

PRE BID/ WRITTEN QUERIES COMPILATION AND RESPONSES (RFP FOR DEVELOPMENT, OPTIMIZATION AND DELIVERY OF ON-PREMISES MULTI-LANGUAGE AI/ML TRANSLATION MODELS FOR EXAMINATION CONTENT, TENDER ID : 2026_SSC_925144_1 DATED 07/09/2026)

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
1	Section 3.4 / Section 4.5 – Scope of Work & Procurement of RFP	7 / 25	The Scope of Work is masked in the public RFP and the complete RFP is to be provided after submission of the NDA.	Kindly confirm whether a duly signed NDA submitted by email is sufficient for release of the complete/unmasked RFP, or whether the original hard copy must also be submitted physically at SSC HQ.	Upon acceptance of the NDA, kindly share the complete RFP, including the unmasked Scope of Work and SLA.	The duly signed NDA shall be submitted at any of the Regional Offices/HQ of SSC as mentioned in Appendix-B to this document. Scope and SLA will be given to the bidder by the Regional Office/HQ after receiving NDA.
2	Section 4.10 – Mode of Submission / RFP Data Sheet	24–26	The RFP refers to online submission through the CPP Portal and also to offline submission of certain documents.	Kindly confirm the exact documents required offline and whether separate sealed envelopes are required for Pre-Qualification, Technical Bid and Financial Bid.	A document-wise online/offline submission checklist may kindly be provided.	Bidders shall comply with the online/offline submission requirements specified in Sections 4.10. The Technical/Pre-Qualification documents shall be submitted in the prescribed manner. Financial Documents should not be submitted offline.
3	Section 4.21 – Bid Security / Appendix D	29–30 / Appendix D	The RFP specifies an EMD of ₹48 lakh and provides for Bid Securing Declaration / applicable concessions.	For a DPIIT-recognized Startup claiming EMD exemption, kindly confirm whether the DPIIT Recognition Certificate together with Appendix D – Bid Securing Declaration is sufficient.	Kindly confirm whether any additional document is required for availing the EMD exemption.	(i) DPIIT-recognized Startups eligible for EMD exemption may avail the exemption subject to applicable Government of India provisions.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
						(ii) All bidders can submit Bid Securing Declaration as in Appendix D in lieu of EMD.
4	Sections 4.10(c), 4.11 and 4.20 – Authorized Representative	26–29	The RFP requires corporate authorization and also refers to a written Power of Attorney for the Authorized Representative.	Kindly confirm whether a Board Resolution / Authorization Letter is sufficient when the bid is signed by a Director, or whether a separate Power of Attorney is mandatory.	This will ensure the authorization documents are submitted in the prescribed form.	As per RFP. [NO CHANGE]
5	Section 4.9 / Part IV – Technical Proposal & Evaluation Criteria	26 / 39–41	The RFP requires prescribed formats and evaluates the Technical Proposal against a detailed 100-mark scoring matrix.	Kindly confirm whether bidders may also submit supporting annexures, architecture diagrams, case studies, team CVs and technical documentation, provided no commercial information is included.	We propose to structure the Technical Proposal in the same sequence as the Technical Evaluation Criteria.	As per RFP. [NO CHANGE]
6	Part V – Proof of Concept (PoC) Evaluation	42 onwards	Shortlisted bidders are required to undertake a mandatory PoC using a dataset provided by SSC.	Kindly clarify the PoC environment, including whether the bidder should use its own infrastructure or SSC-provided VPC/hardware, and the indicative timeline for deployment and execution after shortlisting.	This will help bidders plan technical resources and deployment readiness in advance.	The PoC shall be conducted as prescribed in Part V using the standardized dataset provided by SSC. The detailed PoC arrangements, environment and schedule will be communicated to shortlisted bidders. Bidder should use SSC provided infrastructure for POC deployment.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
7	Part I – Background, Objectives and Scope; Section 3.3 – Objectives	Pg. 6–7	Bidder is required to assess and recommend suitable open-source AI/ML model(s) and optimization strategy for the required languages.	Please clarify whether the bidder is required to deploy a single multilingual translation model for all 13+ languages, or whether multiple open-source AI/ML model(s), selected based on language-wise benchmarking and performance, may be proposed.	—	The bidder may propose one or more approved open-source AI/ML models, including specialized models, provided the proposed architecture meets all language, quality, security, scalability and integration requirements and is supported by benchmarking and technical justification.
8	Part I – Background, Objectives and Scope; Sections 3.1 & 3.3	Pg. 5–7	SSC has approximately 40,000 questions translated into 13+ regional languages and requires leveraging the historical corpus.	Please provide the language-wise count of existing bilingual/parallel examination question pairs available for model training/fine-tuning, separately for English-to-target and Hindi-to-target language pairs.	This is required to assess the feasibility of domain adaptation/fine-tuning, particularly for low-resource languages.	The exact language-wise/subject-wise dataset details shall be shared with the successful bidder to the extent available and permitted under the security requirements. The figures should therefore be treated as approximate until the dataset is formally provided (Approximately 30,000 +) Each of these 30,000 questions are translated into 14 Indian Languages. All these datasets are primarily in PDF format .Further bidder needs to understand that the pdf contains Questions in

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
						“Image” format and not in text format.
9	Part I – Background, Objectives and Scope; Sections 3.1 & 3.3	Pg. 5–7	SSC has an existing historical translated examination corpus and requires its use for language assets/model optimization.	Please confirm whether the existing approximately 40,000 translated questions will be made available to the successful bidder for model benchmarking, domain adaptation/fine-tuning, Translation Memory and glossary development.	—	The historical translated dataset referred to in the RFP shall be made available to the successful bidder.
10	Part I – Background, Objectives and Scope; Sections 3.1 & 3.3	Pg. 5–7	Existing translations are stated to have undergone manual translation and evaluation, and the bidder is required to develop language assets and benchmark the models.	Please clarify the quality/validation status of the historical translated corpus and whether language-wise metadata and translation/review status will be provided to the bidder.	—	The historical corpus has been subjected to manual translation/evaluation as stated in the RFP; however, the bidder is required to validate, clean and curate the data, including identification of duplicate, incomplete and inconsistent translations. There is no significant metadata w.r.t translation available.
11	Part IV – Technical Evaluation Criteria	Pg. 39–40	SSC specifically identifies Manipuri and Konkani as low-resource languages and requires demonstrated capability across 13+ Indian languages.	Where adequate validated bilingual data is not available for low-resource languages, please clarify whether SSC will provide additional validated bilingual data or whether creation and validation of such data will be entirely within the	—	The bidder shall develop and maintain the required language assets for all scoped languages. The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
				bidder's scope.		3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
12	Part I – Background, Objectives and Scope; Part IV	Pg. 5–7, 39–40	Bidder is required to develop language assets and optimize/fine-tune the model for all 13+ languages.	Please clarify whether creation, translation, annotation and linguistic validation of additional bilingual training samples, wherever required for fine-tuning, are within the bidder's scope and whether SSC has an indicative volume requirement.	This has a direct bearing on the T0+6-week model delivery timeline.	Yes. As per RFP. [NO CHANGE]
13	Part I – Background, Objectives and Scope; Section 3.3	Pg. 6–7	Bidder is required to select/optimize open-source AI/ML model(s) and develop language assets and training/benchmark resources.	Please confirm whether bidders may use appropriately licensed publicly available Indic-language parallel corpora and datasets, in addition to SSC-provided data, for model benchmarking, domain adaptation and fine-tuning.	Subject to applicable IPR, confidentiality and security requirements.	Yes. As per RFP. [NO CHANGE]
14	Part V – PoC Evaluation; Section 7.3	Pg. 43	PoC requires correct preservation of mathematical/scientific notation, formulae, symbols and domain terms.	Please clarify whether mathematical expressions, formulae, symbols, numerical values and scientific notation are expected to be translated/modified by the AI model or preserved in their original structured form while translating the surrounding natural-language content.	—	Mathematical expressions, formulae, symbols, numerical values and scientific notation shall be preserved accurately and shall not be altered merely for translation. The surrounding natural-language content shall be translated while maintaining the original mathematical/scientific

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
						meaning and structure.
15	Part V – PoC Evaluation; Section 7.3	Pg. 43–44	PoC evaluates mathematical/scientific notation fidelity and structured-content handling.	Please specify the formats of mathematical/scientific content expected in the PoC and production environment, such as plain Unicode, LaTeX, MathML, images or embedded formulas.	—	Input and output questions are in image format.
16	Part V – PoC Evaluation; Section 7.3	Pg. 43–44	PoC requires translation of image text overlays with image integrity maintained.	Please clarify whether OCR/image-text extraction, translation and rendering of translated text back into the image are within the bidder's scope, or whether OCR-extracted/structured text will be provided by SSC.	—	The bidder shall provide the necessary extraction / processing capability where such input is supplied, while preserving the image and translating applicable text overlays as specified in the RFP.
17		Pg 7	clause, 3.4.1, B. Translation quality	Kindly specify if the department will provide access to state government glossaries, bhashini corpus and NCERT terminology or bidder has to arrange for it?		The bidder shall arrange / access the referenced Central Institute of Indian Languages/NTS Mysore glossaries, Bhashini corpus and NCERT terminology data to the extent required and legally permitted as may be necessary.
18		Pg 8	clause f. AI model development Hub	As the bidder is required to submit the hardware requirement along with the proposal, it will be a tentative requirement as the requirement may change in the future, will department accept such amendments in future?		The hardware requirement submitted with the bid is indicative and shall be validated during the Model Assessment / Solution Finalisation stage. SSC shall provide approved compute infrastructure based on the

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
						validated requirement; reasonable revisions may be considered where justified by the finalized model architecture and agreed project requirements.
19		Pg 10	clause C	Kindly specify, to train the AI/ML models for translation, the dataset required will be provided by SSC? The dataset of 40000 question papers which are already translated? Kindly specify if any effort is required from bidders side for dataset preparation or just pre processing is required from bidders side for which SMEs are required?		Yes. The RFP provides for use of SSC-approved datasets, including the historical translated dataset, for language-asset development and optimization. The bidder is responsible for cleaning, curation, validation and preparation of datasets as specified in the scope, including use of linguistic/SME resources required for such activities. [Refer S. No 8]
20		Pg 11	Clause C, Note	In page number 11, the number of translated question in 13 different languages are said to be 30000, but earlier in page 5, 40000 questions are mentioned. Kindly clarify this ambiguity and provide complete stats on the existing datasets.		It is safe to assume 30,000 plus questions will be given as dataset. [Refer S. No 8]
21			General	To estimate the number of GPUs or which GPU to use kindly provide the average size		Bidders shall make their infrastructure recommendation based on

