

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
1		Is individual eligible to apply the proposal	No
2		Should it be proposed for pan India or we can select the regions?	Kindly refer to 4.1 of ToR section of the RfP, which is self-explanatory
3		Number of Schools Evaluations?	Kindly refer to 4.1 of ToR section of the RfP, which is self-explanatory
4		<p>1. Eligibility and compliance</p> <p>a) For “eligible assignments,” will assignments with partial overlap in scope be considered, or must they be fully comparable education-sector evaluations?</p> <p>b) For universities and academic institutions, are there any relaxed conditions on bid security beyond the exemption already stated for educational institutions?</p> <p>2. Evaluation process</p> <p>a) Will the presentation to the evaluation committee carry separate marks, or is it only part of technical clarification?</p> <p>3. Scope and analytical design</p> <p>a) Should the evaluation compare KVS and NVS using the same analytical framework, or are separate frameworks expected for the two systems?</p> <p>b) Are there any priority indicators or outcome domains that should receive special attention in the study?</p> <p>c) Sample and coverage Is the sample size of 120–150 schools fixed, indicative, or open to refinement by the consultant?</p> <p>d) Can the authority confirm whether the 12 states are already identified, or should the consultant propose the state selection logic?</p> <p>e) Are there any specific states, regions, school types, or stakeholder groups that DMEO wants to ensure are represented in the sample?</p>	<p>1. a) For eligibility and compliance – The RFP states 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 covering a minimum sample size of 2000 respondents.” For more details kindly refer to Clause 4.2 of the RFP</p> <p>b) For details on bid security- Kindly refer to Clause 1.16 of the RFP</p> <p>2. For details on the evaluation process – kindly refer to Clause 2 of the RFP</p>

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
		<p>Are we allowed to engage an agency to collect field-level data for this project? Because the RFP remains salient regarding this.</p> <p>f) Are we allowed to engage an agency to collect field-level data for this project? Because the RFP remains salient regarding this. Further, apart from the regular data analysis requirement, which is feasible, the RFP states that conducting a meta-analysis will add value to the project. If so, we need to have access to secondary data of previous projects.</p>	<p>3. a) Kindly refer to Clause 4.1 of ToR which provides indicative sampling design.</p> <p>b) This will be discussed with the selected firm after the award of the study.</p> <p>c to e) The sample size provided by DMEO is tentative and minimum. The applicants are encouraged to include more relevant stakeholders for Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). However, in no case the no. of stakeholder would be less than what is specified in the RFP.</p> <p>f) Please refer to Clause 6 of the ToR pertaining to 'Mechanism to ensure Data Quality' which allows field investigator to be engaged for conducting survey. The responsibility of data collection lies with Consultant only. DMEO will assist in data collection by coordinating with relevant authorities and Ministries/ Departments after award of the study</p>
5	TIS – Critical Dates Clause 2.3 & 2.7 Page 11	The window between the last date for pre-proposal queries (05.05.2026) and the Authority's response date (12.05.2026) leaves only 8 days for applicants to finalise proposals after receiving clarifications. Please consider extending the PDD by at least 15 days to allow adequate preparation time after the Authority's responses are published.	No change is contemplated

