

Request for Proposal (RFP)
For
Evaluation of Market Intervention Scheme (MIS) and
Price Deficit Payment Scheme (PDPS)

DO No I-19011/01/PMAASHA/2025-DMEQ

September, 2025
Government of India

Contents

Invitation for Proposals	4
Disclaimer.....	5
Glossary	7
Tender Information Summary (TIS).....	9
Checklist of documents	12
1. Introduction and Instructions to Applicants	13
1.1. Background	13
1.2. Scope of Proposal.....	13
1.3. Key Personnel	14
1.4. Conditions of Minimum Eligibility of Applicants	14
1.5. Conflict of Interest	15
1.6. Number of Proposals.....	15
1.7. Cost of Proposal	16
1.8. Verification of information	16
1.9. Right to reject any or all Proposals	16
1.10. Clarifications	16
1.11. Amendment of RFP	17
1.12. Format and signing of Proposal	17
1.13. Technical Proposal	18
1.14. Financial Proposal.....	20
1.15. Submission of Proposal/e-Bid.....	20
1.16. Bid Security.....	21
1.17. Performance Security	22
2. Evaluation Process.....	23
2.1. Evaluation of Proposals	23
2.2. Confidentiality	24
2.3. Clarification	24
3. Appointment of Consultant	24
3.1. Negotiations	24
3.2. Substitution of Key Personnel (During the Subsistence of the Agreement)	25
3.3. Indemnity	26
3.4. Award of Consultancy/draft contract and cancellation	26
3.5. Commencement of assignment	26
3.6. Proprietary Data	26
4. Criteria for Evaluation.....	27
4.1. Evaluation of Technical Proposals	27

4.2	Eligible Assignments	29
4.3	Shortlisting of Applicants	29
4.4	Evaluation of Financial Proposals.....	29
4.5	Combined and Final Evaluation.....	30
5.	Fraud and Corrupt Practices	30
Annexure A		32
Schedule I: Terms of Reference.....		36

No. I-19011/01/PMAASHA/2025-DMEO
Government of India
NITI Aayog
Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office
Sansad Marg, New Delhi -110001

Invitation for Proposals

Date: 03/09/2025

Subject: Request for Proposal (RFP) for Evaluation of Market Intervention Scheme (MIS) and Price Deficit Payment Scheme (PDPS)

The Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), National Institution for Transforming India (NITI) Aayog, Government of India, intends to engage a Technical Consultant to support the **Evaluation of Market Intervention Scheme (MIS) and Price Deficit Payment Scheme (PDPS)** details of which have been provided in the RFP document.

DMEO, NITI Aayog invites proposals for this assignment, from national/international firms/ organizations/ institutions/, which have requisite experience in this field as detailed in the RFP. The salient features of the study, eligibility criteria and instructions on how to bid and other details are available in the RFP document uploaded on the DMEO website (<https://dmeo.gov.in/tenders>) and Government e-Marketplace (<https://gem.gov.in/>). Important information & tentative dates are given in section 1 of the RFP.

Interested applicants are requested to log into Government e-Marketplace (GeM) and submit their RFP response online, on or before **24th September, 2025 (Wednesday), 17:00 hours**. Applicants can also refer to resources available on GeM (<https://gem.gov.in/support/sellers/?lang=english>) for further queries.

Shri Ashish Diwan

Economic Officer

Development Monitoring & Evaluation Office

(DMEO) Room No-431, NITI Aayog, Sansad

Marg

New Delhi, 110001

Email: dmeoeval-niti@gov.in

Disclaimer

- i. The information contained in this Request for Proposals document (**“RFP”**) or subsequently provided to Applicants, whether verbally or in documentary or any other form by or on behalf of the Authority or any of its employees or advisers, is provided to Applicants on the terms and conditions set out in this RFP and such other terms and conditions subject to which such information is provided.
- ii. This RFP is neither an agreement nor an offer by the Authority to the prospective Applicants or any other person. The purpose of this RFP is to provide interested parties with information that may be useful to them in the formulation of their Proposals pursuant to this RFP. This RFP includes statements, which reflect various assumptions and assessments arrived at by the Authority in relation to the Consultancy. Such assumptions, assessments and statements do not purport to contain all the information that each Applicant may require. The assumptions, assessments, statements and information contained in this RFP, may not be complete, accurate, adequate or correct. Each Applicant should, therefore, conduct its own investigations and analysis and should check the accuracy, adequacy, correctness, reliability and completeness of the assumptions, assessments, statements or information contained in this RFP and obtain independent advice from appropriate sources.
- iii. Information provided in this RFP to the Applicants is on a wide range of matters, some of which depends upon interpretation of law. The information given is not an exhaustive account of statutory requirements and should not be regarded as a complete or authoritative statement of law. The Authority accepts no responsibility for the accuracy or otherwise for any interpretation or opinion on the law expressed herein.
- iv. Applicants are advised that selection shall be based on their meeting various criteria enumerated in the different clauses of the RFP. Applicants shall be deemed to have understood and agreed that the Authority shall not be required to provide any explanation or justification in respect of any aspect of the selection process or selection.
- v. The Authority, its employees and advisers make no representation or warranty and shall have no liability to any person including any Applicant under any law, statute, rules or regulations or tort, principles of restitution or unjust enrichment or otherwise for any loss, damages, cost or expense which may arise from or be incurred or suffered on account of anything contained in this RFP or otherwise, including the accuracy, adequacy, correctness, reliability or completeness of the RFP and any assessment, assumption, statement or information contained therein or deemed to form part of this RFP or arising in any way in this Selection Process.
- vi. The Authority may in its absolute discretion, but without being under any obligation to do so, update, amend or supplement the information,

- statements, assessment or assumption contained in this RFP.
- vii. The issue of this RFP does not imply that the Authority is bound to select an Applicant or to appoint the Selected Applicant, as the case may be, for the Consultancy and the Authority reserves the right to reject all or any of the Proposals without assigning any reasons whatsoever.
 - viii. The selection Process shall be governed by the dispute settlement mechanisms (DSM) (Manual for Procurement of Consultancy and Other Services, June 2022).
 - ix. Any information contained in the Proposal shall not in any way be construed as binding on the Authority, its agents, successors or assigns, but shall be binding against the Applicant if the Consultancy is subsequently awarded to it.

Glossary

Acronyms

B.E.	Budget Estimates
CAPI	Computer Aided Personal Interviews
CV	Curriculum Vitae
DMEO	Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GeM	Government e-Marketplace
HH	Household Survey
KII	Key Informant Interview
NGOs	Non-Government Organization
R.E.	Revised Estimates
RFP	Request for Proposal
TIS	Tender Information Summary

Glossary for RFP

Applicant	As defined in RFP Clause 1.2.1
Authorized Representative	As defined in RFP Clause 1.12.2(d)
Authority	As defined in RFP Clause 1.1
Bid Security	As defined in RFP Clause 1.16
Conditions of Eligibility	As defined in RFP Clause 1.4
Conflict of Interest	As defined in RFP Clause 1.5
Consultancy Team	As defined in RFP Clause 1.3
Consultant	As defined in RFP Clause 1.1(b)
Eligible Assignments	As defined in RFP Clause 4.2
Financial Proposal	As defined in RFP Clause 1.14
Key Personnel	As defined in RFP Clause 1.3
Lead Member	As defined in RFP Clause 1.2.1
Legal entity	As defined in RFP Clause 1.4.2 (A)
LOA	Letter of Award as specified in RFP Clause 3.4
Professional Personnel	As defined in RFP Clause 1.13.6
Proposal	As defined in RFP Clause 1.2
Proposal Due Date or PDD	As defined in Tender Information Summary
Selected Applicant	As defined in RFP Clause 4.5.2
Selection Process	As defined in RFP Clause 1.2.2
Sole Firm	As defined in RFP Clause 1.2.1
Support Personnel	As defined in RFP Clause 1.13.6
Team Leader	As defined in RFP Annexure A
Technical Proposal	As defined in RFP Clause 1.13

Glossary for Schedules

Form of Agreement	Form of Agreement as in Schedule-2
--------------------------	------------------------------------

Agreement	As defined in Schedule-2 Clause 1.1.1(a)
Agreement Value	As defined in Schedule-2 Clause 6.1.2
Applicable Laws	As defined in Schedule-2 Clause 1.1.1(c)
Associate	As defined in Schedule-3 Clause 9(f)
Deliverables	As defined in Schedule-1 Clause 7
Effective Date	As defined in Schedule-2 Clause 1.1.1(g)
Final Evaluation Report	As specified in Schedule-1 Clause 7.1
Inception Report	As specified in Schedule-1 Clause 7.1
Member	As defined in Schedule-2 Clause 1.1.1(j)
Personnel	As defined in Schedule-2 Clause 1.1.1(l)
Project Manager	As defined in Schedule-2 Clause 4
Services	As defined in Schedule-2 Clause 1.1.1(n)
TOR	As defined in Schedule-1

a. Tender Information Summary (TIS)

1.0 Basic Tender Details		
1.1.	Tender Title/ Name of Assignment	RFP for Evaluation study of Market Intervention Scheme (MIS) and Price Deficit Payment Scheme (PDPS) - Selection of Technical Consultant"
1.2.	File Number	I-19011/01/PMAASHA/2025-DMEO
1.3.	Tender Type	RFP-Open Tendering
1.4.	Tender Category	Services
1.5.	Proposal Submission	Two Separate Proposals viz Technical & Financial be submitted on GeM Portal
1.6.	Product Category	Consultancy
1.7.	Selection Method	Quality & Cost Based Selection (QCBS) in 70:30 Ratio
1.8.	Appointing Arbitration	Head of the Procuring Organization
1.9.	Language for all type Communication	English only
1.10	Form of Contract	Lumpsum
1.11	Organization:	NITI Aayog
1.12	The Procuring Entity:	DMEO- NITI Aayog
1.13	Mode of Procurement	Online- through GeM Portal
1.14	Tender Inviting Authority (TIA)	DG DMEO- NITI Aayog
1.15	Office Address & Communication for Correspondence	Shri Dharmender Singh Sajwan, Economic Officer Development Monitoring & Evaluation Office (DMEO) Room No-431, NITI Aayog, Sansad Marg New Delhi, 110001 Email: ds.sajwan@gov.in
2.0. Critical Dates		
2.1.	Publication on RFP on GeM Portal	03/09/2025 (Wednesday)
2.2.	Pre-Proposal Queries	Yes
2.3.	Last date for Receiving queries /clarification	08/09/2025 (Monday)
2.4.	I. Mode & Address for submission of Pre-Proposal Conference	Email: dmeoeval-niti@gov.in
	II. Applicants may register for the same until a day prior to the Pre-proposal Conference by submitting the details of their representatives attending the pre-proposal conference at the given link:	Registration Link: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSc1yFJHcGRleG8u9avMgAOzZDr9TcXprsK1dPEiBcNA-mKZaA/viewform?usp=dialog

2.5.	Pre-Proposal Conference, Date, Time & Venue	10/09/2025 (Wednesday), 11:00AM Link: https://dmeo.webex.com/dmeo/j.php?MTID=mad6441e0c6448922614ae393b53fa48f Venue : R.N. 523, NITI Aayog
2.6.	Authority response to Queries	17/09/2025 (Wednesday)
2.7.	Proposal Due Date (PDD)/Last date ¹	24/09/2025 (Wednesday)
2.8.	Opening of Technical Proposals date & Time	25/09/2025 (Thursday)
2.9.	Proposal Validity (Days from the date of Proposal Opening)	90 Days
3.0 Terms of Reference		
3.1	Period of Contract	3 Months
3.2.	Service Details:	As per Terms of Reference / Scope of Work.
4.0 Documents relating to Bid Security and Performance Security		
4.1.	Bid Security (EMD) Amount in INR:	Rs 2 lakhs
4.2.	a. Is Bid Securing Declaration permitted in lieu of Bid Security? b. Udyam Certificate	a. Only for educational institutions as per RFP Clause 1.16.2 b. For MSME only
4.3.	Performance Security	Yes, (3% of Award value)
4.4.	Bid/ Performance Security to be addressed/ in favor of:	PAO, NITI Aayog
4.5.	Form of Bid/ Performance Security	Refer Checklist of documents
4.6.	Payment Schedule	Inception report = 20% Mid-term report =30% Draft report = 30% Final report =20%
5.0 Critical URL Links		
A	Appendix I (Technical Proposal)	
5.1	Letter of Proposal	<i>Form-1</i>
5.2.	Particulars of Applicant	<i>Form-2</i>
5.3	Statement of Legal Capacity	<i>Form-3</i>
5.4	Power of Attorney	<i>Form-4</i>
5.5.	Financial Capacity of the Applicant	<i>Form-5</i>
5.6	Particulars of Key Personnel	<i>Form-6</i>
5.7	Proposed Methodology & Work Plan	<i>Form-7</i>
5.8	Eligible Assignments of the applicant	<i>Form-8</i>
5.9	Deployment of professional Personnel	<i>Form-9</i>
5.10	Support Personnel	<i>Form-10</i>
5.11	Bid Security Declaration Form with substantiated documents like MSME Udyam	<i>Form-11 (applicants for MSME units and government owned universities/</i>

¹ \$ While extending the Proposal Due Date on account of an addendum, the Authority shall have due regard for the time required by Applicants to address the amendments specified therein. In the case of significant amendments, at least 15 (fifteen) days shall be provided between the date of amendment and the Proposal Due Date, and in the case of minor amendments, at least 7 (seven) days shall be provided.

	Certificate etc	<i>academic institutions only)</i>
5.12	Letter of Intent for Technical Collaboration	<i>Form-12</i>
B	Appendix II (Financial Proposal)	
5.13	Covering Letter	<i>Form-1</i>
5.14	Financial Proposal	<i>Form-2</i>
5.15	Estimated Personnel Cost	<i>Form-3</i>
C.	Documents of LOA	
5.16	Form of Agreement	<i>Schedule-2</i>
5.17	Terms of Reference	<i>Schedule 1 of the RFP</i>
5.18	Deployment of Personnel	<i>Appendix I Form 9</i>
5.19	Estimate of Personnel Costs	<i>Appendix II Form 3</i>
5.20	Cost of Services	<i>Appendix II Form 2</i>
5.21	Payment Schedule	<i>Schedule 2 Annex 5</i>
5.22	Bank Guarantee for Performance Security	<i>Schedule 2 Annex 6</i>
5.23	Judicial Stamp Paper	<i>To be appended with Form of Agreement</i>
5.24	Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest	<i>Schedule-3</i>

Checklist of documents

01. Documents to be uploaded on GeM Portal online on or before PDD:		
1.1.	Technical Proposal	As per Appendix-I, Form 1-12 (available on DMEO website)
1.2.	Financial Proposal	As per Appendix-II, Form 1-3 (available on DMEO)
02. Documents to be submitted offline.		
2.1.	Bid Security [Insurance Surety Bonds, Account Payee Demand Draft, Fixed Deposit Receipt, Banker's Cheque (only for EMD), Bank Guarantee]	To be submitted up to 5 days after PDD.
2.2.	Power of Attorney	To be submitted before the award of Contract (Appendix-I Form-4 as available on DMEO website)
0.3. Documents to be submitted offline on signing of Contract:		
3.1.	Performance Security (3% of agreement value) [Insurance Surety Bonds, Account Payee Demand Draft, Fixed Deposit Receipt, Banker's Cheque (only for EMD), Bank Guarantee]	Bank Guarantee to be submitted as per Schedule 2, Annex 6 (available on DMEO Website)
3.2.	Form of Agreement	Schedule-2 (as available on DMEO website)
3.3.	Judicial Stamp Paper (To be appended with Agreement)	On Rs 200 Stamp Paper

1. Introduction and Instructions to Applicants

1.1. Background

- (a) The Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO) (**“the Authority”**) is an attached office of NITI Aayog. Constituted in September 2015 by merging the erstwhile Program Evaluation Office (PEO) and the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO), DMEO works to fulfill the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mandate and to build the M&E ecosystem in India. DMEO has been mandated to actively monitor and evaluate the implementation of schemes, programs and Initiatives of the Government of India (GoI) to strengthen their implementation and scope of delivery on an ongoing basis. Further, evidence-based policy making should be integral to overall governance structure in the country.