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
				of questions or average number of words in each question?		the representative examination content, proposed model architecture and benchmark methodology; final sizing shall be validated during Model Assessment.
22		Pg 14	Clause H	What is the purpose of the prompt library, please clarify the scope and its uses in the translational model? The department wants to maintain hardcoded prompts for each type of translation?		The Prompt Library is intended to maintain version-controlled translation, evaluation and reviewer prompts, including version history, change logs, benchmark results and confidence scores. It is not limited to hard-coded prompts; the bidder shall design and maintain the prompt strategy appropriate to the selected solution. The core idea is to maintain the lineage so that deterministically SSC can reproduce the translation if necessary.
23		Pg 42	clause 7.2	Kindly clarify, what will be the number of days provided for preparing the POC? We hope that after technical evaluation sufficient amount of time will be provided to each bidder for PoC preparation.		All Technically qualified bidders will be given approximately one month time for POC.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
24			General	To estimate the infra sizing, kindly provide total and concurrent users on normal and peak load.		The bidder shall propose the required infrastructure and architecture based on the specified bulk/parallel-processing requirement and the workload assumptions in its solution. Final infrastructure sizing shall be validated by SSC.
25		General	General for POC	Kindly clarify if the dataset which will be provided by department for POC, we have to train our model on that only? Or we have to pre train our model for all 13 language translation and then it will be tested on the departments provided dataset of 500-1000 questions? And for this POC will the bidder bring infra for inferencing or the department will provide the infra?		The PoC dataset is a test/benchmark dataset and shall not be treated as the sole training dataset. Bidders are expected to demonstrate their proposed translation solution on the SSC-provided PoC dataset. The PoC environment and infrastructure arrangements will be communicated by SSC to shortlisted bidders.
26	Section 1 - Letter of Invitation	Page 3	SSC's examination question papers are authored in English and Hindi and are translated into 13+ regional languages to serve candidates nationwide.	Please provide the definitive list of the 13+ target languages and confirm all required source-target language pairs (English→Target, Hindi→Target, and/or Target→English/Hindi).		Yes. The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section 3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
27	Part IV - Technical Evaluation	Page 39	Demonstrated proficiency across the required 13+ Indian languages, including	Please confirm whether Manipuri and Konkani are mandatory target languages		Yes. The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	Criteria, Section 6.1, Criterion 1.2 Indian Language Capability		low-resource languages (Manipuri, Konkani); handling of diverse scripts (Devanagari, Perso-Arabic/Urdu RTL, Meitei Mayek, Dravidian scripts)	and provide the complete mandatory language list against which technical evaluation and PoC will be conducted.		specified in Section 3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
28	Part I - Background Objectives and Scope, Section 3.1 Background	Page 5	Currently, SSC has repository of approximately 1,20,000 examination questions. Out of the 1,20,000 approximately 40,000 are translated into 13+ regional languages including Hindi with the help of manual translation and translation evaluation.	Please clarify how much of the existing bilingual/multilingual corpus will be provided to the successful bidder for model assessment, fine-tuning, Translation Memory, glossary creation and benchmarking, including language-wise distribution.		[Refer S. No. 8] The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section 3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
29	Part I - Background Objectives and Scope, Section 3.3(b) Language Asset Development	Page 6	Language Asset Development: For the scoped languages and subjects, develop and maintain translation repository, translation memory, glossaries, benchmark data set with the help of translator and SMEs.	Please clarify whether translators and SMEs will be provided/onboarded by SSC or are required to be deployed by the bidder. Also confirm the expected number and language-wise requirement of translators/SMEs.		The bidder is responsible for onboarding and managing qualified translators, linguistic experts and SMEs required for language-asset development, as specified in Section 3.4.2(C). The RFP does not prescribe a fixed language-wise headcount; bidders shall propose an adequate resource plan.
30	Part I - Background Objectives and Scope, Section 3.3(a) Model Assessment	Page 6	Model Assessment: Assess SSC examination translation requirements, evaluate suitable open-source AI model and recommend the optimal model and optimization strategy support	Please clarify the definition of “open-source AI model” acceptable to SSC, including acceptable model licences. Are open-weight models with licences permitting enterprise/government		SSC requires approved open-source AI/ML models that can be legally deployed for the intended government/on-premises use. The bidder shall disclose the model and

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			by data.	deployment acceptable?		licence terms for SSC's review/approval. Open-weight models may be considered where their licence permits the proposed use and satisfies SSC's ownership, security and deployment requirements.
31	Part I - Background Objectives and Scope, Section 3.1 Background	Page 5	AI Engineering Software Package Development: Work stream will design, develop, optimize and validate AI translation and evaluation capabilities using approved open-source AI models, together with language assets, model artifacts and necessary supporting components.	Who will provide approval for the selected open-source model(s), and at what stage? Please also confirm whether multiple specialized models may be proposed for different languages/content types instead of one common model for all 13+ languages.		The bidder shall recommend the model(s), and SSC shall approve the selected model(s). Approval of model would be given during the Technical Evaluation stage. Multiple specialized models may be proposed where technically justified; there is no requirement that a single model serve all languages or content types.
32	Part I - Background Objectives and Scope, Section 3.3(d) Optimization and Fine Tuning Translation Package	Page 6	Optimization/Fine Tuning Translation Package: Bidder to optimize the selected and approved translation model(s) using appropriate techniques and deliver a production ready translation package with all required artifacts and configuration.	Please define the minimum artifacts expected as part of the production-ready package, e.g., model weights/adapters, tokenizer, inference code, configurations, containers, prompts, evaluation scripts, deployment manifests and technical documentation.		As per RFP.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
33	Part I - Background Objectives and Scope, Section 3.3(e) Evaluation Model Development	Page 6	Evaluation Model Development: Develop and AI based evaluation package to assess semantic correctness, structural integrity, translation quality along with integration specification.	Should the Evaluation Model be an independent AI/ML model from the Translation Model? Please clarify the expected architecture, supported evaluation dimensions and whether SSC has any prescribed/approved model or methodology.		Yes. As per RFP.
34	Part IV - Technical Evaluation Criteria, Section 6.1, Criterion 4.1 Translation Quality Metrics	Page 40	Proposed quality benchmarks (BLEU, COMET, chrF++, TER, human evaluation framework); approach to achieving and exceeding 95% accuracy; methodology for continuous quality improvement	Please define how the stated “95% accuracy” will be calculated and which metric/combination of metrics constitutes the contractual acceptance criterion. Is this requirement applicable individually to every language?		software libraries/tools and Python package tool commonly used to calculate BLEU, COMET, chrF++. SSC will provide git hub link to the shortlisted Bidders
35	Part V - Proof of Concept Evaluation, Section 7.2(a) PoC Test Dataset	Page 42	A set of [500-1000] examination questions dataset in English and Hindi covering General Knowledge, Reasoning, Mathematics, and English, including questions with tables, images, mathematical notation, and comprehension passages.	Please confirm the final PoC dataset size (500 or 1,000), language-wise distribution and whether the same dataset will be used across all bidders.		The RFP currently specifies a range of 500–1000 questions for the PoC. The final dataset size and detailed distribution will be communicated to shortlisted bidders before the PoC. The standardized dataset/Golden Record will be used consistently for comparative evaluation.
36	Part V - Proof of Concept Evaluation, Section 7.2(b)	Page 42	Reference translations in target languages and topics for benchmarking.	Please confirm which target languages will be evaluated during the PoC and whether reference/golden translations		Yes. The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	PoC Test Dataset			will be available for every evaluated language.		3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
37	Part V - Proof of Concept Evaluation, Section 7.2(c) PoC Test Dataset	Page 42	PoC evaluation will be done for each pair of provided Languages dataset on a separate Dataset (Golden Record) to measure the claimed score and actual available Golden Set.	Please clarify whether the PoC score will be calculated language-wise and then aggregated. If yes, please provide the aggregation/weightage methodology and whether any minimum score must be achieved for each individual language.		The PoC evaluation shall be carried out in accordance with Section 7.3. The stated methodology evaluates the applicable language-pair scores and the bidder must meet the minimum PoC score as mentioned in Section 7.4 Minimum PoC Score.
38	Part V - Proof of Concept Evaluation, Section 7.3, Criterion 1 Translation Accuracy	Page 42-43	For eg Manipuri Max (Score (English ,Manipuri), Score (Hindi,Manipuri)) will be taken	Please confirm whether, for each target language, the higher score between English→Target and Hindi→Target will be considered, or whether both source-language translation directions are mandatory production requirements.		Both the scores will be considered for evaluating of PoC under Section 7.3.
39	Part IV - Technical Evaluation Criteria, Section 6.1, Criterion 1.3 Special Content Handling	Page 39	Approach for mathematical notation, scientific terms, tables, images with text overlays, comprehension passages, and preservation of answer option labels	Please clarify the input formats expected for tables, mathematical notation and images with text overlays. Is OCR/image understanding part of bidder scope, or will SSC CAT provide extracted/structured text to the translation package?		[Refer S.no 8]
40	Part IV -	Page 39	Clarity and feasibility of	Please provide the CAT		Detailed CAT API/interface

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	Technical Evaluation Criteria, Section 6.1, Criterion 2.2 Integration Approach		integration plan with SSC's existing CAT tool; API documentation quality; SDK/connecto/approach; support for bulk/batch and parallel processing	integration specifications/API documentation, authentication mechanism, payload formats, error-handling requirements and sample request/response structures required for solution design.		specifications will be finalized/provided through the mutually agreed integration approach after selection . The bidder shall provide the integration specifications, API schema, request/response formats, error handling and documentation required for SSC/authorized agency to integrate the delivered package .
41	Part I - Background Objectives and Scope, Section 3.1 Background	Page 5	The scope of this RFP is limited to Work stream 1 i.e. development, optimization and delivery of AI Engineering Software Package.	Please confirm the boundary between bidder and SSC responsibilities for Work Stream 2/CAT integration, particularly development, deployment, integration testing, defect resolution and production go-live.		Modification of CAT tool is out of scope of the current bidder. Bidder needs to provide mechanisms to integrate into CAT as directed by SSC which will be discussed with the successful bidder.
42	Part V - Proof of Concept Evaluation, Section 7.3,	Page 44	Simulated integration showing how the service would interact with a CAT tool workflow	For the PoC, will SSC provide a CAT sandbox/API simulator, or is the bidder expected to develop its own simulation		No. SSC will not provide any sandbox /API simulator for CAT.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	Criterion 4.2 CAT Tool Integration Simulation			based on interface specifications provided by SSC?		
43	Part VII - Security Compliance and Data Protection, Section 9.3(a) Infrastructure Security	Page 49	Virtual Private Cloud (VPC) /Hardware: The solution shall be deployed in a dedicated VPC environment/Hardware, not in a shared or multi-tenant ecosystem which shall be made available by SSC.	Please provide the infrastructure specifications that SSC will make available, including GPU type/count/VRAM, CPU, RAM, storage, network bandwidth, operating system/container platform and scaling capability.		SSC will provide the dedicated/approved infrastructure required for deployment. Specific GPU, CPU, RAM, storage, network and platform specifications will be finalized based on the bidder's validated infrastructure requirement and SSC's available infrastructure.
44	Part I - Background Objectives and Scope, Section 3.3(i) Infrastructure Setup and Maintenance	Page 6	Infrastructure Setup and Maintenance: Configure, operated and maintain the complete AI development and optimization environment, including all software components required on SSC provide infrastructure.	Please clarify whether all infrastructure/hardware/GPU capacity will be provided by SSC and the bidder's scope is limited to configuration, software installation and operations. Please also clarify responsibility for additional capacity required due to model/language/volume growth.		The hardware requirement submitted with the bid is indicative and shall be validated during the Model Assessment / Solution Finalisation stage. SSC shall provide approved compute infrastructure based on the validated requirement; reasonable revisions may be considered where justified by the finalized model architecture and agreed project requirements.
45	Part VII - Security	Page 49	No Data Retention by Model Providers: If the Bidder	Since the RFP requires on-premises/private deployment		No external/public/cloud AI service shall be used for

