

RFP for Selection of Acquirer Bank for FASTag-ANPR based Multi Lane Free Flow (MLFF) User Fee Collection at Trans- Haryana Expressway (Bundle-DL 02) on Fixed Transaction Fee Model  
E-tender Id: 2026\_NHAI\_272710\_1  
RFP Reference No.:IHMCL/MLFF-Delhi-02/2026 published on dated 23.03.2026  
Response to Prebid Queries published on dated 20.05.2026

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
1	Pg 21 of 188	Eligibility of Sub-Contractor (SI)	The bidder shall get the MLFF system work done through a reputed Sub-Contractor (hereinafter also referred to as System Integrator, or SI)	Kindly specify how the experience for MLFF to be submitted for Tender, as there is no form for it attached.		As per RFP.
2	Pg 21 of 188	Eligibility of Sub-Contractor (SI)	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 nonresponsive.	Request to amend the clause that the subcontractor can participate in the tender with different bidders as well.		As per RFP.
3	Pg 33 of 188	PERFORMANCE SECURITY	a)The Successful Bidder shall furnish a Performance Security cumulative total of Rs. 11,02,00,000/- (Rupees Eleven Crore Two Lakh only) for all tendered fee plazas for a period of 6 years from the Date of LOA within 15 (fifteen) days of issuance of LOA in the following instruments: (i) a crossed account payee demand draft/pay order amounting to Rs. 5,51,00,000/- (Rupees Five Crore Fifty One Lakh Only) (an amount equal to 50% of the total PBG value); and (ii) a bank guarantee amounting to Rs. 5,51,00,000/- (Rupees Five Crore Fifty One 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.	Kindly clarify the time schedule for submission of Performance Bank Guarantee.		Refer Corrigendum-4
4	Pg 88 of 188	Time Schedule	Submission of Project Implementation plan with detailed resource based work break down schedule for monitoring by IHMCL.	Kindly provide at least 30 days for submission of project implementation plan		As per RFP
5	Pg 150 of 188	SR.No.(2)2 Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) Camera	SR.No. (a)Sensor Type-Progressive scan (CMOS) Day / Night Camera, Global shutter	Request you to consider Sensor type - <b>Progressive Scan CMOS ,Day night or better</b> . This change will fulfill the functional and technical requirements of the projects.		Refer Corrigendum-4
6	Pg 150 of 188	SR.No.(2)2 Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) Camera	SR.No.(b)Resolution-3 Megapixels or better	Request you to consider to amend this clause " <b>Resolution -8 Megapixels of better</b> . The BMP Camera will be better in such highway application where we required high-detail footage and better performance in various lighting conditions, Also informing that due to STQC camera trading is not ban till 200 days from date of notification of STQC. How this project is going to implement . In First phase normal cameras are going to be approved , global shutter or rolling shutter will take approx. 1 year of time for trading in asked brands.		Refer Corrigendum-4
7	33	6.5	a)The Successful Bidder shall furnish a Performance Security cumulative total of Rs. 11,02,00,000/- (Rupees Eleven Crore Two Lakh only) for all tendered fee plazas for a period of 6 years from the Date of LOA within 15 (fifteen) days of issuance of LOA in the following instruments: (i) a crossed account payee demand draft/pay order amounting to Rs. 5,51,00,000/- (Rupees Five Crore Fifty One Lakh Only) (an amount equal to 50% of the total PBG value); and (ii) a bank guarantee amounting to Rs. 5,51,00,000/- (Rupees Five Crore Fifty One 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.	We proposed submission of Surety Bond/ Insurance Bond as BG.		As per RFP. Refer Corrigendum-4.
8	179	Schedule - B, 1.C.i	At Existing Fee Plaza Infrastructure:	Total Number of Lanes to be Provisioned for MLFF Tolling at the Existing Fee Plaza (Including Two (2) Standby Lanes). S. I. be allowed to propose as per system design & traffic flow.		As per RFP.
9	116	Schedule - B, 1.a.iii	Development of the MLFF based tolling facility.	System Integrator allowed to deploy multilane Cameras.		The specifications provided in the RFP are minimum requirements. Bidders may propose better specifications as part of their proposed solution design.
10	116	Schedule - B, 1.a.iii	Development of the MLFF based tolling facility.	System Integrator allowed to deploy multilane Lidars.		Refer Corrigendum-4
11	116	Schedule - B, 1.a.iii	Development of the MLFF based tolling facility.	User be allowed to provide speed output through ANPR.		The specifications provided in the RFP are minimum requirements. Bidders may propose better specifications as part of their proposed solution design.

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
12	91	1.2.16.3.4 Parameters - 2	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. 6. 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 these requirements, which is as below: Type of vehicle Car, Jeep, Van or Light Motor Vehicle Light Commercial Vehicle, Light Goods Vehicle or Mini Bus Bus or Truck (Two Axles) Three-axle commercial vehicles Heavy Construction Machinery (HCM) or Earth Moving Equipment (EME) or Multi Axle vehicle (MAV) (four to six axles) 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 MLFF system can classify vehicles based on dimensions and axle configuration as per NH Fee Rules, 2008. However, it does not measure vehicle weight and therefore cannot determine overloading. In this context, kindly clarify: 1. How will overloading be identified in the absence of weighment systems? 2. Should overloading charges be applied, and if so, based on what mechanism? 3. Is integration with external weighment/enforcement systems envisaged? Your guidance is requested to ensure proper compliance.		Overload detection shall be carried out through the Weigh-in-Motion (WIM) system, and the relevant data and interface details shall be shared with the MLFF system for integration and operational purposes
13	84-85	1.2.6.7	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.	With reference to the RFP provisions, we understand that the raw power supply for the MALFF Gantry and Plaza is to be Supplied by NHAI. In this context - Kindly Clarify whether recurring monthly cost of raw power during the project tenure will be in the scope of the NHAI or Bidder		As per RFP.
14	118	Schedule - B 1.ii.a1	a. The Bidder/Bank shall also design, supply, install, test, and commission MLFF based tolling infrastructure by providing one (1) gantry on the main carriageway, including paved shoulders, in each direction (LHS and RHS) after crossing the toll plaza. The gantry for each direction shall be installed at a location within approximately 350 meters downstream of the respective Fee Plaza, in the direction of traffic movement.	With reference to the relevant clause, we understand that only one (1) gantry on the main carriageway in each direction is to be installed, and no separate MLFF gantry is envisaged at the 14 Interchange/Ramp Fee Plaza locations. Further, we understand that MLFF processing at the Interchange/Ramp Fee Plaza locations shall be carried out through the MLFF sensors/cameras installed within the lanes. We kindly request you to confirm whether our above understanding is correct.		MLFF system is required to be installed on Gantries and at Existing Fee Plaza Infrastructure including both Main Fee Plaza and Interchange/Ramp Fee Plaza as per lane details provided in Schedule B.
