| S.N. | Bidder | RFP Reference (s) (Section, Page) | Content of RFP requiring clarification | Points of Clarification Required | RailTel Response |
|------|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Shaildhar Telecom | Section-2, Clause 2.1.2 | ISP License | We have an ISP license for North East but not Assam. We would like to request RailTel to allow us to bid since we do not plan to take ISP license for Assam and would like to promote RailWire in Assam. | Refer Corrigendum-4, Clause-3 |
| 2 | Shaildhar Telecom | Section-2, Clause 2.1.4 | Turnover | Since Assam is also underserved (more than 80% rural) we would request RailTel to consider cumulative turnover of 5 Crores during last three financial years for Assam also as is being considered for North East In the previous tender in 2014 this deviation was taken for all North East Circles. (RFP Notice No. RailTel/RFP/OT/CO/SB/2014-15/RailWire/MSP/258, Dated: 28.05.2014) | Refer Corrigendum-4, Clause-4 |
| 3 | Kumar Broadband Services Pvt. Ltd. | Section-2, Clause 2.1.4 | Turnover | Kumar Broadband, our Company is no exception. Our aims and aspirations have also been hindered during the last couple of years owing to the pandemic. We were contemplating tremendous opportunities in the business and were planning to encash these opportunities. But in spite of having wide spread network, state of the art infrastructure and hardworking team, our turnovers could not reflect our potential in spite of our best efforts. It would be grateful of you to consider the global scenario especially the economic slowdown and relax the turnover criteria. You may please consider the revised benchmark as Rs.5 crores for past 3 years cumulatively instead of Rs.20 Crores. | There is no change in tender condition except for Assam circle, fir which Refer Corrigendum-4, Clause-4 |
| 4 | Kumar Broadband Services Pvt. Ltd. | Section-2, Clause 2.1.2 | MSO License | The business of Internet and cable based services are driven by local cable operators or LCOs. The LCOs would find it viable and attractive to associate with an organization that has MSO license. We have been closely working with wide number of LCOs in the past few years and found that having a MSO license would immensely benefit us and the LCO. Hence, our company had obtained an MSO license in the mutual interest of the company and LCO. We would like to inform you that this would add strength to our proposal rather than creating a conflict of interest with RailTel. We request you to take this as an essential prerequisite rather than consider it as a disqualification. However, ISP license, on the contrary would definitely be a conflict of interest with RailTel. Hence, companies with MSO license and without ISP license could be considered. | Refer Corrigendum-4, Clause-3 |
| 5 | In Entertainment (India) Limited | Section-2, Clause 2.1.9 | Holding Company | If holding company is UL licensee, whether financial and or technical capabilities of such holding company can be accepted against this EC clause? | There is no change in tender condition and technical and financial capability of holding company having UL license will not be accepted. This is applicable for Consortium also. |
| 6 | In Entertainment (India) Limited | Section-11 | Revenue Share | Since the MSP engagement would be 07+03 years, the renumeration would be at Fix model instead of % age sharing model as ARPU on per year is not fixed. | The renumeration to MSP will be on revenue sharing basis as described in Clause-11 (i) & Clause-11 (ii) of RFP document and refer Corrigendum-4, Clause-2. |
| 7 | In Entertainment (India) Limited | Section-2, Clause 2.1.2 | MSO License | We understand that ISP license make conflict with RailTel License, however, MSO license holder can be wavied off from this clause. | Refer Corrigendum-4, Clause-3 |

| 8 | In Entertainment (India) Limited | Section-11 | AGR Calculation | Definition of AGR is not defined and how the Revenue share to MSP would be calculated. | AGR definition and calculation both are explained in the Clause-11 (iii) of the RFP document |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 9 | KFN ENTERPRISES | Section-2, Clause 2.1.9 | Holding Company | If holding company is UL licensee, whether financial and or technical capabilities of such holding company can be accepted against this EC clause? | There is no change in tender condition and technical and financial capability of holding company having UL license will not be accepted. This is applicable for Consortium also. |
| 11 | KFN ENTERPRISES | Section-11 | AGR Calculation | Definition of AGR is not defined and how the Revenue share to MSP would be calculated. | AGR definition and calculation both are explained in the Clause-11 (iii) of the RFP document and refer Corrigendum-4, Clause-2. |
| 12 | GStech Software Systems Pvt Ltd | Section-11 | AGR Calculation | Definition of AGR is not defined and how the Revenue share to MSP would be calculated. | AGR definition and calculation both are explained in the Clause-11 (iii) of the RFP document and refer Corrigendum-4, Clause-2. |
| 13 | GStech Software Systems Pvt Ltd | Section-2, Clause 2.1.2 | VNO and ISP Licenses | Are we VNO Class A ISP License holders are eligible for this and whether financial or technical of our company can be accepted? | VNO and ISP license holders are not eligible to bid for this RFP as a single entity or along with consortium partner Refer Corrigendum-4, Clause-3 for more clarification about ISP and VNO license holder. |
| 14 | Kailash Cable Network | Section-2, Clause 2.1.7 | Consortium | Can lead bidder Private Limited Company (Having 51% holding of one director) take written credential support from his another own proprietorship company? | There is no change in tender condition and Lead bidder can not make consortium with proprietorship company. Please refer Clause 2.1.7 (b). |
| 15 | Kailash Cable Network | Section-2, Clause 2.1.7 | Consortium | Does lead bidder company of a consortium can use technical and financial strength of its Holding Company/Subsidiary to fulfill prequalification and/or technical or financial eligibility criteria as mentioned in RFP/Corrigenda? | Lead bidder of consortium can not use technical and financial strength of its Holding Company/Subsidiary to fulfill pre-qualification and/or technical or financial eligibility criteria, refer Clause 2.1.9 of the RFP document. |
| 16 | Kailash Cable Network | Section-2, Clause 2.1.1 | Eligibility Criteria | Does proprietorship company with all required credentials participate for bidding after incorporated as Pvt. Ltd. Company or take over by Pvt. Ltd. Company. | At the time of bid submission, bidder should be an Indian registered company or a subsidiary of a Global company, incorporated under Indian Companies Act 1956/2013. The startup companies should have valid Startup India Certificate and/ or Valid Registration certificate as defined under notification of DIPP GSR 501(E) dated 23 May, 2017. Refer S.N. 1 of "Eligibility Criteria Compliance" under Annexure-C. |
| 17 | Cubefibrenet Pvt. Ltd | Section-2, Clause 2.1.4 | Turnover | for existing MSPs given extra weightage marks irrespective of the Turnover. | There is no change in tender condition |