

Response to Queries _ Evaluation of Strengthening of KVK

| Sl. No. | Queries | DMEO Response |
|---------|--|----------------------------|
| 1 | Would an International Research Organisation be eligible to participate in this RFP? It is headquartered outside India, registered as a legal entity there, and also has a significant presence in India through its offices in New Delhi and Anand (Gujarat). | Please refer to the RFP. |
| 2 | Tender Information Summary (TIS) of the ToR mentions that the selection method for the consultant will be Quality & Cost Based Selection (QCBS) in 70:30 Ratio. We would like to submit that the proposed assignment is for contracting a consulting service; and the quality should be the prime focus in accordance with GFR 2017. Thus, in similar consulting assignments with a high emphasis on quality, the standard QCBS weightage for technical and financial bids is 80:20. Thus in the interest of quality, it is requested that technical and financial bid scoring weightage be revised to 80:20. | No change is contemplated. |
| | Tender Information Summary (TIS) of the ToR mentions that the department will officially release the clarifications on the queries of the bidders by September 10, 2025; and the due date for proposal submission is September 17, 2025. It will leave only about one week with the bidders to prepare and submit their proposal. This duration is inadequate for preparing a good-quality proposal suiting the requirements of the assignment. In similar procurements by government multilateral and bilateral agencies at least 2 weeks' time post issue of formal clarifications to queries is provided for proposal submission. In view of the above, it is requested that the consultants may please be allowed at least two weeks (14 working days) time from the actual date of release of clarifications by the client for preparation and submission of the proposal | No change is contemplated. |
| | Point 4.2: Eligible Assignments mentions that assessment/ research/evaluation study in crop science/ agricultural economics/ agricultural extension/ horticulture/ fisheries/ animal husbandry/ rural development/ natural resource management sector conducted for Union/State Government/ regulatory commission/ tribunal/ bilateral agencies/ multilateral | No change is contemplated. |

| | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|
| | <p>agencies/ statutory authorities/ public sector entities in India covering a minimum sample size of 500 respondents. Provided that the Eligible Assignments have been completed in the 8 (eight) financial years preceding the PDD. In view of the above, we request that this eligibility criteria be expanded to also include assessment/ research/ evaluation study undertaken for International NGOs in the mentioned sectors. This addition would acknowledge relevant expertise, broaden participation, and promote a more inclusive and competitive procurement process. Additionally, with respect to longitudinal studies, we request that the completion of even a single round of services be considered sufficient for meeting the evaluation criteria. This would acknowledge the technical rigor and scale of longitudinal assignments, even where multiple rounds are ongoing.</p> | |
| | <p>As per the ToR, the total duration allocated for the completion of the evaluation study is 5 months from the date of contract signing. However, considering the scope and complexity of the assignment which includes document review, tool development, data collection across 21 states and one Union Territory, stakeholder consultations, and preparation of a comprehensive analytical report. It is our assessment that the proposed timeline may not be sufficient to ensure high-quality output. To conduct the study in a thorough and methodologically sound manner, a minimum duration of 6 months is recommended. We request clarification on whether the proposed duration of 5 months is flexible and can be extended to 6 months to ensure the quality and comprehensiveness of the baseline study. This extended timeframe would allow for careful planning, effective stakeholder engagement, high-quality data collection, and detailed analysis, thereby upholding the standards expected in such an assignment.</p> | No change is contemplated. |
| | <p>The ToR document mentions that in case of delay in completion of Services, liquidated damages not exceeding an amount equal to 1% (one per cent) of the Agreement Value per week, subject to a maximum of 10% (ten per cent) of the Agreement Value will be imposed and shall be recovered by appropriation from the Performance Security or otherwise. However, in case of delay due to reasons beyond the control of the Consultant, suitable extension of time shall be granted. Imposing penalties for delays is not a standard practice in the consulting field. Consulting projects require a consultative and iterative approach, where timelines may evolve due to the need for collaborative discussions, adjustments to client requirements, and addressing unforeseen</p> | No change is contemplated. |