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	Compliance and Data Protection, Section 9.2(d) AI and ML Model Security		utilizes any third-party foundation model or cloud AI service, the Bidder shall ensure and contractually guarantee that no SSC data is retained, logged, cached, or used for model improvement by the third-party provider.	using open-source models, please clarify whether any external/cloud AI service is permitted in production, or whether all model inference, evaluation and supporting AI components must operate entirely within SSC-provided infrastructure.		processing SSC examination content in production. The solution shall operate within the SSC-approved secure environment using approved open-source models, subject to the security provisions of Section 9.
46	Part VII - Security Compliance and Data Protection, Section 9.2(a) AI and ML Model Security	Page 49	No Third-Party Model Training: SSC's examination content shall not be used to train, fine-tune, improve, or update any general-purpose, shared, or third-party AI/ML model. Any model fine-tuned on SSC data shall be a private, dedicated instance exclusively for SSC's use.	Please confirm whether parameter-efficient fine-tuning techniques such as LoRA/QLoRA/adapters on an approved open-source base model are permitted, provided the resulting fine-tuned artifacts remain dedicated exclusively to SSC.		Yes. As per RFP.
47	Part IV - Technical Evaluation Criteria, Section 6.1, Criterion 4.2 Human in the Loop Workflow	Page 40	Integration with SSC's linguistic QA team for audit. Back-Translation and Validation Methodology for back-translation-based validation; automated quality gates; error categorization and reporting	Please clarify the expected human-in-the-loop workflow and responsibility split between SSC linguistic QA personnel and bidder-provided linguists/SMEs, including review volumes and acceptance workflow.		Bidder linguistic SME's are for the training and validation of the AI model. Once AI model is deployed there is no human interaction on the part of bidder except for training cycle as and when SSC demands. Bidder to deploy linguistic SME again for the training cycle.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
48	Part IV - Technical Evaluation Criteria, Section 6.1, Criterion 5.1 Throughput and Concurrency	Page 40	Demonstrated capability to handle bulk translation (target: 1,20,000 questions across 13+ languages); parallel processing capacity; expected throughput (questions/hour)	Please provide the expected production workload: peak questions/hour, average questions/day, maximum concurrent language pairs, expected batch size and required turnaround time so that infrastructure and inference architecture can be sized appropriately.		[Refer S.no 8]
49	Part IV - Technical Evaluation Criteria, Section 6.1, Criterion 5.3 Latency and Response Time	Page 41	Expected per-question translation latency; batch processing turnaround time; SLA commitments	Please specify the target/maximum acceptable per-question latency and batch-processing turnaround time that will be used for evaluation and contractual SLA compliance.		Bidders shall state expected latency and batch turnaround in their proposals, and contractual SLA requirements shall be governed by Section 10.3 and the approved solution.
50	Part IV - Technical Evaluation Criteria, Section 6.1, Criterion 6(b) Team Composition	Page 41	Qualifications and experience of proposed key personnel (Project Manager, NLP/ML Lead, Linguists, Integration Lead); language-specific expertise	Please specify the minimum number of linguists, language-specific experts and other key resources expected, along with any mandatory qualification/experience requirements and whether resources are required onsite at SSC.		SSC's objective is to evaluate the AI model. As per requirement of the solution, SMEs to be engaged by the bidder.
51	Part II - Instructions for Bidders, Section 4.40 Consortium	Page 35	Consortium in any form is not allowed in this bid process, and the Service Provider shall not subcontract services.	Please clarify whether engagement of individual linguists/SMEs as bidder personnel/contractual resources is permitted, provided complete contractual responsibility remains with the		Engagement of individual linguists/SMEs as bidder resources is permissible where they are engaged and managed by the bidder and the bidder retains full contractual responsibility.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
				bidder, or whether all proposed resources must be direct employees of the bidder.		This shall not be construed as permitting consortium arrangements or subcontracting of the contracted services contrary to Section 4.40.
52	Part VIII - Deliverables Timelines and Payment Schedule, Section 10.1, Phase 3	Page 54	Delivery of AI Package Version 1 (i.e. Optimized/Fine Tuned Translation and Evaluation Model) for all 13+ languages; Confidence scoring calibration report	Please confirm whether T0+6 weeks is the mandatory timeline for production-ready optimized models for all 13+ languages. Will timeline dependency be adjusted where SSC-provided corpus, infrastructure, language SMEs or approvals are not available from T0?		T0+6 weeks is the stated milestone for delivery of the optimized Translation and Evaluation Model Package for all scoped languages. The bidder's schedule shall be based on SSC providing the agreed datasets, infrastructure and necessary approvals in accordance with the project plan; dependencies affecting the milestone will be managed through the agreed project governance.
53	Part VIII - Deliverables Timelines and Payment Schedule, Section 10.1, Phase 5	Page 54	Final Acceptance with SSC Golden and Pilot Dataset. Mutually agreed Quality benchmarking report (BLEU, COMET, chr F++, human evaluation); Defect resolution report	Please define the quantitative Final Acceptance criteria for each language and clarify whether the UAT Golden/Pilot Dataset will be different from the dataset used during the PoC/model development and inaccessible to the bidder until UAT.		Final acceptance will be based on the agreed hybrid evaluation framework, including the SSC Golden/Pilot Dataset, quality benchmarking, human/SME evaluation, deterministic checks and other acceptance criteria specified in the RFP. Details will be discussed

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
						with the successful bidder.
54	Part VIII - Deliverables Timelines and Payment Schedule, Section 10.1, Phase 7	Page 54-55	Knowledge Transfer including source code, AI models, language assets, documentation and related artifacts.	Please clarify the ownership/IP treatment of bidder pre-existing IP, reusable frameworks, accelerators and generic components versus SSC-specific source code, fine-tuned models, language assets, prompts and artifacts developed under this engagement.		SSC shall own the project-specific deliverables and artifacts created/customized under the engagement as specified in the Ownership clause. Bidder pre-existing/background IP and upstream open-source components remain subject to their applicable ownership/license terms, provided no SSC project asset is retained or reused without SSC approval.
55	Part VIII - Deliverables Timelines and Payment Schedule, Section 10.3 Service Level Agreements	Page 56	Service Level Agreements (pages 56-57) have been masked and the same will be provided to the interested bidders on submission of the Non-Disclosure Agreement as per Annexure –B.	Since SLA requirements directly impact architecture, infrastructure sizing, resource planning, support model and commercials, please provide the complete SLA requirements before bid submission and clarify applicable service credits/penalties.		The complete SLA is part of the RFP and is subject to the applicable NDA/access process .
56	Part I – Scope of Work	Pg. 7–22	Resource mobilisation and execution of AI/ML development, language asset development, evaluation and integration activities are required.	Please clarify whether any resources are required to be deployed onsite at SSC. If yes, kindly specify the number, roles, minimum qualifications and duration of onsite	Onsite deployment will have a direct impact on manpower, travel and accommodation costs.	SME's engaged by Bidder will not be deployed at SSC. Once AI model is deployed there will no human interaction by the bidder

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
				deployment.		with the model till SSC decides for additional training cycle. However any technical manpower that bidder would deploy should be deployed onsite at SSC HQ in New Delhi as infrastructure will be made accessible from SSC HQ.
57	Scalability & Performance	Pg. 40–41 / 44	The solution is expected to support bulk translation of approximately 1,20,000 questions across 13+ languages, including parallel processing.	Please provide the expected average and peak translation volume per day/month, expected concurrent translation requests and required questions-per-hour throughput for production operations.	Required throughput and concurrency will determine GPU capacity, model serving architecture and infrastructure sizing.	[Refer S.no 8]
58	Language Asset Development	Pg. 9–11	Bidder is required to develop/manage language assets, translation memory, glossaries and bilingual datasets with linguists/SMEs.	Please clarify whether SSC will provide the required approved bilingual corpus, translation memory, glossaries and linguistic/SME resources, or whether the bidder is expected to arrange these resources. Kindly provide the approximate dataset/corpus size.	If linguists, SMEs, corpus creation and data preparation are bidder responsibilities, substantial additional manpower and effort will be required.	The bidder is responsible for developing and managing the required language assets and for on-boarding the necessary translators/linguistic experts/SMEs. SSC will provide the approved historical dataset and other data/assets expressly identified in the RFP, subject to security requirements.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
59	Model Optimization / Fine-Tuning	Pg. 46–47	The financial proposal includes a per-cycle cost for additional fine-tuning/optimization; six cycles are assumed over three years.	Please confirm the expected number of mandatory fine-tuning/optimization cycles during the contract period and clarify whether additional cycles beyond the assumed six will be ordered on a need basis and paid separately.	Number of training cycles directly affects GPU-hours, ML engineering effort, validation and deployment effort.	Six fine-tuning/optimization cycles are assumed for financial evaluation over the three-year period. SSC may increase or decrease the number of cycles at its discretion; additional/required cycles shall be ordered and paid as provided in the financial proposal and contract.
60	Security & Compliance	Pg. 50–51 / 54	Third-party security audit, vulnerability assessment, penetration testing and remediation are required.	Please clarify whether the cost of third-party security audit, VAPT, compliance assessment and re-testing/remediation is to be borne by SSC or the bidder. Also specify the expected frequency/number of such audits during the contract period.	Security audit and repeated VAPT/re-testing can create significant external and manpower costs.	The bidder shall comply with the security audit, VAPT and remediation requirements specified in Section 9.3
61	Training, Support & Knowledge Transfer	Pg. 20 / 17–20	Bidder is responsible for training, knowledge transfer, documentation and support for the delivered AI solution.	Please clarify the expected number of training/knowledge-transfer sessions, number of SSC users/personnel to be trained, and whether training is required onsite at SSC or can be conducted remotely.	Number of users, sessions and onsite training requirements will directly impact resource and travel costs.	The bidder shall provide training and knowledge transfer required for deployment, operation, maintenance and future enhancement of the delivered solution. The bidder shall propose an adequate training/knowledge-transfer plan.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
62	Part I – Background, Objectives and Scope, §3.1 Background / §3.4 Scope of Work (masked) / Part IV §6.1 Technical Scoring – Architecture Design & Integration Approach (2.1, 2.2)	5, 7, 25	Background describes CAT only generically. Detailed Scope of Work §3.4 (p.7) is masked pending NDA. Evaluation criteria (p.25) score “API design for CAT tool integration” and “API documentation” but none is provided here.	What is the current technology stack, hosting environment, and API/plugin architecture of the existing Content Authoring Tool (CAT)? Is API/SDK documentation available for integration planning?	Not answered in visible RFP. Likely in masked Scope of Work – submit NDA (Appendix B) immediately.	[Refer S.no 1] SSC will provide the dedicated/approved infrastructure required for deployment. Specific GPU, CPU, RAM, storage, network and platform specifications will be finalized based on the bidder's validated infrastructure requirement and SSC's available infrastructure.
63	Part I – Objectives, §3.3(g) Prompt Library	6	“Develop and maintain a version-controlled prompt library for translation, evaluation and review.” No statement on whether an LLM is used for translation itself or only for evaluation/review.	Does the RFP expect a pure NMT (neural machine translation) pipeline, or a hybrid architecture including LLM-based components, given the brief mentions a “prompt library” implying LLM usage alongside translation models?	Not answered. Architecture-defining – high priority.	RFP is model neutral. NMT or LLM does not matter. All deployed models will be tested as per the RFP criteria.
64	Part IV §6.1 Technical Scoring – Special Content (1.3) / Part V §7.2 PoC Test Dataset & §7.3 PoC Evaluation Criteria (2.1–2.4)	25, 28, 29	PoC criteria test mathematical/scientific notation, tables/structured content, image text overlays, and RTL/multi-script languages – but the full content-type list (MCQ, numeric, comprehension, instructions) and source authoring format are not	What content types must be translated, and is there a defined source format (e.g., LaTeX, HTML, proprietary CAT schema) bidders should design for?	Partially answered via PoC criteria; source format and full content-type list still open.	The historical translated corpus identified in the RFP is intended to support model assessment, language-asset development, benchmarking and optimization, subject to security restrictions and the approved use of the data. However data is in PDF and each question is in image

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			confirmed.			format and not a text format. Please refer Previous Year Question paper available in public source.
65	Part IV §6.1 Technical Scoring – Throughput, Scalability, Latency (5.1–5.3) / Part VIII §10.3 Service Level Agreements (masked)	26–27, 56–57	Evaluation criteria ask bidders to demonstrate throughput/scalability/latency capability, but the numeric SLA target (§10.3) is masked, released only after NDA.	What throughput/latency SLA is expected (e.g., turnaround time per exam, per language, peak-load volume during exam cycles)?	Not answered – NDA-gated. Needed before infra costing.	The complete SLA is part of the RFP and is subject to the applicable NDA/access process .
66	Part IV §6.1 – Integration Approach (2.2) / Part V §7.3 – Batch & Concurrent Processing (3.1, 3.2)	25, 29	RFP language (“bulk/batch and parallel processing,” “questions/hour”) implies batch-oriented processing but never explicitly rules out real-time/interactive use.	Is real-time/interactive translation required within CAT, or is batch/offline processing sufficient?	Implied batch-only but not explicitly confirmed – ask to rule out real-time requirement.	The solution must support bulk/batch processing and parallel processing. The principal requirement is secure production translation through the CAT workflow with the stated batch/parallel capabilities.
67	Part I – §3.2(b) Current Translation and AI Platform / §3.3(f) Objectives / Part V §7.3 – Human Evaluation (1.4)	5, 6, 29	SSC has an existing SME/linguistic panel used for evaluation review (§7.3, §3.2b). Whether the same panel supports language-asset building (TM/glossary creation) is not stated.	Will SSC provide SMEs for building translation memory, glossaries, and benchmark datasets during the asset-development phase, or is SME sourcing for that phase the bidder's responsibility?	Evaluation-stage SME source confirmed; asset-building-stage SME source still open.	No. The bidder is responsible for onboarding/managing translators, linguistic experts and SMEs for language-asset development. SSC reviewers may participate in validation/approval as required under