(b) Request for Proposal

The Authority invites proposals (**the “Proposals”**) for selection of a Technical Consultant (**the “Consultant”**) who shall conduct an evaluation study of the Scheme, in accordance with the TOR (**collectively the “Consultancy”**).

1.2. Scope of Proposal

- 1.2.1 Detailed description of the objectives, scope of services, deliverables and other requirements relating to this Consultancy are specified in this RFP. In case an applicant possesses the requisite experience and capabilities required for undertaking the Consultancy, it may participate in the Selection Process either individually (the **“Sole Firm”**) or as lead member of a Consortium of firms (the **“Lead Member”**) in response to this invitation. The term applicant (**the “Applicant”**) means the Sole Firm (in case of firms) or the Lead Member of a Consortium or Universities or Academic Institutions as the case may be. The manner in which the Proposal is required to be submitted, evaluated and accepted is explained in this RFP.
- 1.2.2. The Authority has adopted a two-stage selection process (**collectively the “Selection Process”**) for evaluating the Proposals comprising technical and financial bids. In the first stage, a technical evaluation will be carried out. Based on this technical evaluation, a list of short-listed applicants shall be prepared. In the second stage, a financial evaluation will be carried out. Proposals will finally be ranked according to their combined technical and financial scores. The first ranked Applicant shall be selected for negotiation (**the “Selected Applicant”**).
- 1.2.3. The Applicant shall submit its proposal (Both Technical & Financial) on GeM Portal. The Technical Proposal shall be submitted in the form as per Appendix-I (as available on DMEO website) and the Financial Proposal to be submitted in the form as per Appendix-II (as available on DMEO website). The Forms to be uploaded on GeM can be accessed on DMEO Website (<https://dmeo.gov.in/tenders>). Upon selection, the Applicant shall be required to enter into an agreement with the Authority in the form specified as per Schedule-2 (as available on DMEO website). The responsibility for the completion of study in terms of submission of deliverables and achievements of milestones, as prescribed in Terms of Reference, lies with the Applicant.

- 1.2.4. Sub-Contracting by the applicant is not permitted. However, for conducting field surveys the applicant may engage field investigators or field survey firms. The responsibility to maintain the highest quality of data collected from this study lies with the applicant. The applicant shall submit the credentials of the survey firms proposed for conducting the field survey in the inception reports.

1.3. Key Personnel

The Consultant shall form a multi-disciplinary team (the “**Consultancy Team**”) for undertaking this assignment. The Consultancy Team shall consist the key personnel (the “**Key Personnel**”) who shall discharge their respective responsibilities as specified below as per Annexure A of RFP:

1.4. Conditions of Minimum Eligibility of Applicants

- 1.4.1 Applicants must read carefully the minimum conditions of eligibility (the “**Conditions of Eligibility**”) provided herein. Proposals of only those Applicants who satisfy the Conditions of Eligibility will be considered for evaluation. The Minimum Conditions of Eligibility as specified in the RFP may be relaxed for a particular Applicant, if applicable, subject to furnishing of relevant and valid documents or certificates, supporting such relaxations or exemptions under Applicable Laws.

- 1.4.2. To be eligible for evaluation of its Proposal, the Applicant shall fulfill the following

- (A) **General Eligibility of the Applicant:** The Applicant must be a **legal entity** as per Applicable Laws. The '**legal entity**' denotes an organization, that is recognized as a distinct entity under law. It can be an incorporated Company or LLP under Indian Laws or university, academic institution and research & development organization. The Applicant should not have been debarred or blacklisted on the date of application by the Central Government, any State Government, any Statutory Authority of the Government, or a Public-Sector Undertaking, from participating in any consulting assignment.
- (B) **Technical Capacity:** The Applicant should have, **over the past 8 (Eight) financial years** preceding the PDD, undertaken **a minimum of 2 (two) Eligible Assignments** as specified in Clause 4.2
- (C) **Financial Capacity:** The Applicant should have a minimum annual total revenue/turnover of Rs 2 Crores (Rupees Two Crore only) in the preceding 3 (three) financial years from the date of the application.
- (D) **Availability of Key Personnel:** The Applicant should offer and make available all Key Personnel meeting the requirements specified in Annexure A of RFP.
- (E) **Age limit of Key Personnel:** All Key Personnel must below the age of 60 Years and fulfill the Minimum Conditions of Eligibility specified in Annexure A of RFP:

- 1.4.3. The Applicant should enclose with its Proposal, certificate(s) from its Statutory Auditors² stating its Annual Turnover/Total Revenue³ for the preceding 3 (three) financial years from the date of application. In the event that the Applicant does not have a statutory auditor, it should provide the requisite certificate(s) from the firm of Chartered Accountants that ordinarily audits the annual accounts of the Applicant.
- 1.4.4. The Applicant should submit a Power of Attorney (POA) as per the format of Appendix-1, Form-4 (as provided on DMEO website). However, that such Power of Attorney would not be required if the Application is signed by a partner in case the Applicant is a partnership firm or limited liability partnership.
In the case of government owned academic institutions in lieu of POA, a letter of authorization duly signed by the competent authority such as Head of the Department, Dean, Registrar, Director etc. should be submitted.
- 1.4.5 An Applicant should, during the last three years, neither have failed to perform on any agreement, as evidenced by imposition of a penalty by an arbitral or judicial authority or a judicial pronouncement or arbitration award against the Applicant, nor have been expelled from any project or agreement nor have had any agreement terminated for breach by such Applicant.
- 1.4.6 While submitting a Proposal, the Applicant should attach clearly marked and referenced continuation sheets in the event that the space provided in the specified forms in the Appendices is insufficient.

1.5. Conflict of Interest

- 1.5.1 An Applicant shall not have a conflict of interest as per Schedule 3 (as available on DMEO website) that may affect the Selection Process or the Consultancy. Any Applicant found to have a Conflict of Interest shall be disqualified. In the event of disqualification, the Authority reserves the right to take action as per the Bid Security or Bid Security Declaration for, inter alia, the time, cost and effort of the Authority including consideration of such Applicant's Proposal, without prejudice to any other right or remedy that may be available to the Authority hereunder or otherwise.
- 1.5.2 It is expected that the Consultant shall provide professional, objective, and impartial advice and at all times hold the Authority's interests' paramount, avoid conflicts with other assignments or its own interests, and act without any consideration for future work. The Consultant should not accept or engage in any assignment that would be in conflict with its prior or current obligations to other clients, or that may place it in a position of not being able to carry out the assignment in the best interests of the Authority.
- 1.5.3 Some guiding principles for identifying and addressing Conflicts of Interest have been illustrated in the Guidance Note on conflict of interest at Schedule-3 (as available on DMEO website).

1.6. Number of Proposals

No Applicant or its Associate should submit more than one Application for the Consultancy. An Applicant applying individually or as an Associate shall not be entitled to submit another application either individually or as a member of any

² \$ Please do not attach complete printed annual financial statements. In case relevant extracts of duly audited annual financial statements containing the requisite details are provided, duly countersigned by the authorized signatory, a separate certification by statutory auditors would not be necessary.

³ Turnover of university means Revenue from all sources + Grant in Aid

consortium, as the case may be. If any Applicant or its Associate is found to submit more than one application either individually or as a member of any consortium, all of their applications shall be rejected.

1.7. Cost of Proposal

The Applicants shall be responsible for all of the costs associated with the preparation of their Proposals and their participation in the Selection Process including subsequent negotiation, visits to the Authority etc. The Authority will not be responsible or in any way liable for such costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the Selection Process.

1.8. Verification of information

Applicants are encouraged to submit their respective Proposals after verification of the documents, reference materials, etc. within the purview of this RFP and the Applicable Laws and regulations or any other matter considered relevant by them.

1.9. Right to reject any or all Proposals

- 1.9.1 Notwithstanding anything contained in this RFP, the Authority reserves the right to accept or reject any Proposal and to annul the Selection Process and reject all Proposals, at any time without any liability or any obligation for such acceptance, rejection or annulment, and without assigning any reasons thereof.
- 1.9.2 Without prejudice to the generality of Clause 1.9.1, the Authority reserves the right to reject any Proposal if:
 - (a) at any time, a material misrepresentation on the part of the applicant is made or discovered, or
 - (b) the Applicant does not provide, within the time specified by the Authority, the supplemental information sought by the Authority for evaluation of the Proposal.

Misrepresentation/ improper response by the Applicant may lead to the disqualification of the Applicant. If the Applicant is the Lead Member of a consortium, then the entire consortium may be disqualified / rejected. If such disqualification / rejection occurs after the Proposals have been opened and the highest ranking Applicant gets disqualified / rejected, the Authority reserves the right to annul the Selection Process.

1.10. Clarifications

- 1.10.1 Applicants should seek clarifications, if any, on the RFP either through GeM portal (<https://gem.gov.in/>) by logging in through their registered ID or by sending an email to dmeo.eval@gmail.com before the date mentioned in the TIS (Critical Dates) .

The Authority shall endeavor to respond to the queries within the period specified therein but not later than 7 (seven) days prior to the Proposal Due Date. The Authority shall post the reply to all such queries on the Official Website/GeM portal without identifying the source of queries.

1.10.2. The Authority reserves the right not to respond to any questions or provide any clarifications, in its sole discretion, and nothing in this Clause 1.10 shall be construed as obliging the Authority to respond to any question or to provide any clarification.

1.11. Amendment of RFP

1.11.1. At any time prior to the Proposal Due Date, the Authority may, for any reason, modify the RFP document by the issuance of Amendment and posting it on the Official Website at <https://dmeo.gov.in>

1.11.2. All such amendments shall be posted on the GeM portal <https://gem.gov.in/> along with the revised RFP containing the amendments and will be binding on all Applicants.

1.11.3. In order to afford the Applicants a reasonable time for taking an amendment into account, or for any other reason, the Authority may, in its sole discretion, extend the Proposal Due Date.

Preparation and Submission of Proposal

1.12. Format and signing of Proposal

1.12.1. The Applicant shall provide all the information sought under this RFP. The Authority will evaluate only those Proposals that are received in the specified forms and complete in all respects.

1.12.2. Bids along with all the scanned copies of the document should be submitted in the electronic form only through the GeM e-tendering system before the PDD. Before the bid documents are uploaded, all attached documents should be signed using digital signatures of any of the following:

- (a) by the proprietor, in case of a proprietary firm; or
- (b) by a partner, in case of a partnership firm and/or a limited liability partnership; or
- (c) by a duly authorized person holding the Notarized Power of Attorney, in case of a Limited Company or a corporation; or
- (d) by the Authorized Representative of the Lead Member holding the notarized Power of Attorney, in case of consortium.
- (e) by the Competent Authority from the Educational Institution

A Notarized copy of the Power of Attorney certified under the hands of a partner or director of the Applicant and notarized by a notary public in the form specified in Appendix-I (Form-4) (as provided on DMEO website) shall be uploaded along with the Proposal.

1.12.3. The documents mentioned below shall be sent separately to the Authority in original through Speed Post/Registered Post or delivered by hand to the person specified in **'Invitation to Proposal' (page no.4 of this RFP)**.

- a) Notarized Power of Attorney as required under Clause 1.4.4 prior to the award of contract and,
- b) Insurance Surety Bond/Demand Draft/Account Payee/ Fixed deposit/ Receipt/ Banker's Cheque /Bank Guarantee (including e-Bank Guarantee) towards Bid Security or Bid Security Declaration, as required under Clause 1.16. Scanned copy of the same shall be uploaded on the GeM portal. Hard copy of the same will have to be submitted directly to the Authority not later than 5 (five) working days after the bid opening (Opening of Technical Proposal date & time).

Kindly note that, the proposal shall be rejected if a hard copy of the Bid security or Bid Security Declaration is not submitted not later than 5 (five) working days after the bid opening. However, the hard copy of Power of Attorney shall be submitted prior to the award of contract.

The envelope should be sealed and shall clearly subscript the following:

RFP for "Evaluation of Market Intervention Scheme (MIS) and Price Deficit Payment Scheme (PDPS)"

- 1.12.4. Applicants should note the Proposal Due Date, as specified in TIS, for submission of Proposals. Except as specifically provided in this RFP, no supplementary material will be entertained by the Authority, and that evaluation will be carried out only on the basis of Documents uploaded on the GeM portal by the closing time of Proposal Due Date as specified in the TIS. Applicants will ordinarily not be asked to provide additional material information or documents subsequent to the date of submission, and unsolicited material if submitted will be summarily rejected.
- 1.12.5. The Authority is neither a party nor a principal in the relationship between the Applicant and the organization hosting the e-procurement portal (hereinafter called the GeM Portal). Applicants must comply with the rules, regulations, procedures, and implied conditions/ agreements of the GeM portal, including registration, compatible Digital Signature Certificate (DSC) etc. Consultants shall settle clarifications and disputes, if any, regarding the Portal directly with them. The Consultant is advised to go through the terms and conditions of the GeM Portal carefully before applying.

1.13. Technical Proposal

- 1.13.1. Applicants should submit the technical proposal online on GeM Portal in the prescribed formats available at Appendix-I (the "**Technical Proposal**") (as provided on DMEQ website)'.
 - 1.13.2. While submitting the Technical Proposal, the Applicant shall, in particular, ensure that:
 - a. The Bid Security or Bid Security Declaration is provided;
 - b. All scanned copies of the forms are submitted in the prescribed formats and signed by the authorized signatories;
 - c. Power of Attorney, if applicable, is executed as per Applicable Laws;
 - d. CVs of all Key Personnel and other professional personnel are duly signed
 - e. Key Personnel and other professional meet the Minimum Conditions of Eligibility laid down at Annexure-A of the RFP;
 - f. Only one CV for each Key Personnel position has been furnished and no

alternates are given.