| complexities. Therefore, we kindly request the removal of this clause to reflect the realities of consulting work and foster a collaborative, result-driven approach. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|--|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|---|-----|---------------------|-----|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|----------------------------|
| <p>6. Annex-5: Payment Schedule at Page no. 86</p> <p>As per the ToR, 20% of the payment is proposed upon approval of the Inception Report and 30% upon submission of the Mid-Term Report (after completion of 40% of data collection). Right from the outset of the assignment, it would be required to work on preliminary activities (meetings/interactions) , manpower deployment, development of data collection application, orientation of data collection teams, travel/ lodging/ boarding for data collection, all these are cost-intensive activities and would need upfront working capital. Besides, each assignment has to pay for itself. Thus, the payment terms mentioned in the ToR will not suffice the working capital requirement at different stages of the assignment, and the consultants will be forced to cross-subsidize the working capital requirements from their other assignments. In view of the above, it is requested to please revise the payment terms for the assignment as follows, to ensure availability of adequate working capital at each stage of the assignment.</p> <table><tr><th colspan="2">Deliverable and Payment as per ToR</th><th colspan="2">Suggested Deliverable and Payment</th></tr><tr><th>Deliverable</th><th>Payment</th><th>Deliverable</th><th>Payment</th></tr><tr><td>KD1: Inception Report approved by Authority</td><td>20%</td><td>Signing of contract</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>KD2: Mid-</td><td>30%</td><td>Inception</td><td>20%</td></tr></table> | | Deliverable and Payment as per ToR | | Suggested Deliverable and Payment | | Deliverable | Payment | Deliverable | Payment | KD1: Inception Report approved by Authority | 20% | Signing of contract | 20% | KD2: Mid- | 30% | Inception | 20% | No change is contemplated. |
| Deliverable and Payment as per ToR | | Suggested Deliverable and Payment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Payment | Deliverable | Payment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KD1: Inception Report approved by Authority | 20% | Signing of contract | 20% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KD2: Mid- | 30% | Inception | 20% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----|------------------------------|--|--|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|---|-----|--|-----|---|-----|--|
| | <table><tr><td>Term Report approved by Authority</td><td></td><td>Report approved by Authority</td><td></td></tr><tr><td rowspan="2">KD3: Draft Evaluation Report approved by Authority</td><td rowspan="2">30%</td><td>Mid-Term Report approved by Authority</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>Draft Evaluation Report approved by Authority</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>KD4: Final Evaluation Report approved by Authority</td><td>20%</td><td>Final Evaluation Report approved by Authority</td><td>20%</td></tr></table> | Term Report approved by Authority | | Report approved by Authority | | KD3: Draft Evaluation Report approved by Authority | 30% | Mid-Term Report approved by Authority | 20% | Draft Evaluation Report approved by Authority | 20% | KD4: Final Evaluation Report approved by Authority | 20% | Final Evaluation Report approved by Authority | 20% | |
| Term Report approved by Authority | | Report approved by Authority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KD3: Draft Evaluation Report approved by Authority | 30% | Mid-Term Report approved by Authority | 20% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Draft Evaluation Report approved by Authority | 20% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KD4: Final Evaluation Report approved by Authority | 20% | Final Evaluation Report approved by Authority | 20% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | <p>General T&C available at GEM portal vs RFP Terms & Conditions at Page 54 of 140 We would like to seek clarification on whether the GEM portal Terms will be appended to the Agreement for Evaluation Study of Strengthening of KVK Scheme (Schedule 2 – Form of Agreement) as set out in the RFP document at Page 54 of 140. Could you please confirm in case of conflict between the two which set of terms shall prevail?</p> | Please refer to the RFP. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Section 3.9 Documents prepared by the Consultant to be property of the Authority Page 73 of 140 As a standard practice, D&B typically retain ownership of our pre-existing IP (such as</p> | No change is contemplated. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------------|
