is mandated to provide verified, export-ready data in a mutually agreed format well in advance of the system transition. Data migration is a critical and time-sensitive activity that often encounters delays due to incompatible database structures, inconsistent vehicle classification logic, or missing transaction records within legacy Toll Management Systems (TMS)	As per RFP.
112	111	Schedule – B d) Control Center	iii. A separate team of staff shall be dedicatedly working on the manual validation and audit process for which the ANPR camera & RFID readers had less accuracy or confidence level to initiate the ETC transaction at the gantry application level. The staff shall be using the evidence from the system generated from the gantry end and validate the correct transaction of the vehicle.	We request the Authority to kindly clarify the defined threshold parameters or logic based on which a transaction will be classified as "low-confidence" and routed for manual validation.	This information is essential for accurately estimating the expected volume of such transactions.	As per RFP.



Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
113	113	Schedule – B  b) Maintenance Activities:	d. STQC and CERT-In Certification: The Bidder shall be required to carry out STQC certification of its MLFF software within 6 months from the date of completion SAT. Further the Bidder shall be required to conduct CERT-In certification of its MLFF software every year post Go-Live of the MLFF.	Given that STQC and CERT-In audits are conducted by third-party government agencies with limited control over scheduling, we request the Authority to kindly confirm whether delays caused solely due to agency unavailability or process backlog will be exempted from being classified as a breach of compliance.		As per RFP.
114	113-114	3. Toll Collection from the MLFF system  c. Rate of User Fee:	4. e-notices to be issued in case of failure to pay by the road user. The e-Notices amount will be double the applicable user fees for that category of vehicles. No enotices shall be issued for exempted vehicles under any circumstances. The share of the revenue to the Bank for e-notice cases shall be as per applicable user fee, not as per the value/amount of e-notice generated.	We request the Authority to clarify whether a defined enforcement mechanism will be in place for repeated toll defaulters, such as blacklisting of vehicle registration numbers, RTO integration, or legal recovery procedures.	A vehicle owner can continuously avoid toll payments, accumulate e-notices, and face no immediate penalty or operational restriction. This creates a risk of repeated violations without financial consequence, potentially leading to significant revenue leakage and undermining the deterrent value of the MLFF enforcement system.	As per RFP.
115	137	1 Standards and Specification of all MLFF Sub System  1.1 RFID Reader	Preferred OEMs - SSI, Tag Master, Kathrein, Zebra	We wish to highlight that restricting preference to a select few OEMs may unintentionally favor certain vendors and limit healthy competition. We request the Authority to consider allowing any OEM that meets the required performance benchmarks and certifications, to ensure a level playing field, better pricing, and supply flexibility without compromising quality.	There are several globally established OEMs offering NETC-compliant RFID readers with equal or superior technical capabilities.	Refer Corrigendum-3
116	141	1 Standards and Specification of all MLFF Sub System  1.3 Audit Surveillance Camera	Preferred OEMs - Pelco/Avigilon, Axis, Vivotek, FETCI, Tattile, BOSCH	We respectfully submit that such specific OEM preferences may limit fair competition and favor select vendors, potentially impacting cost-effectiveness and supply flexibility. We request the Authority to allow participation of any OEM that complies with the functional, performance, and certification requirements laid out in the RFP, to ensure broader participation, technical innovation, and better value discovery.	We wish to respectfully highlight that many of these OEMs currently do not possess STQC certification, which has been recently mandated by the Government of India for surveillance systems used in national infrastructure projects.	Refer Corrigendum-3
117		General	General	We request the Authority to kindly clarify the mechanism for identifying and handling blacklisted vehicles within the MLFF system and what action is expected at the gantry level when such vehicles are detected?		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
118	164	1 . Standards and Specification of all MLFF Sub System	2.6 Detector- LIDAR & RADAR a) The bidder shall propose appropriate technical solution/ product to check speed, count the number of vehicles and classification of the passing vehicle at each lane. The output of the detectors should be to indicate the presence/ passage of vehicles and shall be used to trigger the MLFF system to generate counts, vehicle classification, and speed at each lane.	Reference Clause 1: (c) The type of equipment mentioned in the RFP are bare minimum. In case the solution designed by Bidder requires additional equipment (eg thermal camera etc) to meet the scope of work and SLA, the same should be provided in the solution without any additional financial implication to IHMCL. (Section: 1. Standards and Specifications of all MLFF Sub Systems, Page 137)  Reference Clause 2: 2.6 Detector- LIDAR & RADAR : a) The bidder shall propose appropriate technical solution/ product to check speed, count the number of vehicles and classification of the passing vehicle at each lane. The output of the detectors should be to indicate the presence/ passage of vehicles and shall be used to trigger the MLFF system to generate counts, vehicle classification, and speed at each lane."  Based on the above clauses, we understand that the bidder is permitted to propose an alternative technical solution, such as thermal sensors in place of LiDAR sensors, for vehicle speed detection, counting, and classification, provided the proposed solution meets the functional requirements, as well as the defined Service Level Agreements (SLAs).  Just to highlight below are key differentiators while considering optimum solution  1. Camera based technology is more viable and feasible in Indian scenario as traffic is hetrogenous as compare to		As per the RFP, the BOQ provided is the minimum requirement. Bidders may propose additional quantities or line items as a per of their proposed solution, for enhanced system performance and SLA parameters adherence.