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
						the human-review workflow.
68	Part I – §3.1 Background	5	~40,000 of SSC's 1,20,000 exam questions are already manually translated into the 13+ regional languages.	Can the existing ~40,000 translated question set be provided as seed translation memory / fine-tuning data, and in what format/timeline?	Existence of the corpus is confirmed in RFP; usability/access terms as training data are not – narrowed to that.	Yes. The historical translated corpus identified in the RFP is intended to support model assessment, language-asset development, benchmarking and optimization, subject to security restrictions and the approved use of the data. However data is in PDF and each question is in image format and not a text format.
69	Part I – §3.1 Background	5	Same ~40,000-question corpus; per-language volume breakdown not given.	What volume of parallel corpus (source-target sentence pairs) can SSC supply per language for fine-tuning?	Not answered – follow-on to Query 7.	[Refer S.no 8]
70	Part V §7.2 PoC Test Dataset / Part VIII §10.1 Deliverables – Phase 5 UAT	28, 40	References an “SSC Golden and Pilot Dataset” for PoC and UAT/Final Acceptance – implies SSC owns the benchmark dataset, but validation process/access timeline not stated.	What is the process and timeline for bidder access to the SSC Golden Dataset, and does the bidder have any input into its composition/validation?	Ownership implied (SSC); access process still open – narrowed accordingly.	The Golden Dataset is controlled by SSC and is intended for evaluation/acceptance and no input from the Bidders.
71	Part I – §3.3(f) Confidence Calibration Methodology / Part IV §6.1 – Confidence Score (5.1)	6, 30	RFP requires the bidder to define and validate its own confidence scoring/calibration methodology and thresholds – no SSC-set number given.	Does SSC have an internal ceiling or expectation (e.g., maximum % of content requiring human review) that the bidder-proposed confidence methodology must meet?	Genuinely open – RFP leaves this to bidder design, so ask if SSC has a target the design must satisfy.	The RFP requires confidence calibration against human linguistic/SME review and recommends Green/Amber/Red thresholds.
72	Part I – §3.3(h)	6	“Develop a centralized	Who are the intended users of	Not answered – genuine	Internal SSC reviewers.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	Model Review Management Platform		platform to manage language assets, review workflows, version history, confidence calibration and complete audit trails.” No user roles specified.	the “model review management platform” – internal SSC reviewers, external SME panel, or both? What review workflow/roles are expected?	gap, high priority for platform/UI design.	
73	Part III §5.3 Pre-Qualification Criteria (9 criteria) / Part VII §9.5(f)(g)	23–24, 36	Pre-Qualification list (9 criteria) does not mention STQC or CERT-In empanelment. ISO 27001/CERT-In appear only as ongoing contractual compliance obligations (§9.5), not bid eligibility gates.	Are there any security clearance/empanelment requirements bidders must hold (e.g., CERT-In empanelment, STQC certification) to be eligible, beyond what is listed in the Pre-Qualification Criteria?	Not stated as an eligibility gate – confirm in writing since commonly assumed for govt. security projects.	No additional security certification/empanelment is prescribed as a separate pre-qualification criterion beyond the requirements stated in Part III.
74	Part I – §1 Letter of Invitation / §3.3 Objectives vs. Part IX GCC §11.5.7.1–11.5.7.2 (Property & IPR Rights)	3, 5–6, 58–59	RFP repeatedly frames the deliverable as “open source” (p.3, p.5–6). Standard GCC clause §11.5.7.2 states all deliverables become the exclusive property of SSC, and the bidder may retain a copy but not use it commercially – this directly conflicts with a genuine open-source release, which requires redistribution rights.	CONTRADICTION – please confirm: given GCC §11.5.7.2 grants SSC exclusive ownership of all deliverables with no bidder commercial reuse, does “open source” refer only to the underlying base AI models/components used (standard upstream OSS licenses), while the final integrated package, fine-tuned weights, and platform remain SSC's exclusive property?	Direct contradiction between RFP framing and GCC IPR clause – material to licensing strategy and pricing. Priority confirmation.	The term open-source refers to the approved open-source AI/ML models/components used in the solution. Project-specific optimized models, artifacts, language assets and deliverables created/customized under the engagement shall remain SSC property as specified in the Ownership/GCC provisions, while upstream components remain subject to their applicable licenses.
75	Part VII §9.2(a) AI/ML Model Security / Part	35, 58–59	§9.2(a) requires any SSC-fine-tuned model to be a private, dedicated instance	CONTRADICTION/CONFIRMATION – please confirm SSC's exclusive ownership	Same root issue as Query 13 – confirm explicitly to avoid	Yes. SSC ownership covers the SSC-specific fine-tuned models/artifacts, adapters,

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	IX GCC §11.5.7.1–11.5.7.2		exclusively for SSC's use. GCC §11.5.7.2 gives SSC ownership of all deliverables/software submitted under the contract.	extends to the fine-tuned model weights, translation memory, and glossaries built during this engagement, and clarify what portion (if any) of the base open-source model/tooling the bidder may reuse on other engagements.	ambiguity in contract negotiation.	prompts, translation repositories, datasets, glossaries and other project-created deliverables identified in the Ownership clause. Upstream base models and bidder background IP remain subject to their respective licence/ownership terms.
76	3.1 Background; 3.4.2-C Language Asset Development	5, 11	Section 3.1 states ~40,000 questions have been historically translated, while Section 3.4.2 (Note 1) states the historical dataset is ~30,000 questions.	Please confirm the exact volume of historical translated data available, along with a language-wise and subject-wise breakdown across the 13 target languages.	Accurate volume and distribution materially affects fine-tuning feasibility and timeline planning, especially for low-resource languages.	[Refer S.no 8]
77	3.4.1-F AI Model Development Hub; 3.4.2-B Model Assessment; 10.1 Deliverables & Timelines	8, 9-10, 55	The RFP requires bidders to submit GPU/hardware requirements with the proposal, while Model Assessment (which determines the actual model and sizing) is scheduled post-award at T0+2 weeks.	Please clarify whether a provisional/indicative hardware sizing at bid stage, with a formal revision window after Model Assessment is completed, would be acceptable.	Without this, bidders may be forced to over- or under-size infrastructure before model selection is finalised.	Yes. Indicative hardware sizing may be submitted at bid stage. The final sizing shall be assessed and validated during Model Assessment/Solution Finalisation, after which the infrastructure requirement may be reasonably refined subject to SSC approval.
78	10.1 Deliverables and Timelines (Row 3 - Model Fine-Tuning and Configuration)	55	The RFP requires delivery of the optimised/fine-tuned Translation and Evaluation Model Package for all 13+ languages by T0+6 weeks.	Please confirm whether this 6-week timeline is fixed, or whether a phased/staggered delivery plan (e.g., prioritised languages first) based on a detailed bidder work plan would be considered.	Given linguist/SME onboarding and data curation requirements, a phased approach may better serve quality outcomes for low-resource languages.	T0+6 weeks is the stated delivery milestone for Version 1 for all scoped languages. Any phased delivery, if considered necessary, shall require prior approval of SSC and

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
						shall not dilute the requirement to meet the contractual milestones.
79	7.2 PoC Test Dataset; 7.3 PoC Evaluation Criteria	43	The PoC test dataset is described as examination questions “in English and Hindi,” while PoC evaluation criteria score performance per language pair, including all 13 regional languages.	Please confirm whether SSC will provide reference/golden translations in all 13 target regional languages for PoC scoring, or whether bidders are expected to generate these themselves.	This affects PoC preparation effort and the fairness/consistency of scoring across bidders.	Bidders are not required to create the SSC Golden reference dataset themselves. SSC will not share this Golden Set with any bidder to be fair in evaluation.
80	3.4.1-I Additional Deliverables	8	The RFP states “All manpower will be deployed on-site at SSC HQ located at New Delhi to deliver the project.”	Please clarify whether this on-site requirement applies to the entire team for the full contract duration, or only to specific roles/phases, with remote work permitted otherwise.	Clarifying the scope of on-site presence will help bidders plan resourcing and cost the proposal accurately.	The RFP states that all manpower will be deployed on-site at SSC HQ, New Delhi. Accordingly, the bidder shall plan deployment of the resources required to deliver the project in accordance with this requirement.
81	3.4.1-A (footnote); 3.4.1-D Script and Linguistic Requirements; 6.1 Criterion 1.2	7, 8, 40	Section 3.4.1-A footnote states “Manipuri is required in Bengali script,” while Section 3.4.1-D refers to “Manipuri (dual script: Meitei Mayek and Bengali script),” and Technical Evaluation Criterion 1.2 also references Meitei Mayek.	Please confirm the definitive script requirement(s) for Manipuri translation output — Bengali script only, or both Meitei Mayek and Bengali.	This affects model/font/rendering support requirements and PoC/evaluation preparation.	For the mandatory scope, Manipuri is expressly required in Bengali script in the footnote to Section 3.4.1(A). For the purpose of POC, only Bengali script will be evaluated.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
82	3.4.2-C Language Asset Development; 6.1 Criterion 6(b) Team Composition	10, 42	The scope requires the bidder to “onboard and manage qualified professional translators, linguistic experts and subject matter experts for each identified subject and target language.”	Please confirm whether SSC mandates a minimum of one dedicated SME per language (i.e., 13 SMEs), or whether SMEs may be shared/cover multiple languages or subjects where linguistically appropriate.	This affects team composition, cost estimation, and the staffing plan in the technical proposal.	No fixed requirement of one SME per language is prescribed. The bidder shall provide sufficient qualified linguistic/SME resources to cover each scoped language and subject and may deploy shared resources where they are suitably qualified and this does not affect quality or delivery.
83	3.5 Project Assumptions and Constraints (Point 1); 3.4.1-E Integration Approach with CAT	20, 8	Section 3.5 states SSC shall not provide bidder access to the CAT, unused production questions or any production data, while the scope requires bidders to design integration specifications and simulate CAT integration for the PoC.	Will SSC provide a CAT sandbox environment, API contract/specification, or simulator that bidders can use to design, build and test the integration and PoC simulation without direct production access?	Without a sandbox or documented API contract, bidders cannot validate integration feasibility before contract award.	SSC will provide the dedicated/approved infrastructure required for deployment. Specific GPU, CPU, RAM, storage, network and platform specifications will be finalized based on the bidder's validated infrastructure requirement and SSC's available infrastructure.
84	3.4.1-A Translation Engine / Service	7	The scope states “AI/ML-based translation from English to 13 Indic languages... including Hindi and vice versa.”	Please confirm the exact required language-pair matrix: English-to-regional, Hindi-to-regional, regional-to-English/Hindi, or full bidirectional translation across all pairs (including regional-to-regional, if any).	This materially affects model architecture, training data requirements, and benchmarking scope.	Yes. The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section 3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
85	3.4.2-C Language Asset Development, Note 1	11	Note 1 states SSC has a historical bank of approximately 30,000 translated questions to be shared with the bidder.	Can SSC share the language-wise and subject-wise distribution of this historical dataset prior to bid submission, or confirm the stage at which it will be shared?	This is critical for bidders to assess data sufficiency and plan augmentation strategy for low-resource languages.	[Refer 8]
86	3.4.2-C Language Asset Development, Item (h)	10-11	The scope requires that “the translation repository must include a mutually agreed minimum support by data for each type of required data set,” without specifying the minimum.	What is the minimum dataset volume (number of question-translation pairs) expected per language, per subject, and per question type (MCQ, comprehension, tables, formulas, etc.) for reliable fine-tuning and benchmarking?	A defined minimum will help bidders plan data augmentation and SME effort realistically.	The evaluation is by outcome and not the number of datasets used.
87	10.3 Service Level Agreements (Row 2 - Translation Accuracy)	57	The SLA requires Translation Accuracy >98% (exam-grade, near-zero rejection) uniformly, without differentiating by language.	Will the same >98% accuracy SLA and final acceptance thresholds apply uniformly to low-resource languages (e.g., Manipuri, Konkani) as to high-resource languages, or will differentiated thresholds be considered given data availability constraints?	Low-resource languages typically have less training data available and may need differentiated targets, at least during initial cycles.	The reference to 95% in the Technical Evaluation is an evaluation criterion concerning the bidder's proposed quality approach. Contractual translation accuracy is governed by the agreed acceptance framework and the SLA in Section 10.3.
88	10.1 Deliverables and Timelines (Row 5 - UAT); 3.4.2-I Confidence Calibration Methodology	55, 15	Final Acceptance under UAT is based on “Golden and Pilot Dataset” and a “mutually agreed Quality benchmarking report,” while confidence calibration separately defines Green/Amber/Red thresholds.	What is the exact formula/methodology for final hybrid acceptance — i.e., how are AI evaluation metrics (BLEU/COMET/chrF++), confidence scores, human/SME review outcomes, deterministic structural checks,	A defined, agreed formula upfront avoids disputes at the UAT/acceptance stage.	Final acceptance will follow the hybrid evaluation framework specified in the RFP. The detailed acceptance methodology and thresholds