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
6	Clause 1.2.1 Page 15	Please clarify: (a) the maximum number of members permitted in a Consortium; (b) whether all Consortium members must jointly and severally satisfy the minimum eligibility criteria, or only the Lead Member	Kindly refer to Clause 1.2, 1.6 and 1.9 of the RFP, which is self-explanatory
7	Clause 1.17.4 Page 23	The grounds for forfeiture of Performance Security appear broadly framed. Please clarify: (a) what constitutes 'substandard' work and whether there is an objective quality assessment framework; (b) whether the consultant will be given a notice period and opportunity to rectify deficiencies before forfeiture; and (c) whether forfeiture is limited to specific violations or applies to general quality disputes.	Kindly refer to Clause 1.17 of the RFP, which is self-explanatory
8	Section 4, Clause 4.1.3 Sl. No. 1 (Experience) Page 28	Please clarify: (a) whether 'sample size' refers to completed/verified respondents or the target sample size as stated in the contract; (b) for assignments covering both quantitative surveys and qualitative KIIs/FGDs, whether only the quantitative survey respondents are counted.	Kindly refer to 4.1 of ToR section of the RfP, which is self-explanatory
9	Section 4, Clause 4.1.3 Sl. No. 2 (Methodology) Page 28–29	Please clarify whether the academic institution must be recognized by the UGC or State Government.	The RFP states, “Universities / academic institutions should be recognized by University Grant Commission or any State or the Central Government Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs).”
10	Section 4, Clause 4.1.3 Sl. No. 2 (Methodology) Page 28, Footnote 5	Please clarify: (a) whether 'MCE Specialist (Project Manager)' in this context refers to the 'Education Specialist/Program Manager' (Key Personnel No. 2) or the 'MCE Expert – Quantitative' (Key Personnel No. 3).	Kindly refer to Annexure A of the RFP, which is self-explanatory

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
11	Annexure A Page 32	Please clarify: (a) whether 'education sector' is interpreted broadly to include health, skilling, or social development programmes with an education component, or is it restricted strictly to school/higher education programmes; (b) whether 'publishing reports' refers to peer-reviewed academic publications or government/consultancy reports; and (c) whether assignments done as part of a team (not as lead) qualify for counting the 5-year relevant experience.	Kindly refer to Annexure A of the RFP and the Clause 1.2 - Scope of the Proposal of the RFP.
12	Annexure A Page 32	Please clarify: (a) whether 'Deep expertise in CBSE, NCERT, and UDISE data systems' is a mandatory requirement or a desirable preference, and how it will be evaluated	Kindly refer to Annexure A of the RFP, which is self explanatory
13	Annexure A Page 32–33	Please clarify: (a) whether a Master's in Statistics/Economics from a recognised institution is equivalent to a Bachelor's in Engineering for this position; (b) whether CAPI experience is a mandatory requirement or a preference, and (c) whether the 8 years refers to total professional experience or 8 years specifically in quantitative MCE/survey work.	Kindly refer to Annexure A of the RFP, which is self explanatory
14	Annexure A Page 33	Please clarify: (a) whether proficiency in qualitative software (NVivo/ATLAS.ti) is a mandatory requirement or a preference; and (b) whether candidates with a Master's in Public Health or Public Policy with demonstrated qualitative research experience would qualify.	Kindly refer to Annexure A of the RFP, which is self explanatory
15	Annexure A Page 33	Please confirm whether the 5 years of experience is total professional experience or specifically in mixed-methods research.	Kindly refer to Annexure A of the RFP, which is self explanatory
16	Clause 4.2 – Eligible Assignments Page 29–30	Please clarify: (a) whether 'sample size of 2,000 respondents' refers to survey respondents only, or includes qualitative research participants (KII/FGD participants); (b) whether a single assignment involving multiple phases (with total sample >2,000 across phases) qualifies; (c) whether an assignment awarded to a consortium is eligible and at what value (full contract or proportional share); and (d) whether ongoing assignments are eligible.	a), b) & c) Kindly refer to Clause 4.2 of the RFP d) Only completed assignments are eligible

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
17	Clause 3.2 – Substitution of Key Personnel Page 26	Please clarify: (a) whether the 10%/20% penalty is deducted from the total contract value or only from the specific personnel cost component; (b) in case the Team Leader substitution becomes unavoidable (e.g., serious illness, bereavement), what is the process for seeking approval and the timeline for replacement.	(a) The RFP States, “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.” For more details, kindly refer to Clause 3.2 of RFP. (b) This will be discussed with the selected firm after the award of the study.
18	TOR – Section 8.2 Timeline for Project Execution Page 59	The simultaneous evaluation of KVS (1,256 schools, 13.56 lakh students) and NVS (649 JNVs across all districts) with the full scope of field surveys (4,500+ student surveys, 450+ alumni surveys, 264+ school-level KIIs, 48 FGDs) across 12 states within 180 days is extremely ambitious. Please clarify: (a) whether the project timeline can be extended to total 9 months;	No change is contemplated
19	TOR – Section 9 Payment Schedule Page 60	Please clarify: (a) the payment trigger – is it upon submission of the deliverable or upon formal written approval by the Authority; (b) the maximum number of days within which the Authority will review and approve each deliverable.	(a) It is deliverable based. (b) This will be communicated to the selected firm after the award of the study.