119	Page no. 114 of 178	Schedule B- Clause 4	Obligations of Bidder/Bank	Requesting authority to align the required Compliances and regulatory approvals so that Bidder/Bank can successfully implement MLFF.		As per RFP.
120	Page no. 15 of 178	Clause 1.1 b): Implementation period	05 Months	Requesting authority to increase the time period for implementation considering the mandate for certifications		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
121	Page no. 19 of 178	Clause 3.1- PQ 2 Eligibility of Sub-Contractor (SI)	<p>The bidder shall get the MLFF system work done through a reputed Sub-Contractor (hereinafter also referred to as System Integrator, or SI), subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>i. The Sub-Contractor should be incorporated in India under the Companies Act, 1956/2013 or the Limited Liability Partnerships Act, 2008 or any equivalent foreign act.</p> <p>ii. If the Sub-Contractor/SI is any entity from a country which shares a land border with India, it will be eligible to bid in any procurement whether of goods, services (including consultancy services and non-consultancy services) or works (including turnkey projects) only if the entity is registered with the Competent Authority.</p> <p>iii. The Bidder shall ensure that the Sub-Contractor/SI engaged by them is under an exclusive MOU with the acquirer bank and is not associated as Sub-Contractor/SI with any other Bidder participating in the same tender. For avoidance of doubt, if two or more bids is received having same Sub-Contractor/SI, all such bids shall be treated as non-responsive.</p> <p>iv. In case the Sub-Contractor is a firm incorporated abroad, it may associate with firm(s) incorporated in India for assistance in implementation, operations and other allied works required for MLFF Tolling.</p>	Kindly consider including experience criteria for Sub-Contractor (SI) in Pre-Qualification Criteria either basis implemented Gantry/Lanes/Projects count.		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
122	Page no. 31 of 178	Clause 6.5: Performance Security	<p>a)The Successful bidder shall furnish a Performance Security totaling Rs. 18,00,00,000/- (Rupees Eighteen Crore Only) for a period of 6 years from the Date of LOA in following instruments:</p> <p>(i) a crossed account payee demand draft/pay order amounting to Rs. 9,00,00,000/- (Rupees Nine Crore Only) (an amount equal to 50% of the total PBG value) and</p> <p>(ii) a bank guarantee amounting to Rs. 9,00,00,000/- (Rupees Nine Crore Lakh Only) (an amount equal to 50% of the total PBG value) as per the format prescribed by IHMCL for a period of 6 years from the Date of LOA</p> <p>b)The Bidder shall have the liberty to submit a crossed account payee demand draft/pay order issued by a Scheduled Bank in India in lieu of the bank guarantee.</p> <p>c)The Performance security shall be increased by additional 50% of amount mentioned at 6.5(a), in form of Bank Guarantee in case, the Clean Transaction amount in any financial year increases by 50% of Clean Transaction amount collected in next financial year corresponding to the Bid due date.</p> <p>d)In case the contract is extended, the bidder shall extend the validity of PBG appropriately such that it remains valid until one year beyond completion of the contract.</p>	Requesting Authority to kindly Consider Reduction in PBG amount for Performance Bank Guarantee/Performance Security or Umbrella Guarantee concept to be introduced.		As per RFP.