- g. The latest CVs are signed and dated in blue ink or digitally signed by the respective Personnel, and digitally countersigned by the authorized signatory. Only a copy of the CV signed by respective Key Personnel, duly digitally countersigned by the authorized signatory, shall be accepted. If 50% of the submitted CVs, are not signed by the key personnel, the evaluation of the technical bid shall be carried without considering these unsigned CVs and, if this Consultant is finally selected, the signed CVs shall be submitted by the Selected Consultant before signing of the LoA . The replacement of such key personnel would not be allowed during the evaluation of bids. If 75% of the submitted CVs are not signed by the respective proposed key personnel, the proposal shall be treated as non-responsive and rejected at the technical evaluation stage.
 - h. The CVs contain an undertaking from the respective Key Personnel about his/her availability for the duration specified in the RFP;
 - i. Professional Personnel proposed should have good working knowledge of English language;
 - j. All Key Personnel will be available for the period indicated in the TOR;
 - k. The proposal is responsive in terms of Clause 2.1.3.
- 1.13.3. Failure to comply with the requirements spelt out in this Clause 1.13 shall make the Proposal liable to be rejected.
- 1.13.4. If it is found by the Authority at any stage that an applicant or individual Key Personnel has made a false averment regarding his qualification, experience or any other particulars, or his commitment regarding availability for the Project is not fulfilled, the Applicant, Individual Person or both shall be liable under breach of Code of Integrity for Public Procurement and shall be debarred for any future assignment of the Authority for a period not exceeding 2 (two) year as per GFR Rule 151. The award of this Consultancy to the Applicant may also be liable to **be cancelled** in such an event. In such an event, the Authority also reserves the right to forfeit bid security and/or debar the Applicant, without prejudice to any other right or remedy that may be available to the Authority.
- 1.13.5. The Technical Proposal should not include the Financial proposal or any information relating to the Financial Proposal. In the event of the financial proposal being included in the technical proposal the bid will be treated as non-responsive and rejected at technical evaluation stage.
- 1.13.6. The proposed team should be composed of experts and specialists (the **“Professional Personnel”**) in their respective areas of expertise and managerial/support staff (the **“Support Personnel”**) such that the Consultant should be able to complete the Consultancy within the specified time schedule. The Key Personnel specified in Annexure-A of RFP shall be included in the proposed team of Professional Personnel. The CV of each such Professional Personnel, if any, should also be submitted in the format at Form-6 of Appendix-I.
- 1.13.7. The Authority reserves the right to verify all statements, information and documents, submitted by the Applicant in response to the RFP. Any such verification or the lack

of such verification by the Authority to undertake such verification shall not relieve the Applicant of its obligations or liabilities hereunder nor will it affect any rights of the Authority thereunder.

1.14. Financial Proposal

1.14.1. Applicants should submit online the financial proposal in the Prescribed Formats available at Appendix-II (the “**Financial Proposal**”), clearly indicating the total cost of the Consultancy (Form-2 of Appendix-II, as provided on DMEO website) in both figures and words, in Indian Rupees (INR or ₹), and signed by the Applicant’s authorized signatories as mentioned in Clause 1.12.2. In the event of any difference between figures and words, the amount indicated in words shall prevail. In the event of a difference between the arithmetic total and the total shown in the Financial Proposal, the lower of the two shall prevail. In the event of a difference between the figures shown in the Financial Proposal Form-2 and the GeM Portal, the amount encrypted & submitted through GeM portal shall prevail

1.14.2. While submitting the Financial Proposal, the Applicant should ensure the following:

- (i) All the costs associated with the assignment shall be included in the Financial Proposal. These shall cover remuneration for all the Personnel (Resident, in the field, office etc.), accommodation, air fare, equipment, printing of documents, surveys, geo-technical investigations etc. The total amount indicated in the Financial Proposal should be without any condition attached or subject to any assumption, and shall be final and binding. In case any assumption or condition is indicated in the Financial Proposal, it shall be considered non-responsive and liable to be rejected.
- (ii) The Financial Proposal should be exclusive of any tax liabilities.
- (iii) The consultant is liable to pay all the taxes as applicable for this consultancy. Also, all payments by the Authority shall be subject to deduction of taxes at source as per Applicable Laws.
- (iv) Costs (including breakdown of costs) shall be expressed in INR exclusive of tax liabilities.

1.15. Submission of Proposal/e-Bid

1.15.1 The Applicants should submit the Proposal in the prescribed formats provided in the respective links as per TIS of this RFP on GeM Portal with all pages numbered serially and by giving an index of submissions. Each page of the submission shall be digitally signed by the Applicant’s authorized signatories as mentioned in Clause 1.12.2. In case the proposal is submitted on the document downloaded from the Official Website, the Applicant shall be responsible for its accuracy and correctness as per the version uploaded by the Authority and shall ensure that there are no changes caused in the content/format of the downloaded document. In case of any discrepancy between the downloaded or photocopied version of the RFP and the original RFP issued by the Authority, the latter shall prevail.

1.15.2 The proposal should be submitted online on the GeM Portal only; manual/offline bids shall not be accepted under any circumstances. Also, the applicant will have to send the original hard copy of Bid Security or Bid Security Declaration and Notarized Power of Attorney separately as specified in Clause 1.12.3(b).

1.15.3 The Technical and Financial bids must be submitted separately on GeM Portal in their respective folders/options, one clearly marked “**Technical Proposal**” and the other clearly marked “**Financial Proposal**”. If financial proposal is included in the *folder/option* of technical proposal, the bid will be summarily rejected. The folder marked —Technical Proposal shall contain:

- (i) Application in the prescribed format (Form-1 of Appendix-I) along with Forms 2 to 12 of Appendix-I and supporting documents; and
- (ii) Scanned copy of Bid security Declaration or Bid Security Declaration as specified in Clause 1.12.3(b).

The folder marked —Financial Proposal shall contain the Financial Proposal in the prescribed format (Forms 1, 2 & 3 of Appendix-II).

1.15.4. The complete Proposal must be submitted online on or before 17:00 hours on the Proposal Due Date as specified in TIS. Proposals submitted by post, fax, telex, telegram, in-person or e-mail shall not be entertained.

1.15.6 The Proposal should be made in the Forms specified in this RFP at Appendix-I and Appendix-II. All such forms are also available on DMEO <https://dmeo.gov.in/tenders>. Any attachment to such Forms must be provided on separate pages and only information that is directly relevant should be uploaded. This may include scanned photocopies of the relevant pages of printed documents. No separate documents like printed annual statements, company brochures, etc. will be considered.

1.15.7 The rates quoted in the financial proposal should be firm throughout the period of performance of the assignment up to and including acceptance of the final report by the Authority and discharge of all obligations of the Consultant under the Agreement.

1.16 Bid Security

1.16.1 The Applicant should furnish as part of its Proposal, a bid security of Rs. 2 Lakhs (Rupees Two Lakhs Only) in the form of Insurance Surety Bonds/Demand Draft/ Account Payee/ Fixed Deposit/ Receipt/ Banker's Cheque /Bank Guarantee (including e-Bank Guarantee) issued by one of the Nationalized/ Scheduled Banks in India in favor of PAO, NITI Aayog payable at New Delhi, except Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) who are registered on the Udyam Portal of Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) (subject to compulsory submission of Udyam Certification) ([Udyam Portal](#)).

1.16.2 Bid securities of the unsuccessful bidders during the first stage i.e. technical evaluation, would be returned within 30 days of declaration of results of the technical evaluation, except for the first and second highest ranked applicants. In the event that the first ranked Applicant commences the assignment as required in Clause 3.5, the second ranked Applicant, who has been kept in reserve, shall be returned its Bid Security forthwith, but in no case later than 120 (one hundred and twenty) days from

PDD. After the award of the contract, the Selected Applicant's Bid Security shall be returned within 30 (thirty) days on receipt of the performance security in accordance with the provisions thereof. In case of government owned universities/academic institutions, the Applicant shall furnish, as part of its Proposal, a Bid Security Declaration (instead of bid security) as per format specified in Appendix-I Form-11. Universities/academic institutions (hereunder referred to as universities/institutions)/ should be recognized by University Grant Commission or any State or the Central Government Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs).

- 1.16.3 Any Bid not accompanied by the Bid Security or Bid Security Declaration, as the case may be, shall be rejected by the Authority as non-responsive
- 1.16.4 The authority shall not be liable to pay any interest on the Bid Security and the same shall be interest free.
- 1.16.5 The Applicant, by submitting its Application pursuant to this RFP, shall be deemed to have acknowledged that without prejudice to the Authority's any other right or remedy hereunder or in law or otherwise, the Authority reserves the right to forfeit the bid security or take action as per the Bid Security Declaration for, inter alia, the time, cost and effort of the Authority in regard to the RFP including the consideration and evaluation of the Proposal under the following conditions:
 - a. If an Applicant submits a non-responsive Proposal;
 - b. If an Applicant engages in any of the Prohibited Practices specified in Section 5 of this RFP
 - c. If an Applicant withdraws its Proposal during the period of its validity as specified in this RFP and as extended by the Authority from time to time;
 - d. In the case of the Selected Applicant, if the Applicant fails to reconfirm its commitments during negotiations as required vide Clause 3.1;
 - e. In the case of a Selected Applicant, if the Applicant fails to sign the Agreement or commence the assignment as specified in Clauses 3.5 and 3.6 respectively; or
 - f. If the Applicant is found to have a Conflict of Interest as specified in Clause 1.5.

1.17 Performance Security

- 1.17.1 The Applicant, by submitting its Application pursuant to this RFP, shall be deemed to have acknowledged that without prejudice to the Authority's any other right or remedy hereunder or in law or otherwise, its Performance Security shall be forfeited and appropriated by the Authority under circumstances specified in this Clause 1.17.4.
- 1.17.2 An amount equal to 3% (three per cent) of the Agreement Value shall be deemed to be the Performance Security. Performance Security may be furnished in the form of Insurance Surety Bond/Bank Guarantee (including e-Bank Guarantee), Account Payee Demand Draft, Fixed Deposit receipt issued by one of the Nationalized/Scheduled Banks in India.
- 1.17.3 Bid security shall be refunded to the successful bidder on receipt of Performance Security.
- 1.17.4 The Performance Security may be forfeited and appropriated by the Authority if the work submitted by the Consultant is felt to be substandard by the Authority and non-compliance with the scope of the study.

2. Evaluation Process

2.1. Evaluation of Proposals

- 2.1.1. The Authority shall open the Proposals at 17:00 hours on the next working day after the Proposal Due Date via online bid opening. The folder of Technical Proposal shall be opened first. The folder of Financial Proposal shall be kept locked for opening at a later date.
- 2.1.2. Proposals withdrawn prior to Proposal Due Date shall not be considered for evaluation.
- 2.1.3. Test of Responsiveness: Prior to evaluation of Proposals, the Authority will determine whether each Proposal is responsive to the requirements of the RFP. The Authority may, in its sole discretion, reject any Proposal that is not responsive hereunder. A Proposal shall be considered responsive if:
 - a. The Technical Proposal is received in the forms specified at Appendix-I; (All forms to be scanned and uploaded in pdf form on GeM Portal duly signed by the authorized signatory, statutory auditor and/or key personnel, as applicable)
 - b. It is received by the Proposal Due Date including any extension thereof pursuant to Clause 1.2;
 - c. It is accompanied by the Bid Security or Bid Security Declaration Form as specified in Clause 1.16 or Appendix-I Form-11 (as available on DMEO website) .
 - d. It is digitally signed, numbered and submitted as stipulated in Clauses 1.15;
 - e. It is accompanied by the Power of Attorney as specified in Clause 1.12.3 and Appendix-I Form 4(as available on DMEO website) ;
 - f. It contains all the information (complete in all respects) as requested in the prescribed formats as per TIS of the RFP.
 - g. It does not contain any condition or qualification; and
 - h. It does not contain the financial proposal or any information regarding the financial proposal.
 - i. It is not non-responsive in terms hereof.
- 2.1.4. The Authority reserves the right to reject any Proposal which is non-responsive and no request for alteration, modification, substitution, or withdrawal shall be entertained by the Authority in respect of such Proposals.
- 2.1.5. The Authority shall subsequently examine and evaluate Proposals in accordance with the criteria set out in Section 4 of this RFP (Criteria for Evaluation).
- 2.1.6. After the technical evaluation, the Authority shall prepare a list of pre-qualified and shortlisted Applicants in terms of Clause 4.4 for opening of their Financial Proposals. A date, time and venue will be notified to all Applicants for announcing the result of evaluation and opening of Financial Proposals. Before opening of the Financial Proposals, the list of pre-qualified and shortlisted Applicants along with their

Technical Score will be read out. The opening of Financial Proposals shall be done in presence of respective representatives of Applicants who choose to be present. The Authority will not entertain any query or clarification from Applicants who fail to qualify at any stage of the Selection Process. The financial evaluation and final ranking of the Proposals shall be carried out in terms of Clauses 4.4 and 4.5.

2.2. Confidentiality

Information relating to the examination, clarification, evaluation, and recommendation for the selection of Applicants shall not be disclosed to any person who is not officially concerned with the process or is not a retained professional adviser advising the Authority in relation to matters arising out of, or concerning the Selection Process. The Authority shall treat all information, submitted as part of the Proposal, in confidence and shall require all those who have access to such material to treat the same in confidence. The Authority may not divulge any such information unless it is directed to do so by any statutory entity that has the power under law to require its disclosure or is to enforce or assert any right or privilege of the statutory entity and/or the Authority or as may be required by law or in connection with any legal process.

2.3. Clarification

- 2.3.1 To facilitate evaluation of Proposals, the Authority may, at its sole discretion, seek clarifications from any Applicant regarding its Proposal. Such clarification(s) shall be provided within the time specified by the Authority for this purpose. Any request for clarification(s) and all clarification(s) in response thereto shall be in writing.
- 2.3.2 If an Applicant does not provide clarifications sought under Clause 2.3.1 above within the specified time, the Authority may proceed to evaluate the Proposal by construing the particulars requiring clarification to the best of its understanding. The Applicant shall be barred from subsequently questioning such interpretation of the Authority.

3. Appointment of Consultant

3.1. Negotiations

- 3.1.1 The Selected Applicant may be invited for negotiations, if necessary. The negotiations shall generally be for re-confirming the obligations of the Consultant under this RFP. Issues such as deployment of Key Personnel, understanding of the RFP, methodology and quality of the work plan shall be discussed during negotiations. There shall be no change in the scope of the work/services during negotiation. **Up to two Key Personnel** who is/are not eligible as required in Annexure-A of RFP be replaced by the Applicant with better candidate (s) as per Clause 3.1.2. In case the Selected Applicant fails to reconfirm its commitment, the Authority reserves the right to forfeit the bid security or initiate debarment of the firm as per Bid security declaration of the Applicant in accordance with the provisions of Clause 1.16. Notwithstanding the above, the substitution of Key Personnel at the negotiations may be considered if due solely to circumstances outside the reasonable control of and not foreseeable by the applicant, including but not limited to resignation, death or medical incapacity. In such a case, the Selected Applicant shall offer a substitute Key Personnel within the period specified in the invitation letter to

negotiate the Contract, who shall have equivalent or better qualifications and experience than the original candidate.