| | tools, methodologies, templates etc.) and the reports / deliverables created under the engagement. We provide the customer with a very broad, perpetual, and non-exclusive license for the report (final deliverable) usage. | |
| | <p>Section 2.6 Modification of Agreement Page 63 of 140</p> <p>There shall be no modification in the terms and conditions of this Agreement unless the reasons are beyond the control of both parties i.e. the Applicant and the Authority. In no circumstances, the cost should be higher than the agreement cost due to modifications in the terms and conditions. During the course of engagement, if there are changes in the scope of work or obligations which materially impact delivery, such changes may necessitate corresponding modification in costs and timelines. We request confirmation that in such scenarios, the Parties will mutually discuss and agree upon the impact of changes, including cost adjustment.</p> | No change is contemplated. |
| | <p>Section 2.8 Suspension of Agreement Page 65 of 140</p> <p>2.8. Suspension of Agreement The Authority may, by written notice of suspension to the Consultant, suspend all payments to the Consultant hereunder if the Consultant shall be in breach of this Agreement or shall fail to perform any of its obligations under this Agreement, including the carrying out of the Services; provided that such notice of suspension (i) shall specify the nature of the breach or failure, and (ii) shall provide an opportunity to the Consultant to remedy such breach or failure within a period not exceeding 21 (twenty one) days after receipt by the Consultant of such notice of suspension. We request reconsideration, as suspension of all payments may be disproportionate to the breach and could adversely affect the ongoing engagement. We suggest that any suspension of payments be limited to amounts directly related to the disputed or non-performed obligations, while payments for satisfactorily rendered services continue to remain payable.</p> | No change is contemplated. |
| | <p>Section 3.4 Liability of the Consultant Page 72 of 140</p> <p>3.4.3 (ii) for any direct loss or damage that exceeds (a) the Agreement Value set forth in Clause 6.1.2 of this Agreement, or (b) the proceeds the Consultant may be entitled to receive from any insurance maintained by the Consultant to cover such a liability in accordance with Clause 3.5.1, whichever of (a) or (b) is higher.</p> | No change is contemplated. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>3.4.4 This limitation of liability specified in Clause 3.4.3 shall not affect the Consultant's liability, if any, for damage to Third Parties caused by the Consultant or any person or firm acting on behalf of the Consultant in carrying out the Services subject, however, to a limit equal to 3 (three) times the Agreement Value. Can you please confirm that the cap for direct losses shall be limited to the Agreement value only, to provide certainty and avoid variability linked to insurance coverage. The liability cap for third-party claims at 3x Agreement Value appears significantly high. We request you to kindly consider capping such liability at 1.5x the Agreement Value.</p> | |
| | <p>Section 6.3 Mode of billing and payment Page 77 of 140 6.3 (d) The final payment under this Clause shall be made only after the final report and a final statement, identified as such, shall have been submitted by the Consultant and approved as satisfactory by the Authority. The Services shall be deemed completed and finally accepted by the Authority and the final deliverable shall be deemed approved by the Authority as satisfactory upon expiry of 90 (ninety) days after receipt of the final deliverable by the Authority unless the Authority, within such 90 (ninety) day period, gives written notice to the Consultant specifying in detail, the deficiencies in the Services. The Consultant shall thereupon promptly make any necessary corrections and/or additions, and upon completion of such corrections or additions, the foregoing process shall be repeated. The Authority shall make the final payment upon acceptance or deemed acceptance of the final deliverable by the Authority. The payment term is 45 days, and the deemed acceptance of services is 90 days. This effectively extends the payment cycle to over four months from the date of submission of the final report. We request you to kindly consider revising the deemed acceptance period to a shorter duration, of 15 to 30 days, to ensure a fair and balanced payment cycle. Moreover, we would want to limit the number of iterations for corrections to a maximum of two iterations.</p> | No change is contemplated. |