15	140	SLA Table-System Accuracy - Instance Wise: point no.10	Incorrect Manual: In case of any incorrect VRN based manual transaction done as per NHAI Manual Transaction Policy	With reference to the relevant clause, we understand that the penalty is applicable only in cases of incorrect manual VRN entry, specifically for those instances where vehicles are not identified by the MLFF cameras/sensors. Further, as per our understanding, such cases pertain to situations where toll is deducted for vehicles for which Bidder is unable to provide the valid evidence/ proof should only be defined as incorrect transaction. We kindly request you to confirm whether our above understanding is correct and elaborate the definition of Incorrectness for the levy of Penalty.		As per RFP
16	143	Schedule - B 13. Minimum Operation & Maintenance (O&M) Manpower	Operation & Maintenance (O&M) Manpower: Project Manager (Dedicated On-site) - (1 Nos.) Auditor/Transaction Validator ( 4 in each shift + 2 reliever)	With reference to the RFP, the requirement for the Project Manager is indicated as one (1) number and Auditor/Transaction Validator ( 4 in each shift + 2 reliever) In this regard, we kindly request you to clarify whether the Project Manager and auditor/ Transaction Validator is to be deployed on per plaza basis or for all plazas at Tender level covered under the scope of this tender.		Refer Corrigendum-4
17	NA	NA	Request for the extension of bid due date.	As per the RFP requirements, the bidder is required to establish tie-ups with banks for participation in the bidding process. Additionally, detailed evaluation of site conditions for the MLFF gantry setup is also necessary. Considering the time required to complete these essential activities, we kindly request the Authority to grant an extension of one (1) month in the bid submission due date.		Refer Corrigendum-4
18	104	1.2.30.3 Consequences of Force Majeure	iv. The Affected Party may claim an extension of the Contract Period as per Clause 1.2.30.4, subject to the following conditions: a. If the Force Majeure period occurs within 365 days (1 year) of Go-Live, there shall be no extension of the Contract Period.	As per our understanding Force majeure is beyond the control of Bidder which can occur anytime after the go live. So requesting to concerned authority to consider Force majeure period from Go live date.		As per RFP.
19	138	10. Service Level Agreement (5)- 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. Below 98% accuracy, shall be considered as breach.	Requesting authority to kindly change the Penalty threshold from 99% to 98% .Also requesting to lower the breach % from 98% to 97%		As per RFP.

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
20	23,70	3.1.1. ELIGIBLE ORIGINAL EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURER (OEM) CRITERIA Form-T:13 - Manufacturer's Authorization Form (MAF)	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. iv. We confirm that we have been in the business of the said product or solution or technology for at least three (3) years as on the date of issue of the RFP.	We request the Authority to kindly amend the OEM experience requirement from 3 years to 1 year for the quoted product/technology. Justification: 1. The MLFF ecosystem is rapidly evolving with continuous innovation in ANPR, AI-based analytics, and edge computing. 2. Several new-age OEMs with advanced, compliant, and globally deployed technologies may not meet the 3-year criterion despite having proven capabilities. 3. Relaxation will encourage wider participation, foster innovation, and enhance competition, ultimately benefiting the Authority with better technological options and cost efficiency. Please amend it as, "OEM for each product or technology quoted should be in the business of that product or solution or technology for at least 3 years 1 year as on the date of release of the RFP."		As per RFP
21	88	2. Phased SAT and Go-Live for Bundle of Fee Plazas as per Schedule A	The Central/Local Control Room and all associated backend infrastructure are fully completed, tested, and operational prior to declaration of Go-Live of any individual Fee Plaza; and	Please share the location address where the on-premises server and video wall are to be installed. We understand that the recurring power charges at the CCC will be borne by IHMCL. Kindly confirm.		As per RFP.
22	-	-	General - Vehicle Count History Data	Kindly provide the month-wise total count of vehicle passes across the specified toll plazas for the past 12 months. This information is required for accurate financial modelling and estimation of transaction volumes.		The bank shall carryout their own due diligence. Month-wise ETC transaction reports may be accessed through IHMCL website: <a href="https://ihmcl.co.in/etc-transaction-reports/">https://ihmcl.co.in/etc-transaction-reports/</a>
23	168	2.3 ANPR and Application	ANPR system automatically captures the license plates of any vehicle(s) in the field of view (FOV) of a camera and stores them in database, so that details of the vehicles are available at any later point in time along with related video footage. It's OCR engine then converts captured license plate number into editable text, for ease of validation of vehicle details. OCR engines need to be designed and customized as per the multiple number plate and various Indian scripts apart from standard HSRP number plates	We understand that ANPR functionality in MLFF systems is typically achieved through a combination of imaging hardware (camera) and backend video analytics / OCR software. In this context, we request clarification on the following: 1. Architecture Flexibility: Whether the Authority intends ANPR to be implemented as: A dedicated standalone ANPR camera (with inbuilt OCR), OR A combination of standard surveillance/IP camera integrated with centralized video analytics and OCR engine. Please confirm. 2. Technology Approach: It is noted that fully integrated ANPR cameras with inbuilt OCR supporting diverse Indian scripts and formats are available only with limited OEMs, which may restrict competition. We request the Authority to leave this to the bidder to propose the solution based on either architecture.		As per RFP
24	-	-	General - Minimum Guarantee / Revenue Assurance	We understand that tolling and user fee collection under MLFF systems are variable and dynamic in nature, influenced by multiple external factors beyond the control of the bidder, including but not limited to: - Administrative policies and enforcement mechanisms - User / citizen adoption of FASTag and MLFF ecosystem - Traffic patterns and diversion trends - Regional preferences and behavioural shifts in road usage - Competing routes and infrastructure developments Given the above, toll revenue and transaction volumes are not entirely predictable or controllable by the bidder. In view of the inherent variability and dependency on external factors, we request the Authority to provide "Minimum Guarantee / Revenue Assurance" for the bidder.		As per RFP
25	-	-	General - Data Retention	What will be the data retention timeframe for the MLFF transaction data in live and archival mode?		As per RFP.
26	-	-	General - Storage	What is mandatory retention period in live and archival mode for images captured by Cameras? What is mandatory retention period in live and archival mode for video feed captured by evidence camera?		As per RFP.
27	84	1.2.6. Scope of Work	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 NHA. c) Electricity Charges: The bidder will bear all recurring electricity charges, including those for illumination in plaza area, power backup etc.	1. It is mentioned that raw power will be supplied by NHA. We understand that the electricity consumption and recurring charges for field-level MLFF components, including equipment installed at gantries and toll plazas (limited to MLFF solution and associated illumination), shall be borne by the bidder. Kindly confirm. 2. We further understand that the electricity consumption and associated recurring charges for fixed infrastructure at toll plazas, such as video walls, servers, storage systems, and air conditioning (required for maintaining environmental conditions), shall be borne by NHA. Kindly confirm.		As per RFP.

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
28	134	8. MLFF Project	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	We understand that the bidder is required to provision open and standard APIs to enable integration with future tolling technologies such as GNSS, NHAI applications (e.g., Rajmarg Yatra), ATMS, or other similar systems. In this regard, we request clarification that: "The bidder's scope is limited to providing API readiness and necessary interface support, and Any future integrations, custom developments, or associated costs for integrating with such external systems shall not be in the bidder's scope and will be handled separately." Kindly confirm.		As per RFP.