- 3.1.2 The Authority will examine the CVs of all other Professional Personnel and those not found suitable shall be replaced by the Applicant to the satisfaction of the Authority.
- 3.1.3 Before issuing a Letter of Award (LoA) to the successful Applicant, the Authority may, at its discretion, ask the selected Applicant to submit self-attested copies of **relevant certificates for minimum educational qualifications and proof of relevant experiences, given in the CVs in the proposal, of the Key Personnel for verification**. If so decided, the photocopies of such self-certified documents shall be verified and signed by the authorized signatories and kept in the records as part of the contract agreement. If the consultant fails to provide such originals or in case of substantive discrepancies in such documents, the proposal will be considered as non-responsive and rejected thereon. In such cases, the Authority may forfeit the Bid Security or/and initiate suitable action as per the provision of Bid Security Declaration.
- 3.1.4 The negotiations shall be concluded with a review of the finalized draft Contract, which shall be initiated by the Authority and the Applicant's authorized representative. If the negotiations fail, the Authority shall inform the Applicant in writing of all pending issues and disagreements and provide a final opportunity for the Applicant to respond. If disagreement persists, the Authority shall declare the proposal non-responsive, informing the Applicant of the reasons for doing so. The Authority shall invite the next-ranked responsive Applicant to negotiate a Contract. Once the Authority commences negotiations with the next-ranked Applicant, the Authority shall not reopen the earlier negotiations. In case, the second ranked applicant is invited for negotiation, the lower cost, as per financial proposals, between the highest ranked applicant and the second highest ranked applicant shall be offered to the second highest ranked applicant for the award of contract.

3.2. Substitution of Key Personnel (During the Subsistence of the Agreement)

- 3.2.1 The Authority will not normally consider any request of the Selected Applicant for substitution of Key Personnel as the ranking of the Applicant is based on the evaluation of Key Personnel and any change therein may upset the ranking. Substitution will, however, be considered only based on the Consultant's written request and due to compelling or unavoidable situations outside the reasonable control of the consultant, including but not limited to resignation, death or medical incapacity. The substitution shall be subject to the provision of equivalent or better qualified and experienced personnel being provided to the satisfaction of the Authority. Such substitution shall ordinarily be limited to one Key Personnel subject to equally or better qualified and experienced personnel being provided to the satisfaction of the Authority. As a condition to such substitution, a sum equal to 10% (ten per cent) of the remuneration specified for the original Key Personnel shall be deducted from the payments due to the Consultant from the date of replacement till the completion of contract. In the case of a second substitution hereunder, such deduction shall be 20% (twenty per cent) of the remuneration specified for the original Key Personnel shall be deducted from the payments due to the Consultant from the date of replacement till the completion of contract. Any further substitution may lead to disqualification of the Applicant or termination of the Agreement.

3.2.2 Substitution of the Team Leader will not normally be considered and may lead to disqualification of the Applicant or termination of the Agreement.

3.2.3 In case the Authority is not satisfied with the performance of any Key Personnel, the Authority may initiate a request for substitution of such Key Personnel.

3.3. Indemnity

The Consultant shall, subject to the provisions of the Agreement, is liable to indemnify the Authority for an amount of the contract value, for any loss or damage that is caused due to any deficiency in services.

3.4. Award of Consultancy/draft contract and cancellation

Letter of Award (the “**LOA**”) shall be issued, in duplicate, by the Authority to the Selected Applicant and the Selected Applicant shall, within 7 (seven) days of the receipt of the LOA, sign and return the duplicate copy of the LOA in acknowledgement thereof. In the event the duplicate copy of the LOA duly signed by the Selected Applicant is not received within 7 days of receipt of the LOA, the Authority, unless it consents to extension of time for submission thereof, reserves the right to cancel the LOA and the application and forfeit the bid security.

3.5. Commencement of assignment

The agreement shall be signed between the authority and the selected applicant within 7 days of receipt of signed LOA. The date of agreement will be the date of commencement. If the Consultant fails to sign the Agreement, the Bid Security of the Consultant shall be forfeited or action shall be initiated by the Authority as per the Bid Security Declaration in accordance with the provisions of Clause 1.16.5. The Selected Applicant shall not be entitled to seek any deviation⁴ in the Agreement.

3.6. Proprietary Data

All documents and other information provided by the Authority or submitted by an Applicant to the Authority shall remain or become the property of the Authority. Applicants and the Consultant, as the case may be, are to treat all information as strictly confidential. The Authority will not return any Proposal or any information related thereto. All information collected, analyzed, processed or in whatever manner provided by the Consultant to the Authority in relation to the Consultancy shall be the property of the Authority. The Consultant shall make suitable arrangements for the preservation of data collected during the study, such as filled in schedules, tabulation or working sheets, reports, photographs etc., relating to the Project in electronic form and this shall be shared with the Authority at the time of submission of Final report. The ownership of all such data shall remain with the Authority. All raw data compiled during the consultancy assignment shall be transferred to the authority. No data collected in context of the study may be destroyed or otherwise disposed of or given to any other organization/individual, unless so approved by the Authority.

⁴ “Deviation” refers to any departure from the term and conditions specified in the RFP document.

4. Criteria for Evaluation

4.1. Evaluation of Technical Proposals

4.1.1. In the first stage, the Technical Proposal will be evaluated based on the eligibility criteria for the Applicant as laid down in Clause 1.4.2, their experience, understanding of the TOR, proposed methodology and Work Plan, and the qualifications and experience of the Key Personnel. Only those Applicants whose Technical Proposals get a score of 70 (seventy) marks or more out of 100 (one hundred) shall qualify for further consideration and shall be ranked from highest to the lowest based on their technical score.

4.1.2. Technical score (ST) is calculated by considering the highest Technical Proposal (TMax) and will be given a technical score (ST) of 100 points. The technical scores of other proposals will be computed as follows:

$$ST = 100 \times T / TMax$$

(T = absolute score of Technical Proposal)

4.1.3. The scoring criteria to be used for evaluation shall be as follows.

S. No.	Parameter	Maximum Marks	Criteria
1.	Relevant Experience of the Applicant	30	<p>Maximum 10 assignments can be submitted by the applicant.*</p> <p>(a) Sample size of eligible assignments of the applicant (10 marks). The marks will be allocated based on the following: Each eligible assignment with survey sample size of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 500 to 700 respondents: 0.5 mark • 701 to 900 respondents: 0.7 mark • > 900 respondents: 1 mark⁵ <p>(b) Average annual total revenue/turnover of the applicant (10 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ₹ 2 crore to ₹ 5 crores: 8 marks • > ₹5 crore to ₹ 10 crores: 9 marks • > ₹ 10 crores: 10 marks <p>(c) Value of Eligible Assignments (10 marks). The marks will be allocated based on the following: Each eligible assignment with value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ₹10 Lakhs to ₹50 Lakhs: 0.8 mark • >₹50 Lakhs to ₹1 Crore: 0.9 mark • >₹1 Crore: 1 mark

2.	Proposed Methodology and Work Plan	40	<p>Evaluation will be based on the quality of submissions, as per Appendix-I Form-7, & Form-12 and the presentation made by the Applicant⁵.</p> <p>1. Proposed Methodology and work Plan: (36 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of ToR • Methodology and Work Plan • Quality of PPT • Response to Queries <p>2. Collaboration / consortium / partnership with academic institutions⁶ : (4 marks)</p>
3.	Experience of Proposed Key Personnel of the Applicant	30	<p>Marks shall be awarded for the relevant experience based on the years of relevant experience</p> <p>1. Team leader (Maximum Marks 8)</p> <p>5 to 8 years: 6 marks >8 to 15 years: 7 marks More than 15 years: 8 marks</p> <p>2. M & E Specialist – Sector Expert I (Maximum Marks 6)</p> <p>3 years to 5 years: 4 marks >5 years to 8 years: 5 marks More than 8 years: 6 marks</p> <p>3. Agriculture Specialist- Sector Expert II (Maximum Marks 6)</p> <p>3 years to 5 years: 4 mark >5 years to 8 years: 5 marks More than 8 years: 6 marks</p> <p>4. Economist/Statistician (Maximum Marks 6)</p> <p>3 years to 5 years: 4 mark >5 years to 8 years: 5 marks More than 8 years: 6 marks</p> <p>5. Data Management & Analytics (Maximum Marks 4)</p> <p>3 years : 2 mark >3 years to 5 years: 3 marks More than 5 years: 4 marks</p>
Total		100	

* Only 1st ten assignments will be considered for evaluation

⁵ The presentation shall be made by all the proposed team members (key personnel) only for their respective part of the proposal (in-person or virtually). The Team Leader must present the majority of the proposal (approximately 50%) of the proposal. In case of absence of Team leader and M&E Specialist (Project Manager) during presentation, the proposal may be rejected by the Authority.

⁶ The Applicant will present how it plans to involve and collaborate with academic institutions while designing and delivering on the Project, if collaborating with such an institution as per Form-12.

4.2 Eligible Assignments

For the purposes of determining Conditions of Eligibility and for evaluating the Proposals under this RFP, advisory/ consultancy assignments, for the following projects shall be deemed as eligible assignments (the “**Eligible Assignments**”):

- a. In case the applicant submits more than ten assignments, only 1st ten assignments will be considered for evaluation
- b. Assessment/research/evaluation study in Agriculture/ Horticulture / allied sector /food and public distribution /agri-processing/agri infrastructure /public policy conducted for Union/State Government/ regulatory commission/ tribunal/ bilateral agencies/ multilateral agencies/ statutory authorities/ public sector entities in India covering a minimum sample size of 500.
- c. Provided that the Eligible Assignments have been completed in the 8 (eight) financial years preceding the PDD.
- d. Provided that the value of each eligible assignment submitted by the Applicant is at least Rs. 10 Lakhs.
- e. For the Eligible Assignments, the Applicant shall provide requisite supporting documents such as copies of contracts, agreements etc. The value for the assignment should be clearly mentioned in the supporting documents provided. In the absence of supporting documents with requisite details, the assignment will not be considered as an Eligible Assignment.

4.3 Shortlisting of Applicants

The technically qualified applicants shall be short-listed for financial evaluation in the second stage.

4.4 Evaluation of Financial Proposals

- 4.4.1 In the second stage, the financial evaluation will be carried out as per this Clause. The financial score (SF) for the applicant will be arrived at based on the formula given in Clause 4.4.3.
- 4.4.2 For financial evaluation, the total cost indicated in the Financial Proposal will be considered
- 4.4.3 The Authority will determine whether the Financial Proposals are complete, unqualified and unconditional. The cost indicated in the Financial Proposal shall be deemed as final and reflecting the total cost of services. Omissions, if any, in costing any item shall not entitle the firm to be compensated and the liability to fulfill its obligations as per the TOR within the total quoted price shall be that of the Consultant The lowest Financial Proposal (FMin) will be given a financial score (SF) of 100 points. The financial scores of other proposals will be computed as follows:

$$SF = 100 \times F_{\text{Min}}/F$$

(F = amount of Financial Proposal)

4.5 Combined and Final Evaluation

- 4.5.1 Proposals will finally be ranked according to their combined technical (ST) and financial (SF) scores is follows:

$$S = ST \times Tw + SF \times Fw$$

Where, S is the combined score, and Tw and Fw are weights assigned to Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal, which shall be 0.70 and 0.30 respectively.

- 4.5.2 The “Selected Applicant” shall be the first ranked Applicant (having the highest combined score). The Authority reserves the right to take action as per the Bid Security Declaration in accordance with the provisions of Clause 1.16.5, in case the first-ranked Applicant withdraws, or fails to comply with the requirements specified in Clause 3 as the case may be.

5. Fraud and Corrupt Practices

- 5.1 The Applicants and their respective officers, employees, agents and advisers shall observe the highest standard of ethics during the Selection Process. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this RFP, the Authority shall reject a proposal without being liable in any manner whatsoever to the Applicant, if it determines that the Applicant has, directly or indirectly or through an agent, engaged in corrupt practice, fraudulent practice, anti- competitive practice, coercive practice, conflict of interest, obstructive practice in the Selection Process or after the issue of the LOA or the execution of the Agreement. In such an event, the Authority shall, without prejudice to its any other rights or remedies, take action as per the Bid Security or Bid Security Declaration, or forfeit and appropriate the Bid Security or Performance Security, as the case may be. Further, such an Applicant or Consultant shall not be eligible to participate in any tender or RFP issued by the Authority during a period of 2 (two) years from the date of such an order.
- 5.2 For the purposes of this Section, the following terms shall have the meaning hereinafter respectively assigned to them:
- (a) “**Corrupt practice**” means making an offer, solicitation or acceptance of a bribe, reward, gift or any material benefit in exchange for an unfair advantage in the Procurement Process or to otherwise influence the Procurement Process
 - (b) “**Fraudulent practice**” means any omission or misrepresentation that may mislead or attempt to mislead so that financial or other benefits may be obtained or an obligation avoided. Such practices include a false declaration or false information for participation in a Procurement Process or to secure a Contract, or in the execution of the agreement
 - (c) “**Coercive practice**” means harming or threatening to harm persons or their property to influence their participation in the Procurement Process or affect the execution of the agreement
 - (d) “**Anti-competitive practice**” means any collusion, Proposal-rigging or anti-competitive arrangement, or any other practice including cartels coming under the

purview of the Competition Act, 2002, between two or more Applicants, with or without the knowledge of the Authority, that may impair the transparency, fairness, and the progress of the Procurement Process or to establish Proposal prices at artificial, non-competitive levels

- (e) **Conflict of interest**” means participation by a bidding firm or any of its affiliates who are either involved in the Consultancy Contract to which this procurement is linked; if they are part of more than one Proposal in the procurement; or if their personnel have a relationship or financial or business transactions with any official of Authority who are directly or indirectly related to tender or execution process of contract; or improper use of information obtained by the (prospective) Applicant from the Authority with an intent to gain unfair advantage in the Procurement Process or for personal gain or in any other manner specified in Clause 3 Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest .
- (f) **“Obstructive practice”** means materially impeding Authority's investigation into allegations of one or more of the above-mentioned prohibited practices either by deliberately destroying, falsifying, altering; or by concealing evidence material to the investigation; or by making false statements to investigators and/ or by threatening, harassing or intimidating any party threatening, harassing or intimidating any party to prevent it from disclosing its knowledge of matters relevant to the investigation or from pursuing the investigation, or by impeding the Authority's rights of an audit or access to information.

Annexure A

Details of minimum Education qualification & Experience required from the Consultancy Team

S. No .	Key Personnel ⁷	Minimum Educational Qualification ⁸	Length of Professional Experience	Minimum Length of Relevant Experience	Responsibility
1.	Team Leader	Master's Degree (or equivalent)	15 years	At least 5 years in the last 10 years immediately preceding the date of submission of application in handling evaluation/research projects	<p>S/he will lead, co-ordinate and supervise the multidisciplinary team for preparation of the Evaluation Study, and act as a focal point to the Authority throughout the duration of the Consultancy. S/He will be responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall execution of the consultancy assignment • Accountable leadership providing guidance, problem solving support, strategic inputs and leading discussions with senior stakeholders • Ensuring that all deliverables and milestones are satisfactorily and timely delivered • Ensuring high quality of data collection, analysis and report writing • Driving discussions with senior officials in the Government at the Centre and state levels, sector experts, key stakeholders, etc. to refine the investigative instruments and gain insights about scheme • Monitoring, tracking and reporting on progress and performance on all the aspects of the evaluation study • Defining project tasks, milestone, assign roles and responsibilities to the team members • To brief Authority at least on a weekly basis on the progress and challenges apart from specific deliverables mentioned in the Terms of Reference • Identification of reliable sources for access, synthesis and meta-analysis • Transforming the collected data into meaningful insights

⁷ The upper age limit of the proposed key personnel shall not exceed the age of 60 years.