123	Page no. 128 of 178	Schedule- B, Clause 10; Schedule B, Clause 11	Service Level Agreement; Consistent Penalty	Requesting Authority to please consider capping the Penalty amount		As per RFP.
124	Page no. 15 of 178	Clause 1.1 b): Period	05 Months (Design, Development and Implementation period) and 60 Months as O&M period (After successful completion/commissioning of the MLFF based tolling System)	Requesting Authority to consider increasing the tenure for contract (considering capex and ROI)		As per RFP.
125	-	-	-	Kindly allow Annual Pass implementation		Refer Corrigendum-3
126	Page no. 20 of 178	Clause 3.1: PQ 2 Eligibility of Sub-Contractor (SI), Sub-clause iii.	The Bidder shall ensure that the Sub-Contractor/SI engaged by them is under an exclusive MOU with the acquirer bank and is not associated as Sub-Contractor/SI with any other Bidder participating in the same tender. For avoidance of doubt, if two or more bids is received having same Sub-Contractor/SI, all such bids shall be treated as non-responsive	For all the released MLFF projects, kindly consider allowing Banks to participate with multiple SI partners		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
127	Page no. 119 of 178	Schedule- B, Clause 7	E-Notice Module	MLFF switch for transaction processing will be based on ICD 2.5 or ICD 2.6? If ICD 2.6 then the transaction and e-notice flow needs to be redefined.		The indicative process flow diagram for transaction processing as well as E-notice generation is already provided in the RFP. Detailed Technical Specification Document for barrier-less tolling shall be provided to Successful bidder during implementation phase.
128	Page no. 119 of 178	Schedule- B, Clause 7	E-Notice Module	Procedural guidelines document should be corroborated in collaboration with NHAI/IHMCL, NPCI, Acquiring Bank, Issuer Bank and SI Partner to address all anomalies and e-notice redressal		The indicative process flow diagram for transaction processing as well as E-notice generation is already provided in the RFP. Detailed Technical Specification Document for barrier-less tolling shall be provided to Successful bidder during implementation phase.
129	Page 22	3.1.1. Eligible Original Equipment Manufacturere (OEM) Criteria, Point (e)	OEM for each product or technology quoted should be in the business of that product or solution or technology for at least 3 years as on the date of release of the RFP.	We kindly request that the clause be relaxed to encourage greater participation from startups, thereby fostering innovation and broader competition in the tender process.	As a DPIIT-recognized startup OEM, the OEM should be exempted from the requirements related to prior experience and minimum turnover, in accordance with the provisions outlined in the Government of India's Public Procurement Policy for Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) and Startup India initiative. This exemption encourages innovation and supports emerging businesses by enabling fair participation in public procurement processes, without compromising on technical competence or product quality. Startup exemption for OEMs should be considered, as the government is also actively promoting startups.	As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
130	Page 86	1.2.16.3. Parameters to be checked during Site Acceptance Testing (SAT)	ANPR Camera Accuracy- The ANPR camera system should read all types of vehicle registration number (VRN) plates with minimum accuracy of 99% under both day and night conditions, without any manual validation/audit.	We request that the accuracy requirement be relaxed from 99% to 95% to allow for practical implementation under real-world conditions.	Achieving 99% accuracy in real-time scenarios can be challenging due to various external factors, including environmental conditions. Therefore, it is advisable to consider a more practical accuracy benchmark of 95% to account for these real-world variables and ensure system reliability.	As per RFP.