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
				and pilot results combined into a single pass/fail acceptance decision?		for individual metrics will be mutually agreed during the project, as expressly provided for the Evaluation Package, and will include AI metrics, deterministic validation, human/SME review, confidence calibration and Golden/Pilot Dataset results.
89	3.4.2-C Language Asset Development, Items (l)-(m); 3.4.1-G Training, Knowledge Transfer, and Support	11, 8	The scope requires human review workflows covering Linguistic Experts, SMEs, and “wherever requested” SSC reviewers, with the bidder responsible for onboarding/managing these resources.	Will SSC provide/depute its own final human reviewers/SMEs for approval sign-off, or is the bidder solely responsible for sourcing all reviewers? If SSC reviewers are involved, what turnaround time will SSC commit to for review and approval cycles?	Reviewer turnaround time directly impacts the bidder's ability to meet the aggressive project timeline.	The bidder shall provide the required linguistic/SME resources for language-asset development. SSC reviewers may participate in Authority Review/approval as required. Review timelines and workflow shall be agreed during implementation to support the project schedule.
90	4.40 Consortium	36	“Consortium in any form is not allowed in this bid process, and the Service Provider shall not subcontract services.”	Given the scope requires specialised linguistic experts and SMEs across 13+ languages and 7 subject areas, please confirm whether engaging individual language experts/SMEs directly (as employees, retainers, or professional service contracts, not as a subcontracted firm) is	Very few single organisations will have in-house full-time experts across all 13 languages and 7 subjects; clarity here is essential for proposal planning.	Yes, individual linguists/SMEs may be engaged directly by the bidder as bidder-managed resources, subject to full responsibility remaining with the bidder and compliance with the non-subcontracting/consortium provisions. This does not

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
				permitted under this clause.		permit consortium or subcontracting of the contracted service.
91	3.4.1-I Additional Deliverables	8	“All manpower will be deployed on-site at SSC HQ located at New Delhi to deliver the project.”	Does “all manpower” include linguists, translators, ML engineers, DevOps/infra staff, and support resources, or only certain core roles?	A role-level clarification will help bidders build an accurate staffing and cost plan.	SME’s engaged by Bidder will not be deployed at SSC. Once AI model is deployed there will no human interaction by the bidder with the model till SSC decides for additional training cycle. However any technical manpower that bidder would deploy should be deployed onsite at SSC HQ in New Delhi as infrastructure will be made accessible from SSC HQ.
92	3.4.2-J Infrastructure Scope	15-16	“The SSC shall provide only the approved compute infrastructure (GPU, CPU, memory, storage and network resources) as requested by bidder and validated by SSC/SSC authorised agency.”	What specific infrastructure (GPU model/count, CPU, memory, storage, network bandwidth) will SSC commit to provisioning, and what is the process/timeline if the provided GPU capacity proves insufficient during optimisation or scale-up?	Compute availability is a critical-path dependency for meeting the T0+6 week model delivery milestone.	SSC shall provide approved compute infrastructure as requested by the bidder and validated by SSC/its authorized agency. Specific capacity will be finalized during solution assessment; any additional capacity shall be subject to validation, approval and availability.
93	9.1 Data Sovereignty; 9.2 AI/ML	50	The RFP mandates no public AI services or cloud-hosted LLM APIs, and all data must	Will the deployment environment be fully air-gapped (no internet access)? If	An air-gapped environment significantly affects	The RFP requires the solution to operate in the SSC-approved secure

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	Model Security		remain within SSC's controlled environment.	so, what is the approved process for importing open-source model weights, libraries, and dependencies into the environment?	setup time and the bidder's technical approach to dependency management.	environment and prohibits public AI services/cloud-hosted LLM APIs for SSC data. Where the environment is network-isolated, approved procedures for importing model weights/software/dependencies will be defined by SSC's security/IT process.
94	3.4.2-J Infrastructure Scope	15-16	The bidder is responsible for configuring and maintaining “the complete AI software stack, including operating system, drivers, libraries, AI frameworks, inference engines.”	Who will manage the underlying GPU drivers, OS-level patching, container orchestration platform (Kubernetes/OpenShift, if any), container registry, and any privileged/root-level installations — the bidder, or SSC's infrastructure/IT team?	Privileged-access boundaries need to be clear given the on-premises, security-sensitive environment.	SSC will provide the dedicated/approved infrastructure required for deployment. Specific GPU, CPU, RAM, storage, network and platform specifications will be finalized based on the bidder's validated infrastructure requirement and SSC's available infrastructure.
95	8.1 Financial Proposal Format (Note on Model Re-Training); 10.6 Warranty and Support	47, 59	Section 8.1 defines a paid “fine-tuning cycle” as distinct from “routine operational support... covered under AMC,” while Section 10.6 describes warranty support as including corrective, preventive, adaptive, and	Are warranty obligations limited to defect/bug fixes only, or do they also include model retraining, prompt updates, and glossary updates made in response to reviewer feedback?	This boundary directly affects commercial risk and proposal pricing for the per-cycle cost component.	Warranty/support covers corrective, preventive, adaptive and perfective maintenance, including required patches, updates, performance tuning and troubleshooting.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			perfective maintenance.			
96	8.1 Financial Proposal Format (Note on Model Re-Training); 10.6 Warranty and Support	47, 59	See above — the RFP distinguishes a billable “fine-tuning cycle” from free warranty/AMC support, without a precise trigger definition.	What specifically triggers a billable fine-tuning cycle versus support that must be delivered free of cost under warranty?	A precise trigger definition avoids disputes over billing during the warranty and post-warranty period.	A billable fine-tuning cycle is an end-to-end model improvement activity involving additional bilingual corpora/terminology, re-training or fine-tuning, optimization, validation/testing and deployment of an updated model. Routine operational support, bug fixes, security patches and infrastructure maintenance are covered under AMC/warranty and are not separate cycles.
97	10.2 Payment Schedule (Milestone A)	55-56	60% of One-Time Cost is payable upon “Completion and successful [conduct] of two multilingual examinations after integration of model into CAT” (Milestone A).	If the first two multilingual examinations are delayed for reasons attributable to SSC (e.g., examination scheduling, data/reviewer availability), when will the associated 60% milestone payment be released to the bidder?	Tying a major payment milestone to an externally scheduled event outside the bidder's control creates cash-flow risk; an alternate trigger or interim payment mechanism may be worth considering.	No change.
98	O. Ownership	19-20	“All deliverables, intellectual property and project artifacts created, developed or customised under this engagement shall be the sole	Please confirm that this ownership clause applies to SSC-specific fine-tuned artifacts, adapters, prompts, datasets, and custom	Clear IP boundaries are essential, since base open-source models carry their own licensing terms	Yes. The Ownership clause applies to project-specific deliverables created/developed/customized under the engagement.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			and exclusive property of the SSC,” including optimised/fine-tuned models, adapters, prompts, and datasets.	application code developed under this engagement, and not to the bidder's pre-existing frameworks, tools, base open-source models, or general-purpose IP used to deliver the engagement.	independent of this contract.	Bidder background IP, pre-existing frameworks/tools and upstream open-source models remain subject to their existing ownership/licensing terms, while SSC-specific artifacts must be handed over and not reused without approval.
99	3.4.1(A) Translation Engine/Service; 7.3 PoC Evaluation Criterion 1.1	7,42–43	Section 3.4.1(A)(a) requires translation “from English to 13 Indic languages ... including Hindi and vice versa.” Since SSC content is authored in both English and Hindi (Section 3.1), and the PoC BLEU methodology explicitly computes $\text{Max}(\text{Score}(\text{English}, \text{Manipuri}), \text{Score}(\text{Hindi}, \text{Manipuri}))$, both English-sourced and Hindi-sourced translation appear to be required.	Please confirm the complete language-pair matrix in scope i.e., whether translation is required only English ↔ 13 regional languages, or both English ↔ 13 languages and Hindi ↔ 13 languages, and whether English ↔ Hindi translation is also within scope.	A clear language-pair matrix (all source/target combinations) would help bidders correctly size model development, benchmarking and PoC effort.	Yes. The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section 3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
100	10.2 Payment Schedule; Sl. No. 1 (Milestone A)	55	Section 10.2, Sl. No. 1 states Milestone A (60% of the One-Time Cost) is	We request that the payment schedule be linked to project milestones, considering the	Tying the full 60% Milestone A payment solely to CAT integration	No change.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			payable on 'Completion and successful conduct of two multilingual examinations after integration of model into CAT.' The entire 60% is thus tied to a single	cash-flow constraints typically faced by MSMEs. It would be helpful if 30% of the One-Time Cost could be released upon successful handover of the	n and live examination conduct — events outside the bidder's direct control and timeline — creates significant cash-flow strain, particularly for	
101	7.2PoCTest Dataset	42	Section 7.2(a) states SSC shall provide “a set of [500-1000] examination questions dataset,” with the range appearing to be an unconfirmed placeholder.	Please confirm the final, fixed size of the PoC test dataset, its exact subject and language coverage, and the date it will be shared with shortlisted bidders relative to the PoC date (to be “informed separately” per the RFP Data Sheet).	Recommend at least 2–3 weeks between dataset sharing and PoC demonstration to allow adequate preparation and validation.	[Refer S.no 8]
102	4.39Duration of Contract; 8.1 Financial Proposal Format(Table 2)	35,46–47	Table 2 (Total Cost of Contract)showsthe“Fixed cost for per additional cycle” (Component B) repeated identically under Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3, while the narrative states “6cyclesoffline-tuningare assumedoveraperiodof3 years.”	Please clarify how the 6 assumed fine-tuning cycles are to be distributed across Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3 (e.g., 2 cycles per year) for computing $[P2] = B$ in Table 2, since this directly affects the Total Cost of Contractusedforfinancial evaluation.	A clear per-year cycle count in the Financial Proposal format would remove ambiguity and ensure uniform financial bids across bidders.	For financial evaluation, six fine-tuning cycles are assumed over three years, and Table 2 uses the quoted per-cycle amount for the assumed cycles. The distribution is for financial evaluation and the Commission may increase/decrease the number of cycles as provided in the RFP. [Refer]