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
20	TOR – Section 7 Liquidated Damages and Penalties Page 86	The main RFP body references liquidated damages provisions (Clause 7.2 of Schedule 2) but the quantum of LD per day/week of delay is not specified in the key sections visible in the RFP. Please confirm: (a) the rate of liquidated damages (e.g., 0.5% per week, subject to a cap of 10% of contract value); (b) whether LDs are applicable only when delays are attributable to Consultant.	Kindly refer to Clause 7 of the RFP, which is self explanatory
21	TOR – Section 6 Data Quality Mechanisms Page 56–57	Clause 6(v) specifies 5% back-checks for FGDs, while Annexure B (Roles of MCE Expert – Qualitative) mentions '10% back-checks on FGDs.' Please clarify the authoritative back-check requirement. Also, for school-level KIIs in remote/tribal areas with poor mobile connectivity, please confirm whether offline geo-tagging (with subsequent upload) or an alternative verification method is acceptable.	10% backchecks for FGDs. Latter will be discussed with the selected firm after the award of the study.
22	TOR – Section 13 Miscellaneous Page 64	Please clarify: (a) whether 'all Key Personnel deployed at this office' means a mandatory physical presence throughout the 6-month assignment, or whether partial remote working is permitted.	(a) This will be discussed with the selected firm after the award of the study.
23	TOR – Sections 3 C 4 Evaluation Objectives – NVS Page 47–50	The NVS evaluation scope is substantially broader than KVS given the residential model, alumni survey, and migration analysis. Please clarify: (a) whether separate budgets and staffing plans should be prepared for KVS and NVS evaluations, or a consolidated plan covering both. (b) whether NVS would provide the database of alumni and facilitate alumni interactions	(a) The consultant has to decide the field movement given the timeline maintaining quality of the survey work. Detailed and consolidated plan containing extensive details under each header as per RFP should be submitted. (b) DMEO will assist in data collection by coordinating with relevant authorities and Ministries/ Departments after award of the study. However, the responsibility of data collection lies with Consultant only.
24	Budget	What is the indicative budget of the exercise?	RFP is floated for the price discovery of the project

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
25	Reference to Clause 3.1.5 and “Standard of Living Parameters” (Page 119)	In the table on page 119, reference is made to Clause 3.1.5, which does not appear to be present in the RFP document. Additionally, the fourth column heading appears incomplete and refers to “standard of living parameters.” We request clarification on: The correct reference for Clause 3.1.5, and The intended definition and scope of “standard of living parameters” to be considered.	Kindly refer to Clause 4.2 of the RFP
26	Experience Requirements for Key Personnel (Pages 29 and 32)	Page 29 indicates differentiated scoring based on varying years of professional experience for proposed personnel, whereas page 32 specifies minimum experience requirements (e.g., 8 years for Expert roles). We request clarification on how these two should be interpreted together?	Kindly refer to Annexure A of the RFP, which is self explanatory
27	Sample Size Criteria for Eligible Assignments (Pages 28 and 30)	Page 30 specifies that eligible assignments must have a minimum sample size of 2,000 respondents. However, page 28 provides differentiated marking based on varying sample sizes. We seek clarification on whether assignments below 2,000 respondents are ineligible?	The RFP states, “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 covering a minimum sample size of 2000 respondents. ” For more details, kindly refer to Clause 4.2 of the RFP
28	Budget Cap for the Assignment	We request confirmation on whether there is a predefined budget ceiling for this assignment. If so, kindly specify the same to enable appropriate resource planning and proposal design.	Same as #24

