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### List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPR</td>
<td>Business Process re-engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>Common Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeGS</td>
<td>District e-Governance Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeitY</td>
<td>Department of Electronics and Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDS</td>
<td>Electronic Delivery of Services Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQ</td>
<td>Frequently Asked Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoI</td>
<td>Government of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMP</td>
<td>Mission Mode Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeGP</td>
<td>National eGovernance Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Service Centre Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>State Data Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAN</td>
<td>State Wide Area Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Context

The Empowered Committee (EC) has decided to adopt centralised planning and decentralized approach to project implementation to enable fast roll-out of the eDistrict MMP. Consequently, some changes are proposed to the approach envisaged earlier and conveyed to all Stakeholders through the e-District Roll-out Guidelines released in June 2011. While the flexibility to the State Governments in choosing their own strategy for service deployment, vendor selection, hardware selection, application development, site preparation & networking and resource management would help the States in the implementation, it is also necessary to have a standard set of guidelines to ensure that the overall objective of the e-District MMP is protected from un-retractable deviations and time & budget over-runs.

This document provides a standard set of guidelines to the SDAs for e-District Project Implementation. Guidelines concerning the following areas have been covered as part of this document:

1. Financial Flexibility
2. Unbundling of the RFP
3. Purchase of hardware
4. Model RFP for selection of SI for e-District Implementation
5. Hiring of e-District Managers
6. Data entry
7. Site preparation & Networking
8. Setting up of District e-Governance Society
1 Financial Flexibility

Providing financial flexibility to the States has been indicated in Para 3.2 of the Integrated Framework for Delivery of Services (July 2012). While exercising the flexibility, the following guidelines should be followed by the States:

1. DeitY has approved the DPR under various heads (like Hardware, Software, Data entry, Site preparation etc.) within the overall framework of e-District Scheme. It is noticed that various State Governments/UTs have unique scenarios where the expenditure may not be as per the amounts or items sanctioned under these heads. In such a scenario, the IT Department of the State may place the proposal for approval/ decision of the State Apex Committee under the Chief Secretary, for re-allocation of Grants-in-Aids components amongst the various heads, provided the overall amount sanctioned in the administrative approval is not exceeded. A report shall be submitted to DeitY specifying the reappropriations approved by the Apex Committee.

2. When System Integrator is selected for a set of activities for multiple cost heads, then it is difficult to check the utilization under each head. In such situation, the utilization would be deemed to be as per the budgeted amount under each cost head, provided it does not exceed the sum total of all the cost heads corresponding to SI’s scope of work. Any re-allocation between other cost heads and the cost heads for which SI is responsible shall be only with the prior approval of the State Apex Committee.

3. A successful appraisal of the DPR should not be taken as a guarantee for the release of funds. Other mandatory criteria like 70% operational CSCs in each of the districts, launching of 5+5 service categories, delivery of high-volume, high-impact e-Services to the citizens, effecting of over 200 transactions per month in the CSCs etc also need to be fulfilled.

Note: At this Stage, DPRs of 24 States have been appraised, For balance 11 States, 5 of which whose DPRs are under appraisal and 6 from whom DPRs are to be obtained, the following points will apply

a. The expenditure under various heads will be submitted by the State Government to DeitY for appraisal. Funds under the DPR head would be released only when the DPR has been found to satisfactorily meet all the requisite criteria.

The prime objective of the MMP is to deliver public services at the door-step of the common man at the district level. Hence if the State has devised other ways of fulfilling the infrastructural requirements at the field level, the DeitY may consider approving DPR for fund release. For example if a State/UT has a few districts where SWAN is not implemented but an alternative connectivity exists in the form of
broadband/leased line etc., the Empowered Committee may consider this alternative / back-up plan favourably during the approval of the DPR.

### 2 Unbundling of the RFP

Unbundling of various components of the RFP has been indicated in Para 3.2 of the Integrated Framework for Delivery of Services (July 2012).

“The State Government/UT administration may decide the best way to implement the project by “bundling” the entire scope of work to one System Integrator or allow multiple vendors to take responsibility for various components of the Scope of Work. For example, the State Government/UT administration may decide that the Data entry or Training should be “unbundled” from the main scope of work and be selected through various tenders. While doing this, the State Government/UT administration should ensure that there is no dilution of responsibility towards completion of the scope of work and delivery of services.”