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
103	3.4.1(A)items 4–5;3.1 Background; 5.1 Throughput and Concurrency (Technical Evaluation); 7.2PoCTest Dataset	5,7,40, 42,44	The RFP requires bulk/batch and parallel processing capability and references a target corpus of approximately 1,20,000 examination questions across 13+ languages (Sections 3.1, 3.4.1(A), 5.1), but does not specify (i) the required concurrency level, (ii) the required throughput (questions/hour) or completion/turnaround window, or (iii) whether this volume is a one-time backfill or a recurring per-examination-cycle load.	Please specify: (a) the peak number of simultaneous translation requests/questions the deployed solution must be sized to sustain (concurrency level); (b) the required throughput (questions/hour) and turnaround window within which an examination's content must be translated; and (c) whether the approximately 1,20,000-question corpus is a one-time backfill or a recurring per-examination-cycle load. These factors are the primary drivers of the number of model instances required and directly affect infrastructure sizing and pricing of Component A.	Concurrency, throughput and load-recurrence are the key determinants of the number of model instances required for Component A. Specifying these (rather than total corpus size alone) would allow bidders to size infrastructure and price consistently.	[Refer S.no 8] The solution must support bulk/batch processing and parallel processing. The principal requirement is secure production translation through the CAT workflow with the stated batch/parallel capabilities.
104	3.4.2(A) item 5(Translation Engine); 3.4.2(C)items	7,9	Section 3.4.2(C)(5) references handling of OCR input from images/PDFs “where required,” and	Please confirm (i) whether a separate OCR/text-extraction capability is within the bidder’s scope, or whether	An OCR capability requires a separate set of model instances and infrastructure,	OCR/text extraction for images/PDFs is included where required under the scope. The bidder shall provide the necessary

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	2 and 5 (Special Content Handling)		image handling is scoped as retaining images as-is with only text overlays translated. It is not specified whether OCR/text-extraction is a capability the bidder must build, or whether SSC's CAT tool supplies already-extracted text.	CAT supplies pre-extracted text for translation; and if OCR is in scope, (ii) the expected proportion/volume of image- or PDF-based questions requiring OCR.	which must be sized and priced independently of the core translation engine.	capability where applicable; SSC will provide the approved test content for the PoC. All these datasets are primarily in PDF format .Further bidder needs to understand that the pdf contains Questions in "Image" format and not in text format.
105	3.4.2(B) Terminology and Glossary Management; 3.4.2(C) Language Asset Development; 8.1Table1	9–10	Sections 3.4.2(B)/(C) require management of domain-specific terminology, glossaries and translation memories, referencing sources such as State Government glossaries, Bhashini corpus, and NCERT terminology.	Please clarify whether SSC or its agencies will provide seed glossaries, approved terminology and bilingual corpora at contract commencement (and facilitate usage rights for referenced third-party corpora such as Bhashini), or whether the bidder is expected to source, licence and build these assets.	Whether reference corpora and glossaries are SSC-provided or bidder-built materially affects both solution effort and pricing of Component A.	The bidder shall arrange / access the referenced Central Institute of Indian Languages/NTS Mysore glossaries, Bhashini corpus and NCERT terminology data to the extent required and legally permitted as may be necessary.
106	7.3PoC Evaluation Criteria – Criterion1.4 (Human Evaluation)	43	Criterion 1.4 (Human Evaluation) under the PoC Evaluation Criteria is allocated a maximum of 15 marks. However, the scoring bands specified for	Please clarify whether the correct maximum marks for Human Evaluation(1.4) is 15 or 10, and confirm the corresponding total for Criterion 1 (Translation	Recommend aligning the criterion's stated maximum marks with the scoring band table (or revising the band to sum to 15), so bidders	There is an inconsistency in the published PoC matrix: Criterion 1.4 is described as 15 marks, while the listed scoring bands total 10 marks. SSC will issue an appropriate clarification/corrigendum

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			this criterion ($\geq 4.5 = 10$ marks; $4.0-4.4 = 7$ marks; $3.5-3.9=4$ marks; $<3.5=0$ marks) sum to a maximum achievable score of only 10 marks, not 15.	Accuracy), since this discrepancy also affects whether the stated sub-total (42 marks) and the associated minimum qualifying threshold for Criterion 1 are accurate.	can compute the exact minimum performance required to clear the Translation Accuracy sub-gate.	before evaluation. Until then, bidders should not assume a revised total without the formal clarification. [Refer Corrigendum]
107	3.1 Background; 3.4.2(C) Language Asset Development, Note 1; 3.5 Project Assumptions and Constraints (points 1, 2, 17); 10.1 Deliverables and Timelines (Phase 5 – UAT)	5,11, 20–21, 54	Multiple sections reference overlapping but inconsistently described datasets: (i) Page 5 states “approximately 40,000” of the 1,20,000 questions are translated into 13+ regional languages, while Note 1 (page 11) puts the historical translated dataset in the vault at “~30,000 questions” — a direct quantity discrepancy; (ii) Section 3.5 states SSC “shall not provide bidder access to ... unused production questions or any production examination content at any stage,” yet Note 1 states this same historical dataset “will	Please clarify: (a) the correct, reconciled count of historical human-translated question pairs to be shared, with a language-wise, subject-wise and difficulty-level-wise breakup; (b) whether this historical dataset constitutes “production examination content” under Section 3.5, and if not, the exact data category and basis for the distinction; and (c) whether the “Golden Dataset” referenced in Section 3.5(17) and Phase 5 (UAT) is the same as, overlaps with, or is a subset of this historical dataset—and if distinct, its volume, language/subject coverage, and availability	Consolidating these into a single clarification avoids bidders receiving inconsistent answers on what is effectively one dataset thread. A consolidated data inventory and classification note (trainable vs. evaluation-only vs. Golden Dataset) would let bidders design compliant data pipelines and plan optimization effort accurately from the outset.	The exact language-wise/subject-wise dataset details shall be shared with the successful bidder to the extent available and permitted under the security requirements. The figures should therefore be treated as approximate until the dataset is formally provided (Approximately 30,000 +) Each of these 30,000 questions are translated into 14 Indian Languages. All these datasets are primarily in PDF format. Further bidder needs to understand that the pdf contains Questions in “Image” format and not in text format.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			be shared with the bidder under the RFP security guidelines” — creating a potential conflict over whether this counts as restricted “production examinationcontent”;and (iii)Section3.5(17)andthe Phase5(UAT)deliverables separately reference an “SSCGoldenDataset”used for performance measurement and final acceptance, without clarifying whether it is the same as, a subset of, or distinct from the historical dataset in Note 1.	timeline relative to PoC, Model Fine-Tuning and UAT.		
108	3.4.2(F)AI Model Development Hub; 3.6(c) Out of Scope; 10.1 Deliverables andTimelines	8,22,54	Section3.4.2(F)(b)requires the bidder to submit GPU/hardware requirements with the proposal, to be “made available by SSC.” Section 3.6(c) explicitly excludes “Hardware/GPU Procurement and Installation” from scope.	Please clarify: (a) the timeline for SSC to provision the recommended GPU/compute infrastructure after contract signing, relative to the T0+6-week start of Model Fine-Tuning; (b) whether any indicative baseline hardware	Clarifying PoC infrastructure is critical, as bidders cannot demonstrate an on-premises, network-isolated solution without knowing whether SSC will provide	Yes for PoC GPU will be made accessible. [Refer S.no 40 & 42]

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			Phase 3 (Model Fine-Tuning) is scheduled to begin at T0+6 weeks.	configuration already exists at SSC; and (c) what infrastructure will be made available for the mandatory Proof of Concept (Part V), which precedes contract award.	sandboxed GPU access for the PoC stage.	
109	4.40 Consortium; GCC 11.5.5 Assignment and Sub-contracting; 3.4.2(C) Language Asset Development	35, 70, 10	Section 4.40 states “Consortium in any form is not allowed ... and the Service Providers shall not subcontract services.” However, GCC Clause 11.5.5 and other GCC clauses (e.g., 11.5.10, 11.8.2.4) contain detailed “Sub-consultant” provisions, and Section 3.4.2(C) requires onboarding of translators, linguistic experts and SMEs.	Please clarify whether engaging specialized linguists, translators and SMEs — commonly retained on a contractual/consultancy basis in the language-services industry — is permitted, or whether Section 4.40 requires all such personnel to be direct payroll employees of the bidder.	Recommend permitting engagement of linguists/SMEs/translators as sub-consultants (bidder retaining full contractual responsibility), consistent with the GCC's existing sub-consultant framework.	individual linguists/SMEs may be engaged directly by the bidder as bidder-managed resources, subject to full responsibility remaining with the bidder and compliance with the non-subcontracting/consortium provisions. This does not permit consortium or subcontracting of the contracted service.
110	Appendix A – Covering Letter; Fact Sheet	115, 4	The Fact Sheet/cover page states the RFP Reference No. as “HQ-QB012/21/2026-QB,” whereas the Covering	Please confirm the correct and complete RFP reference number to be quoted by bidders in the Covering Letter and all other bid	Recommend a corrigendum clarifying the reference number to avoid inconsistent	The Tender ID on CPPP is 2026_SSC_925144_1. Bidders shall quote the tender/RFP reference exactly as appearing in the final CPPP/RFP documents

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			Letter template in Appendix A refer to "RFP No. _____ dated [DD/MM/YYYY]."	documents/correspondence.	bid submissions.	and any corrigendum issued by SSC. Any inconsistency in the templates will be clarified through the official tender communication.
111	5.3 Pre-Qualification Criteria (Sl. No. 7 – Firm Experience)	38	Sl. No. 7 requires "at least 1 year of experience in providing AI/ML based projects," without specifying the required number, scale, or domain (NLP/translation-specific vs. general AI/ML) of qualifying project(s).	Please clarify (a) the minimum number of reference projects/work orders required, (b) whether the experience must be specific to NLP/machine translation or any AI/ML project qualifies, and (c) any minimum contract value threshold for the qualifying project(s).	Suggest aligning this criterion more closely with the "Similar Project Experience" criterion under Technical Evaluation (Section 6.1) to avoid ambiguity during bid scrutiny.	The RFP requires at least one year of AI/ML project experience. The bidder shall provide the supporting performance capability statement/work orders/contracts as specified.
112	3.4.1(I)(c) Additional Deliverables; 9.9 Non-Disclosure and Confidentiality	8, 51	Section 3.4.1(I)(c) mandates that "all manpower will be deployed on-site at SSC HQ located at New Delhi," and Section 9.9 classifies all SSC examination content as "Secret" and "Highly Confidential."	Please clarify (a) the expected minimum number of on-site personnel/workstations, (b) working days/hours and holiday calendar for on-site deployment, (c) the security clearance/background-verification process required for personnel accessing	Clear guidance on on-site logistics and security-clearance lead times is essential to plan resource mobilization within the Phase I (T0) timeline.	The RFP states that all manpower will be deployed on-site at SSC HQ, New Delhi. Accordingly, the bidder shall plan deployment of the resources required to deliver the project in accordance with this requirement.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
				“Secret”-classified content, and (d) whether SSC will provide workspace, network connectivity and end-user devices, or whether the bidder must bring its own equipment.		
113	5.3Pre-Qualification Criteria (Sl. No.8,9);Fact Sheet (Bid Security)	38,4	The Fact Sheet exempts DPIIT-recognizedStart-ups and MSMEs from Bid Security(EMD)“asperGOI policy,” but Sl. No. 8 (minimum turnover of INR 2 Crore in any of the last 5 FYs) and Sl. No. 9 (positive networth)applyuniformly with no stated relaxation for Start-ups/MSMEs.	Pleaseclarifywhetherany relaxation in the turnover/financial-capability criteria is available to DPIIT-recognized Start-ups and MSMEs, in line with the GoI Public Procurement PolicyforMicroandSmall Enterprises and Startup India norms, consistent with the EMD exemption already provided.	Recommend explicit alignment of financial eligibility criteria with GoI's MSE/Start-up procurementrelaxation policy for consistency within the RFP.	The RFP expressly states the EMD exemption for eligible DPIIT-recognized Start-ups/MSMEs as per applicable Government of India policy. However, the turnover and positive-net-worth criteria in Part III are separately specified and no relaxation is stated in the RFP; therefore, those criteria shall continue to apply unless formally amended by SSC.
114	9.11 Provisions Overriding GCC; 6.1 Technical ScoringMatrix (Team Composition);	52,41, 82–84	Section9.11states“asthis is not a manpower-based contract, the provisions relating to Key Personnel and Non-Key Personnel as stipulated in the GCC shall not be applicable.” However, Section 6.1	Pleaseclarifywhetherthe key roles proposed and evaluated under Section 6.1(b) will be treated as “Key Personnel” for contract-administration purposes (e.g., requiring SSC approval for substitution),	Recommendclarifyi ng whichGCCpersonnel-relatedclauses,ifany, survive Section 9.11's exclusion, to avoid disputes	Section 9.11 expressly states that, as this is not a manpower-based contract, GCC provisions relating to Key Personnel and Non-Key Personnel shall not apply. The roles shown in the Technical Evaluation are for assessment of the proposed team and shall not,