| | <p>Section 6.3 Mode of billing and payment Page 77 of 140 6.3 (f) In the event of non-completion of Services within 2 (two) years of the Effective Date, the Final Payment shall not become due to the Consultant, save and except the costs incurred for meeting its reimbursable expenses during the period after expiry of 24 (twenty-four) months from the Effective Date, including travel costs and personnel costs, at the agreed rates The clause appears redundant, given that the contractual term is five</p> | Please refer to Pg 77 (Clause 6.3) of the RFP. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>months. Even with iterations or corrections, it is highly unlikely that the services would extend to two years. We request clarification on the intent of this provision to ensure alignment. Additionally, in the unlikely event that the engagement does extend beyond two years, would the Consultant be entitled to payment for the services duly performed and deliverables already accepted prior to the expiry of the two-year period?</p> | |
| | <p>Section 7.1 Performance Security Page 78 of 140 The Authority shall retain by way of performance security (the “Performance Security”), 3% (three per cent) of all the amounts due and payable to the Consultant, to be appropriated against breach of this Agreement or for recovery of liquidated damages as specified in Clause 7.2. We request clarification on whether, in lieu of the Performance Security, the following alternatives may be considered: Submission of a fixed-term bank deposit of equivalent value, or Retention of 3% from each invoice or payment milestone, to be held until the completion of contract term.</p> | No change is contemplated. |
| | <p>Section 7.2. Liquidated Damages Page 78 of 140 Section 7.2. Liquidated Damages</p> <p>Page 78 of 140 7.2.1. Liquidated Damages for error/variation: In case any error or variation or plagiarism is detected in the data, data analysis or reports, submitted by the Consultant and such error or variation is the result of negligence or lack of due diligence on the part of the Consultant, the consequential damages thereof shall be quantified by the Authority in a reasonable manner and recovered from the Consultant by way of deemed liquidated damages, subject to a maximum of 10% (ten per cent) of the Agreement Value.</p> <p>7.2.2. Liquidated Damages for delay: In case of delay in completion of Services, liquidated damages not exceeding an amount equal to 1% (one per cent) of the Agreement Value per week, subject to a maximum of 10% (ten per cent) of the Agreement Value will be imposed and shall be recovered by appropriation from the Performance Security or otherwise. LDs for error, variation or plagiarism is not standard industry practice. Would you kindly consider addressing such matters under the normal dispute resolution mechanism rather than LD. Please confirm that both categories of LD will not be applied concurrently for the same breach/event, and that there will be no double recovery for the</p> | Please refer to Pg. 78 (Clause 7.2 and 7.3) of the RFP. |

| | | |
|----|--|----------------------------|
| | same default. Please clarify whether the overall capping of liquidated damages is an aggregate cap of 10% of the Agreement Value (irrespective of the type of breach) or whether each head of LD has a separate 10% cap. Please confirm that liquidated damages are the sole and exclusive remedy for the specified breaches, and that no additional claims (such as consequent damages) will be pursued for the same event. | |
| 4. | 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. We request that substitution of the Team Leader be permitted in exceptional cases such as resignation, inability to continue, or availability of a better-qualified candidate, subject to prior approval of the Authority. | No change is contemplated. |
| | While we understand the eligible assignment value criteria provided, we kindly request a revision of the same. Specifically, we propose the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ₹50–80 lakhs: 0.8 marks • ₹80 lakhs–₹1 crore: 0.9 marks • More than ₹1 crores: 1 mark | No change is contemplated. |
| | Page no 21 4.2 Eligible Assignment It is a humble request to kindly add social sector/impact assessments/ PMU/Household survey assignments in this. | No change is contemplated. |