⁸ For degrees obtained from the accredited foreign Boards/universities, the applicant shall furnish a self-declaration on the academic equivalence to the 'Minimum Educational Qualifications' as defined in Annexure-A.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring content accuracy, creativity, consistency and innovation in the report Leading pilot of the survey instruments, training of the investigators, timely inception of survey, field movement plan, data collection, updating the status of field survey, data analysis, and report writing Providing guidance on all the research activities including research tools, analysis plan and training Preparing a detailed evaluation matrix mapping all the objectives with the types of data to be used (secondary and primary), its analysis plan, evaluation methods, and relevant literature Performing other relevant duties as assigned by the Authority
2.	M & E Specialist – Sector Expert I	Master's Degree (or equivalent) in Economics/ Statistics/ Social Sciences (Sociology, Anthropology, Development Studies)/Mathematics or related fields	8 years	At least 3 years of relevant work experience in monitoring and evaluation of projects / experience in survey designs /data analysis and management/ demographic studies/household surveys	<p>S/He will be responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designing the overall study approach in terms of robust evaluation and monitoring techniques Organizing and overseeing the use of qualitative and quantitative evaluation techniques Designing primary data collection tools like discussion guides for focus group discussions, agenda for in-depth interviews, household-level survey questionnaires and preparing a data analysis plan. Ensuring the quality of primary data collected as part of evaluation study is superior and the use of latest analytical tools for qualitative and quantitative data analysis. Contribute to documentation of lessons learned and best practices for knowledge sharing Support the analysis of M&E findings to assess scheme on REESI+C+E Framework. Acts as the nodal person for all data related matters and data management in the team
3.	Agriculture Specialist – Sector Expert II	Master's Degree (or Equivalent) in Agriculture/ Agri Business Management / Agri Economics or Agri Statistics	8 years	At least 3 years of relevant work experience in projects related to Agriculture or Rural Development or Agri marketing or	<p>S/he will be responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studying existing literature and building analytical understanding of the Indian agriculture/horticulture sector Track policy, regulatory, and market developments associated with the agriculture/horticulture sector Providing subject matter/sector/domain expertise for evaluation of the schemes

		or related field (s)		Agri business or food processing etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide inputs to all matters pertaining to evaluation of the scheme from the perspective of a domain expert • Conduct thorough evaluations of the schemes on the basis of REESI+C+E framework using the expertise in agriculture sector. • Assess the alignment of the schemes with national agricultural policies and goals • Engage with various stakeholders, including farmers, government officials, and NGOs, to gather insights and feedback on the schemes. Monitor the conduct of Household Surveys, FGDs and KIIs with farmers/ Agri dept officials • Nodal person for evaluation report of MIS
4.	Economist/ Statistician	Master's Degree in Economics/Statistics, Econometrics or related fields.	8 years	At least 3 years of relevant experience in economic modeling/ analysis/ sampling methodology and use of statistical tools in projects	<p>S/he will be responsible for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Providing economic and statistical perspectives on all aspects of the project - Conducting econometric/ statistical analysis of primary and secondary data and to derive useful insights from the data for evaluation - Financial analysis and support throughout the project. - Monitors the conduct of FGDs/ KIIs with traders, processors, millers, mandi officials etc. - Provide inputs in designing research tools for quantitative and qualitative research - Leading analysis and visualization of data (quantitative as well as qualitative) - Nodal person for report preparation of PDPS
5.	Data Management & Analytics	Master's Degree (or equivalent) in Data Science /Economics/Statistics/Mathematics/I T or related fields	5 years	At least 3 years of relevant experience in quantitative and qualitative data analysis/data science with a knowledge of the relevant statistical tools and with an ability to create visualizations of	<p>S/He will be responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assisting team members in research and analysis • Conducting meta-analysis and secondary research from different sources for the study and producing reports • Maintaining a structured database for storing and managing project data • Conducting data cleaning, data analysis and assisting the senior team in report writing. • Providing basic mathematical rigour in developing methodology and data analysis plan. • Assisting in designing research tools for quantitative and qualitative research • Developing CAPI tool- configuring the questionnaire developed by M&E expert on CAPI

				analysis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and reviewing the CAPI tools prepared for data collection. • Making contingency plans to overcome issues related to technical problems of CAPI. • Leading analysis and visualization of data (quantitative as well as qualitative) • Assisting other team members in research and analysis. • Conducting detailed analysis report writing and content editing.
--	--	--	--	-----------	---

Schedule I: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference (ToR)
For
Evaluation of Market Intervention Scheme (MIS) And
Price Deficit Payment Scheme (PDPS)
Under the Umbrella Scheme of Pradhan Mantri- Annadata Aay
Sanrakshan Abhiyan (PM -AASHA)



NITI AAYOG
Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office
Government of India
New Delhi

Content

	Particular	Page No.
1.	Quality Assurance of the Evaluation Report	38
	1.1 <i>Executive Summary (ES)</i>	38
	1.2 <i>Professional Language and Referencing:</i>	38
	1.3 <i>Objective Findings and Recommendation:</i>	38
	1.4 <i>Ethical Considerations and Data Protection:</i>	39
2.	Background	39
	2.1 <i>A brief overview of the Price Support Policy</i>	39
	2.2 <i>Market Intervention Scheme (MIS)</i>	39
	2.2.1 <i>Objectives of MIS Scheme</i>	40
	2.2.2 <i>Implementation mechanism of the MIS Scheme</i>	40
	2.2.3 <i>Expenditure of MIS Scheme</i>	41
	2.3 <i>Price Deficit Payment Scheme (PDPS)</i>	41
	2.3.1 <i>Objectives of PDPS Scheme</i>	42
	2.3.2 <i>Implementation mechanism of the PDPS Scheme</i>	42
	2.3.3 <i>Expenditure of PDPS Scheme</i>	43
3.	Evaluation of MIS & PDPS	43
	3.1. <i>Objectives of the evaluation study-MIS</i>	43
	3.2. <i>Objectives of the evaluation study-PDPS</i>	44
	3.3. <i>Programme Rationalization- MIS & PDPS</i>	45
4.	Scope of Services - MIS & PDPS	45
	4.1 <i>Reference period of the study-MIS</i>	45
	4.2 <i>Reference period of the study-PDPS</i>	45
	4.3 <i>Secondary Research -MIS &PDPS</i>	45
	4.4 <i>Field Study -MIS & PDPS</i>	46
	4.5 <i>Primary Data Collection Methodology - MIS</i>	47
	4.6 <i>Primary Data Collection Methodology - PDPS</i>	48
5.	Sampling (Indicative) - MIS & PDPS	48
	5.1. <i>Methodology and Framework</i>	48
	5.2. <i>REESI+C+E Framework</i>	48
	5.3. <i>Sampling (Indicative)-MIS</i>	49
	5.3.1 <i>Details of KIIs and FDGs for evaluation study-MIS</i>	52
	5.3.2 <i>Household Surveys -MIS</i>	53
	5.3.3 <i>Facility Visits – MIS</i>	53
	5.4. <i>Sampling (Indicative)-PDPS</i>	54
	5.4.1 <i>Details of KIIs and FDGs for evaluation study-PDPS</i>	56
	5.4.2 <i>Household Surveys -PDPS</i>	57
	5.5. <i>Instructions on Sampling -MIS&PDPS</i>	57
6.	Mechanisms to ensure Data Quality -MIS & PDPS	57
7.	Deliverables & Timelines	58
	7.1. <i>Major Deliverables</i>	58
	7.2. <i>Timeline for Project Execution-MIS&PDPS</i>	60
8.	Payment Schedule- MIS&PDPS	61
9.	Indicative Report Structure-MIS&PDPS	61
10.	Reporting – MIS &PDPS	62
11.	Responsibility of the Principal Investigator (PI)-MIS&PDPS	62
12.	Non-Performance by the Consulting Firm-MIS & PDPS	63
13.	Meetings -MIS &PDPS	63
14.	Miscellaneous -MIS &PDPS	63

1. Quality Assurance of the Evaluation Report

The evaluation report submitted by the Consultant must comply with quality standards of DMEQ in order to be accepted. In case of any compromise in the quality of the deliverables, a suitable penalty would be imposed on the Consultant as per the provisions given in the RFP. An indicative quality standard followed by DMEQ is given below. The consultant may include superior standards to further enhance the quality of the reports.

1.1. Executive Summary (ES):

The executive summary (ES) is meant to be read by a wider audience. So, it must be written with extreme clarity and attention to detail. It should be written comprehensively, with coherence, and crispness. The findings of the report should be elaborated with key statistics and the recommendations on the basis of evaluation of the scheme. The ES should present the triangulated findings succinctly and suggest feasible policy options. The ES should be forthright in its observations, precise in its deductions, and proactive in its suggestions. ES should ideally be written in short, separate paragraphs that do not exceed ten pages. All data/findings/ recommendations cited from the main report need to be properly referenced using page numbers. The evaluation questions, issues, and problems should not be over-emphasized in the ES. It should be briefly presented without detailed elaborations. The ES needs to be brief and focused on the conclusions and suggestions emerging from the evaluation study.

1.2. Professional Language and Referencing:

The report should be written in a professional manner and in accordance with the standards of a typical double-blind, peer-reviewed publication. The report should be free from grammatical errors, plagiarism and spelling mistakes. Reports that have plagiarism content of more than 20 percent will not be accepted. It must adhere to the suggested structure of the report and must be appropriately referenced with necessary citations. All data, diagrams, and graphs must be appropriately labelled and cited.

1.3. Objective Findings and Recommendation:

The report should be a succinct, stand-alone document with objective language that can be used for informed decision-making and policy formulations. The findings should be presented clearly, providing sufficient evidence, and systematically addressing all the evaluation objectives. The recommendations should be clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings of the report. It should be clearly articulated and prioritised based on their importance and potential impact for the improvement of the scheme. The conclusions drawn from primary and secondary research must be given equal weight. Recommendations that lead to an increased financial burden on the government (such as those on increasing budgetary allocation) should be avoided, unless there is sound evidence emerging from the analysis that an increase may be expedient. Focus should be on resource optimisation/judicious usage of resources.

1.4. Ethical Considerations and Data Protection:

Ethical considerations, such as confidentiality, data protection, and data quality, must be upheld throughout the process.

2. Background

2.1 A Brief Overview of the Price Support Policy

Price support policy of Government of India aims at providing support to farmers against sudden and unprecedented fall in prices. Till the mid-1970s, the Government had announced two sets of prices- Minimum Support Prices (**MSPs**) and Procurement Prices. The purposes served by these two sets of announced prices were different and the prices were announced at two different time periods –MSP at the time of cropping season to allow farmers to make informed choices about the crops and Procurement prices at the time of harvest season to facilitate procurement by designated agencies like Food Corporation of India (**FCI**). Later, Government started announcing only Minimum Support Prices and the entire system of production and procurement started to revolve around the signal price called the MSP.

At present, Government announces price support for 25 crops. Commission for Agricultural Costs and Prices (**CACP**) provides MSP recommendations for 22 agricultural crops and Department of Food and Public Distribution (**DFPD**) announces Fair and Remunerative Price (**FRP**) for sugarcane. Besides this, MSP for Toria and de-husked coconut is fixed by the Department of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare (**DA&FW**) based on MSPs of Rapeseed/mustard and Copra respectively.

Pradhan Mantri- Annadata Aay Sanrakshan Abhiyan (**PM-AASHA**) was launched in September 2018 to provide remunerative prices to farmers for their produce and to control the price volatility of essential commodities by ensuring their availability to consumers at affordable prices. The Union Cabinet approved the continuation of the PM-AASHA Scheme on September 2024 with a total financial outlay of Rs. 35,000 crores during the 15th Finance Commission Cycle up to 2025-26. The Integrated Scheme of PM-AASHA has Integrated Price Support Scheme (**IPSS**—by merging Price Support Scheme (**PSS**) and Price Stabilization Fund (**PSF**) scheme), Price Deficit Payment Scheme (**PDPS**) and Market Intervention scheme (**MIS**) as components.

2.2 Market Intervention Scheme (MIS)

The MIS is a price support scheme implemented by DA&FW to ensure remunerative prices to the farmers of perishable agricultural and horticultural commodities for which MSP is not announced. This scheme has been operational since 1983-84 upon the request of State Governments in the event of fall in prices below Market Intervention Price (**MIP**) in order to ensure that the farmers are not forced to make distress sales of their produce. Therefore, MIS is a demand-based scheme where a proposal from state governments require approval from DA&FW for implementation. This scheme is sanctioned only in cases where there is reduction in the market prices by at least 10% over the rates of the previous normal season. The target for procurement should not exceed 25 % of the anticipated production of the commodity for that year/season. The loss, if any, is shared between Centre and States on 50:50 and 75:25 basis in case of general and North Eastern states respectively.

With the launch of PM-AASHA in September 2018, MIS scheme was included as a component of PM AASHA. A revision has been made in the scheme guidelines in October 2024. In place of physical procurement, if the state chooses so, can adopt for price deficiency payment (difference between Market Intervention Price and Selling Price up to maximum price difference of 25%) in case of MIS.

2.2.1 Objective of MIS Scheme

The objective of the MIS is to ensure remunerative prices to the farmers of perishable agricultural and horticultural commodities for which MSP is not announced.

2.2.2 Implementation mechanism of the MIS Scheme

Implementation process of the scheme is initiated with a proposal from the state government which must reach DA&FW at least 15 days before the proposed date of implementation. The proposal from the state is considered by a Committee in DA&FW which finalizes the terms and conditions of the scheme implementation. Procurement happens at the Market Intervention Price (MIP) which should not exceed the cost of production. MIP is fixed by a committee at the state level. Since the scheme is implemented by the states, agencies are designated by the states for physical procurement of perishable crops and provide necessary working capital for the scheme.

State nodal agencies (**SNAs**) purchase stocks from farmers, cooperative societies and farmer organizations, at Fair Average Quality (**FAQ**) norms fixed by states, to eliminate middle men from taking advantage of the scheme. Procured stocks should not be kept for more than 3 months under normal circumstances. The procured stocks are disposed off in the market by SNAs based on disposal prices fixed by agencies themselves. However, the process is monitored by the Committee which fixed the MIP.

Duration of the scheme is initially not more than 30 days. In case of states who choose price deficiency payment in MIS, differential payment between MIP and selling price, subject to coverage of 25% of production of crops and maximum of price difference up to 25% of MIP is credited to the bank accounts of the farmers. Central share of the loss is provided as a reimbursement to the states after submission of audited accounts of the state designated agencies to DA&FW.

There is a special provision for **TOP** (Tomato, Onion and Potato) crops under the MIS scheme. When there is a price difference between producing and consuming states in TOP crops, the operational costs incurred by Central Nodal Agencies in storing and transporting crops from producing to other consuming states will be reimbursed under the scheme.

