

Response to Queries reg. Evaluation of ADP and ABP:

Sl. No.	Queries	DMEO Response
1.	Page Limitation: We understand that the Proposed Methodology and Work Plan has a page limitation of 10 pages distributed by sub-sections. Could you kindly confirm whether this should be treated as a total of 10 pages for the combined Proposed Methodology and Work Plan, or if section-wise page limits are to be maintained? Also, because the RFP talks of 2 different programs? the ADP and the ABP? Is this page limitation for both programs together or for each program?	The page limit for the methodology and work plan is 10 pages, applicable to both programmes. Only a single consolidated document is to be submitted for the methodology and work plan. A reasonable extension of pages may be permitted.
2.	Ethical Protocols & IRB Approvals: The RFP mentions adherence to ethical protocols and data confidentiality norms. Please clarify whether any specific IRB approvals/certifications need to be obtained for this assignment.	Please refer to Pg. 76 (Section 1.4) of the RFP
3.	Recording of Interviews: The RFP states that the survey agency shall record telephonic interviews and email responses for verification and validation. Please note that interviews can only be recorded with respondent consent. Kindly confirm if respondent consent will be considered sufficient to meet this requirement.	Will be discussed once the agency is onboarded for the evaluation study.
4.	Quality & Penalties: The RFP specifies that in case of compromise in quality, a suitable penalty would be imposed on the consultant. As quality is a subjective measure, could you please help define the parameters of quality? in this context and also clarify how the penalties would be quantified?	Please refer to Pg. 135 (Clause 7) of RFP.
5.	Beneficiary Surveys: The RFP proposes 375 beneficiary surveys to be conducted with relevant stakeholders. Could you please define the term relevant stakeholders for beneficiary surveys and provide guidance on how they should be approached?	Will be discussed once the agency is onboarded for the evaluation study. Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP.

6.	Parameters & Indicators: Section 5.1.2 states that the consultant should propose a comprehensive list of parameters and indicators for data collection and analysis. We understand this is to be developed and submitted in the Inception Report, and not in the technical proposal. Please confirm.	Yes.
7.	Reports in Hard Copy: The RFP mentions that all reports are required to be submitted in hard copy (10 nos) and soft copy. By all reports in hard copy, does this refer only to the Final Report, or to all deliverables such as the Inception Report, Mid-Term Report, and Final Report- 10 copies of each (around 30 reports)?	For Inception Report and Mid-term Report soft copy is sufficient. However, the final report has to be submitted in both hard copy (10 nos) and soft copy.
8.	Project Office: The RFP states that the consultant shall maintain attendance/time sheets of all personnel in the Project Office. Could you please clarify whether Project Office? refers to the agency/consultants office or the DMEO office?	Please refer to Pg. 55(Clause 11 (a)) of the RFP.
9.	What baseline data will be used to measure the impact of ADP and ABP interventions? Would the baseline data be available with the districts or with Niti Aayog?	Will be discussed once the agency is onboarded for the evaluation study.
10.	Is the evaluation expected to isolate ADP's impact from other concurrent development programs in these districts? Since no provision for control is specified in the RFP, would DMEO expect to understand this impact specifically?	Will be discussed once the agency is onboarded for the evaluation study.
11.	For ADP, what does the primary research reference period being of 3 years mean (2021-2022 to 2024-25)?	Will be discussed once the agency is onboarded for the evaluation study.
12.	Reference to the ToC/Result Chain, is the consultant expected to design the projects ToC/Result chain at the Inception stage or make modifications to any existing ToC that Niti Aayog already have for the programs?	Will be discussed once the agency is onboarded for the evaluation study.
13.	Can you let us understand what specific elements/indicators of the Champions of Change Dashboard are most relevant for the impact analysis?	Will be discussed once the agency is onboarded for the