| 5. | Section No.: NA Clause No.: NA Page No.: NA Context: Budget Query: Request kind clarification on the tentative budget for execution of the assignment if any. | Not Applicable |
| | Section No.: 4 Clause No.: 12 Page No.: 47 Context: Duration Query: We understand that the consultant will not be held accountable for any delays in submission of deliverables which are not solely attributable to the performance of the consultant. Please clarify if our understanding is correct. | As per RFP |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Section No.: 4 Clause No.: 12 Page No.: 47 Context: Timeline of deliverable submission Query: We understand that the deadlines for submission of the next deliverable will be on acceptance of the previous deliverable by the client. Kindly clarify if our understanding is correct.</p> | <p>As per RFP</p> |
| | <p>Section No.: 4 Clause No.: 4.1 & 4.2 Page No.: 37–40 Context: Scope of Services – inception, field survey, data analysis, reporting, and stakeholder consultation. Query: Request your kind clarification on whether the manpower deployment for field surveys and analysis can include engagement of third-party survey agencies or subcontracting for data collection? Also, please confirm if there is any ceiling on subcontracting or preferred vendor lists.</p> | <p>As per RFP</p> |
| | <p>Section No.: 4 Clause No.: 4.2b & 4.2c Page No.: 37–39 Context: Collaboration with host organisations, sampling of KVKs, and coverage areas. Query: Kindly clarify the expected sample size breakdown across states and zones, and whether the list of KVKs to be included will be provided by the Authority? Can the consultant propose an alternative sampling approach if justified?</p> | <p>Please refer to Pg. 39 (Section 5.1.1) of the RFP. Details will be discussed once the agency is onboarded for the evaluation study.</p> |
| | <p>Section No.: 5 Clause No.: 5.1 & 5.2 Page No.: 39–41 Context: Primary & secondary data collection, quality assurance, and use of software tools. Query: Request your guidance on whether standard CAPI tools need to be used or can customised survey platforms be proposed? Also, please clarify any security or encryption requirements for data transmission and storage.</p> | <p>Please refer to Pg. 37 (Section 4.2) of the RFP.</p> |
| | <p>Section No.: 1 Clause No.: 1.4.3 & Annexure A Page No.: 19, 67–68 Context: Qualifications and experience of team members with specified minimums. Query: Request your kind confirmation that the inclusion of candidates with slightly lower qualifications but significant relevant experience can be considered? Are replacements for</p> | <p>Please refer to Pg. 25 (Annexure A) of the RFP.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | Key Personnel permitted once the assignment starts, and under what conditions? | |
| | <p>Section No.: 6 Clause No.: 6 Page No.: 76–77</p> <p>Context: Payment is linked to deliverables, currency, and no escalation.</p> <p>Query: Please clarify if travel and other direct costs are to be included in the fixed fee or reimbursed separately following actuals? Also, kindly confirm payment timelines after submission and approval of deliverables.</p> | Please refer to Pg 121 (Appendix II - Form 2) and Pg 86 (Annex 5) of RFP. |
| | <p>Section No.: 1 Clause No.: 1.12 & 1.15 Page No.: 7, 16</p> <p>Context: Submission procedures via GeM portal, number of envelopes, and signing requirements.</p> <p>Query: Kindly clarify the number and format of envelopes to be submitted. Any instructions regarding the offline submission of documents like the Power of Attorney and Bid Security?</p> | Please refer to Pg 6 (Clause 1.12) and Pg 10 (Clause 1.15) of RFP. |
| | <p>Section No.: 1 Clause No.: 1.5 & Annexure Page No.: 4, 88–92</p> <p>Context: Definitions and illustrations of conflict of interest scenarios.</p> <p>Query: Kindly clarify if the consultant team members can simultaneously be involved in other related consultancy work for different government programmes? Also, guidance on disclosure requirements is requested.</p> | Please refer to Pg 68 (Clause 3.2) and Pg 89-92 (Schedule 3) of RFP |
| | <p>Section No.: 3 Clause No.: 3.9 Page No.: 69</p> <p>Context: Ownership of documents and reports.</p> <p>Query: Request confirmation regarding the ability of the consultant to use anonymised data and reports derived from the assignment for academic publications and promotional purposes.</p> | Please refer to Pg. 73 (Clause 3.9) of the RFP. |