2.2.3 Expenditure of MIS Scheme

Table 1:
Budget Allocation for MIS (2019-20 to 2022-23)

Expenditure Incurred under PSS and MIS scheme (in Rs. Crores)		
Year	Revised Budget Estimate (PSS & MIS)	Actual Expenditure (MIS)
2019-20	2531.80*	8.26
2020-21	1681.10*	-
2021-22	3595.61*	38.79
2022-23	4500*	-
Expenditure Incurred under MIS scheme (in Rs. Crores)		
2023-24	40.00**	0.00
2024-25	75.13**	22.59
Total expenditure under MIS		69.64

Source: Department of Agriculture & Farmers' Welfare

*Common Budget heads were allocated for MIS and PSS before 2023-24

**A separate head for MIS was introduced

2.3 Price Deficit Payment Scheme (PDPS)

The Government of India implements the Price Deficit Payment Scheme (PDPS) to support the farmers of notified oilseeds & aims at ensuring remunerative prices when the crops are sold in the harvest season without actual procurement by the government agencies. The scheme envisages direct payment of the difference between the MSP and the selling / modal price to pre-registered farmers, selling notified oilseeds of prescribed Fair Average Quality (FAQ) norms within the stipulated period in the notified market yard /APMC through a transparent auction process, directly into the bank account of farmers.

Coverage will be provided to those oilseeds for which MSP is declared by Government of India. The oilseeds include *Groundnut in shell, Soyabean, Sunflower, Sesamum, Niger seed, Rapeseed/ mustard seed, Safflower and Toria*. The states/ UTs have the option to choose either Price Support Scheme or PDPS for notified oilseeds for the marketing season /year for whole of the state. PDPS does not involve any physical procurement.

It is a central sector scheme where percentage of loss of MSP, up to 15 percent (inclusive of administrative cost), of each commodity for which PDPS is implemented is fully borne by the Government of India. The states/UTs opting for the scheme will get support of Government of India up to 40 percent of state production for that marketing season/year and the maximum price difference of up to 15 percent of MSP. Implementation period of the scheme should not exceed 120 days and should coincide with the peak harvesting period of the notified oilseed crops for the particular season by the implementing states/UTs.

2.3.1 Objectives of PDPS Scheme

1. To ensure remunerative price to the producers of oilseeds whose MSP are notified by Government of India without physical procurement.
2. To reduce the loss burden of the Government on account of procurement in terms of storage, interest on working capital, transportation and service charges to CNAs/SNAs etc.

2.3.2 Implementation Mechanism of the PDPS Scheme

States select specific oilseed crop/s and send a proposal to Government of India for implementation of PDPS in their states in the marketing season with details of state preparedness, period of the scheme and estimated expenditure with details. A portal has to be specifically developed for the purpose of registration of farmers under PDPS scheme. After the approval of state's proposal by DA&FW, farmers must register online or at notified centers with details such as Aadhaar number, crop details, land records, area under the crop, bank account number etc. A Unique Registration Number (URN) is generated for the registered farmers which is used at the time of sales of the crops in the designated APMC mandi.

For sales in notified markets, farmers bring their FAQ crop produce in approved APMC markets/ Mandis and sell it through transparent auction mechanisms. States calculate the "modal price" (usually fortnightly average price from mandis via AGMARKNET portal) and publish it on the website of state PDPS. The price deficiency payment is calculated in the following manner-

1. If the sale price of selected agricultural commodity in notified market yard(s) is more than MSP, no compensation is provided to the farmer.
2. If the sale price of selected agricultural commodity in notified market yard(s) is less than MSP, but more than Modal wholesale price, compensation would be admissible to the extent of difference between MSP and actual sales price.
3. If the sale price of selected agricultural commodity in notified market yard(s) is less than Modal wholesale price, compensation would be admissible to the extent of difference between MSP and Modal wholesale price declared by state/UT.

The farmer would be paid the difference between MSP and the estimated modal price within 30 days of sales of the produce by the farmer in the notified market/APMC. However, price deficit payment will be given to farmers only when the crop is sold in notified markets through a transparent auction process and farmers have received payment through RTGS or other methods of e-payment from the traders into their own bank account registered under the PDPS.

2.3.3 Expenditure of PDPS Scheme

Table 2:
Budget Allocation for PDPS (2019-20 to 2024-25)

(Value in Rs Crore)

Year	Budget Estimate	Revised Estimate	Actual Expenditure
2019-20	1,300.00	321.00	313.18
2020-21	300.00	200.00	0.00
2021-22	250.00	0.50	0.00
2022-23	0.50	0.00	0.00
2023-24	0.01	0.00	0.00
2024-25(PM AASHA)*	6,437.50	6,476.13	5,437.99
*A common head under PM-AASHA was introduced in Oct. 2024 which includes schemes like PSS			

Source: Department of Agriculture & Farmers' Welfare

PDPS was implemented in Madhya Pradesh during 2018-19 in *soyabean* for trade of 16.83 Lakh Metric Tonnes (31 percent of total production of the state) and released Rs 313.18 crores for the scheme.

3. Evaluation of Market Intervention Scheme (MIS) & Price Deficit Payment Scheme (PDPS)

3.1 Objectives of the Evaluation Study - MIS

1. To assess whether farmers are getting remunerative prices on a timely basis under MIS scheme and whether there is sufficiency of subsidy to farmers.
2. To analyse the factors that influence the choice exercised by the states between procurement/price deficiency payment in MIS.
3. To understand the dynamics of decision-making for implementation of MIS in the states.
4. To evaluate the operational efficiency of MIS scheme, its implementation and to assess whether the procurement and storage mechanisms of perishable commodities in the state are sufficient to meet the scheme objectives.
5. To understand the impact of the scheme on the decisions and behavior of market players in the supply chain like farmers, APMC, traders, processors, etc.
6. To analyze the challenges faced by the state designated agencies in procurement of selected crops.
7. To assess the mechanism of disposal (sale) of crops in the implementing states.
8. To assess whether MIS implementation has led to price stabilization in the chosen crops.

9. To assess the reasons for non-implementation of MIS in other major producing states of selected horticultural crops.
10. To identify the deficiencies, if any, in the program design and implementation process and to assess measures taken to enable transparency and accountability.
11. To examine and compare other complementing or existing schemes at the state or national level in perishable commodities.
12. To bring out the best practices in related interventions for enhancing the effectiveness of MIS scheme both nationally and internationally.

3.2 Objectives of the Evaluation Study-PDPS

1. To provide an overview of the oilseed sector in the country in terms of its supply chain- geographical distribution of productions, patterns of consumptions, capacity of processing, export-import scenario etc.
2. To assess whether farmers are getting remunerative prices on a timely basis under PDPS scheme and whether there is sufficiency of subsidy to farmers.
3. To assess the impact of the scheme in terms of loss of burden to the Government – specifically in terms of savings due to non-procurement on storage, interest on working capital, transportation and service charges to CNAs/SNAs.
4. To analyze the impact of the scheme on procurement and storage mechanisms of oilseed crops in the states and whether the scheme has led to price stabilization.
5. To understand the impact of the scheme on the decisions and behavior of market players like farmers, APMC, traders, millers etc.
6. To assess the reasons for non-implementation of the scheme in other major oilseed producing states.
7. To understand the dynamics of decision making for implementation of PDPS in states.
8. To identify deficiencies, if any, in the program design and implementation process and to identify measures to strengthen transparency and accountability.
9. To examine and compare other converging, complementing or existing schemes Nationally & Internationally.
10. To bring out the best practices in related interventions for enhancing the effectiveness of the PDPS Scheme.

3.3 Programme Rationalization - MIS & PDPS

Based on the above analysis, recommendations on the need to continue the scheme in their existing, modified, scaled up or scaled down versions must be provided. In case they need to be modified, such revisions in the scheme/design of scheme may be suggested for the effective implementation of the scheme in future.

4. Scope of Services - MIS & PDPS

4.1 Reference period of the study- MIS

- Primary Research: 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25.
- Secondary Research: Since the inception of the scheme.

4.2 Reference period of the study -PDPS

- Primary Research: 2018-19, 2019-2020, 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25.
- Secondary Research: Since inception of scheme

4.3 Secondary Research- MIS & PDPS

The data and methods will involve review of various scheme documents that are relevant for the evaluation study. The following is the indicative list of documents (**but not restricted to**):

1. Price support policy related documents at the National, State and International level.
2. Annual reports of the Department of Agriculture & Farmer Welfare for output and outcome assessments of MIS & PDPS scheme.
3. Annual progress reports and implementation documents of MIS & PDPS scheme at the national and state levels.
4. Financial data on allocation and expenditure of the schemes at national, state and district levels.
5. Agricultural Census.
6. Agricultural Statistics at a Glance and other documents: for production, procurement, processing and storage related data of selected crops.
7. Standing Committee reports, CAG reports, demand for grants.
8. Internal scheme guidelines and policy documents;
9. Third party evaluation reports/ evaluations done by non-government agencies, etc.

10. Scheme/policy documents and administrative data related to MIS & PDPS.
11. Articles/research papers of peer-reviewed journals.
12. Dashboards of MIS & PDPS scheme if any.
13. Analysis of annual/audit reports of procurement agencies involved in MIS.
14. Any other relevant document.

4.4 Field Study- MIS & PDPS

The field study, analysis and report writing should include the following:

1. Designing of structured questionnaires /schedules for **Farmer/ Household surveys (HH)**, discussion guides for **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)**, interview guides for **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)** and other relevant stakeholders.
2. Finalizing the sampling and field survey plan with the approval of DMEO.
3. Preparation of the analysis plan, detailed tabulation and chapterization plan and sections and key contents under each chapter.
4. Pre-testing, piloting and finalizing the required tools with the approval of DMEO team.
5. Establishment of a managerial structure for field operations.
6. Recruitment of investigators and training/capacity building of all the field investigators. Multiple training sessions to be conducted by the consultant if the investigators have not understood the questions, response formats, response length etc. Investigators must be trained and re-trained properly to get adequate and authentic responses by adhering to the directions in the questionnaire.
7. Putting in place appropriate IT hardware and application software for data collection and management on an immediate basis after signing the contract agreement.
8. Collecting and compiling quality data from selected areas.
9. High quality data management and adherence to quality assurance mechanisms as per agreed protocols, plans and schedules.
10. Data collation and data cleaning.
11. Conducting thorough data analysis and creating relevant cross-tabulations/ summarizations for analysis.

12. Preparation of draft report, making presentations at DMEO, as and when required by DMEO.
13. Before writing the evaluation report, the consultant firm will present the key findings from the field survey data, share all the data tables – analytical, graphs and charts with DMEO and layout all the data quality checks and protocols that have been followed.
14. Submission of inception report, mid-term report, final report and dissemination of key findings.
15. Incorporating concurrent feedback into the workflow.

During secondary research and field study, inputs from DMEO/concerned Ministry/department may be incorporated for fine tuning the methodology, preparation of the analysis plan, listing of secondary data sources, investigator training and tool/questionnaire design. Relevant Ministry may be approached after taking prior approval from DMEO.

4.5 Primary Data Collection Methodology- MIS

Quantitative and qualitative study backed with extensive secondary data analysis should be conducted to provide scheme level assessment. The study will consist of

- a) **Household Surveys (HH)**–A selected sample of farmer/ household surveys must be interviewed using structured/pre-designed questionnaires to assess the beneficiary level impact of the scheme.
- b) **Key Informant Interviews (KII)**: Key informant interviews with ministry/department personnel at national level, relevant departments in state governments, state-level implementing bodies, district and block level officials, other stakeholders supporting implementation or indirectly involved in enabling scheme's success and opinion makers at village level (e.g. farmers, procuring agencies, traders, warehouse agents, transporters etc.) must be done. National level key informants should also include national level think tanks, institutions, prominent non-profit organizations, government officials, procuring agencies like NAFED, NCCF etc. Quantitative response seeking questions to be included in the questionnaire for the KIIs are to be covered through Computer Assisted Personal Interview (**CAPI**) tool.
- c) **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)**: Focus Group discussions (FGDs) should be conducted with important stakeholders like farmers, traders, warehouse agents, processors etc. preferably at the mandi or any convenient location as found suitable for the consultant. FGDs should have specific questions that elicit quantitative responses that shall be kept in a spreadsheet format (.xls, .csv etc.) and analyzed quantitatively. These quantitative questions are to be administered through a robust Computer Assisted Personal Interview (**CAPI**) tool.
- d) **Facility visits**: Visits to facilities like storage houses, warehouses, refrigerated store houses etc. are included to understand the adequacy and quality of such facilities.

4.6 Primary Data Collection Methodology for PDPS

Quantitative and qualitative study backed with extensive secondary data analysis should be conducted to provide scheme level assessment. The study will consist of:

- a) **Household Surveys (HH)**—A selected sample of farmer/ household surveys must be interviewed using structured/pre-designed questionnaires to assess the beneficiary level impact of the scheme.
- b) **Key Informant Interviews (KII)**: Key informant interviews with ministry/department personnel at national level, relevant departments in state governments, state-level implementing bodies, district and block level officials, other stakeholders supporting implementation or indirectly involved in enabling scheme's success and opinion makers at village level (e.g. farmers, procuring agencies, traders, warehouse agents, transporters etc.) must be done. National level key informants should also include national level think tanks, institutions, prominent non-profit organizations, government officials, procuring agencies like NAFED, NCCF etc. Quantitative response seeking questions to be included in the questionnaire for the KIIs are to be covered through Computer Assisted Personal Interview (**CAPI**) tool.
- c) **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)**: Focus group discussions (FGDs) should be conducted with important stakeholders like farmers, traders, millers etc. preferably at the mandi or any convenient location as found suitable by the consultant. FGDs should have specific questions that elicit quantitative responses that shall be kept in a spreadsheet format (.xls, .csv etc.) and analyzed quantitatively. These quantitative questions are to be administered through a robust Computer Assisted Personal Interview (**CAPI**) tool.

All the quantitative components of both MIS & PDPS are to be captured through CAPI (that has .xls, .csv, etc. in backend, which could be downloaded anytime by DMEO). Stakeholders' consultations are to be done in accordance with the objectives of the evaluation study as per Clause 3.1 & 3.2 of Terms of Reference. During the conduct of the study, strict adherence to ethical protocols, data confidentiality norms and procedures must be ensured. The discussion guides/questionnaires for KIIs and farmer/ Household surveys should include relevant data points pertaining to the evaluation of MIS & PDPS.

5. Sampling (Indicative)- MIS & PDPS

5.1 Methodology and Framework

A mixed method of quantitative and qualitative analysis to be adopted to triangulate findings from farmers/household surveys

5.2 REESI + C+ E framework

Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness Sustainability, Impact, Coherence, Equity framework has to be followed for evaluation of Market Intervention Scheme.

5.3 Sampling (Indicative) - MIS

The objective of the evaluation study is to analyze the MIS Scheme through field surveys and secondary research to determine the extent to which the scheme fulfills its objectives. MIS covers only perishable agricultural/ horticultural crops. Particulars of the scheme implementation with specific reference to crops and states during the last 6 years are provided in Table-3. Jammu & Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh (*Apples*), Karnataka (*Mango and Turmeric*) and Mizoram (*Ginger and Grapes*) have implemented MIS scheme during the sampling period selected for the study.