		evaluation study.
14.	On ABP, what specific metrics will evaluate the contribution of Aspirational Block Fellows?	Please refer to Pg. 81 (Section 3) of RFP
15.	We would request for a time extension for the proposal submission as the existing timeline for a proposal of this complexity is very less. We would request for atleast 7-10 working days after Pre-bid response date as per your provisions mentioned in the RFP.	No change is contemplated.
16.	As per page 30-31, section 4.2 (Eligible assignment), point (c), it is mentioned that the eligible assignments must have been completed in the 8 (eight) financial year preceding the PDD. As per our understanding, studies completed between April 2017 and March 2025 would be considered. Kindly confirm if this interpretation is correct.	Please refer to Pg. 31 (Clause 4.2 (c)) of RFP.
17.	<p>As per the RFP Financial Capacity " The Applicant should have a minimum annual total revenue/turnover of Rs 2.07 Cr preceding 3 (three) financial years from the date of the application"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you please explain what 3 (three) financial years means i.e. for FY 2021-22, FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 or FY 2022-23, FY 2023-24 and FY 2024-25. 2. In case FY 2024-25 is considered whether provisional balance sheet figures are admissible. 3. Is it necessary to have a minimum of Rs.2.07 crores for each of the Financial years by the applicant agency. 	<p>Please refer to Pg. 16 (Clause 1.4.2 (c)) of the RFP</p> <p>Preceding three financial years as applicable will be considered.</p>
18.	1.4.2.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. Please clarify if the above point means that the organisation should have a minimum of 8 registration / financial years. Population Council Consulting Private Limited got its registration in December 2018. Ever since its inception we have undertaken several such assignment as specified in the clause 4.2. However, we have completed only 7 financial cycles and would like to be certain if we are eligible to apply for the mentioned RFP.	Please refer to pg. 16 (Clause 1.4.2(b) of RFP.

19.	Joint Venture / Consortium Eligibility: Kindly confirm whether Joint Ventures/Consortiums are permitted under this RFP.	Please refer to Pg. 15 (Clause 1.2.1) of RFP.
20.	Lead / Primary Bidder: In case of a consortium, please clarify who will be considered the Lead Member / Primary Bidder for contractual obligations, signing of agreement, and correspondence with the Authority.	Please refer to Pg. 15 (Clause 1.2.1) of RFP.
21.	Submission of Credentials & Financials: For consortium bids, are both partners required to submit their financial and technical credentials separately, or is it sufficient for only the Lead Member to provide these documents to meet the eligibility requirements?	Please refer to Pg. 15 (Clause 1.2) of RFP.
22.	Budget Clarification: As per this RFP, is there any specified budget ceiling or estimated value of the consultancy assignment? If not, will the Authority provide an indicative budget range for guidance?	Not Applicable
23.	Sample Size Flexibility: Regarding the survey component, can applicants propose their own scientifically justified sample size, or is it mandatory to follow only the sample size specified in the RFP?	Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP.
24.	Sampling Across States & UTs: How many sampling districts are expected to be covered in the proposed 12 States and one Union Territory? Is there a prescribed distribution of districts across these geographies?	Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP.
25.	Pilot Study Requirement (Section 5.3): The RFP mentions that a pilot study should be conducted. Could you please provide more insights on the scope, coverage, and expected methodology of this pilot study?	Please refer to Pg. 86 (Section 5.2 (b)) of RFP.
26.	Timeline Clarification (Section 12): The timeline mentioned in Section 12 — is it applicable to each state individually, or does it represent the overall timeline for the entire assignment across all 12 States and 1 UT?	The timeline is applicable for the entire evaluation.
27.	Under ADP the sample size is indicated as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII -50 	Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FGD - 25 • Beneficiaries - 475 <p>Under ABP the sample size is indicated as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII - 50 • FGD - 25 • Beneficiaries - 350 <p>Please confirm whether the total sample size will be the sum of these two or the sample size of ABP will be the subset of ADP sample size?</p>	
28.	1. Given the nature and rigor of the scope, we feel 4 months to complete it may not be enough. We would request this to be made 6 months	No change is contemplated
29.	2. We request for additional marks for an academic partnership to be dropped as sometimes these partnerships don't serve its intended benefit.	No change is contemplated.
30.	<p>Tender Information Summary (TIS) of the ToR mentions that the department will officially release the clarifications on the queries of the bidders by September 04, 2025; and the due date for proposal submission is September 8, 2025. It will leave only about 2 working days 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 least 2 weeks' time post issue of formal clarifications to queries is provided for proposal submission.</p> <p>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, that is, till September 18, 2025.</p>	No change is contemplated.
31.	<p>Section 4.2. Eligible Assignments at Page no. 30</p> <p>Point 4.2: Eligible Assignments mentions that assessment/ research/ evaluation study in health/ nutrition/agriculture/ education/financial inclusion/skilling/rural development sector conducted for Union/ State Government/ regulatory commission/ tribunal/ bilateral agencies/ multilateral agencies/ statutory authorities/ public sector entities in India</p>	No change is contemplated.

