				Corrigendum – Tende	r Reference No.: DGRPG/Storage_Backup/202	21/1
SN	Tender / ATC No.		Page No.	Tender / ATC Clause	Tender / ATC clause details / specification	Revised Clause
1	5.2.1: Unified Specification	Storage	22		Controllers – 256 GB DRAM Across Controllers. The System must be supplied with scalability of at least 512 GB of DRAM Cache for supplied system in scale-up or scale-out architecture. PCle Based cache or Cache on external gateways will not be	with scalability of at least 768 GB of DRAM Cache for supplied system in scale-up or scale-out architecture. PCle Based cache or
2	5.2 T Specifications	echnical	21	Gbps	Speed of front-end Ports in Gbps – 8x 32Gbps ports, 8x10Gbps Ports, 4x40Gbps Ports. In case 40Gbps ports are not available, then 10/25/32/100Gbps ports across dual controllers be provided uniformly to achieve 160Gbps.	or equivalent Ethernet ports.
3	5.2 T Specifications	echnical	21	Cache Type	Global/Federated	Global/Federated/Mirrored
4	5.2 T Specifications	echnical	23	, , ,	Storage Temp Range: -30 to 60 degree celcius	This Clause stands deleted.
5	5.2 T Specifications	echnical	23	Operating Humidity (Rh)	Operating Humidity - 8 to 80%	This Clause stands deleted.
6	5.2 T Specifications	echnical	23	Storage Humidity (Rh)	Storage Humidity – 8 to 90 %	This Clause stands deleted.

	Response to Queries (RTQ) – Tender Reference No.: DGRPG/Storage_Backup/2021/1												
SN	Firm's	Tender / ATC	Page	Tender /	ATC	Tender	/ A	TC clau	se Amen	dment	Sought /	Justification	PSeGS response
l	Name	Clause No.	No.	Clause		details/s	pecific	cation	Sugg	estion			

	I Hitachi /HP/ IBM	Storage Specification	Total configurable Cache (GB) across Controllers	(GB) across Controllers – 256 GB DRAM Across Controllers. The System must be supplied with scalability of at least 512 GB of DRAM Cache for supplied system in scale-up or scale-out architecture. PCle Based cache or Cache on external gateways will not be considered as Storage System Cache.	configurable Cache (GB) across Controllers – 512 GB DRAM Across Controllers or higher. PCIe Based cache or Cache on external gateways will not be considered as Storage System Cache. IBM:- requested to consider minimum 768 GB Cache Memory to have a level playing architecture across the different Systems, Primary Storage as well as Backup.	Hitachi:-Midrange enterprise storages are highly engineered storage systems which are tested and validated with fixed configurations. Upgrading the cache at a later stage will not necessarily improve the storage performance. Hence many OEMs including Hitachi do not offer cache scalability in midrange storage systems, since that will not improve the performance. Also In order to match the IOPS generated by SSDs it is recommended to have minimum 512 GB DRAM Cache or higher from day one, to avoid any performance bottlenecks. In case if DGR still wants cache scalability, then please include the controoller addition/upgrade using storage virtualization for the same, for better participation from all the OEMs. HP:-Being the rate contract RFP, the specifications doesn't call for any future expandability, in terms of number of controllers, caching, data availability when additional capacity will be added in the array, the performance will be impacted if we add additional capacity within same set of controllers without upgrading to 4 controllers. IBM:- It is asked for 256 GB Cache across Controllers. However, this will allow entry level Systems to be qualified and will become a bottleneck in performance. Especially, with Backup Memory ask of 1024 GB (512 GB per Controller), it will mean that Primary Storage running with less DRAM Cache Memory as compared to Backup Storage. Hence, it is requested to consider minimum 768 GB Cache Memory to have a level playing architecture across the different Systems, Primary Storage as well as Backup. Department is using DRAM Cache from years, which is de-facto standard across industry including in high end storage for caching. Surprisingly, current RFP is allowing with SSD / Flash caching, which is inferior technology. This will only give advantage to specific OEM. Whereas department will be losing on technology and changing current storage infrastructure road	Corrigendum
--	--------------------------	-----------------------	--	---	--	---	-------------