29	-	-	General - Overall Penalty Capping	We understand that multiple SLA parameters define penalties for non-compliance; however, there is no explicit cap on the total cumulative penalties applicable on the bidder. In this regard, we request the Authority to kindly clarify and consider that: "The total cumulative penalty in any given month shall be capped at 10% of the monthly payable mount/invoice value to the bidder, across all SLA parameters and locations."		As per RFP
30	-	-	General - Early Termination & Capex Protection	We understand that significant upfront capital investment is required for deployment of MLFF infrastructure. However, there is no explicit provision safeguarding recovery of such investments in case of early termination. Request: Kindly clarify whether any mechanism will be provided to ensure recovery of unamortized CAPEX in the event of early termination not attributable to bidder default.		As per RFP
31	7	Schedule C - Functional Requirements	MLFF system shall use RFID, ANPR, LiDAR/Radar for transaction processing	We understand that the MLFF system utilizes multiple technologies such as RFID, ANPR, and LiDAR/Radar for vehicle detection and transaction processing. In this regard, we request clarification on the decision hierarchy and conflict resolution logic in scenarios where there is a mismatch between data captured from different sources. For instance: In cases where RFID tag data and ANPR-read vehicle number do not match (e.g., due to incorrect tag usage, tag swapping, or misuse by vehicle owners), What shall be the priority mechanism for transaction validation and toll charging?		In mismatch scenarios between RFID (FASTag) and ANPR, the ANPR-read vehicle number is given priority. If the RFID tag data does not match the ANPR result, the transaction and any enforcement action (including e-notice generation) shall be based on the ANPR-captured number plate.
32	8	2.3 ANPR & Application	System decides based on ANPR confidence	What is minimum acceptable ANPR confidence threshold? Is it configurable?		As per RFP.
33	7	Schedule B - E-Notice Module	Bank responsible for e-notice generation	Please define exact responsibility split between Bank, IHMCL, NIC, NPCI for notice generation & recovery		As per RFP.
34	7	Schedule B - E-Notice Module	Manual validation required	What is expected TAT for manual validation of low-confidence transactions?		As per RFP and NETC PG guidelines
35	8	Schedule B - Transaction Processing	Toll collection through MLFF system	What is the final system of record for transaction acceptance (RFID vs ANPR vs manual override)?		As per RFP.
36	109	1.2.35. Consequence of Termination	i. During ( 06 Months Implementation period) + O&M Period (60 months) :	Is phased rollout (plaza-wise Go-Live) allowed or only full bundle Go-Live? We request authority to allow phase wise rollout?		Refer Corrigendum-4
37	149	ANPR System & Functional Requirements	ANPR system defined as part of MLFF with accuracy requirements	Whether ANPR cameras are required to have in-built ANPR processing (edge-based) or is centralized/server-based ANPR processing acceptable? Please confirm acceptable architecture and any minimum processing latency requirements.		As per RFP.
38	-	Financial Bid / Pricing	Fixed Per Transaction Fee shall be inclusive of PMF and all Taxes/GST	Please clarify whether the PMF (Program Management Fee) is fixed throughout the contract period or subject to change by NPCI. In case of revision in PMF or applicable GST rates during the contract period, will the same be reimbursed/adjusted separately, or is the bidder required to absorb such changes within the quoted transaction fee?		Refer Corrigendum-4
39	7	POS Setup	POS setup for FASTag sale	What are detailed POS functional requirements (payments, reconciliation, stock mgmt)?		As per RFP.
40	7	Control Centre	Central monitoring required	Is single centralized control centre sufficient for all plazas? Does bidder has to provide video wall and server at each toll plazas?		Refer Corrigendum-4
41	-	Application Software	Offline capability implied	What is max offline buffering time and sync mechanism?		As per RFP.
42	120	Schedule - B	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.	We request the Authority to kindly clarify and consider allowing either STQC or CERT-In certification (any one) to be complied with, instead of mandating both, to avoid duplication of effort, cost, and timelines.		As per RFP.

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
43	76	Financial Bid Note 1	Any variation in quantities or omitted items will not result in additional payments	Please clarify whether any change in scope, design, site conditions, or additional requirements during implementation will be treated as change request or must be absorbed by bidder		As per RFP.
44	76	Financial Bid Note 1	Bidder to fill quantities to meet Schedule B & C	Whether IHMCL will validate/approve the bidder's proposed BoQ/design before execution, and whether such approved BoQ will be considered final for scope		As per RFP.
45	76	Financial Bid Note 1	No additional payment for omitted items	In case of missing/ambiguous requirements in RFP or integration changes (NPCI/NIC), will bidder still be required to absorb cost?		As per RFP.
46	76	Financial Bid Note 2	₹5 Cr cap for depreciated cost per plaza	Please clarify the purpose of depreciated cost calculation and scenarios where it will be applied (termination, asset takeover, etc.)		As per RFP.
47	76	Financial Bid Note 2	Depreciated cost capped at ₹5 Cr	In case actual capex exceeds ₹5 Cr per plaza, will the excess investment be fully at bidder's risk without recovery?		As per RFP.
48	76	Financial Bid Note 2	Depreciated cost mechanism	Please clarify depreciation method (SLM/WDV), rate, and tenure considered for calculation		As per RFP.
49	76	Financial Bid Note 2	Form F-2 not used for L1	If Form F-2 is not part of evaluation, will unrealistic under-quoting of BoQ have any technical/financial implications?		As per RFP.
50	76	Financial Bid Note 3	GST excluded in rates	There is a contradiction as earlier clause states transaction fee inclusive of GST, while here it states rates excluding GST. Please clarify correct treatment for GST		As per RFP.
51	76	Financial Bid	Equipment/services/software rates	Whether bidder is allowed to optimize design (reduce equipment quantity) while still meeting SLA, or minimum BoQ is mandatory		As per the RFP, the BOQ provided is the minimum requirement. Bidders may propose additional quantities or line items as per of their proposed solution, for enhanced system performance and SLA parameters adherence.
52	76	Financial Bid	Full responsibility on bidder	In case of technology upgrades mandated by Authority during contract period, will cost be reimbursed or absorbed by bidder?		As per RFP
53	76	Financial Bid	BoQ-based costing	Please confirm whether spares, replacements, consumables, and lifecycle upgrades are to be included in BoQ pricing		As per RFP
54	76	Financial Bid	Depreciated cost concept	Please confirm whether asset ownership transfers to Authority at end of contract or only upon termination		As per RFP
55	180	3. Plaza Level Equipment	MLFF Local Server (HA mode)   Nos   Qty.: 2	The clause specifies "MLFF Local Server (HA Mode) - Qty: 2." In this regard, we request clarification on the intended configuration: Whether the requirement is for 2 servers in total configured in High Availability (HA) mode, OR 2 sets of HA configuration (i.e., total 4 servers)		As per RFP. Total configuration in HA Mode
56	180	3. Plaza Level Equipment	Redundant Internet Connectivity (1 Gbps)   Nos   Qty.:2	The clause specifies requirement of 2 numbers of redundant internet connectivity links (1 Gbps each). In this regard, we request clarification whether these links are required to be sourced from two different Internet Service Providers (ISPs/telecom operators) to ensure true redundancy.		Yes, understanding is correct.
57	-	-	General - White IR	We request clarification regarding the acceptability of using white IR in pulse mode for illumination in the proposed solution.		As per RFP.