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
29	Clause 1.4.2(b) & Clause 4.2	Clause 4.2 states that eligible assignments must have a minimum sample size of 2,000 respondents. However, the technical scoring criteria (Clause 4.1.3) awards marks for assignments with 500–1,000 and >1,000–2,000 respondents. Kindly clarify whether assignments with sample size below 2,000 respondents will be considered as Eligible Assignments for meeting the minimum eligibility threshold of 2 assignments.	marks for assignments: 2,000 -3000 respondents = 0.5 mark > 3000-4000 respondents = 0.7 mark > 4000 respondents = 1 mark
30	Clause 1.4.2(b) & Clause 4.2	Clause 4.2(b) lists eligible sectors as health, nutrition, agriculture, education, financial inclusion, skilling, and rural development. Kindly confirm whether evaluations/ assessments conducted for Central Government autonomous bodies (e.g., UGC, NCERT, CBSE) qualify as Eligible Assignments under 'Union/State Government' for the purpose of eligibility.	Kindly refer to Clause 4.2 of the RFP
31	Clause 1.4.2(b) & Clause 4.2(d)	The RFP states that the value of each eligible assignment must be at least Rs. 30 Lakhs. Kindly clarify whether this refers to the total contract value or only the consultancy/professional fee component, and whether GST/taxes are to be included in computing the assignment value.	Kindly refer to Clause 4.2 of the RFP
32	Clause 4.2(b)	Clause 4.2(b) lists eligible clients as Union/State Government, regulatory commission, tribunal, bilateral agencies, multilateral agencies, statutory authorities, and public sector entities in India. Kindly clarify: (a) whether assignments conducted for international organisations (such as UNDP, UNICEF, WHO, World Bank, ADB, GIZ etc.) qualify as Eligible Assignments under 'multilateral/bilateral agencies'; and (b) whether assignments conducted for registered National or International NGOs (e.g., CARE India, Pratham, Aga Khan Foundation, PATH etc.) are eligible, either independently or as sub-assignments under a government-funded project.	Kindly refer to Clause 4.2 of the RFP

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
33	Schedule 1 – TOR, Table 1	The TOR requires a facility survey of at least 30 comparable schools (PM SHRI, State Government, and private schools). Kindly clarify: (a) who will identify/select these comparable schools — the Authority or the Consultant? (b) Will DMEO provide a list, or is it the Consultant's responsibility to identify them during the inception phase?	DMEO will assist in data collection by coordinating with relevant authorities and Ministries/Departments after award of the study. However, the responsibility of data collection lies with Consultant only.
34	Schedule 1 – TOR, Table 1	The TOR requires an alumni survey of ~450 NVS respondents across 3 graduation cohorts (5, 10, 15 years ago). Kindly clarify whether DMEO/NVS will provide alumni contact data, or whether the Consultant is expected to independently identify and reach alumni. If the latter, what is the acceptable methodology for this?	DMEO will assist in data collection by coordinating with relevant authorities and Ministries/ Departments after award of the study. However, the responsibility of data collection lies with the Consultant only.
35	Schedule 1 – TOR	The TOR refers to a sub-sample of students who have 'migrated from another state' for the NVS migrant student survey. Kindly clarify whether 'migrant students' refers to students enrolled in a JNV outside their home state due to the migration provision under NVS policy, or students who have physically relocated with their families.	Kindly refer to Pg 48 of RFP
36	Clause 4.1.3, S.No. 2	The technical scoring awards 4 marks for 'Collaboration/consortium/partnership with academic institutions'. Kindly clarify: (a) Is this a mandatory requirement or purely optional for additional marks?	Kindly refer to Clause 1.2 of the RFP
37	4 Criteria for Evaluation 4.1.3 The scoring criteria to be used for evaluation	BRIEF Pvt. Ltd. requests clarification on whether assignments valued between ₹10 Lakhs to ₹25 Lakhs will be considered for technical scoring, as the eligibility criteria under Clause 4.2(d) page number 30 specifies a minimum assignment value of ₹30 Lakhs. Kindly clarify the applicable criteria for evaluation.	Kindly refer to Clause 4.2 of the RFP
38	#RFP Page Number 28, SL. No 1 and Page number 30	BRIEF Pvt. Ltd. respectfully requests DMEO to consider suitable relaxation/exemption for UDYAM-registered MSME firms under the Average Annual Turnover criteria, in line with Government of India MSME procurement provisions. Further, kindly clarify the applicable technical scoring methodology/marks for MSME firms under this evaluation parameter.	No change is contemplated