2		5.2 Technical Specifications	21	end Ports in Gbps	Gbps – 8x 32Gbps ports, 8x10Gbps Ports. In case 4x40Gbps Ports are not available, then 10/25/32/100Gbps ports across dual controllers	10G iSCSI Ports and 8 x 10G NAS (NFS/CIFS) ports. Dell :- Request you to remove 4X40Gbps port requirement for us to qualify. IBM :- RFP ask is for 40 Gbps ports from storage system,	Hitachi: 160 Gbps front end throughput on a midrange storage system (having 256/512 GB cache) favors particular OEM. Please note that the requested 2,00,000 IOPS can be achieved alone by 2 x 10G Ports only. Hence having more than 8 x 10G Ports (which can deliver more than 6 times the requested IOPS), will only restrict some OEMs including Hitachi from the participation. Request to please change the same for better participation from all the OEMs. Dell: The throughput generated from the asked capacity will be very much supported with 8x32 Gbps ports and 8x10Gbps ports, therefore we recommend DGR to make this requirement optional for additional 160Gbps.
3	Hitachi	5.2 Technical Specifications	23	management software for	software for configuration and native multipathing (part of the supply) – Yes	native multipathing refers to the native multipathing software	Query: Kindly confirm if the native multipathing refers to the native multipathing software from the storage OEM or the native multipathing software provided by host OS vendor. Native multipathing software storage OEM.

4	Dell	5.2 Technical 21 Specifications	Cache Type	Global/Federated	Global/Federated/Mirrored	In Dual Controller architecture, Global cache does not matter, so you will not find any reference of Global cache in our documentation but we do mirror all writes across all controllers. Requesting you to allow offering Mirrored write cache for high availability. Global/ Federated is applicable in case of more than 2 controller. Since the required capacity is sufficient with two controllers so request you to ammend this point.	Corrigendum
5	Dell	5.2 Technical 22 Specifications	3-DC Zero Data Loss Support	3-DC Zero Data Loss Support -(Yes)	Single Array, How DGR intends to setup 3 DC Zero RPO solution. Generally Financial institutes ask for such solutions where even single transaction loss can cause huge commercial loses. Aside to storage supporting 3 DC replication, DGR needs to invest in high speed low latency	Understand DGR is looking for Single Array, How DGR intends to setup 3 DC Zero RPO solution. Generally Financial institutes ask for such solutions where even single transaction loss can cause huge commercial loses. Aside to storage supporting 3 DC replication, DGR needs to invest in high speed low latency network. Therefore we recommend DGR to make this requirement optional or else elaborate the use case so that proper solution can be offered.	Document
6	Dell	5.2 Technical 23 Specifications	Storage Temp Range	Storage Temp Range: -30 to 60 degree celcius	Request DGR to change this to -10 to 30C for wider participation.	Request DGR to change this to -10 to 30C for wider participation.	Refer Corrigendum
7	Dell	5.2 Technical 23 Specifications	Operating Humidity (Rh)	Operating Humidity - 8 to 80%	Request DGR to change this to 20% to 80% for wider participation	, ,	Refer Corrigendum
8	Dell	5.2 Technical 23 Specifications	Storage Humidity (Rh)	Storage Humidity – 8 to 90 %	Request DGR to change this to 20% to 80% for wider participation	, ,	Refer Corrigendum

9	Dell	5.2.2.1 Technical Specifications	25	Transfer rate under Compression mode (TB/Hour)		Please clarify if this is required for single drive or all drives	Please clarify if this is required for single drive or all drives	Required for all drives
10	Dell	5.2.2.1 Technical Specifications	25	100TB with minimum Cartridges Quantity		maximum capacity of each Drive is 12TB, request you to clarify on required capacity. Kindly remove 60 count as this	As LTO 8 is required and maximum capacity of each Drive is 12TB, request you to clarify on required capacity. Kindly remove 60 count as this will give 720TB.Request DGR to amend this point so proper solution can be offered capacity.	currently required is 100 TB. But minimum of 60 cartridges are
1:	Dell	5.2.2.1 Technical Specifications	25	Maximum Capacity of Each Drive under Compression (TB)	Maximum Capacity of Each Drive under Compression (TB) - 12 TB	It should be 30TB, Please clarify		Maximum Capacity of Each Drive - 12TB. The Same disk under Compression should be 2.5 times of 12 TB i.e 30 TB.
12	2 Dell	5.2.2.2 Technical Specifications	33		OS, Linux OS, UNIX OS,	corrigendum, we need clarity		required is