131	Page 138	1.3 Audit Surveillance Camera	Speed Limit- 150 km/hr	Since vehicle speed is captured using radar and ANPR cameras, it is not necessary to detect speed through the overview camera. Overview cameras with very wide-angle lenses are primarily for general monitoring and not suitable for accurate speed estimation. Speed detection should rely on specialized sensors designed for high-speed capture. OEMs should focus overview cameras on situational awareness rather than speed analytics	Detection of vehicle speed up to 150 km/hr is not feasible using very wide-angle cameras due to distortion and limited pixel coverage over distance. Accurate speed estimation requires narrower field-of-view lenses that can track vehicle movement clearly across frames. Wide-angle lenses are more suited for general surveillance, not high-speed analytics. OEMs should consider appropriate lens specifications for high-speed detection scenarios.	As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
132	Page 162	System Parameter, Point 14 Mounting Structure, Point no (b)	The ANPR camera shall be placed in such a way that it should be able to view the edge shoulders as well as the service lanes to capture the vehicle license plates and process the same for deduction of toll.	ANPR cameras should be configured with a narrow field of view, ideally covering a single lane for maximum accuracy. To ensure no vehicle is missed, it is recommended to deploy an additional camera dedicated to monitoring the road shoulder. This ensures detection of vehicles using non-designated paths or attempting to bypass lanes. Proper lane-wise and shoulder coverage enhances overall system reliability and enforcement.	ANPR cameras are designed with a very narrow angle of view and are best suited for monitoring a single lane to ensure high accuracy. Using them for multiple lanes may reduce performance due to limited pixel density per vehicle. For optimal results, each lane should be covered by a dedicated ANPR camera. This setup ensures reliable license plate recognition even at high speeds.	As per RFP.
133	19	PQ - 1 Entity	A) The bidder must be either i. A Scheduled Bank in the list of Agency Banks as notified by RBI as on Bid due date. OR, ii. A Payments Bank as notified by RBI as on BID due date.	As per RFP any bank can participate with this Bid irrespective of NETC Certified. Ideally there should be some capping on no of Toll Plaza which should be live with NETC FASTagservices. So that only certified and experienced bank should be allowed to bid in this RFP		As per RFP.
134	20	PQ 2 - Eligibility of Sub-Contractor (SI)	The bidder shall get the MLFF system work done through a reputed Sub-Contractor	Qualification of Subcontractor should be related to MLFF (at-least one similar project anywhere across the globe)		As per RFP.
135	116	4. Obligations of the Bidder/Bank	g) The bidder/bank shall ensure that the toll plaza, including its equipment, is powered primarily by the (raw power) grid and secondarily by UPS, DG sets, and other renewable sources. The secondary power sources must ensure seamless connectivity in case of grid power cuts. All electricity charges for both grid and secondary power sources shall be borne by the bidder/bank.	We request the Authority to kindly confirm whether the bidder is permitted to use the existing electricity connection and infrastructure available at the toll plaza, subject to a formal takeover process.	This will help avoid redundant civil and electrical work, reduce deployment time, and ensure more efficient use of existing resources.	As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
136	130	10. Service Level Agreement  Accuracy - Vehicle Count and classification	• For any missing count of any vehicle in the accuracy, a penalty of Rs 100000 shall be applicable Per day.	Please clarify below points,  1. We request the Authority to kindly clarify whether the penalty applies only when daily accuracy falls below 99%, or for every single missed count regardless of the accuracy threshold  2. We would like to highlight that the SLA, as currently defined, is extremely stringent given the realities of MLFF operations. Factors such as lane-changing vehicles, occlusion due to heavy traffic, weather interference, or sensor drift can cause occasional miscounts despite the system functioning correctly. We recommend considering a more practical SLA framework or explicitly excluding non-controllable scenarios to ensure fair and feasible compliance.	Additionally, considering the open-road MLFF environment, we suggest clearly defining acceptable exclusions (e.g., occlusions, adverse weather, dual-lane overlap) to avoid penalizing conditions beyond system control.	As per RFP.
137	123	f.	The Bank will be provided with space in the Toll Plaza building for setting up of MLFF Control Centre.	Without affecting the existing toll plaza operations, is there available space within the current toll plaza premises that can be provided?  Will IHMCL construct a new Control Centre or utilize space within an existing building? Please refer to Attachment 1 showing the current toll plaza control room. Could you confirm whether this control room will be provided?  What is the planned handover date for the Control Centre?  Can IHMCL provide the proposed layout of the Control Centre? The space should be sufficient to accommodate a power room, generator set, server rooms, and the O&M team, including areas for monitoring and validation.  Are all bidders required to install new UPS and generator sets?		Bidders shall use the existing and proposed future facilities available at the toll plaza.  Bidders can setup the control centre at remote location for support services like audit, validation etc. subject to approval of IHMCL.