58	180	2.11 Indicative Minimum Bill of Quantity (BOQ):	1. Equipment's at Gantry for each fee plaza: 2. Equipment at Fee Plaza Existing Lanes	We understand that MLFF-based tolling is primarily enabled through gantry-level infrastructure for vehicle detection and transaction processing. In this regard, we request clarification on whether deployment of hardware at each existing toll lane is mandatory, as this may lead to duplication of functionality already being handled at gantry level.		As per RFP
59	88/187	1.2.16.5	"Go-Live" of MLFF system, subject to successful completion of SAT for each fee plaza	We request inclusion of a provision for "Provisional Go-Live", allowing partial commissioning of the MLFF system prior to final Go-Live. This will enable phased validation of subsystems, early issue identification, and smoother transition to full-scale operations.	Considering the complexity of MLFF systems involving multiple technologies (ANPR, RFID, backend integration), a provisional stage is critical to mitigate risks and ensure stable final Go-Live.	As per RFP.
60	88/187	1.2.16.3	Design, Development & Implementation of FASTag-ANPR based MLFF User Fee Collection System and Offer for Site Acceptance Testing (SAT) with an intimation for "Go-Live" readiness.- 5 months	We request extension of the implementation timeline from 5 months to 8 months.	The MLFF system is a large-scale, multi-location turnkey project involving design finalization, procurement, civil works, integration, testing, and STQC compliance. Additionally, dependencies on approvals, site readiness, and integration with external stakeholders necessitate a realistic timeline to ensure quality and compliance. Extending to 8 months will reduce implementation risks and improve system reliability.	Refer Corrigendum-4

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
61	90/187	1.2.16.2 (i)	De-scoping of Fee Plaza without any financial liability to IHMCL	We request clarification whether partial de-scoping (plaza-wise) will apply only to failed plazas or can it extend to entire bundle. Additionally, request confirmation that payments for successfully completed plazas will not be impacted.	To ensure bidder risk is limited only to failed locations and not the entire project.	As per RFP.
62	90/187	1.2.16.2 (ii)	Forfeiture of cash component of Performance Security	We request that forfeiture be limited proportionately to the specific failed Fee Plaza(s) instead of entire Performance Security.	Current clause imposes disproportionate financial risk compared to scope (plaza-wise execution).	As per RFP.
63	90/187	1.2.16.2 (ii & iii)	Forfeiture not considered as penalty	We request reconsideration of this clause to allow reasonable cure/rectification attempts beyond one cycle or provision for partial recovery instead of full forfeiture, especially for performance issues that are correctable.	MLFF systems involve real-world variability (traffic, environment); strict forfeiture may be too harsh.	As per RFP.
64	90/187	1.2.16.2 (iv)	The Acquirer Bank shall be responsible for dismantling and removing all equipment, hardware, and associated infrastructure installed at the site, at its own cost and within the timeline specified by IHMCL.	We understand, this dismantling and removal is related to the Equipment installed by the Bidder only. Please clarify.		As per RFP.
65	90/187	1.2.16.2 (v)	Restoration to original condition	We understand: 1. This restoration works are related to site changes which bidder has done during the course of project and same will be applicable only in case of unsuccessful SAT 2. We request clarification on definition of "original condition" and scope of restoration, including civil works, cabling, and third-party infrastructure.	Avoids ambiguity and future disputes during closure.	As per RFP.
66	90/187	1.2.16.2 (overall)	No provision for external dependencies	We request inclusion of a clause stating that failure of SAT due to factors beyond bidder control (e.g., site readiness, stakeholders & regulatory approvals) shall not be treated as unsuccessful SAT.	SAT success depends on multiple external dependencies not fully controlled by bidder.	As per RFP.
67	90/187	1.2.16.2 (overall)	Strict consequence after second failure	We request provision for joint review mechanism between IHMCL and bidder before declaring SAT unsuccessful.	Ensures transparency and avoids unilateral decision impacting project viability.	As per RFP.
68	90/187	1.2.16.3	The following high-level parameters shall be evaluated during the Site Acceptance Test (SAT). IHMCL reserves the right to provide further specifications or details regarding any of the requirements outlined in this RFP, as deemed necessary.	We understand that IHMCL may issue additional specifications or clarifications regarding SAT parameters. However, we request that all <b>detailed evaluation criteria, thresholds, methodologies, and acceptance conditions for SAT be defined and frozen at the bidding stage itself</b> , and no new parameters or changes impacting compliance be introduced during execution/SAT.	SAT success is directly linked to project acceptance, financial implications, and potential penalties (including de-scoping and performance security forfeiture). Any post-bid introduction or modification of requirements may lead to uncertainty, redesign, cost escalation, and unfair risk exposure to bidders. Hence, all requirements should be clearly defined upfront to ensure transparent and fair bidding.	As per RFP.
69	90/187	1.2.16.3	Performance under various environmental conditions (fog, rain, glare, etc.)	We request clarification on whether all environmental scenarios must be demonstrated during SAT, or will these be considered based on OEM certifications / historical performance reports.	Practical limitation: all conditions may not be available during SAT window.	As per RFP.
70	90/187	1.2.16.3	Vehicle classification accuracy as per NH Fee Rules	Request clarification on treatment of ambiguous/mixed vehicle cases (e.g., overloaded vehicles, modified vehicles, temporary plates).	Real-world classification ambiguity may impact accuracy metrics.	As per RFP.
71	91/187	1.2.16.3- Point 1 of the table	Vehicle count accuracy	1. Kindly clarify the methodology, tools, and acceptance criteria for validation through the independent system, and whether results from bidder systems and independent systems will be jointly reconciled. 2. Also, clarify the scope of "independent system's validation"	Avoids ambiguity and mismatch in measurement methods leading to SAT failure and also the project's scope.	As per RFP.
72	91/187	1.2.16.3- Point 2 of the table	The vehicle classification accuracy shall be validated through the TMS report of the plaza. IHMCL may also validate the same with an independent system.	1. Kindly clarify the methodology, tools, and acceptance criteria for validation through the independent system, and whether results from bidder systems and independent systems will be jointly reconciled. 2. Also, clarify the scope of "independent system's validation"	Avoids ambiguity and mismatch in measurement methods leading to SAT failure and also the project's scope.	As per RFP.
73	91/187	1.2.16.3- Point 2 of the table	Vehicle count accuracy validation through TMS report	Kindly confirm the baseline/reference system for vehicle count (ground truth) and reconciliation mechanism in case of deviation between TMS and MLFF system.	Ensures clarity on how accuracy % is computed.	As per RFP.
74	91/187	1.2.16.3- Point 3 of the table	The bidder shall be solely responsible of deployment of any additional arrangement e.g. lighting etc. to achieve the desired accuracy.	We request Competent Authority to clarify if bidder can deploy the white light IR for the ANPR cameras- in pulse mode or continuous mode.	These provisions may give benefit to the project in achieving the strategic and operational outcomes.	As per RFP. Refer Schedule C, Clause 1.5, IR Illuminator
75	91/187	1.2.16.3- Point 3 of the table	ANPR accuracy minimum 99% without manual validation	We request clarification whether non-readable / damaged / non-standard number plates (beyond "humanly unreadable" definition) will be excluded from accuracy calculation.	Critical to avoid penalization for non-compliant plates.	As per RFP.
76	90/187	1.2.16.3	Live traffic validation during SAT	Request clarification on minimum traffic volume / duration required for SAT validation under live conditions.	Ensures fair and statistically valid testing.	The methodology and duration for SAT shall be finalized on a plaza-specific basis in consultation with IHMCL and the PIU during the implementation phase by the Bank.