	<p>covering a minimum sample size of 500 respondents.</p> <p>Provided that the Eligible Assignments have been completed in the 8 (eight) financial years preceding the PDD.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	
32.	<p>Section 4.5 Combined and Final Evaluation at Page no. 31</p> <p>Section 4.5 Combined and Final Evaluation mention that proposals will finally be ranked according to their combined technical (ST) and financial (SF) scores as 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.</p> <p>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 assignment 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.</p>	No change is contemplated.
33.	<p>Section 5.1.1 Sampling.</p> <p>The ToR mentions a total of 550 interactions (KIIs, FGDs, and surveys across stakeholders) to be conducted.</p> <p>We understand that this sample is to be covered for all 12 states taken together; and is the total sample for the study. Kindly confirm if our understanding is correct.</p>	Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP.

34.	<p>Section 7. Deliverables and Timelines at Page no. 50</p> <p>As per the ToR, the total duration allocated for the completion of the evaluation study is 4 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 12 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 outputs.</p> <p>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 4 months is flexible and can be extended to 6 months to ensure the quality and comprehensiveness of the baseline study.</p> <p>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.
35.	<p>Section 7.2.2 Liquidated Damages for delay at Page no. 136</p> <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.</p> <p>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 complexities. Therefore, we kindly request the removal of this clause to reflect the realities of consulting work and foster a collaborative, results-driven approach.</p>	No change is contemplated.
36.	<p>Annex-5: Payment Schedule at Page no. 143</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</p>	No change is contemplated.

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.

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-Term Report approved by Authority	30%	Inception Report approved by Authority	20 %
KD3: Draft Evaluation Report approved by Authority	30%	Mid-Term Report approved by Authority	20%
		Draft Evaluation Report approved by	20%

			Authority			
	KD4: Final Evaluation Report approved by Authority	20%	Final Evaluation Report approved by Authority	20%		
37.	Tender Information Summary (TIS)4.1 Bid Security (EMD) Amount in INR: Rs 3.1lakhs. We assume that MSME registered companies are exempted from submitting EMD. Please confirm our understanding.					Please refer to Pg. 23 (Clause 1.16.1) of RFP.
38.	As the bid will be submitted in the GeM portal, please clarify whether there is a requirement of sending a physical copy of EMD to the DMEO office.					Please refer to Pg. 19 (1.12.3) of RFP.
39.	Details of minimum Education qualification & Experience required from the Consultancy Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team Leader (Evaluation Expert)- Masters (or equivalent) in Economics, Public Policy, Development Studies, Social Sciences, or any relevant field • Social Development Expert I - Master's (or equivalent) in social development or related fields. • Social Development Expert II -Master's (or equivalent) in social development or related fields. We assume that the qualification of MBA will be considered as a relevant field for these positions. Please confirm our understanding					Please refer to Pg. 34 (Annexure A) of RFP.
40.	It is proposed to cover 12 states- 2 in each zone and select 375 beneficiaries. Can the programme targeted blocks under each district be also furnished to estimate the project coverage within districts?					Please refer to Pg. 93 of RFP for List of 500 Aspirational Blocks.
41.	The qualitative consultations for Key Informant Interview include Niti Ayog Ministry, District Collectors and State Planning Secretary. The consultant expects that the communication and facilitation to these key personnel may be done by DMEO as otherwise					This will be discussed after onboarding of the agency.

	seeking appointment from such personnel will become tedious as the assignment is of short duration.	
42.	It is recommended that pilot study should be conducted on at least 2% of the sample size for Key Informant Interviews, FGDs and beneficiaries to fine tune the survey tools. A brief on the learnings from such a pilot exercise and subsequent improvements in the tools/questionnaires should also be shared with DMEO. This appears to be a fairly large sample for a pilot testing. The total sample for the beneficiary survey is 4500 and 2% would mean about 90 samples. We request to reduce this to 1% for each category. The pilot testing can be done in one location to fine tune the tools	No change is contemplated.
43.	A detailed list of stakeholders to be interacted with during the key informant interviews, FGDs, facility and beneficiary surveys to be formulated by the consultant in consultation with DMEO. The list of stakeholders is already provided in page 49 of the RfP. Are significant changes anticipated in the same? If so, would the overall sample size vary considerably?	Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP. This will be discussed after onboarding of the agency.
44.	Presentations and sub-reports on primary data collection, data quality check, secondary research, best practices compendia, etc. as and when requested by DMEO. The consultant understand that all of these are part of the mid term report and no separate document will be submitted say of best practices etc. Kindly confirm?	Please refer to Pg. 51 of RFP for the details on the key deliverables.
45.	Pg 85 Distribution of KIIs, FGDs and Survey across Stakeholders Would the sample covered for evaluation of the ADP and the ADP have to be mutually exclusive?	Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP.
46.	Will both evaluations have to be undertaken in parallel?	Yes. Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP.
47.	Will both evaluations be undertaken by the same team of experts?	Please refer to Pg. 34 (Annexure A) of RFP.
48.	Section 4.1.3: We hereby request the DMEO to kindly review and consider the following revision of the Evaluation criteria of technical proposal as, "Maximum 10 assignments can	No change is contemplated.