Table -3

Details of Sanction accorded to various states under MIS from 2020-21 to 2025-26

Sl. No.	Year	Crops	State	Sanctioned Qty (in MTs.)	Actual Procurement Qty (in MTs.)	Market Intervention Price (MIP) (Rs. Per MTs.)	Remarks
1	2020-21	Apple	Jammu & Kashmir	12,00,000	1.605		Central Share to be released.
2	2021-22	Potato	Nagaland	14,200		8,620	Not implemented
3	2022-23	Onion	Rajasthan	2,56,400		7,780	Not implemented
4	2022-23	Garlic	Rajasthan	1,07,836		29,570	Not implemented
5	2022-23	C-grade Apple	Himachal Pradesh	1,44,936	86,142	12,960	Implemented
6	2022-23	Mango	Himachal Pradesh	1,250		11,700	Not implemented
7	2022-23	Potato	Uttar Pradesh	10,00,000		6,500	Not implemented due to market price above MIP
8	2022-23	Turmeric	Karnataka	22,006		66,940	Implemented. Profit earned in the operation.
9	2023-24	C-grade Apple	Himachal Pradesh	1,16,060	1,734.341	12,960	Implemented
10	2024-25	C-grade Apple	Himachal Pradesh	1,16,571	8789.6	12,960	Implemented
11	2024-25	Grapes	Mizoram	3,460	3460	50,000	Implemented
12	2024-25	Red Chillies (PDPS)	Andhra Pradesh	2,58,238		117812.5	Not implemented due to Modal Price above the MIP
13	2024-25	Ginger	Karnataka	59,948		24450	Not implemented due to Modal Price above the MIP
14	2025-26	Red chillies (season 2024-25) (PDPS)	Karnataka	73,732		1,05,892.00	Not implemented due to Modal Price above the MIP
15	2025-26	Red chillies (season 2024-25)	Telangana	1,72,135		1,03,740.00	Not implemented due to arrival of below FAQ crop
16	2025-26	Ginger	Mizoram	15,058		27,800.00	Implemented
17	2025-26	Mango (PDPS)	Karnataka	2,50,000		16,160.00	Implementing

Source:- Department of Agriculture & Farmers' Welfare

For this evaluation study, 5 crops where MIS has been implemented during the reference period of primary research are selected. Crops included in the evaluation study are *Grapes* (Mizoram), *Turmeric* (Karnataka), *Ginger* (Mizoram), *Mango* (Karnataka–price deficiency payment option of MIS) and *Apples* (Himachal Pradesh & Jammu & Kashmir). The states which have been included as the sample states for the study are Mizoram, Karnataka, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir. However, various reasons for non-implementation of MIS in other major states, where the selected crops are produced in plenty, must be ascertained. Therefore, this evaluation study warrants a comparative analysis of implementing and non-implementing states of MIS in the selected crops during the reference period. The largest producer of the selected crop, if not covered under MIS, is selected as a non-implementing state. Uttarakhand is selected as a non- implementing state in *Apple* for comparison as the major producing states have implemented MIS. States which form a part of sample of non-implementing states are Maharashtra (*Grapes and Turmeric*), Madhya Pradesh (*Ginger*), Uttar Pradesh (*Mango*) and Uttarakhand (*Apples*). Various states where the evaluation study will be conducted are given below.

Table -4

States for comparison of MIS scheme (Indicative sampling)

Crops	Implementing State	Non-Implementing State
Grapes	Mizoram	Maharashtra
Turmeric	Karnataka	Maharashtra
Ginger	Mizoram	Madhya Pradesh
Mango	Karnataka	Uttar Pradesh
Apples	Himachal Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir	Uttarakhand

In the implementing states (Mizoram, Karnataka, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir), the district which is the largest producer of the selected crop will be chosen for field surveys. If MIS scheme was not implemented in the largest producing district of selected crop in the state during the reference period, district with the next highest production will be chosen for field surveys. In each implementing state, only one district will be chosen for field evaluation – household surveys, FGDs, KIIs and facility visits. Here, perspective of the farmers, their rate of satisfaction towards the scheme, challenges in implementation etc. will be assessed through household surveys. 100 farmer households (80 beneficiaries and 20 non-beneficiary farmer households) will be selected in each implementing district as per robust sampling procedures for evaluation. Besides KIIs, market dynamics of the scheme will be assessed through FGDs of traders, processors, farmers, cold storage operators etc. Facility visits of warehouses, storage centres, procurement centres etc. must be conducted in the district to assess the adequacy of such centres.

In the non-implementing states chosen for comparison purposes (Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra and Uttarakhand), the same procedure as described above will be followed. The largest producing district for the selected crop will be chosen in each state for field study. Besides KIIs, a brief analysis of preferences/awareness of the farmers towards procurement/price deficiency payment of perishable commodities will

be assessed using FGDs in the district. With the same objective, FGDs will be conducted with traders, processors, warehouses, cold storages etc. in the chosen district. To understand the adequacy and quality of perishable storage mechanisms in the district, facility visits will be performed in the chosen district of non-implementing states.

Production details of the chosen crops in the selected states for sampling are provided in Table 5. An indicative field activity plan is provided in Table 6.

Table -5

Production details of states and crops chosen as part of indicative sampling plan

Crop	State	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
		Production ('000' tonnes)	Production ('000' tonnes)	Production ('000' tonnes)
Grapes	Mizoram	17.30	17.31	17.23
	Maharashtra	2477.36	2497.68	2489.27
Turmeric	Karnataka	110.03	130.07	66.83
	Maharashtra	367.84	315.42	310.01
Ginger	Mizoram	60.13	60.13	60.29
	Madhya Pradesh	521.97	551.33	608.32
Apple	Jammu & Kashmir	1898.59	2146.35	2064.30
	Himachal Pradesh	611.90	672.34	506.69
	Uttarakhand	64.88	43.33	42.97
Mango	Karnataka	1620.21	1462.25	1457.03
	Uttar Pradesh	4662.45	4662.45	5990.53

Source: Agricultural and Processed Products Export Development Authority

Table-6

Field activity plan for districts (**plan provided is only indicative and the numbers for HH surveys, FGDs, KIIs etc. are set at the minimum level**)

Crops	Selected states	Household surveys	FGDs	KIIs	Facility Visits
Grapes	Mizoram	Beneficiary: 80 Non-beneficiary: 20	Farmers: 4 Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>Mandi officials: 2</u> <u>District officials: 1</u> <u>Bank Officials:1</u>	Procurement Centre/ APMC Mandi/ Warehouses/Cold Storage : 1
	Maharashtra	No	Farmers: 2 Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>Mandi officials:1</u> <u>District officials: 1</u>	Warehouses/Cold Storages : 1
Turmeric	Karnataka	Beneficiary: 80 Non-beneficiary: 20	Farmers: 4 Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>Mandi officials:2</u> <u>District officials: 1</u> <u>Bank Officials:1</u>	Procurement Centre/ APMC Mandi/ Warehouses/Cold Storages : 1
	Maharashtra	No	Farmers: 2 Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>Mandi officials:1</u> <u>District officials: 1</u>	Warehouses/Cold Storages : 1

Ginger	Mizoram	Beneficiary: 80 Non-beneficiary: 20	Farmers: 4 Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>Mandi officials:2</u> <u>District officials: 1</u> <u>Bank Officials:1</u>	Procurement Centre/ APMC Mandi/ Warehouses/Cold Storages : 1
	Madhya Pradesh	No	Farmers: 2 Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>Mandi officials:1</u> <u>District officials: 1</u>	Warehouses/Cold Storages : 1
Mango	Karnataka	Beneficiary: 80 Non-beneficiary: 20	Farmers: 4 Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>Mandi officials:2</u> <u>District officials: 1</u> <u>Bank Officials:1</u>	Procurement Centre/ APMC Mandi/ Warehouses/Cold Storages : 1
	Uttar Pradesh	No	Farmers: 2 Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>Mandi officials:1</u> <u>District officials: 1</u>	Warehouses/Cold Storages : 1
Apple	Himachal Pradesh	Beneficiary: 80 Non-beneficiary: 20	Farmers: 4	<u>Mandi officials:2</u>	Procurement Centre/ APMC Mandi/ Warehouses/Cold Storages : 1
			Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>District officials: 1</u> <u>Bank Officials:1</u>	
	Jammu & Kashmir	Beneficiary: 80 Non-beneficiary: 20	Farmers: 4	<u>Mandi officials:2</u>	Procurement Centre/ APMC Mandi/ Warehouses/Cold Storages : 1
			Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>District officials: 1</u> <u>Bank Officials:1</u>	
	Uttarakhand	No	Farmers: 2	<u>Mandi officials:1</u>	Warehouses/Cold Storages : 1
			Traders/Processors/ WH/storage: 1	<u>District officials: 1</u>	

5.3.1 Details of KIIs and FGDs for evaluation study-MIS

Table 7:
Indicative stakeholders for KIIs and FGDs

Sr. No.	Level	Stakeholders	Type of instrument	Minimum number
1.	National	Department of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare	KII	2
		CNAs- NAFED, NCCF and others	KII	2
2.	State (Implementing state)	Department of Agriculture/ Horticulture	KII	4 (At least 1 per state)
		State /UT level committee	KII	4 (At least 1 per state)
		State level Agencies	KII	12 (At least 2 per state per crop)
		MIS Nodal Officer	KII	4 (At least 1 per state)
3.	State (Non-implementing state)	Department of Agriculture/ Horticulture	KII	4 (At least 1 per state)
		State level agencies	KII	4 (At least 1 per state)
4.	District (Implementing)	APMC/ Mandi Committee	KII	12 (at least 2 per district)

	state)			per crop)
		District Agricultural/ Horticulture Officers/ Procurement officers	KII	6 (at least 1 per district per crop)
		Bank Officials	KII	6 (at least 1 per district)
		Farmers	FGD	24 (at least 4 per district)
		Traders/ Processors/ WH/ Cold storage	FGD	6 (at least 1 per district per crop)
5.	District (Non-implementing state)	APMC/ Mandi Committee	KII	5 (at least 1 per crop)
		District Agricultural/ Horticulture Officers/ Procurement officers	KII	5 (at least 1 per crop)
		Farmers	FGD	10 (at least 2 per crop)
		Traders/ Processors/ WH/ Cold storage	FGD	5 (at least 1 per crop)

5.3.2 Household Surveys-MIS

For each crop where MIS was implemented, a minimum of 100 farmer households must be surveyed in each selected district of the implementing state for the evaluation study. The sample will be further categorized into 80 beneficiary and 20 non-beneficiary farmer households of the chosen crop.

5.3.3 Facility Visits - MIS

The details of facility visit to be conducted in the chosen districts of all the selected states are given below

Stakeholder	Minimum No.
Procurement Centre/ APMC Mandi/Warehouses/Cold storages	11 (at least 1 per district)

Table 8

Details of Farmer/household surveys/KIIs/FGDs for the entire MIS study

Categories	Minimum Number
Farmer/Household surveys	600
KIIs	70
FGDs	45
Facility Visits	11

5.4 Sampling (Indicative) - PDPS

- a) The objective of the evaluation study is to analyze the PDPS Scheme through field surveys and secondary research to determine the extent to which the scheme fulfills its objectives. PDPS covers only notified oilseeds. In 2018-19, 6,20,945 oilseed growers have been registered under the PDPS in the state of Madhya Pradesh during Kharif 2018-19 session for Soyabean crop (Source: DA&FW). However, the reasons for non-adoption of the scheme by other major oil seed producing states will have to be understood properly. Therefore, a scenario analysis in the major oil seed producing states will have to be conducted.
- b) For a comparative analysis, the three major oilseed crops of the country in terms of production - *Rapeseed/ Mustard*, *Soyabean*, *Ground nut*- are included in the study. Production details of these oil seed crops are provided in Table-9. States for the sample survey are selected based on production of these oil seed crops.

Table 9

Major Oil seeds of India – Production (in Lakh Tonnes)

Sl.No.	Crop	Year		
		2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
1	Rapeseed/ Mustard	119.631 (31.5)	126.432 (30.5)	132.591 (33.4)
2	Soyabean	129.867 (34.2)	149.849 (36.2)	130.62 (32.9)
3	Groundnut	101.35 (26.6)	102.967 (24.8)	101.801 (25.6)

Source: Directorate of Oilseeds Development) Percentage of production of oil seed crop is given in parantheses

- c) For soyabean, the crop in which PDPS was implemented, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra -the two main producers of the crop– are selected for a comparative analysis of implementing/non-implementing states. In these states, the perspective of farmers will be assessed through household surveys along with FGDs and FGDs only in implementing and non-implementing state respectively. Five and one district will be selected in Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra respectively to perform household surveys, KIIs and FGDs. To reduce biasedness in the sample, five non-contiguous Soyabean producing districts are selected from Madhya Pradesh for field study. The largest soyabean producing district is chosen from the non-implementing state, Maharashtra for comparative analysis. Market dynamics of PDPS will be assessed by covering traders, millers etc. in major mandis to understand the key points of decision making when PDPS scheme is in place.
- d) For other selected oil seed crops where PDPS is not implemented, the major producing states of each oil seed crop were listed (the top three in terms of production) and two states among the list are chosen (on the basis of need and cost parameters) to understand the reasons for non-participation of the states in PDPS. Besides KIIs in these states, a brief analysis of preferences/awareness of the farmers towards price deficit payments (without physical procurement) will be done through Focus Group Discussions. The district with the largest

production of particular oilseed in the selected state will be taken for conduct of FGDs with the farmers. One such district will be selected for each sample state to analyse the reasons for non-participation in PDPS. Market dynamics of oil seed crops will be assessed by covering traders, millers etc. in major mandis to understand the key points of decision making in the trade /procurement of oil seeds in those selected districts. Sample states (districts in parentheses) selected for the evaluation study are Madhya Pradesh (*Ujjain, Rajgarh, Vidisha, Mandsaur & Betul* for Soyabean and *Bhind* for Rapeseed and Mustard), Maharashtra (*Buldhana* for Soyabean), Rajasthan (*Tonk/Alwar* for Rapeseed and Mustard and *Bikaner* for Groundnut), and Gujarat (*Rajkot* for Groundnut).

Table -10

States for comparison of PDPS scheme (Indicative sampling)

Crops	State A	State B
Soyabean (Crop in which PDPS is implemented)	Madhya Pradesh	Maharashtra
Rapeseed/ Mustard	Rajasthan	Madhya Pradesh
Ground Nut	Gujarat	Rajasthan

e) An indicative sampling plan is provided in Table 11.