	T _	<u> </u>		1						T
13	1		21	Automated						CCS :-All Enterprise Storage OEMs have As per Tender
	HP	Technical		Storage tearing						moved their product line towards all Flash Document
		Specifications							of multiple	drives only due to higher performance,
					case of	•	/e drive	system) - No		lesser price difference between SSD and
				drives types (in		'es				other SAS/NLSAS mechanical drives and
				case of multiple						hence we doesn't support Tiering in our
				drive system)						latest generation enterprise storage
										products. Also tiering has inherent
										drawback where once the data is tiered to
										lower performance drives, it requires
										multiple hits or reads for data to become
										candidate for moving to faster tier (this can
										take 4 hrs to 24 hrs until data is moved to
										faster tier) till such time data is served from
										the slower drives, which means
										applications will starve for performance.
										Tiering was relevant in those days when
										entire data use to live on lower performing
										drives (SAS/NLSAS) and by just adding
										small quantities of SSD (because drive
										capacities were small and cost was
										prohibitively high) as performance tier and
										application could get performance
										acceleration, data was living on slow
										performing drives anyways hence a small
										acceleration would be considered as
										handful gain because cost of SSD Drives
										at that time prevented systems to be built
										for entire capacity on SSD's. However
										today it is not only the cost of SSD's have
										become at par very large capacity drives
										are also available, SSD's also provide
										100's of Time more performance, Host
										systems or the application servers have
										become more powerful, bringing Tiering
										only deteriorates the user experience.
										Hence present day OEM's are deprecating
										the use of Tiering in the architecture. In
										present day Flash/SSD Drive capacities
										have increased and per TB SSD cost has
										come down drastically, so it is expected
										that parformance oriented workloads live in

14	5.2.1Technical Specifications	21	feature across the populated	feature across the populated drives types (in	Automated Storage tearing feature across the populated drives types (in case of multiple drive system) - No	Same As Above	As per Document	Tender
15	5.2.1Technical Specifications	21		installed in State Data Centre which are of size	of Higher power consumption and Rack space requirements in Data Centre while using mechanical drives in storage	The current RFP specifications completely ignored the aspect of Higher power consumption and Rack space requirements in Data Centre while using mechanical drives in storage instead of All Flash/All NVMe which will definitely add cost while calculating total cost of ownership.	As per Document	Tender

16	IBM	5.2.1Technical Specifications	21	supported by the	Protocols supported by the storage system from the demands S3, Swift and HDFS protocols. Current RFP is protocols. Current RFP is protocols. Current RFP is missing to provide cloud (S3 and Swift) like infra from storage point of view to 50 departments of Punjab Government and 3 crore people of Punjab. Leadership always expect Al base reports (HDFS) from existing available data to take decision on right time or proactively. Whereas RFP is missing with storage solution to provide complete pipe for data workflow (Ingest -> Organize -> Analyze -> Inference) New generation application demands S3, As per Tender Swift and HDFS protocols. Current RFP is Swift and HDFS protocols. Current RFP is missing to provide cloud (S3 and Swift) like infra from storage point of view to 50 departments of Punjab Leadership always expect Al base reports (HDFS) from existing available data to take decision on right time or proactively. Whereas RFP is missing with storage solution to provide complete pipe for data workflow (Ingest -> Organize -> Analyze -> Inference)

17 IBM/ SISL	 Backup	Backup Server/Appliance – Bidder to provide physical backup server along with required operating system and any other software and hardware, if proposed backup solution requires separate physical server. Backup Server should have Active-Active HA configuration as under:-	GB. We assume this is per server. We request you to consider 512 GB across servers or total 512 GB, as Backup Servers don't have low latency requirements like primary Storage and often are able to cater with limited memory for the said requirements. SISL: Please give clarity on	We request you to consider 512 GB across servers or total 512 GB, as Backup Servers don't have low latency requirements like primary Storage and often are able to cater with limited memory	previous RTQ
		or higher	Operating System and Backup Software of Same OEM.	only possible if department ask for Purpose Build Appliance based Backup Device.	