	<p>be submitted by the applicant. (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"> • 500-1000: 0.8 • between 1000-1500: 0.9 marks • Between 1500-2000: 1 mark.” 	
49.	<p>Section 4.2 (b) Eligible Assignments- We hereby request the DMEO to kindly review and consider the following revision, “Assessment/ research/ evaluation study in health/ nutrition/agriculture/ education/financial inclusion/skilling/rural development sector conducted for Union/ State Government/ regulatory commission/ tribunal/ bilateral agencies/ multilateral agencies/ donor funded projects/CSR Projects/ private clients statutory authorities/public sector entities in India covering a minimum sample size of 500 respondents.</p>	No change is contemplated.
50.	<p>Section 4.2 (c) Eligible Assignments- Provided that the Eligible Assignments have been completed in the 8 (eight) financial years preceding the PDD. We hereby request the DMEO to kindly review and consider ongoing assignments as well and revise the following clause as, “Provided that the Eligible Assignments are ongoing or have been completed in the past 10 (ten) financial years preceding the PDD.”</p>	No change is contemplated.
51.	<p>Annexure A Details of minimum Education qualification & Experience required from the Consultancy Team Social Development Expert I and II Master’s (or equivalent) in social development or related fields. We hereby request the DMEO to consider “Master’s (or equivalent) in social sciences, economics or other related fields</p>	No change is contemplated.
52.	<p>Annexure A Details of minimum Education qualification & Experience required from the Consultancy Team Data Analyst Masters (or equivalent) in data science/statistics/or related field(s) We hereby request the DMEO to consider “Master’s (or equivalent) in data science/statistics/economics or other related fields</p>	No change is contemplated.
53.	<p>Annexure A Details of minimum Education qualification & Experience required from the Consultancy Team Research Associate Master’s degree in development related fields We hereby request the DMEO to consider “master’s degree in social sciences, economics or</p>	No change is contemplated.

	other related fields	
54.	Terms of Reference Pg 48 “A minimum of 50 KIIs, 25 FGDs, 100 stakeholder surveys and 375 beneficiary surveys are proposed to be conducted with the relevant stakeholders to evaluate the Scheme.” We hereby request the DMEO to kindly clarify whether the minimum number of Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), stakeholder surveys, and beneficiary surveys specified in the RFP are to be conducted per State or per district within the selected sample.	Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP.
55.	Section 3.2 Conflict of Interest-3.2.2 Consultant and Affiliates not to be otherwise interested in the Project The Consultant agrees that, during the term of this Agreement and after its termination, the Consultant or any Associate thereof and any entity affiliated with the Consultant shall be disqualified from providing goods, works, services, loans or equity for any project resulting from or closely related to the Services and any breach of this obligation shall amount to a Conflict of Interest; "We hereby request the DMEO to kindly review the conflict-of-interest clause and suggest that it should be applicable only during the term of this agreement. We kindly request the removal of the phrase 'after its termination' from the clause."	No change is contemplated.
56.	Section 3.2 3.2.3- Prohibition of Conflicting activities - Neither the Consultant nor its Sub-Consultant, nor the Personnel of either of them shall engage, either directly or indirectly, in any of the following activities: “(b) after the termination of this Agreement, such other activities as may be specified in the Agreement; or” "We hereby request the DMEO to kindly consider modifying this clause to prohibit conflicting activities only during the term of the agreement."	No change is contemplated.
57.	Section 3.4 3.4.3 Liability of the Consultant- “The Parties hereto agree that in case of negligence or wilful misconduct on the part of the Consultant or on the part of any person or firm acting on behalf of the Consultant in carrying out the Services, the Consultant, with respect to damage caused to the Authority’s property, shall not be liable to the Authority: a) for any indirect or consequential loss or damage; and b) 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	No change is contemplated.