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
77	95/187	1.2.17.3	Damages for Non-Compliance to Safety Standards at site	It is observed that while damages/penalties are defined for non-compliance to safety standards, there are no explicit BOQ line items or cost provisions defined for safety-related infrastructure, manpower, and compliance measures. We request the Authority to clearly define and quantify the scope and corresponding BOQ provisions for safety requirements, or confirm that such costs are deemed included with clear guidelines.	Safety compliance involves significant costs including PPE, safety personnel, training, barricading, signage, traffic management, and statutory compliance. Absence of defined scope/BOQ may lead to varied assumptions by bidders, resulting in non-uniform and non-comparable bids. Clear definition will ensure fair and transparent bidding.	As per RFP.
78	96/187	1.2.19.	Payment post successful transactions	Kindly confirm the payment cycle (e.g., weekly/fortnightly/monthly) and maximum timeline for payment release from invoice submission.	Shorter payment cycles are critical to sustain O&M and operational expenses.	As per RFP.
79	96/187	1.2.19.	Dependency on transaction realization	We request clarification on minimum assured payment / revenue protection mechanism, especially during initial stabilization phase post Go-Live.	Initial traffic ramp-up and system stabilization may impact transaction volumes beyond bidder control.	As per RFP.
80	96/187	1.2.19.	Deductions / penalties adjustment	Kindly confirm whether SLA penalties, damages, or other deductions will be capped per billing cycle, and not exceed invoice value.	Ensures predictable cash flow and prevents negative payouts.	As per RFP.
81	96/187	1.2.19.	Invoice approval dependency	Request clarification on approval timelines for invoices and deemed approval mechanism if no response is received within defined period.	Avoids delays due to administrative bottlenecks.	As per RFP.
82	96/187	1.2.19.	GST and statutory payments	Please confirm that GST and other statutory taxes will be paid along with invoices without delay, irrespective of internal approval timelines.	Important for statutory compliance and avoiding financial burden on bidder.	As per RFP.
83	100/187	1.2.21 (General)	Authority may request change in scope	We request clarification that any change in scope shall be mutually agreed between both parties, including technical, commercial, and timeline impact, prior to implementation.	Prevents unilateral imposition of scope changes.	As per RFP.
84	101/187	1.2.23	NHAI/IHMCL reserves the right to install or appoint any third party to install additional infrastructure, such as a separate gantry, cameras, or any other equipment, to facilitate third-party audits. This infrastructure may be deployed to independently verify data, monitor operations, or ensure compliance with service level agreements (SLAs). The successful bidder shall provide all requisite support to the third-party facility such as Power, Integration with successful bidder solution etc. without any additional cost to NHAI/IHMCL.	We understand that: 1. The audits referred to in this clause shall be conducted only during the project lifecycle. 2. The costs associated with such third-party audits, including integration costs (if any), power supply, bandwidth, and other related expenses, shall not be borne by the successful bidder and are outside the bidder's scope.	The clause introduces ambiguity regarding scope and associated costs for third-party audits, which are not fully defined. This may lead to additional financial and operational burden on the bidder due to external dependencies. Clear demarcation of responsibilities and exclusion of such costs from bidder scope is essential for fair and transparent bidding.	As per RFP.
85	104/187	1.2.29	All Intellectual Property of the respective Parties shall continue to vest with the respective Party and one Party may make use of the Intellectual Property only with the express consent of the other Party. However, it is agreed and acknowledged by the Bidder that intellectual property rights in the Proprietary Information as well as any other data or information/ reports generated during the performance of services contemplated herein by the Bidder shall always vest with IHMCL and Bidder or its em	We understand that all project-specific data, reports, and outputs generated during the execution of the project shall vest with IHMCL. However, we request clarification that the bidder's pre-existing intellectual property, proprietary tools, software, platforms, algorithms, and methodologies used for execution of the project shall remain the sole property of the bidder, and IHMCL shall have only a limited right to use such components for the purpose of this project.	The current clause does not distinguish between project deliverables and bidder's proprietary IP. This may lead to unintended transfer of bidder's core intellectual property, which is critical for reuse across projects. Clear demarcation is essential for fair and industry-standard IP allocation.	As per RFP.
86	116 of 187	Schedule B.1.A.vi	Additionally, the bidder must ensure the proper migration of all databases from the existing TMS before transitioning to the new MLFF system.	We request the Authority to kindly clarify the following: 1. The Authority shall facilitate access to the existing TMS provider for sharing complete database schema, architecture, table structures, APIs, and all necessary technical details required for seamless data migration. 2. Kindly specify indicative data volume and expected infrastructure/computing requirements for migration, as this has significant cost implications and impacts solution design. 3. Any third-party costs, including charges from the existing TMS provider for data access, extraction, or integration support, shall be borne by the Authority and not by the bidder. 4. In case of any limitations such as licensing, access restrictions, or non-cooperation from the existing TMS provider, the Authority shall intervene and ensure compliance to enable smooth migration.	Data migration from an existing TMS involves dependencies on third-party systems, access to legacy database structures, and potential licensing constraints, which are beyond bidder control. The absence of clarity on data volume, infrastructure requirements, and third-party coordination may lead to significant cost uncertainty and execution risks. Clear definition of responsibilities and support from the Authority is essential for accurate estimation and fair bidding.	As per RFP.
87	117/187	Schedule B.1.C.i	Requirement of ancillary structure for installation of MLFF equipment with structural certification	It is understood that ancillary structures, if required, shall be provided by the bidder and certified by a Chartered/Structural Engineer. We request the Authority to clearly define and quantify the scope of such structural requirements, including type, size, location, and quantity, and provide corresponding BOQ line items or standard design guidelines. Alternatively, kindly confirm if such costs are deemed included with defined assumptions.	Structural works involve significant cost and design considerations, which may vary across sites. Absence of defined scope/BOQ may lead to non-uniform assumptions by bidders, impacting fair and competitive bidding. Clear quantification will ensure transparency and cost comparability.	As per RFP.

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
88	117/187	Schedule B.1.C.i	Upon successful commissioning of the MLFF system, the remaining lanes (if any) not designated for tolling operations shall be closed by NHA. The Bidder/Bank shall ensure that such nondesignated lanes remain closed, physically secured, and are not used for any tolling or traffic operations during the Contract Period, unless expressly authorized in writing by the Authority.	We request clarification on the following: 1. Who shall bear the cost for physical closure and securing of non-designated lanes, including barricading, civil works, manpower, and maintenance during the contract period? 2. Whether such lane closures are intended to be temporary or permanent, and accordingly, the expected design/standard for closure may be specified. Additionally, kindly confirm whether detailed guidelines/specifications for lane closure will be provided by the Authority.	Physical closure of lanes involves significant cost related to materials, civil works, safety arrangements, and ongoing maintenance. In absence of clear scope and cost allocation, bidders may assume varying approaches, impacting commercial bids. Clarification is essential to ensure fair and uniform bidding.	Any physical lane closure, barricading arrangements required for non-MLFF lanes at the Existing Fee Plaza Infrastructure shall be facilitated by the concerned PIU. However, the Successful Bidder shall remain responsible for carrying out all operation and maintenance activities under the scope of work as specified in the RFP.