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	GCC 11.8.2		awards 15 marks for “Team Composition” (Project Manager, NLP/ML Lead, Linguists, Integration Lead), and GCC 11.8.2 contains detailed Key/Non-Key Personnel provisions (CV approval, substitution limits/penalties).	notwithstanding the exclusion in Section 9.11, or whether such personnel may be freely substituted post-award.	regarding substitution of key technical staff.	by themselves, override Section 9.11.
115	6.1 Technical Scoring Matrix (4.1); 7.3 PoC Evaluation Criteria; 10.3 Service Level Agreements (Parameter 2)	40,42–44,56	Three distinct quality/accuracy frameworks appear across the RFP: Section 6.1(4.1) references “achieving and exceeding 95% accuracy”; Section 7.3 PoC evaluation scores on BLEU/COMET/chrF++/Human Evaluation scales (e.g., full marks at BLEU $\geq$ 70, COMET $\geq$ 0.85); and SLA Parameter 2 sets “Translation Accuracy” at “>98%” with penalties below 99%/98%.	Please clarify how the “95% accuracy” Technical Evaluation reference, the BLEU/COMET/chrF++ PoC thresholds, and the “>98%”/“ $\geq$ 99%” SLA accuracy metric relate to one another—specifically whether SLA “accuracy” uses the same BLEU/COMET methodology as the PoC or a separate human-adjudicated metric, and how it will be measured in production once integrated into CAT (outside this RFP's scope).	Recommend a single, unified quality-metric framework with clearly mapped thresholds, applied consistently across Technical Evaluation, PoC and post-Go-Live SLA compliance.	software libraries/tools and Python package tool commonly used to calculate BLEU, COMET, chrF++. SSC will be provide git hub link to the shortlisted Bidders
116	4.4 Request	23–24	The Data Sheet schedules	Given the technical depth	An extension would	Not relevant

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	for Proposal Data Sheet (Sl.No.4,5, 6)		the Pre-Bid Conference for 14.09.2026, the Last Date for Submission of Written Queries for 17.09.2026, and Release of Responses/Clarifications for 23.09.2026 — leaving only 3 days between the Pre-Bid Conference and the query-submission deadline.	and scale of this RFP (spanning AI/ML translation across 13+ Indic languages, security/compliance and complex commercial structuring), we request SSCtoconsiderextending the last date for submission of written queries by at least 7 additional days, and correspondingly the release of responses and proposal submission deadline.	improve the quality and competitiveness of bids received, consistent with SSC's objective of selecting the most capable service provider.	
117	Part V - Proof of Concept (PoC) Evaluation Sec. 7.2 - PoC Test Dataset	42	The RFP provides for PoC evaluation across language pairs using a standardized examination dataset.	Considering the objective and duration of the PoC, may SSC kindly consider limiting the PoC evaluation to 2-3 target languages, to be selected and specified by SSC in advance, while the final production solution remains required to support all languages specified in the RFP?	A smaller SSC-selected language set would allow deeper and more comparable PoC evaluation while preserving the full production-language obligation.	Yes. The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section 3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
118	Part V - Proof of Concept (PoC) Evaluation Sec. 7.2 - PoC Test Dataset	42	Clause 7.2(b) states that reference translations in target languages and topics will be provided for benchmarking.	Kindly clarify whether the reference translations for the PoC will be shared with shortlisted bidders or retained by SSC solely for evaluation and scoring.	The mode of access to reference translations materially affects the PoC preparation and evaluation methodology.	The prescribed PoC methodology and under the confidentiality/security conditions specified by SSC.
119	Part I - Objectives Sec. 3.3(a) &	6, 54	The RFP requires model assessment and benchmarking, while post-	Please confirm whether the open-source base model demonstrated during the PoC	This would allow the final production model to be selected on the	As per RFP

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	(c); Part VIII - Deliverables		award Model Assessment and Solution Finalisation is scheduled at T0 + 2 weeks.	may subsequently be changed or replaced during the post-award Model Assessment and Solution Finalisation stage, based on benchmark results, provided the final selected model meets all RFP requirements.	basis of formal benchmarking and optimization results.	
120	Part IV - Technical Evaluation Sec. 6.1 (Quality Assurance) and SLA provisions	40, 56-57	The Technical Evaluation refers to an approach for achieving/exceeding 95% accuracy, whereas the SLA provisions prescribe higher translation-accuracy thresholds including 98%/99%.	Kindly clarify the final contractual definition, calculation methodology, sampling method and acceptance threshold for 'translation accuracy', and the relationship between the >95% technical-evaluation requirement and the 98%/99% SLA thresholds.	A single agreed measurement methodology is required for benchmarking, UAT, SLA and acceptance.	The >95% reference is part of Technical Evaluation; the >98% translation-accuracy SLA is the contractual production requirement, with no-penalty performance at $\geq 99\%$ and penalties below that as specified in Section 10.3. The exact acceptance/measurement methodology will be based on the agreed hybrid evaluation framework and SSC audit.
121	Part V - PoC Evaluation Sec. 7.3 - Translation Accuracy	43	Human Evaluation (Adequacy + Fluency) is allocated 15 marks, while the listed scoring bands award a maximum of 10 marks.	Kindly confirm the correct maximum marks and scoring methodology for Human Evaluation under the PoC.	There appears to be an arithmetic/scoring inconsistency in the published PoC matrix.	Refer Corrigendum
122	Part I - Objectives Secs. 3.3(b)-(d); Part IV Sec. 6.1(2.3)	6, 40	The RFP requires development of language assets, benchmarking and optimization using approved data/corpora, but does not clearly specify whether	Kindly confirm whether the bidder may use its own legally owned/licensed pre-existing database of questions, bilingual corpus, terminology assets or other relevant multilingual	Permitting high-quality pre-existing domain-relevant data can improve baseline quality, language coverage and	Bidder can use his own data as long as there are no liabilities on SSC.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			bidder-owned pre-existing multilingual data may be used as supplementary training or benchmarking material.	data, in addition to SSC-provided data, for benchmarking, domain adaptation and fine-tuning, subject to applicable licensing, security and data-isolation requirements.	convergence, particularly for lower-resource languages.	
123	Part V - PoC Test Dataset / Part VIII - UAT	42, 55	The RFP refers to Golden Record/Golden and Pilot Dataset for evaluation and final acceptance. Training data and Golden data are intended to remain separate.	Kindly confirm the expected size, language coverage and stage of availability of the Golden Dataset, and whether the Golden Dataset will remain fully segregated from training/fine-tuning, prompt optimization and Translation Memory until formal evaluation/UAT.	A held-out Golden Dataset is necessary for unbiased acceptance testing.	The exact language-wise/subject-wise dataset details shall be shared with the successful bidder to the extent available and permitted under the security requirements. The figures should therefore be treated as approximate until the dataset is formally provided (Approximately 30,000 +) Each of these 30,000 questions are translated into 14 Indian Languages. All these datasets are primarily in PDF format .Further bidder needs to understand that the pdf contains Questions in “Image” format and not in text format.
124	Part I - Objectives	6, 44	The RFP requires confidence-score calibration against	Please clarify whether confidence thresholds are	The calibration design depends on how SSC	Confidence thresholds shall be calibrated using human

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	Sec. 3.3(f); Part V - PoC Quality Transparency		human linguistic/SME review and PoC correlation of confidence with human evaluation per question.	expected to be calibrated separately by language and/or subject/content type, and whether SSC will prescribe the human-acceptance thresholds corresponding to the confidence bands.	intends to interpret and use the confidence score.	linguistic and SME review outcomes. The RFP specifically contemplates language/subject/model-specific Green, Amber and Red thresholds; the bidder shall propose and validate the thresholds, which will be subject to SSC approval.
125	Part IV - Technical Evaluation Sec. 6.1, Audit Trail & Governance	40	The RFP requires comprehensive logging, traceability of all translations and confidence-scoring transparency.	Kindly confirm whether the reproducibility requirement means that the same input question, when processed using the same released model version, language assets and configuration, is expected to generate the same translated output on repeated execution.	This definition will guide inference settings, version control and audit-lineage design.	Yes. The solution is required to provide deterministic and consistent translation for identical inputs, as expressly stated in the optimization requirements. The same released model, prompt, language assets and configuration should therefore produce reproducible results, subject to the agreed runtime configuration.
126	Part VIII - Deliverables and Timelines Sec. 10.1	54-55	Milestones require delivery of the AI/integration package and subsequent Go-Live in CAT, while CAT-side integration and SSC/NIC dependencies may be outside the bidder's direct control.	Kindly confirm the responsibility for CAT-side development/integration activities and whether delays attributable to CAT-side changes, SSC/NIC infrastructure availability, access or other dependencies outside the bidder's control will result in corresponding extension of affected bidder	Milestone responsibility should be linked to dependencies actually controlled by the bidder.	CAT-side application modification is out of scope for the bidder. The bidder shall provide integration specifications and support for integration of the delivered package. Dependencies attributable to SSC/ authorized agencies, infrastructure or access shall

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
				milestones without penalty.		be managed through the agreed project plan and may require corresponding adjustment of affected milestones, subject to SSC approval.
127	Part VIII - Payment Schedule Sec. 10.2	55	60% of the one-time cost is payable after successful completion of two multilingual examinations following integration of the model into CAT.	Please clarify the payment treatment where completion of two multilingual examinations is delayed due to examination scheduling, CAT integration, SSC/NIC infrastructure or other dependencies not attributable to the bidder.	The payment milestone should have a defined treatment for dependencies beyond the bidder's control.	As per RFP. No change.
128	Part VIII - Deliverables / Knowledge Transfer and applicable IPR provisions	55; applicable IPR clauses	The RFP requires handover of source code, AI models, language assets, documentation and related artifacts, and the solution is intended to remain operable by SSC without bidder dependency.	Kindly confirm that bidder-owned pre-existing software frameworks, generic utilities, methodologies, tools and pre-existing corpora will remain the bidder's Background IP, while project-specific customized models, adapters, prompts, datasets, language assets and other project-created deliverables will be handed over to SSC as required.	A clear distinction between Background IP and Project IP will avoid ambiguity while ensuring complete SSC operational independence.	Bidder Background IP remains with the bidder, subject to the applicable licences. SSC shall receive ownership/control of the project-specific customized models, adapters, prompts, datasets, language assets and other deliverables created under the engagement, as specified in the RFP.
129	Part VIII - Deliverables / Warranty & Support Secs. 10.1 and 10.6	55, 58-59	The milestone table provides 32 months of warranty/support post Go-Live, while Sec. 10.6 specifies a comprehensive warranty period of 12 months unless a longer period is specified elsewhere.	Kindly clarify the relationship between the 12-month warranty obligation and the 32-month post-Go-Live support period, particularly with respect to defect correction, model improvement/re-training, updates and	Required for correct technical staffing and commercial costing over the contract term.	As per RFP