However, the following guidelines should be kept in mind:

1. Unbundling is a flexibility extended to the State/UTs so that States/UTs can choose to implement the project at their own pace and manner without deviating from the overall implementation plan.

2. Unbundling should be used for fair competition amongst vendors so that they have fair chance to participate in the project. But precaution should be taken by the State/UT to see that engagement of too many vendors working at the same time should not become an administrative overhead thus putting pressure on the project aspects of cost, quality, time and manageability. The unbundling of work should not result in inability to establish the agency responsible for the failure. Accordingly it is suggested that the following guidance be followed for the “unbundling” of the responsibilities of the System Integrator as indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Cost head</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Systems at SDC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Systems Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LAN Networking and Horizontal Connectivity</td>
<td>These items should necessarily be a part of a single System Integrator to ensure that a single agency is responsible for the uptime of the entire solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Technical Support for 3 years @ 2.4 Lakhs per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl. No</td>
<td>Cost head</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Software for Pilot</td>
<td>This responsibility unbundled from the SI’s responsibility only when the NIC/State agency is to develop the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Application Support</td>
<td>It should be the same agency, which has developed the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Data digitization</td>
<td>Given the profile of agencies undertaking the data entry work, the State Government/UT may decide to “unbundle” it from the SI’s responsibility and undertake a tender at a District / Division level. However in such cases, the State Government/UT would have to undertake the responsibility for developing the data entry front end application, the database formats and technical compatibility with the SI’s solution etc. The State/UT may also leverage the CSCs for data entry at the price determined through market discovery as case may be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Two type of trainings are envisaged for the e-District application. The “General Awareness” training can be unbundled from the SI’s scope of work. However “application training” has to be the responsibility of the agency who has developed the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>Can be unbundled; as it not a part of the technical solution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Unbundling the RFP should not lead to changes in the General terms & conditions of the model RFP. The State should exercise complete precaution while drafting different RFP for the unbundled scopes so that exclusivity of works and services are preserved without compromising the objective of the project.

4. The State/UT should use this flexibility to prioritize the works and services depending upon State/UT specific situations and dynamics. For example, a State/UT may decide to execute data digitization first while some of the CSCs become operational in some districts or the SWAN is commissioned. It is recommended that while unbundling the scope for application development related to implementation of services, applications developed by different vendors do not give rise to integration issues. It is strongly recommended that similar open technology and platform be used for development and deployment.
5. Any proposal to unbundle/bundle the components included in the SI scope of work must be submitted to the State Apex Committee stating clearly the reasons for the proposal and outlining the methodologies to ensure the coordination and dispute resolution in the implementation process. The unbundling/bundling must be proceeded with only after the approval of the State Apex Committee.

3 Purchase of Hardware

1. For the purpose of hardware purchase, the budgeted amount per district is Rs. 88 Lakhs and at the State level i.e. at the SDC, the budgeted amount is Rs. 175 lakhs. As per the guidelines provided in the “Unbundling of the RFP” above, the procurement of the hardware cannot be unbundled from the SI’s scope of work.

2. However, in case the State Government/UT feels that there is a justified case for unbundling the hardware procurement, it may seek the prior approval of the State Apex Committee. However the justification should be initiated post the following pre-requisites:

   a. Development of the eDistrict application and obtaining of necessary certification from STQC
   b. Issuance of Government Orders for implementation of recommendations emerging from Business Process Re-engineering, and
   c. Issuance of EDS rules

3. The State/UT may choose from any of the following options for hardware procurement, including O&M thereof (strictly in accordance with the procurement rules/procedures/guidelines of the State Government/UT administration):

   a. Use the empanelled vendors of NICSI and procure from them at NICSI rates
   b. Use the empanelled vendors of a State/UT PSU and procure from them through duly approved rate contract
   c. Purchase at DGS&D approved rates from vendors following the standard procurement policy and procedures of the State / UT Government and the procedures prescribed by GOI on DGS&D procurement.
   d. Procurement through open tender process, following the relevant procurement procedures/ guidelines.
4. In case the State wishes to procure any other hardware/ software/ licenses not mentioned in the Roll-out guidelines but required for implementation of e-District, the following points needs to be kept in mind:
   
a. The State/UT may procure any gap hardware even including items not listed in the BOM specified in the model RFP, subject to the approved limit of the hardware component in the approved DPR. Savings in other heads should not be used to procure additional hardware. For this purpose, the State must use its own funds.

b. In case the State/UT has inventory of any hardware/ software/ license which can be used as a solution stack as an alternative, the same should be preferred so that the overall cost of the project is reduced.