Table 11

Field activity plan for districts (plan provided is only **indicative and the numbers are set at the minimum level**)

Oilseeds	Sample State	Sample Districts	Household Survey	FGDs	KIIs
Soyabean	Madhya Pradesh	Ujjain	Beneficiary: 50 each district Non-beneficiary: 10 each district Total: 300	Farmers – 2 Millers -1 Mandi Traders- 1 Total- 20	Mandi officials -2 District officials – 1 Bank officials – 1 Total- 20
		Rajgarh			
		Vidisha			
		Mandsaur			
	Betul				
	Maharashtra	Buldhana	No	Farmers – 2 Mandi Traders-1 Millers- 1	Mandi officials-2 District officials -1
Rapeseed & Mustard	Rajasthan	Tonk/ Alwar	No	Farmers – 2 Mandi Traders-1 Millers- 1	Mandi officials -2 District officials – 1
	Madhya Pradesh	Bhind	No	Farmers – 2 Mandi Traders-1 Millers- 1	Mandi officials -2 District officials – 1
Ground Nut	Gujarat	Rajkot	No	Farmers – 2 Mandi Traders-1 Millers- 1	Mandi officials -2 District officials – 1
	Rajasthan	Bikaner	No	Farmers – 2 Mandi Traders-1 Millers- 1	Mandi officials -2 District officials – 1

5.4.1 Details of KIIs and FGDs for the evaluation study - PDPS

Table 12 :
Indicative stakeholders for KIIs and FGDs

Sr. No.	Level	Stakeholders	Type of instrument	Minimum number
1.	National	Department of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare	KII	2
		CNAs- NAFED, NCCF and others	KII	2
2.	State (Implementing state)	Department of Agriculture	KII	2
		State /UT level committee	KII	2
		State level Agencies	KII	2
		PDPS Nodal Officer	KII	1
3	State (Non-implementing state)	Department of Agriculture	KII	4 (at least 1 per state)
		State/UT level committee	KII	4 (at least 1 per state)
		State level agencies	KII	4 (at least 1 per state)
		PSS/Oilseed procurement officer	KII	4 (at least 1 per state)
3.	District (Implementing state)	APMC/ Mandi Committee	KII	10 (at least 2 per district)
		District Agricultural Officers/Procurement officers	KII	5 (at least 1 per district)
		Bank Officials	KII	5 (at least 1 per district)
		Mandi Traders	FGD	5 (at least 1 per district)
		Farmers	FGD	10 (at least 2 per district)
		Millers	FGD	5 (at least 1 per district)
4	District (Non-implementing state)	APMC/ Mandi Committee	KII	10 (at least 2 per district)
		District Agricultural Officers/Procurement officers	KII	5 (at least 1 per district)
		Mandi Traders	FGD	5 (at least 1 per district)

		Farmers	FGD	10 (at least 2 per district)
		Millers	FGD	5 (at least 1 per district)

5.4.2 Household surveys for PDPS

A minimum of 60 farmer households must be surveyed in each selected district of the implementing state for the evaluation study. The sample will be further categorized into 50 beneficiary and 10 non-beneficiary farmer households of the chosen crop.

Table 13
Details of Farmer/household surveys/KIIs/FGDs for the entire study

Categories	Minimum Number
Households/ Farmer Households	300 (60 per implementing district: 50 beneficiaries 10 non-beneficiaries)
KIIs	62
FGDs	40

5.5 Instructions on Sampling – MIS & PDPS

It is reiterated that Clauses 5.3 & 5.4 show an indicative sampling framework only. The consultant must ensure that the sample design must be stratified in such a way that the selected sample is stratified over geographic sub-areas and farmer population sub-groups properly. The size of the sample must take account of competing needs so that costs and precision parameters are optimally balanced. Besides, consultants may suggest changes in the methodology best suited to meet the objectives of the evaluation. Also, the above KIIs/FGDs/Facility visits/Household surveys represent a minimum number that should be conducted as part of field study. Consultants are free to increase the sample size for achieving estimates at higher precision. **The final methodology will be approved by DMEO.** Besides, a detailed list of stakeholders to be interacted during KIIs, FGDs, Facility visits and farmer/household surveys are to be formulated by the consultant in consultation with DMEO.

6. Mechanisms to ensure Data Quality- MIS & PDPS

A multi-pronged robust process for quality control needs to be followed during data collection. The following aspects need to be considered:

1. A data quality management (**DQM**) team must be formed by the consulting firm/organization/institution at national level with active communication with the state evaluation team. The role of the national DQM team would be to check the incoming data from the field (area of survey) daily during the survey and submit weekly development to the PI of the study. The overall responsibility for supervising the work of DQM teams lies with the PI, who on a fortnightly basis present the details of the quality management tools applied for ensuring high quality data collection to the Project Director and WG at DMEO.

2. The field investigators to be engaged in conducting the key informant interviews/FGDs should have at least 3 years of experience in conducting similar surveys/interviews. 2-step training (classroom and on-the-field training) should be conducted for all field investigators. The consultant should put in place adequate screening mechanisms so that only those surveyors who attain a certain level of understanding of questionnaires would be deployed for the study.
3. It is recommended that pilot surveys should be conducted on at least 2% of the sample size (surveys, KIIs and FGDs) to fine tune the inquiry tools. A brief on the learnings from such a pilot exercise and subsequent improvements in the tools/questionnaires should also be shared with DMEO, NITI Aayog.
4. 100% of the collected data should be validated using a validation checklist. Missing data points should be recollected.
5. In case of FGDs, 5% back checks should be undertaken to ensure 100% data verification.
6. In case of KIIs, it must be geo-tagged and GPS location of the KII should be submitted along with transcripts. Also, pictures of the building showing the name of the Department/Agency visited should also be submitted. The consulting firm can deploy additional methods for tracking the successful completion of KIIs.
7. Use of mobile-based, near real-time and geo-tagged data collection and validation tools should be done to ensure efficiency and accuracy in data collection. Access to tools and data should be provided to the Authority.

7. Deliverables & Timelines

7.1 The following are the Major Deliverables

Table 14
Major Deliverables

Sl. No.	Deliverable	Broad Topics (Indicative)
1.	Inception Report (maximum 20-30 pages excluding annexures) and presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction and background of the study • Objectives of the study • Approach and methodology • Literature review and preliminary findings • List of stakeholders and insights from preliminary stakeholder consultations • Sampling plan including sample coverage • Pilot plan • Analysis framework and plan (Mapping of objectives with data points and potential data sources, etc.) • Deliverables and timeline of the study (Weekly Gantt Chart) • Survey Team structure

Sl. No.	Deliverable	Broad Topics (Indicative)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training plan for the survey team • Field movement plan (Indicative) • Quality control mechanism • Perceived risks/ limitations and mitigation plan • Research tools/instruments/ software- Qualitative and Quantitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaires, discussion guides, etc. • Details of CAPI questionnaire development • Data/ information analysis software for both quantitative and qualitative research • Detailed report structure
2.	Mid-term report (maximum 30-40 pages excluding annexures) and presentation (to be submitted as per the timeline and covering a minimum of 40% of the sample)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study progress details including training and pilot summaries • Summary on data collected so far including methods used • Challenges faced and mitigation measures • Preliminary findings and key observations • Revised work plan, if applicable • Measures adopted for ensuring data quality including data verification, data validation, back checks, surprise inspections, use of CAPI and tracking systems.
3.	Draft evaluation report (maximum 120 pages excluding annexures and references) and presentation for stakeholder consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary (It should be crisp, direct, lucidly written with emphasis on appropriate sections such as Findings and Recommendations. Findings should be elaborated with key statistics and the recommendations should follow the findings. Length of the Executive Summary should be between 5 to 10 pages.)
4.	Final evaluation report (maximum 120 pages excluding annexures and references) and presentation after incorporation of inputs from all concerned stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector and scheme Overview • Study Objectives, Approach & Methodology (Brief discussion in the main report. The details could go in the Annexure) • Analysis of the scheme based on the REESI+C+E framework and using the primary survey data. • Secondary and administrative data and literature to be used to triangulate findings from primary survey. • Identify gaps and challenges for each component separately under the REESI+C+E framework. • Key Takeaways & Recommendations for each component of the scheme. • Actionable points under each recommendation for the M/D to implement. • To record best practices and case studies. • References & Appendices
5.	Presentations and sub-reports on primary data collection, data quality check, secondary research, best practices compendia, etc. as and when requested by DME0	

- (1) **Separate reports (As mentioned in Table 14) must be submitted by the consultant for MIS & PDPS Evaluation.**
- (2) All the reports are required to be submitted in hard copy (5 copies) and in soft copy, together with relevant intermediate work products like excel sheets, data sets, etc. A Hindi translation of the Final Evaluation report in hard and soft copy also should be submitted and sent through e-mail. A synopsis of the final evaluation report is also required to be submitted (not more than 5 A-4 size pages). In addition to the reports, for further analysis, verified raw data in soft copy should also be shared with DMEO. This will include detailed transcriptions of Key Informant Interviews in MS Word and MS Excel/CSV format, raw data of farmer surveys in MS Excel/CSV format and FGDs in real time CAPI dashboard. It is to be noted that the consultant shall maintain high quality in the report content (including proper references) which will be peer-reviewed by DMEO. The flow of findings and recommendations shall be clearly indicated in the report based on intellectual rigor. In case of any compromise in the quality, a suitable penalty would be imposed on the consultant as per the provisions given in the RFP.

7.2 Timeline for Project Execution- MIS & PDPS

The total duration of the evaluation study is 3 months (90 days) wherein the inception report has to be submitted by the consultant within 14 days (T+2 weeks) from the signing of the contract. Mid Term Report must be submitted by the consultant within 49 days (T+7 weeks) of contract signing agreement. Draft evaluation report and final evaluation report must be submitted within 77 days (T+11 weeks) and 90 days (T+13 weeks) of contract signing agreement respectively.

- 1 In the Inception report, the consultant is required to submit Gantt Chart (weekly) of all the activities and sub-activities (**Separate Gantt Charts are required for MIS & PDPS**).
- 2 The payment linked deliverables shall adhere to the requirements given in Section-7 Deliverables and Timelines of the Terms of Reference.
- 3 The project monitoring will be done by the Authority based on the timelines submitted by the consultant in the Inception report (Gantt chart) for the payment linked deliverables.
- 4 In case of any delay in the submission of payment linked deliverables namely, inception report, mid-term report, draft evaluation report and final evaluation report, the consultant will be penalized as per the extant provisions of the RFP.

8. Payment Schedule- MIS & PDPS

The payment terms will be linked to the key deliverables as mentioned below:

Table -15
Payment against Deliverables

Key Deliverable	Description of Deliverable	Payment
KD1	Inception report approved by the authority	20%
KD2	Mid-Term Report approved by Authority	30%
KD3	Draft Evaluation Report approved by Authority	30%
KD4	Final evaluation reports approved by Authority	20%
Total		100%

9. Indicative Report Structure- MIS & PDPS

The Final Evaluation Report (**separate reports are to be submitted for MIS & PDPS**) must be crisp and should cover the following aspects:

Executive Summary

1. Introduction
 - Background and context
 - Objective of the study
 - Scope of the study
 - Structure of the report
 - Sector overview
2. Approach & Methodology
 - Sampling - Sample size, Sample selection including selection of States, Districts, Blocks etc.
 - Qualitative and Qualitative Instrument/Tools
 - Stakeholder and geographical coverage
 - Qualitative Tools - Evaluation Instruments/Tools
 - Quantitative Tools - Evaluation Instruments/Tools
3. Scheme Analysis
 - Scheme Name
 - Background and components
 - Fund flow processes
 - Key stakeholders of the scheme
 - Physical and financial Progress
 - Performance Analysis using REESCI + Equity Criteria
 - Relevance
 - Effectiveness

- Efficiency
 - Sustainability
 - Coherence
 - Impact
 - Equity
4. Key takeaways and recommendations
 5. Actionable Points
 6. Program Harmonization
 7. References

10. Reporting- MIS & PDPS

1. The Consultant will work closely with the Authority. The Authority has established a Working Group (the “WG”) to enable conduct of this assignment. A designated Project Director of the Authority will be responsible for the overall coordination and project development. He will play a coordinating role in disseminating the Consultant’s outputs, facilitating discussions, and ensuring required reactions and responses to the Consultant.
2. The Consultant may prepare Issue Papers highlighting issues that could become critical for the timely completion of the Project and that require attention from the Authority.
3. The Consultant will make a presentation on the Inception Report and Draft Evaluation Report for discussion with the WG at a meeting. This will be a working document. The Consultant is required to prepare and submit a weekly update that includes and describes, inter alia, general progress to date; data and reports obtained and reviewed, conclusions to date, if any; concerns about availability of, or access to, data, analyses, reports; questions regarding the TOR or any other matters regarding work scope and related issues; and so on. The Consultants’ work on the TOR tasks should continue while the report is under consideration and is being discussed.
4. Regular communication with the WG and the Project Director is required in addition to all key communications. This may take the form of telephone/ teleconferencing, emails, faxes, and occasional meetings.

11. Responsibility of the Principal Investigator (PI)- MIS & PDPS

1. The PI is responsible for driving the evaluation study from beginning to the end i.e. final submission of the report to the satisfaction of the Authority (DMEO).
2. PI will be responsible for his/her individual and also the collective output of the consulting team working on the project. He /She is required to be hands-on the project all the time for the total duration of the project. He /She will report to the Project Director in DMEO and will be responsible for briefing and presentations on the ongoing and future plan of action for efficient and timely execution of the deliverables of the evaluation study.

3. The PI is also responsible for framing the analysis plan for the evaluation study, developing and finalising the instruments (questionnaire) for the survey which will be approved by DMEO, conduct at least 5 FGDs and 2 percent of the KII/Facility Visits himself/herself, make presentation of such findings from the field survey at DMEO, finalization of the inception, mid-term, draft final and final report, presentation of the key findings from the field survey after its completion, supervise the (Data Quality Management (**DQM**) teams.
4. In case, the Principal Investigator (PI) doesn't fulfill his/her abovementioned responsibility according to authority's expectation then the authority has the right to direct the consulting firm to replace the PI with someone of similar qualification and experience and/or impose penalty on the consultancy firm and take other actions as deemed fit by DMEO.

12. Non-Performance by the Consulting Firm- MIS & PDPS

1. In case of sub-standard work done by consultancy firm with respect to deliverables set by DMEO, the authority has right to penalize the consultancy firm by imposing fine that shall be deducted from outstanding amount of the total project cost at the time of imposition of such fine. The amount of fine would be proportionate to the quantum of dereliction of duty, which shall be decided by DMEO and the decision of DMEO will be final and binding on the Consultancy Firm.
2. If the performance of the consulting firm on the evaluation report is poor even after imposition of fine, the consultancy firm will be blacklisted by DMEO, NITI Aayog and will not be eligible to bid for any future projects tendered by DMEO, NITI Aayog for a period of 5 years.

13. Meetings- MIS & PDPS

The Authority may review with the Consultant any or all of the documents and advice forming part of the Consultancy, in meetings and conferences held at the Authority's office. No travel time allowance shall be payable for attending meetings at the Authority's office. The consultant is required to work at the Authority's office, if required.

14. Miscellaneous- MIS & PDPS

All the study outputs including primary data shall be compiled, classified and submitted by the Consultant to the Authority in soft form apart from the reports indicated in the Deliverables (Section 7). The study outputs shall remain the property of the Authority and shall not be used for any purpose other than that intended under these Terms of Reference without the permission of the Authority. The Consultancy shall stand completed on acceptance by the Authority of all the Deliverables of the Consultant and execution of the Agreement. The Consultancy shall in any case be deemed to be completed with mutual consent of the Authority and the Consultant.