| | <p>Section No.: 3 Clause No.: 3.3 Page No.: 69</p> <p>Context: Confidential information handling.</p> <p>Query: Kindly clarify if the consultant is required to sign a specific Non-Disclosure Agreement or if confidentiality is covered under the contract? Any specific data protection standards?</p> | Please refer to Pg. 70 (Clause 3.3) of the RFP. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Section No.: 7 Clause No.: 7.2 & 7.3 Page No.: 77–78 Context: Penalties for error, delay, and deficiency in work. Query: Request your guidance on practical thresholds and appeal mechanisms related to penalties. Also, is there any provision for extension of timelines in case of unavoidable delays beyond the consultant's control?</p> | <p>Please refer to Pg. 78 (Clause 7) of the RFP.</p> |
| <p>Section No.: 4 Clause No.: 4.2 (Manpower & Deployment) Page No.: 69, 99–101 Context: Staffing requirements and deployment schedules. Query: Please clarify if the proposed support staff numbers are flexible? Is it mandatory to follow the specified resource plan, or can variations be proposed, aligned with the methodology?</p> | <p>Please refer to Pg 9 (Clause 1.13.6) and Pg 74 (Clause 4.2) of RFP.</p> |
| <p>Section No.: 2 Clause No.: 2.2 & 2.3 Page No.: 63 Context: Timeline to start work after contract signing. Query: Kindly confirm the expected timeline for the commencement, and if any penalties for delayed commencement under normal circumstances are grounds for extension of the project timeline.</p> | <p>Please refer to Pg. 62 (Clause 2.1 and 2.2) of the RFP.</p> |
| <p>Section No.: 1 Clause No.: 1.8 & 1.11 Page No.: 7–8, 12 Context: Pre-bid queries for submissions and official corrigenda. Query: Request your confirmation on the official communication channel for clarifications and amendment issuance? We request an extension of the timeline for submission of the proposal to at least 2 weeks after publication of clarifications to the queries.</p> | <p>Please refer to Pg 12 (Section 2.4) of the RFP.</p> <p>No change is contemplated.</p> |
| <p>Section No.: 4 Clause No.: 4.1 (Methodology & Work Plan) Page No.: 110–112 Context: Expectations on methodology, sampling, quality assurance and timelines. Query: Kindly confirm if a collaborative research approach with local academic partners is encouraged, and how it is expected to be reflected in the proposal. Any preferred sampling criteria?</p> | <p>Please refer to Pg 19 (Clause 4.1.3), Pg 39 (Section 5) and Pg. 111 (Appendix-I Form 7) of the RFP.</p> |
| <p>Section No.: 4 Clause No.: 4.3 (Deliverables) Page No.: 43–44 Context: Report structure expectations and appendices. Query: Request your approval process on the draft and final evaluation reports? How</p> | <p>Please refer to Pg. 42 (Section 7) of the RFP.</p> |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | many rounds of revisions are anticipated? | |
| | <p>Section No.: 5 Clause No.: 5.3 Page No.: 41</p> <p>Context: Quality control procedures, including back-check, telephonic validation, and CAPI.</p> <p>Query: Is geo-tagging and data validation mandatory?</p> | Please refer to Pg. 41 (Section 5.3) of the RFP. |
| | <p>Section No.: 4 Clause No.: 4.4 Page No.: 111</p> <p>Context: Proposed involvement of academic institutions in the project.</p> <p>Query: Please clarify the preferred extent of engagement with academic institutions for technical inputs, data analysis or report review? Are consortia encouraged?</p> | Please refer to Pg 19 (Clause 4.1.3), Pg. 111 (Appendix-I Form 7), Pg 118 (Appendix-I Form 12) and Pg 124 (Appendix-III) of the RFP. |
| | <p>Section No.: 4 Clause No.: 1.4.2 (B) Page No.: 2–5</p> <p>Context: Applicant should not have been debarred/blacklisted by Government, Statutory Authority, or PSU.</p> <p>Query: We would like to humbly submit that the time period for eligibility criteria/declaration regarding prior blacklisting is very long. We request you to kindly modify the eligibility criteria to allow Bidders that have not been blacklisted as on date or for a specific period (like 2 years) in the past, to participate in the bid. We also request you to kindly allow Bidders to declare that they are not blacklisted as on date or for a specific period (like 2 years) in the past.</p> | No change is contemplated. |
| 6. | <p>On page 34, section 4.1.3, under “Relevant Experience of the Applicant” the scoring parameters on sample size and value of assignments are different from that on page 36, section 4.2 – Eligible Assignments.</p> <p>We request your guidance on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which criteria will be considered final for evaluation – the scoring framework in section 4.1.3 (page 34) or the assignment list in section 4.2 (page 36)? 2. Should applicants submit assignments strictly from the list on page 34, or can they | Please refer to Pg 19 (Clause 4.1.3) of the RFP. |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | include other eligible assignments as per the parameters mentioned in section 36? | |