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
				chargeable fine-tuning cycles.		
130	Part I - Infrastructure Setup & Maintenance Sec. 3.3(i); Part VII Secs. 9.1-9.3	6-7, 49-50	The RFP requires an on-premises/private solution and provides that the production solution will be deployed on SSC-provided dedicated infrastructure. It is not explicit where all development, data preparation, model assessment, optimization/fine-tuning and testing activities must be performed.	Kindly confirm whether development, data preparation, model assessment, optimization/fine-tuning and testing may be carried out at the bidder's secure premises/secure bidder-controlled infrastructure located in India, subject to RFP security requirements, with PoC and final production deployment on SSC/NIC infrastructure; or whether any/all such activities are mandatorily required to be performed at SSC/NIC premises/infrastructure.	This clarification is required to plan the secure development environment, staffing, infrastructure and project schedule.	Bidder may use any environment for development, but final deployment will happen on SSC provided infrastructure.
131	Part VIII - Warranty & Support Secs. 10.1 and 10.6; Part VII Sec. 9.11	52, 55, 58-59	The RFP requires warranty/support and SLA compliance, while Sec. 9.11 states that the contract is not manpower-based. The required mode of support and any mandatory onsite staffing level are not explicitly specified.	Kindly confirm whether warranty/AMC/technical support is required to be provided onsite at SSC/NIC premises or may be provided remotely/offsite with onsite visits as required. If continuous onsite support is mandatory, kindly specify the minimum number of personnel, required roles, working hours/shift coverage and location(s).	Required for compliant resource planning and accurate support costing.	The RFP does not prescribe a separate minimum continuous on-site support headcount for the warranty period. Support shall be provided in accordance with the SLA and contractual requirements; where on-site deployment is required for project delivery, the bidder shall comply with the stated on-site requirement.
132	Part I - Infrastructure Setup and Maintenance /	6-7, 54	The bidder is to specify/configure the required AI environment on SSC/NIC-provided infrastructure, and	Kindly confirm at what stage the bidder must submit final production GPU/server sizing and whether the required	Infrastructure readiness is a critical dependency for model assessment, fine-tuning,	Will be discussed with successful bidder.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	Part VIII - Deliverables		final solution milestones commence immediately from T0.	SSC/NIC production infrastructure will be provisioned and made available in time to meet the T0 + 2 week and T0 + 6 week milestones.	benchmarking and deployment.	
133	Part V - PoC Evaluation / Sec. 7.3 - Translation Accuracy	42-43	The PoC Translation Accuracy score is based on BLEU, COMET and chrF++ scores for the provided language pairs. The RFP does not specify the treatment where any prescribed automated metric cannot produce a valid or reliable score for a particular required language pair due to metric/tool/model, language or script support limitations.	Kindly clarify the scoring methodology where BLEU, COMET and/or chrF++ is unavailable, unsupported or otherwise cannot generate a valid score for any required language pair. In such a case, will SSC prescribe an alternate metric/tool, exclude the unavailable metric and normalize the remaining applicable marks, or apply another defined methodology? Kindly also specify the exact metric implementation/model/version, tokenization and configuration that SSC proposes to use for PoC scoring so that results are reproducible and comparable across bidders.	This clarification is required to ensure uniform and reproducible PoC scoring and to avoid penalizing a bidder where a prescribed metric itself has a language/script support limitation.	The PoC scoring will follow the metrics and methodology specified in Section 7.3.
134	Part VII - Security, Compliance and Data Protection Requirements / Secs. 9.1, 9.5 and 9.6	49-51	The RFP provides that SSC training data and any derived data must remain within India, that the bidder will act as a Data Processor, and that processing must follow applicable data-protection requirements including	Kindly confirm whether, solely for the purposes of this project and within the approved secure environment, the bidder may create or add derived annotations/metadata to SSC-provided training data, such as unique record IDs,	Such controlled metadata/annotation is normally required for corpus alignment, fine-tuning, quality control, traceability and model evaluation. The clarification will ensure	The bidder may create derived annotations/metadata required for dataset curation, alignment, validation without creating any liability to SSC.

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
			purpose limitation and data minimization. The RFP does not expressly state whether the bidder may enrich SSC-provided training data with project-specific annotations or metadata required for model development.	language/script tags, subject/topic tags, question-component labels, source-target alignment markers, terminology/glossary tags, OCR/layout coordinates, quality flags or error-category labels, without altering the substantive examination content. Kindly also clarify whether any such annotation schema requires prior SSC approval and whether all derived annotations will be governed under the same security, retention and usage restrictions as the underlying SSC data.	that these activities remain fully aligned with SSC instructions and applicable data-protection obligations.	
135	Part V - PoC Evaluation / Sec. 7.3, Criterion 4.1 - API Demonstration	44	Criterion 4.1 refers to a live API demonstration using "RESTful/gRPC endpoints" for single and bulk translation, but it is not explicit whether both interface types are mandatory.	Kindly clarify whether the PoC API demonstration is required to support both REST and gRPC interfaces, or whether demonstration of either REST or gRPC is sufficient. If both are mandatory, kindly confirm whether both must support single as well as bulk translation with equivalent functionality; if either one is acceptable, kindly confirm that either approach will be evaluated on an equivalent basis.	This clarification is required to finalize the PoC integration architecture, API implementation effort and demonstration scope.	The PoC criterion refers to RESTful/gRPC endpoints. The bidder may demonstrate the proposed API approach consistent with the agreed integration architecture; the RFP does not expressly require two separate implementations unless SSC specifies otherwise in the final PoC instructions.
136	Part V - PoC Evaluation /	42-43	The PoC dataset is stated to include English and Hindi	Kindly clarify the exact source-target language pairs and	A clear source/reference/target	Yes. The complete language list

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
	Secs. 7.2 and 7.3 - PoC Test Dataset and Translation Accuracy		source content, while the BLEU, COMET and chrF++ scoring examples for a regional language refer to scores for English-to-target and Hindi-to-target language pairs. Hindi itself is also a required translation language, creating ambiguity regarding how Hindi-as-target will be benchmarked and scored.	scoring methodology for Hindi during the PoC. In particular, for English-to-Hindi translation, will SSC provide an independent Hindi reference translation/Golden reference against which BLEU, COMET and chrF++ will be computed? Where Hindi is used as a source language for translation into regional languages, how will Hindi-as-target performance be separately evaluated? Kindly also confirm whether the stated approach of considering English-to-target and Hindi-to-target scores applies to all regional languages and how the final language-wise/overall translation-accuracy score will be derived.	definition is necessary to ensure that Hindi is evaluated independently and that automated scoring is reproducible and comparable across bidders.	is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section 3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
137		Page 39, Clause 6.1.1		Kindly confirm whether SSC will provide a prescribed/approved list of open-source AI/ML models, or bidders are expected to propose the most suitable model(s) for SSC approval.	To determine the bidder's model-selection responsibility and final solution approach.	Bidders are expected to propose suitable open-source AI/ML model(s) for SSC's assessment and approval.
138		Page 39, Clause 6.1.1		Kindly clarify whether SSC expects a unified multilingual model or separate customised models for specific language pairs.	To decide model architecture, GPU sizing, fine-tuning approach, and deployment design.	The RFP permits one or more models. The bidder may propose a unified multilingual model or multiple customized models

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
						based on benchmarking and technical justification, subject to SSC approval and all RFP requirements.
139		Page 39, Clause 6.1.2		Kindly provide the final list of required languages, scripts, and translation directions under this RFP.	To define the exact language scope, scripts, and translation-pair coverage.	The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section 3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
140		Page 39, Clause 6.1.2		Kindly clarify the expected approach for low-resource languages and special script requirements, including Manipuri and Urdu.	To ensure support for low-resource languages, dual scripts, and Urdu RTL requirements.	The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section 3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
141		Page 39, Clause 6.1.3		Kindly clarify the expected handling of mathematical content, tables, images, comprehension passages, and answer options.	To define technical handling needed to preserve exam content and answer integrity.	Mathematical/scientific notation, tables, images/text overlays, comprehension passages and answer-option labels shall be handled without loss of meaning or structural integrity. Numerical values, formulas, symbols and option sequence must be preserved as specified in the optimization requirements.
142		Page 39, Clause 6.1.3		As examination questions may contain tables, images and text overlays, kindly confirm whether bidders may propose open-source vision-	To determine whether vision-capable open-source models may be used instead of relying only on OCR/text	Yes. As per RFP

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
				language/multimodal models, along with text-based translation models, for accurate content understanding and translation.	extraction for image-based or structured question content.	
143		Page 40, Clause 6.1.2		Kindly provide the broad API and integration requirements for connecting the proposed solution with SSC's CAT platform.	To design the required API, data flow, authentication, bulk processing, and integration approach.	Detailed CAT API/interface specifications will be finalized/provided through the mutually agreed integration approach after selection. The bidder shall provide the integration specifications, API schema, request/response formats, error handling and documentation required for SSC/authorized agency to integrate the delivered package.
144		Page 40, Clause 6.1.2.3		Kindly provide the availability, language-wise volume, quality, format, and permitted use of SSC's bilingual corpus, translation memory, glossary, and benchmark data for model training, fine-tuning, validation, and testing.	To assess whether SSC-provided data is sufficient and usable for training, fine-tuning, validation, and testing.	[Refer S.no 8]
145		Page 40, Clauses 6.1.2.3		Kindly clarify whether bidders may use suitable publicly available and legally compliant	To confirm whether additional legal corpora may be used where SSC	Yes, suitable publicly available and legally compliant corpora may be

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
		and 6.1.3.1		language corpora in addition to SSC-provided data for model development.	data is insufficient, especially for low-resource languages.	used as permitted under the RFP.
146		Page 40, Clause 6.1.3.1		Kindly clarify the translation quality benchmarks and the method for measuring the required accuracy.	To understand the final quality target and avoid ambiguity between accuracy and translation metrics.	Yes. The complete language list is the 13 Indic languages specified in Section 3.4.2(A), with Hindi additionally included as required by the RFP.
147		Page 40, Clause 6.1.3.2		Kindly clarify the scope and expected use of back-translation, human review, automated quality checks, and error reporting.	To estimate the quality-assurance solution and review/validation requirements.	The bidder shall implement back-translation, automated quality gates, human linguistic/SME review, structural validation and error categorization/reporting as appropriate to the proposed solution. The exact workflow shall be documented and integrated with the SSC review process.
148		Page 40, Clause 6.1.3.2		Kindly clarify the expected confidence-scoring methodology and its use in the translation review process.	To design confidence scores for correct review routing and quality control.	The bidder shall design and validate confidence scoring using semantic accuracy, terminology compliance, structural integrity and other agreed signals, calibrated against human linguistic/SME outcomes. Green/Amber/Red

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
						thresholds shall be proposed and validated for appropriate language/subject/model contexts.
149		Pages 40–41, Clauses 6.1.5.1–6.1.5.3		Kindly provide the expected performance requirements for translation volume, concurrent processing, and response time.	To size infrastructure and design the model-serving solution for required performance.	[Refer S.no 8]
150		Sections 3.3(h), 3.1 and 3.4		Kindly clarify whether the Model Review Management Platform is to be developed as a separate software application, and provide its required features, user roles, review workflow, dashboards, audit trail, and integration requirements.	To estimate the development scope, software architecture, user-interface requirements, integrations, and effort for the review mechanism.	Yes. As per RFP.
151		Sections 3.1, 3.4 and 9.2		Kindly clarify the scope boundary between AI package development and CAT integration, including the required approach for a private, dedicated SSC model.	To avoid scope ambiguity and ensure the proposed model deployment meets SSC security requirements.	Work Stream 1 covers development, optimization and delivery of the AI Engineering Software Package. CAT application modification is out of scope; the bidder shall nevertheless provide integration specifications/ support and deliver a private, dedicated SSC solution in accordance with Sections 3.4 and 9.2.
152		Sections		Kindly confirm the SSC-	To confirm	SSC shall provide the

S. No.	Bidding Document Section	Reference Page No.	Content of RFP Requiring Clarification	Point of Clarification	Remarks / Suggestions	Reply/Clarification of the Committee
		3.3(i), 9.3 and 10.1		provided technical environment and the technical acceptance requirements for model delivery, UAT, and Go-Live.	infrastructure readiness, SSC dependencies, and measurable technical acceptance conditions.	approved compute infrastructure required for the solution, while the bidder shall configure and maintain the AI software environment. Acceptance will follow the phased milestones, UAT with the SSC Golden/Pilot Dataset, quality benchmarking, security audit and Go-Live/handover requirements specified in Part VIII.