138	112	SCHEDULE-B 3.c.5.	The Acquirer bank shall be responsible for conducting thorough due diligence to evaluate the project's potential and sustainability. This process includes, but is not limited to, carrying out detailed traffic surveys, site visits etc. to assess the estimated volume of traffic and estimate the potential revenue.	The limited time available for the tender strongly hinders the possibility of conducting a thorough traffic survey and study, which is essential for the project.  Please extend the deadline for the tender to 10/07/2025		Refer Corrigendum-3



Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
139	Page 22	3.1.1. Eligible Original Equipment Manufacturere (OEM) Criteria, Point €	OEM for each product or technology quoted should be in the business of that product or solution or technology for at least 3 years as on the date of release of the RFP.	We kindly request that the clause be relaxed to encourage greater participation from startups, thereby fostering innovation and broader competition in the tender process.	As a DPIIT-recognized startup OEM, the OEM should be exempted from the requirements related to prior experience and minimum turnover, in accordance with the provisions outlined in the Government of India's Public Procurement Policy for Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) and Startup India initiative. This exemption encourages innovation and supports emerging businesses by enabling fair participation in public procurement processes, without compromising on technical competence or product quality. Startup exemption for OEMs should be considered, as the government is also actively promoting startups.	As per RFP.
140	Page 86	1.2.16.3. Parameters to be checked during Site Acceptance Testing (SAT)	ANPR Camera Accuracy- The ANPR camera system should read all types of vehicle registration number (VRN) plates with minimum accuracy of 99% under both day and night conditions, without any manual validation/audit.	We request that the accuracy requirement be relaxed from 99% to 95% to allow for practical implementation under real-world conditions.	Achieving 99% accuracy in real-time scenarios can be challenging due to various external factors, including environmental conditions. Therefore, it is advisable to consider a more practical accuracy benchmark of 95% to account for these real-world variables and ensure system reliability.	As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
141	Page 138	1.3 Audit Surveillance Camera	Speed Limit- 150 km/hr	Since vehicle speed is captured using radar and ANPR cameras, it is not necessary to detect speed through the overview camera. Overview cameras with very wide-angle lenses are primarily for general monitoring and not suitable for accurate speed estimation. Speed detection should rely on specialized sensors designed for high-speed capture. OEMs should focus overview cameras on situational awareness rather than speed analytics	Detection of vehicle speed up to 150 km/hr is not feasible using very wide-angle cameras due to distortion and limited pixel coverage over distance. Accurate speed estimation requires narrower field-of-view lenses that can track vehicle movement clearly across frames. Wide-angle lenses are more suited for general surveillance, not high-speed analytics. OEMs should consider appropriate lens specifications for high-speed detection scenarios.	As per RFP.
142	Page 162	System Parameter, Point 14 Mounting Structure, Point no (b)	The ANPR camera shall be placed in such a way that it should be able to view the edge shoulders as well as the service lanes to capture the vehicle license plates and process the same for deduction of toll.	ANPR cameras should be configured with a narrow field of view, ideally covering a single lane for maximum accuracy. To ensure no vehicle is missed, it is recommended to deploy an additional camera dedicated to monitoring the road shoulder. This ensures detection of vehicles using non-designated paths or attempting to bypass lanes. Proper lane-wise and shoulder coverage enhances overall system reliability and enforcement.	ANPR cameras are designed with a very narrow angle of view and are best suited for monitoring a single lane to ensure high accuracy. Using them for multiple lanes may reduce performance due to limited pixel density per vehicle. For optimal results, each lane should be covered by a dedicated ANPR camera. This setup ensures reliable license plate recognition even at high speeds.	As per RFP.