89	117/187	Schedule B.1.C	Based on the mutually agreed location and site conditions, the Bidder/Bank shall finalize the detailed MLFF design, including optimal gantry placement and configuration. Each gantry may be designed to cover a minimum of two (2) lanes and up to five (5) lanes, as required, ensuring that the entire traffic flow on the main carriageway is effectively captured under the MLFF tolling system.	We request the Authority to kindly provide indicative/standard gantry design details, including typical span, structural configuration, and lane coverage approach. Additionally, we request clarification on the expected number of lanes to be covered per gantry for each site or representative locations, to enable accurate design and cost estimation.	The provision of designing gantries for 2 to 5 lanes introduces significant variability in structural design, material requirements, and associated costs. In the absence of standardized design inputs or	As per RFP.
90	Page No. 165		Solid state LED illumination technology or LED based Technology or equivalent	You are kindly requested to please add below mentioned clause so department will get the better technology. <u>"P1.25 Active LED Display with COB Technology &amp; 100% Bazzle Free Technology"</u>		As per RFP.
91	Page No. 165		55" cubes in a 4 X 2 display	You are kindly requested to please add below mentioned clause so department will get the better technology. <u>"Complete Display Size should be 4800 mm x 1350mm or matrix arrangements of cabinets can be change as per site requirement."</u>		As per RFP.
92	Page No. 165		IP Based	Kndly add below mentioned inputs in place of IP Based so Desktops/Laptops & Server easily connect through below mentioned INPUTS <u>"HDMI 1.3/HDMI2.0/USB 3.0"</u>		As per RFP.
93	179, 153	2.11 Indicative Minimum Bill of Quantity (BOQ) 1.6 Detector-Lidar	2.11 Indicative Minimum Bill of Quantity (BOQ): > 2. Equipment at Fee Plaza Existing Lanes 1.6 Detector-Lidar : Note: Lidar shall be installed at the Gantry Infrastructure only. Lidar shall not be installed at the Fee Plaza lanes.	There is no requirement for "Detector - LiDAR". Is that Intentional or unintentional. Do we need to put a LIDAR on existing plaza or not?		As per RFP.
94	154	1.7 Detector-Radar	Detector-Radar	Is there a need of RADAR on existing fee plaza? Considering that, we will not put LIDAR, we can avoid keeping the RADAR and, instead, the RADAR can be put at new MLFF Gantry		Refer Corrigendum-4.
95	117	Construction of MLFF tolling gantry after crossing the fee plaza :	The gantry for each direction shall be installed at a location within approximately 350 meters downstream of the respective Fee Plaza, in the direction of traffic movement	In some of the Plazas, at 350 meters from existign plaza, the width of the road is up to 5 Lanes. As that is more than the lanes of the road, can we setup the MLFF plaza further down the road where the number of lanes is reflective of the Lanes for the road?		As per RFP.
96	114	Schedule - A	In "SCHEDULE A : Site of the Project", we have the below values under the column "Highway Lane Configuration (2LPS/4L/6L/8L)"	4L/6L - Does this mean, the lane currently is 4 lane and will be made 6 Lanes in the future? 2LPS / 4L - We understand, 2 LPS means 2 Lanes plus shoulder? What does / 4L mean, does this mean, the lane currently is 4 lane and will be made 6 Lanes in the future?		4/6 means project comprises of section of 4 lane and 6 lane.  2LPS/4 L means project comprise of section of road having 2 LPS and 4 Lane.
97	NA	NA	In all the RFPs, there is a discrepancy on the below: 1. Number of Lanes on Existing Plazas - Number of Listed lanes in RFP are more than what we actually have at the plaza. 2. Number of Lanes on the toll Road - Number of listed lanes in RFP are more than what we actually have on the highway	Has the data been validated or we should go by what is in RFP?		As per RFP.
98	116	Schedule B 1.a	Given that : "SCHEDULE B 1. A) The MLFF system will consist of field equipment and sensors mounted on gantries, which will capture the necessary information from passing vehicles. This data will be transmitted to the NETC payment ecosystem for the deduction of the user fee." Coverage Requirement: The equipment must be installed to ensure "that the entire traffic flow on the main carriageway is effectively captured under the MLFF tolling system". Please find the below paragraph in all RFPs: "i. At Existing Fee Plaza Infrastructure: In the event that any ancillary structure is required for installation of MLFF equipment at the Fee Plaza lanes, such structure shall be structurally stable, secured with sufficient ground clearance and duly certified by a Chartered Engineer/ Structural Engineer."	Given these points on the left and the fact that : 1/ there are currently no Gantries at the existing toll-plazas 2/ there is no clear requirement for building gantries at the Existing plazas level : Can we assume that, as long as the coverage requirement is "exhaustively" performed at the level of the new MLFF steel Gantries (ie covering all the traffic), the equipment and BOQ at the existing toll plaza is purely "indicative" and not mandatory ?		As per RFP.

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
99	116	Schedule B	Page 116 > Schedule - B > ci > At Existing Fee Plaza Infrastructure	As per the RFP, it is indicated to use the existing plaza as a redundant or primary gantry in the overall MLFF Solution. After reviewing and doing a site visit of some of the fee plazas, they are not consistent nor following any standard and each one is following its own design making it very difficult to implement at scale and consistency. And also, keeping in mind the structural integrity of the existing fee plazas. Considering that, can we design and install our own gantry for the full length of the road on both sides of existing toll fee plaza? So, the gantry we build will cover both primary and secondary without using the existing fee plaza.		As per RFP.
100	181	2.14 Overload Fee Deduction through FASTag	a. IHMCL is in process of formulating guidelines for deduction of overload fee through FASTag based on overload detection through Weigh In Motion (WIM) System. b. The Successful bidder shall integrate the existing system with the overload fee collection system and collect overload fee through FASTag in terms with the above guidelines without any additional cost to IHMCL/NHAI.	1) Shall weigh In Motion (WIM) System hardware provided by IHMCL ?		The installation of the Weigh-in- Motion (WIM) system is not within the scope of the Acquirer Bank. The appropriate technology for WIM system shall be installed by a separate vendor which shall be engaged by IHMCL. The bank shall be required to do needful development for integration for facilitating the collection of overload fee via FASTag as per RFP
101				2) Where will WIM installed (below the gantry or other location) ? please confirm.		The location of the WIM system shall be finalized based on design solution/technology provided by a separate vendor in consultation with IHMCL/NHAI.
102				3) Will this WIM transaction considered as additional transactions count for per transaction fee		No.
103				4) How to identify whether the vehicle is overloaded or not from Acquirer stand point?		Overload detection shall be carried out through the Weigh-in-Motion (WIM) system, and the relevant data and interface details shall be shared with the MLFF system for integration and operational purposes
104				5) For WIM transactions, how we should calculate pricing? Will there be separate tariff provided for overweight?		The applicable overload fees shall be provided to the bank for configuration in the acquiring system as per the NH Fee Rules and Toll Fee Notification
105				6) Will WIM provides the overload weight tariff to the MLFF ?		The applicable overload fees shall be provided to the bank for configuration in the acquiring system as per the NH Fee Rules and Toll Fee Notification
106	90	1.2.16.3. Parameters to be checked during Site Acceptance Testing (SAT)	6) Confirmation that e-Notices are generated, dispatched, tracked, and archived appropriately as per defined business rules	Hope this scope is under the NIC system as part of e-notice dispatch and archival.		As per RFP.