| 7. | <p>Pg 34 of the RFP– technical evaluation criteria – relevant experience of the applicant. Maximum 10 assignments can be submitted by the applicant.</p> <p>We humbly request for the following relaxation in the evaluation criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sample size of eligible assignments of the applicant (10 marks). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 500 to 1,000 respondents: 0.5 mark 2. 1,000 to 2,000 respondents: 0.7 mark 3. > 2,000 respondents: 1 mark ii. Value of Eligible Assignments (10 marks). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rs 10 lakhs - Rs 50 lakhs: 0.8 marks 2. Rs 50 lakhs – Rs 1 crore: 0.9 marks 3. > Rs 1 Crore: 1 mark | No change is contemplated. |
| | As per the ToR, 3000 Farmers includes both Beneficiaries & non-Beneficiaries. Could you please specify the expected split. | Details will be discussed once the agency is onboarded for the evaluation study. |
| | We would like to know whether the applying agency is permitted to form a consortium with 2–3 partners; if yes, can it include both academic institutions and non-academic firms ? | Please refer to Pg 1 (Clause 1.2.1) of the RFP. |
| | As per Clause 4.1 - Evaluation of Technical Proposals, in the scoring criteria for Relevant Experience of the Applicant (a) it is given that each eligible assignments having sample size of 1000 – 2000 respondents can score 0.5 marks, however in the Clause 4.2 Eligible Assignments it is given that - “Assessment/research/evaluation study in crop science/ agricultural economics/ agricultural extension/horticulture/ fisheries/ animal husbandry/ | Please refer to Pg 19 (Clause 4.1.3) of RFP for the scoring criteria. No change is |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | rural development/ natural resource management sector 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 respondents.” Please confirm the marking scheme for assignments with a sample size between 500 and 1,000 respondents, as this range is not explicitly covered in Clause 4.1 | contemplated. |
| | Query 2: As per Clause 4.1 - Evaluation of Technical Proposals, in the scoring criteria for Relevant Experience of the Applicant (c) it is given that Value of Eligible Assignments from 50 lakhs to 1 Crore will be given 0.8 marks, however in the Clause 4.2 Eligible Assignments it is given that – “Provided that the value of each eligible assignment submitted by the Applicant is at least Rs. 10 Lakhs.” Please confirm the marks to be awarded for assignments with a contract value between ₹10 lakhs and ₹50 lakhs, as this range is not addressed in the scoring criteria of Clause 4.1. | Please refer to Pg 19 (Clause 4.1.3) of RFP for the scoring criteria. No change is contemplated. |
| | We wanted to know if projects funded by 3ei (international initiative for impact evaluation) would qualify as eligible assignments. 3ie members include government agencies from low-and middle-income countries, and multilateral development agencies who are committed to using rigorous evidence to improve their policies and programs. | Please refer to Pg 21 (Clause 4.2.(b)) of RFP. No change is contemplated |
| | As per the RFP Financial Capacity " The Applicant should have a minimum annual total revenue/turnover of Rs 3.76 Cr preceding 3 (three) financial years from the date of the application" Our organisation is having more than 5 crores average annual turnover for the year FY 2022-23, FY 2023-24 and FY 2024-25 as well as more than 5 crores in each of these financial years. However, the final audited report is awaited. We only have the provisional balance sheet. In that case CA will not provide a turnover certificate for FY 2024-25. We also have average annual turnover more than 5 crores for FY 2021-22, FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24. However, for the financial year 2021-22 we have less than 3 crores. We can provide a CA certificate for these three financial years with average annual turnover more than 5 crore. In such a situation are we eligible for applying for the RFP. We have considerable scores as per technical capacity in terms of relevant studies, technical manpower in terms of eligible assignments. If a consortium can be made with | Please refer to Pg. 2 (Clause 1.4.2 (c)) and Pg 108 (Appendix I- Form 5) of the RFP |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>another organisation having more than 5 crore turnover. In that case can we be allowed as a lead agency and show the financial capacity of consortium partners.</p> <p>Otherwise can a consortium Partner having financial capacity as per RFP show the other technical capacity and eligible assignment of CMRSD.</p> | |
|--|---|--|