143	113	3. Toll Collection from the MLFF system  c. Rate of User Fee:	3. The bidder/bank shall not be allowed to make its own interpretation about a particular type of vehicle attracting a particular rate to charge a higher rate from a particular type of vehicles. The decision of the Authority on such matter shall be final and binding.	In an MLFF system, however, vehicle classification is automated using sensors like Radar, which may sometimes misclassify non-standard or borderline vehicles. Since the bidder cannot modify classifications or rates. In such instances, there is potential for revenue disputes or challenges from users if the toll charged differs from their expectation. Please guide us How this problem will be managed ?		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
144	130	10. Service Level Agreement  Control Centre Equipment and Software	<p>Availability of all MLFF Equipment and Software in Control Center-</p> <p>The uptime availability of all equipment of MLFF system shall be 99.9% per month The downtime shall be calculated at a cumulative level when any of the equipment is non-operational.</p> <p>Maximum permissible downtime for all Equipment shall be 44 minutes per month, subject to availability of MLFF system through redundant System (Gantry/Lanes).</p>	<p>Please clarify the below points,</p> <p>1. We request the Authority to reconsider this threshold and confirm whether a more practical downtime allowance?</p> <p>2. We request understanding on whether downtime will be assessed individually per equipment or holistically at the system level only when toll transaction processing is impacted?</p>	<p>Justification : The stipulated SLA of 99.9% uptime per month, allowing for a maximum cumulative downtime of just 44 minutes across all MLFF equipment, is extremely stringent. In practical field scenarios, even a minor fault in a critical component—such as a gantry-mounted camera, or network switch—often requires safety-compliant manual intervention, equipment access (especially at height), and testing post-replacement. These activities typically exceed 44 minutes, even with standby personnel and spares.</p>	As per RFP.
145	131	10. Service Level Agreement  Accuracy - Vehicle Count and classification	<p>For any missing Classification of any vehicle in the accuracy, a penalty of Rs 100000 shall be applicable per day.</p>	<p>Please clarify below points,</p> <p>1. We request the Authority to clarify whether the penalty is applicable only when classification accuracy drops below 99%, or whether each misclassification, regardless of aggregate accuracy, attracts the penalty.</p> <p>2. Additionally, we would like to highlight that this SLA is exceptionally stringent in the context of real-world MLFF environments. Automated vehicle classification relies on sensor data (LiDAR, RADAR), which may be impacted by factors such as:</p> <p>1) Overloaded or modified vehicles, 2) Vehicles with indistinct physical characteristics (e.g., border-case LCV vs HCV).</p> <p>We recommend allowing a reasonable buffer for uncontrollable anomalies and clearly defining exempted scenarios (e.g., temporary occlusion, non-standard axle configurations) to ensure fair and implementable SLA compliance.</p>	<p>Even with high-end sensors and AI/ML correction, achieving 99%+ classification accuracy consistently in dynamic highway environments is technically challenging.</p>	As per RFP.
146	-	General	General	<p>What is the maximum vehicle throughput capacity required for the MLFF system, particularly during peak hours? Are there performance benchmarks to meet under high traffic volumes to avoid congestion?</p>		As per RFP.

Sr. No	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
147	15	Part-I, Section 1.1 (b)	The Project shall include implementation of a comprehensive MLFF based tolling system and its Operation and Maintenance at Nemili fee plaza of National Highway 44.	Can IHMCL provide details regarding the number of lanes and the expected traffic volume (daily/weekly/monthly) at the Nemili Fee Plaza to assist in designing the MLFF system? Additionally, is there a provision for future scalability in case of lane expansion?		The bidders are strongly advised to carryout their own traffic studies for assessment of traffic volume. The MLFF system design should be modular and scalable to accommodate future lane expansion, as required.
148	110	Schedule B, Section - 1, C	c) The Bidder shall develop: MLFF based tolling facility by installing new Gantries on main carriageway of the road (minimum 02 (01 Main & 01 redundant)) for each direction (LHS & RHS) for MLFF based tolling within approx. 200m of existing fee plaza.	Can we utilize existing infrastructure/10 lanes of Nemili Toll Plaza, as redundant or main gantry		Yes, Bidder can utilize existing infrastructure at the fee plaza in addition to the minimum requirement (gantry etc.) as mentioned in RFP.
149	1	Clause V	Gujarat , NH-8	In actual its "Tamil Nadu, NH-48". Please confirm		Refer Corrigendum-3