107	116	Schedule - B 1. Development of the MLFF based tolling facility. a) About the MLFF based Tolling Project	vi. The bidder must ensure the proper migration of all databases from the existing TMS before transitioning to the new MLFF system	Please confirm how much historical data should be migrated from the old system to the new system, and which categories of data should be included in the migration. What is the expected usage of migrated data?		As per RFP
108	119	2. Operations & Maintenance of the MLFF based Tolling System (Refer detailed roles and responsibilities in Section 8 below)	a) Operations Activities --> 2. Customer Support : iii. Assistance in payment of e-Notice payments	Please confirm the type of assistance the MLFF system is expected to provide for e-Notice payments, as e-Notices are managed at NIC system.		The bank shall provide assistance to the customers in payment of e-Notices at toll plaza POS location.
109	127-134	7. E-Notice Module	2. Tag transaction flow by MLFF entity / Acquirer Bank	For violation cases of unregistered/hotlist/blacklist/Closed, how acquirer can notify the e-notice to NPCI vice versa. Is it a API communication or file based communication. Please confirm and provide the specifications		The indicative process flow diagram for transaction processing as well as Enotice generation is already provided in the RFP. Detailed Technical Specification Document for barrier-less tolling shall be provided to Successful bidder during implementation phase.

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
110	127-134	7. E-Notice Module	2. Tag transaction flow by MLFF entity / Acquirer Bank	For the vehicles which are having temporary reg number (newly purchased vehicles), will not able to fetch the VRN or Chasis number from NPCI. As per the flow provided, it has to be fetched from VAHAN with Chasis number. In this scenario, it is not possible to fetch details from VAHAN as chasis number is not available with transaction.		As per prevailing regulations, all newly purchased vehicles under 'M' and 'N' categories are mandated to be fitted with a FASTag at the time of sale. Accordingly, tag can be read and processed through NETC. Detailed Technical Specification Document for barrier-less tolling shall be provided to Successful bidder during implementation phase.
111	127-134	7. E-Notice Module	2. Tag transaction flow by MLFF entity / Acquirer Bank	For the vehicles which are having multile closed tags, which bank tag details will be consider by NPCI to notify the issuer.		As per existing NETC guidelines.
112	127-134	7. E-Notice Module	2. Tag transaction flow by MLFF entity / Acquirer Bank	As there is possibility that Tag/VRN can be removed from blacklist status (05) by banks. According to this, vehicle user shall be provided a window of 24 hrs post crossing the MLFF fee plaza and then raise the e-Notice E-notice to NPCI within next 48 hrs. Please checka and confirm.		As per RFP.
113	127-134	7. E-Notice Module	Note: E-Notice Issuance Timelines	Incase acquirer is unable to generate E-notices within next 48 hours,raising e-Notice later, will that be declined by NPCI ?		As per RFP.
114	122	4. Process flow for Grievance Mechanism:	MLFF entity/ Acquirer review and verify the NIC portal	Is NIC portal access will be provided to MLFF/Acquirer system?		E-notice and Grievance portal shall be developed by NIC. User credentials for plaza level shall be created based on the details provided by the bidder. Bidder will have admin right to create further users for action on e-notice grievances pertaining to the plaza.
115	122	4. Process flow for Grievance Mechanism:	MLFF entity/ Acquirer review and verify the NIC portal	1. What is the further process if the vehicle owner details are not available in VAHAN / DMV to generate the e-notices by NIC. 2. What is next process if the customer has not responding to e-notices.		As per RFP. Enforcement measures shall be taken up with concerned authorities.
116	134	Illustration 1:	If the vehicle performs six (6) transactions daily for 30 consecutive days in June 2025, only 120 transactions (4 per day × 30 days) shall be eligible for payment. Furthermore, the total monthly payout for this vehicle shall be capped at ₹350/-, being the value of the Local Pass for FY 2025-26.	Required more details on the month wise trips calculation		As per RFP.
117	136	Illustration 2:	Let's assume the following data is recorded for a given week (from Tuesday, 04.03.2025 00:00:00 hrs to the following Monday, 10.03.2025 23:59:59 hrs):	Required more details on the table data to understand the scenarios		As per RFP.
118	126	Illustration 1: -->E-Notice Amount and Payout	E-Notice Amount and Payout: Each e-Notice shall reflect an amount equivalent to twice the applicable user fee for the vehicle's category. The Bank shall be entitled to a payout for e-notices issued. The payout for e-notices shall be calculated based on Fixed Per-Transaction Cost multiplied by total number of e-Notice issued, provided the notices are accurate, correct and substantiated by clear photographs of the vehicle (front and rear) and subject to (ii) above. iv. The Bank shall be entitled for adjusting payout for e-notices cases from the user fee collection only after 14 days of the issuance of e-notices. For avoidance of doubt, the applicable payout for e-notice cases authorized in week one (1) shall be adjusted by bank from collected user fee in week three (3) duly considering the SLAs for e-notices.	What is settlement process flow for e-notice payments between NIC, NPCI and MLFF system? Please provide the specifications also.		As per RFP.
119	135	1.2.20. Incentive for higher clean transactions	If, in any given quarter, the number of clean ETC transactions exceeds 95% of the total transactions recorded at the toll plaza, the Bidder shall be entitled to an additional amount. This additional amount shall be calculated as 25% of the Fixed Per Transaction Cost, applicable only to the number of clean ETC transactions that exceed the 95% threshold and are successfully settled during that quarter	Need more clarity on incentives for higher clean transactions. Who will check and calculate the clean transaction percentage? Provide the settlement process for incentives.		As per RFP.
120	149	1.4 Automatic Number Plate Recognition Systems	The Camera should have feature and functionalities to capture number plate and video	How many no of images should be maintain for each vehicle transaction?		As per RFP.

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
121	173	2.9 MLFF Application Software	7) The MLFF application shall be integrated with the VAHAN database of NIC through an API to retrieve the Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW) of vehicles passing through the gantry/lanes based on Vehicle Registration Number (VRN) or Vehicle Identification Number (VIN).	1. Request you to provide the purpose of integrating MLFF with VAHAN of NIC. 2. Is Vahan system is the existing NETC Vahan system which is providing by NPCI OR it will be new. 3. Does IHMCL provides access to Vahan System? 4. Provide the specifications for VAHAN integration.		As per RFP. Detailed Technical Specification Document for barrier-less tolling shall be provided to Successful bidder during implementation phase.
122	175	2.10 Web-Portal:	1) Dashboard 2) E-Notice Module 3) Reports	Kindly provide the elements in the Dashboard, report formats and specifications, date and time-duration for the data population		As per RFP.
123	126	E-Notice	Tag Status having the exception code 08 ( e-notice)	Do we raise the e-notices as well for the tags which are added to exception code 08 ? How to get the revenue for the trips post tag added into exception code 08		E-Notices shall be issued as per RFP. Further, details shall be provided in Technical Specification Document to Successful bidder during implementation phase
124	126	E-Notice	20 minutes SLA between Request Balance Check and Request Pay	For the tags which are in 01 or 03, Is 20 minutes SLA is applicable between RequestBalanceCheck and Request Pay ?		As per RFP & NETC Guidelines.