---

4 Model RFP for selection of SI for e-District implementation

1. DietY has created a Model RFP for selection of SI for the e-District implementation in the State.

2. Desired flexibility in detailing the scope of the Work of the SI is provided in the RFP. For e.g. in case the State wishes to use the NIC application for e-District rollout in the State, then the scope of work relating to application development can be removed from the Scope of Work of SI

3. The States/UTs can customize the model RFP, approve it at their level and issue the same.

---

5 Hiring of e-District Managers

1. The amount budgeted for e-District Manager is Rs. 30,000 /month/district (non-pilot)

2. DietY has published the e-District Manager Guidelines, specifying the minimum qualification, scope of work etc. DietY is also currently working towards “fellowship” scheme for these resources. The State Government is fully responsible for the selection of these resources; the role of DietY is only for facilitation.

3. The State Government has the flexibility to:
   
a. Follow a more elaborate process for the selection of the e-District Manager, than prescribed in the guidelines.

b. Engage any resource (including existing resources currently working on other e-Governance projects), provided they are selected through a transparent interview process and are working full-time on the eDistrict MMP only.
4. The State Government/UT administration may hire e-District Managers through professional manpower providers or through RFP route thereby engaging an agency/IT or ITeS company who can deploy their resources at the districts as e-District Managers.

5. The State Government/UT administration should immediately report the deployment of e-District managers to DeitY NPMU with complete staffing details and contact details (mobile numbers and email addresses).

6 Data Entry

1. The budgeted amount for data entry is Rs. 50 lakhs/district.

2. Since correctness of information and data quality is of prime importance for any public service, data entry should be viewed as a very critical activity at the district level for providing Type 1 services.

3. Data entry requires a significant commitment from the State Government specifically for undertaking the Quality Check on the data entered. Hence it is recommended that States constitute a Data Quality Assurance team who ensure that data entered into the database for a service is as per the data quality framework for that particular service.

4. There is a need for the State Government/UT administration to review the scope of the data entry in line with the resources available for the Quality Check.

5. The provision of statutory services across the counter, like a variety of certificates, requires that the database is digitally signed by the competent authority in bulk in advance, so that when any citizen makes a request the relevant record is downloaded and a certificate can be issued by the CSC agent. It is thus recommended that the State should make necessary arrangement for trainings to CSC agents on process of ensuring data quality right at the data collection source so that future issues can be averted.

7 Site Preparation and Networking

1. The budgeted amount for district site preparation is Rs. 30 lakhs/district. For LAN Networking and Horizontal Connectivity, the budgeted amount is Rs. 25 lakhs. Due diligence should be done before planning expenditure under the following heads.

   a) Site preparation
   Site Preparation is 100% ACA component. The States are advised to follow the statutory guidelines related to site preparation in the eDistrict MMP roll-out
guidelines issued earlier. It is important that while drafting the SI RFP, all activities related to site preparation are clearly captured.

In case the State requires higher amount for the site preparation, it can do so by following the State Government procedures, as this is 100% ACA.

b) **LAN Networking and Horizontal Connectivity**:
   For each Block/Tehsil and District offices, the technical & financial feasibility of horizontal offices need to be worked out. The States are advised to follow the statutory guidelines related to site preparation in the eDistrict MMP roll-out guidelines issued earlier.

   Under the SWAN Scheme for Horizontal office connectivity (20, 10, 5 for SHQ, DHQ and BHQ respectively), some district & sub-district level offices may already be networked/planned to get networked. States must ensure that funds for networking at the district & sub-district levels under the eDistrict program are used only for the offices that have not been covered (or are not proposed to be covered) under the SWAN scheme.

---

**8 District e-Governance Society**

Some States have approached DeitY with the proposal that they may be permitted to set-up an e-Governance Society at the State level under SDA with district level committee headed by the District Collector.

But this is against the decision of the GOI which has mandated the formation of DeGSs at the district level as per the eDistrict guidelines. Moreover, formation of the Society at the State level, would defeat the cause of decentralization and empowerment of the Districts. Hence, it is recommended that States should expedite the process of DeGS formation in all districts covered under the eDistrict program. Setting up of DeGS is a mandatory requirement for the release of funds to the districts.