	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. “We hereby request the DMEO to kindly consider limiting the liability of the consultant to the amount of the contract only”	
58.	Section 3.6 Accounting, inspection, and auditing - We hereby request the DMEO to kindly include a provision that requires the consultant's consent for third-party auditing appointed by the client, specifically in cases where there is a potential conflict of interest due to the same line of business.	No change is contemplated.
59.	Appendix-I Technical Proposal; Point- 12; We further certify that no investigation by a regulatory authority is pending either against us or against our Associates or against our CEO or any of our Directors / Managers / employees. We hereby request the DMEO to kindly review and reword the declaration as follows: “We further certify that no investigation by a regulatory authority is pending either against us or our Associates or against our CEO or any of our designated partners.”	No change is contemplated.
60.	Appendix-I Technical Proposal; Point- 13; “I/We hereby irrevocably waive any right or remedy which we may have at any stage at law or howsoever otherwise arising to challenge or question any decision taken by the Authority [and/ or the Government of India] in connection with the selection of consultant or in connection with the Selection Process itself in respect of the above mentioned Project.” We hereby request the DMEO to kindly consider removing the following clause from the declaration: 'I/We hereby irrevocably waive any right or remedy which we may have at any stage at law or howsoever otherwise arising to challenge or question any decision taken by the Authority [and/ or the Government of India] in connection with the selection of the consultant or in connection with the Selection Process itself in respect of the above-mentioned Project.	No change is contemplated.
61.	Critical Dates: 2.7 Proposal Due Date (PDD)/Last date: 8th September 2025 (Monday) We Hereby request the DMEO to extend the PDD/Last date to 19th September 2025. This will allow us time to submit a comprehensive, high- quality proposal.	No change is contemplated.

62.	<p>Since there are two separate ToRs—one for the Aspirational Districts Program and another for the Aspirational Blocks Program—and we are required to select 25 districts and 50 blocks:</p> <p>1.Do we need to develop two distinct methodologies for the evaluation, or can a unified approach be applied with necessary adaptations?</p> <p>2.Should the sampling be based on separate sampling frames for districts and blocks, or can we draw from the same geographic areas?</p>	Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP.
63.	<p>1.Should each eligible assignment be a completed assignment, or can we also include ongoing assignments?</p> <p>2.Is there a timeframe for the assignment to be considered eligible (for example, assignment undertaken within the last 5 years or within the last 10 years, etc.)?</p>	Please refer to Pg.30 (Section 4.2 (c)) of RFP
64.	1.It is mentioned in multiple pages of the RfP that a Project Manager will be engaged in the core team, under the Team Leader. But the Table in Annexure A (Details of minimum Education qualification & Experience required from the Consultancy Team) does not include the Project Manager. Can you please clarify if we have to propose a Project Manager in the core team as well?	Please refer to Pg. 34 (Annexure A) of RFP.
65.	Since there are two distinct studies with separate reports and deliverables, do we need to propose a team of 5 for each study?	Please refer to Pg. 34 (Annexure A) of RFP.
66.	Whether MSME exemption on turnover is available?	As per RFP.
67.	Will CSR impact assessment for PSUs and private sector companies be acceptable for eligibility?	Please refer to Pg.30 (Section 4.2 (b)) of RFP
68.	Is there any limit or ceiling for the bid amount?	Not Applicable
69.	Can the EMD be waived off for government institutes?	Please refer to Pg.23 (Clause

		1.16.2) of RFP
70.	Are we supposed to submit separate proposals for separate themes? If yes, do we have to submit one bid security for all?	As per RFP.
71.	We are keen to participate in the bidding process and would request the authority to extend the proposal submission deadline by at least 15 working days to enable us to submit a competitive bid.	No change is contemplated.
72.	Bid Security Declaration Form with substantiated documents like MSME Udyam Certificate etc- for Appendix-I Form-11 (applicants for MSME units and government owned universities/academic institutions only), (ii) Applicable for MSME- HLFPPPT is a trust (non-for-profit) organization of HLL Lifecare Limited (a mini-ratna enterprise under MoFHW). Is HLFPPPT exempted from EMD - Bid Security Submission?	Please refer to Pg.23 (Clause 1.16) of RFP
73.	On page 49- a minimum sample of 475 has to be collected as primary data. Out of which, is 50 KII, 25 FGDs qualitative data? The beneficiaries data 375 is the quantitative data that has to be collected. Kindly clarify quantitative data sample size.	Please refer to Pg. 48 and Pg. 84 (Section 5.1.1) of RFP.
74.	The agency will submit a consolidated report for ADP and ABP or two different reports for the evaluation of both the programmes?	Two separate reports are to be submitted.
75.	To relax the clause for collaborating with academic institution/partnership/consortium - on page-30	No change is contemplated.
76.	Request for extension of the PDD	No change is contemplated