125	126	E-Notice	20 minutes (against the reader read tim) buffer duration of blacklist tag status (05,01,03 ) business rule	20 minutes (against the reader read tim) buffer duration of blacklist tag status (05,01,03 ) is applicable to process the transaction as normal transaction instead of 48 hours blance check mechanism in MLFF		As per RFP & NETC Guidelines.
126	126	E-Notice	20 minutes SLA between Request Balance Check and Request Pay	For the tags which are in 01,03, Is 20 minutes SLA is applicable between RequestBalanceCheck and Request Pay ?		As per RFP & NETC Guidelines.
127	126	E-Notice	E- Notice Payment duration by the vehicle owner	Confirm the E-Notice payment duration SLA for e-notice generated vehicles . Based on this SLA confirmation, acquirer will raise the exception code 08 addition through RequestMngException API to NPCI.		As per RFP. Detailed Technical Specification Document for barrier-less tolling shall be provided to Successful bidder during implementation phase.
128	126	E-Notice	Decline of e-notice by e-Notice System as Vehicle/Owner details are not present in Vahan	Provide the further process of transaction in case of e-notice request declined due to vehicle details are not present in Vahan.		As per RFP.
129	133	ICD2.6 - Request Balance Check API	ICD2.6 - Request Balance Check API	Suggesting to include vehicle number as well in the ICD2.6 Request Balance check API schema. So that balance check can be done for trasactions which are processed with vehicle number i.e., RFID failed and ALPR success cases		As per RFP.
130	161	1.14 Edege level switch	1) Minimum 24 port 1 Gbps PoE/PoE+ and 2 No's fiber Uplink ports of 10G	BOQ requests an 8 port switch, which is preferred?		As per RFP
131	151	A7	1 IR Illuminator per lane	BOQ requires two cameras per lane, but only one IR Illuminator, is this intentional?		Refer Corrigendum-4
132	143	A2	1 RFID Reader per lane	A single reader can control up to 4 lanes, must the requirement include an entire reader for every lane?		As per RFP
133	162	A10	1 Layer 3 switch per direction.	The site description mentions 12 lanes and 4 redundant landes but does not mention the division of directions. 6 lanes in each direction plus 2 redundant in each direction?		As per RFP
134	123	Section 4	MLFF application at Gantry/lanes should be capable of distinguish between tollable and non-tollable vehicles (two-wheelers, 3-wheelers, etc.) without any human intervention. It should have the function to determine the direction of the vehicle travel (such as forward or reverse)	Please clarify. Will direction of travel change? How will this need to be reported?		As per RFP.
135	120	Display of Rate of User Fee and User Fee Notification	Display of Rate of User Fee and User Fee Notification	Is it a overhead digital display board with details that change at schedules or fixed Hoardings.		As per RFP.
136	144/146	Specification of all MLFF Sub System 1.2 RFID Antenna:	2) Gain 10 dBi ± 1 dB	Will 10dBi gain not be very low power equipment ? What is the requirement of beamwidth ?	10dBi gain might limit coverage range and read reliability in environments requiring high-performance or long-range . Higher-gain antennas (e.g., 12-14 dBi) might be more appropriate for multi-lane scenarios where tags are at varying distances. Beamwidth: Narrower horizontal beamwidth for precise lane targeting - a 3dB beamwidth of <30Degrees Wider vertical beamwidth for accommodating varied vehicle heights.	As per RFP
137	153	1.6 Detector-Lidar	1.6 Detector-Lidar	Specification does no specify technology with in Lidar e.g. 2D or 3D Lidar is preferred ?	3D Preferred for Vehicle classification	As per RFP.

Sr.No.	Page no. of RFP	Clause	RFP Statement	Query	Remarks	Response IHMCL
138	32	6.5. PERFORMANCE SECURITY	a) The Successful bidder shall furnish a Performance Security cumulative total of Rs 35,20,00,000/- (Rs Thirty Five Crore Twenty Lakh only) for all tendered fee plazas for a period of 6 years from the Date of LOA within 15 days of issuance of LOA in following instruments:	High PBG is unviable, since cash collection is not done by Bank. Request for token PBG of 1cr.		Refer Corrigendum-4
139	Page no. 90	Schedule C, 1, 3 (Note 3)	The 99% ANPR accuracy refers to the ANPR system's overall performance, considering recognition from either the front or rear license plate	In MLFF during heavy-traffic conditions or a small size vehicle behind the large size vehicle ( for example a car behind the truck ) it is common for a vehicle's rear plate to partially or fully occlude the following vehicle's front plate—for example when vehicles align closely, overtake, or one vehicle's plate is intentionally/ unintentionally covered by another (tail-gating/plate covering). Kindly clarify the tolerance for missed reads caused by such physical occlusion. Specifically: (a) will occlusion events documented by video evidence be excluded from ANPR accuracy calculations. (b) what evidence and metadata will be required to support an exclusion; and (c) how will such exclusions be reflected in reporting and SLA measurement?		As per RFP.
140	Page no. 91	Schedule C, 1, 3 (Note 3)	ANPR Accuracy shall be evaluated and reported across diverse real-world test scenarios... including fog, rain, glare... non-standard plates.	Kindly confirm: (a) the minimum OCR confidence score that will be accepted as a "Clean Read".		As per RFP.
141	Page no. 148	Schedule C, 1.4 (Parameter 1)	Camera should have feature. to capture number plate and video evidence. at maximum speed of 150KM/Hr or higher	Kindly clarify whether the 99% ANPR accuracy SLA is expected to apply to vehicles travelling above 150 km/h as capture performance typically degrades at very high speeds; if the 99% target does not apply above certain speed thresholds, please specify the intended accuracy targets (or allowable deviations) for higher speed bands (for example: 150-200 km/h, >200 km/h) and the speed profile to be used for acceptance testing.		As per RFP.
142	Page no. 150	Schedule C, 1.4 (Video Recording 4-a)	The system should be capable of continuous video recording in control center in Unified Storage for 30 days	Kindly specify the minimum video resolution (e.g., 1080p) and frame rate required for the 30-day retention, to enable accurate storage/SAN capacity planning.		Refer Corrigendum-4
143		ANPR Camera, Audit Surveillance Camera	Preferred OEM's: Pelco/Avigilon, Axis, Vivotek, FETCI, Tattile, BOSCH Or an OEM whose ANPR Camera product has been deployed in a Multilane Free Flow Tolling (MLFF) System, either in India or internationally, and has been operational for a minimum of one (1) year as of the bid submission date.	We would like to highlight that Multilane Free Flow Tolling (MLFF) is a relatively new technology in India and is currently under phased implementation; therefore, most Indian OEMs do not yet have MLFF-specific deployment experience, even though they possess strong technical capabilities and proven deployments in ANPR and Audit Camera systems. The core technology required in MLFF systems is ANPR and Audit Cameras, which are already widely deployed and operational in India by Indian OEMs. Further, as per guidelines of the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC), government tenders should avoid specifying or naming particular OEMs or brands and should instead focus on functional and performance-based technical specifications to ensure fair competition and equal participation. Therefore, we respectfully request the authority to remove the specific OEM names mentioned in the clause and allow Indian OEMs to participate, with eligibility based on technical compliance and performance parameters, thereby ensuring fair competition and equal opportunity in line with CVC guidelines and the Make in India initiative.	Request to remove	As per RFP