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
		We have average turnover of last 3 years is more than 3 crores, but in the year 2023-24 we have less than 3 crores. Whether it will be considered?	
39	4.2.b	<p>On Page 28 of the RfP, the marking framework allocates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 500–1000 respondents: 0.5 marks · 1000–2000 respondents: 0.7 marks · Above 2000 respondents: 1 mark <p>However, Page 29 specifies that only assignments with a minimum sample size of 2000 respondents are considered eligible. This creates a contradiction, as assignments in the 1000–2000 range are awarded marks but appear to be deemed ineligible.</p> <p>We request clarification on this inconsistency.</p>	Same as Point #29
40	4.2.c	The RfP restricts eligible assignments to the last 8 financial years preceding the PDD. Kindly consider extending this to the last 10 financial years, to allow inclusion of relevant past experience and ensure wider participation.	No change is contemplated
41	4.2.d	Page 28 provides marks for assignments starting from ₹10 Lakhs, while Page 29 specifies a minimum eligible assignment value of ₹30 Lakhs, creating a mismatch.	<p>The marks will be allocated based on the following:</p> <p>Each eligible assignment with value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ₹30 Lakhs to ₹40 Lakhs: 0.8 mark • >₹40 Lakhs to ₹50 Lakhs : 0.9 mark • >₹50 Lakhs: 1 mark
42		Kindly clarify this inconsistency. We request that the minimum eligibility be aligned with the marking criteria (₹10 Lakhs), or the marking framework be revised accordingly.	No change is contemplated
43	Page no. 32, Annexure A,	the education qualification subjects in each post appear to be mostly of non-science background, should we understand those qualification subjects work for the Science background as well? For example; Masters in Science (physics, mathematics, biology, chemistry) and PhD in Science.	Kindly refer to Annexure A of the RFP, which is self explanatory

Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog			
RFP for the Evaluation Study of KVS & NVS			
Responses to Queries of Bidders			
S. No.	RFP Clause	Query	Response
Invitation for Proposals			
44	4.2 point b	Our organization is an autonomous research institute functioning under the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). We have in-house R&D projects with more than 10k data points. Could that satisfy the point b as it mentions assessment/ research/ evaluation study shall cover a minimum sample size of 2000 respondents?	Kindly refer to Clause 4.2 of the RFP
45		(1) It is requested to learn more on the provisioning / enabling of relevant current data and such access of recent five - ten years etc towards support that may be provisioned to the agency undertaking the study for possibly also enabling access to any suitable archived reports and earlier studies of KVS and NVS from the phase of inception stage to important milestones, to enable valuable insights to be drawn and integrated regarding the evolution of the Institutions	DMEO will assist in data collection by coordinating with relevant authorities and Ministries/ Departments after award of the study. However, the responsibility of data collection lies with the Consultant only.
46		(2) In case a website / portal and IT based tools are considered for additional data inputs from the field to strengthen the study to obtain insights, where may the website / portal be ideally established. Would it be preferable to do so at the Study undertaking agency website or would DMEO - Niti Aayog guide the establishment of such a website/portal at suitably associated platform or suitable IT support agency associated with NITI - Aayog.	This will be discussed with the selected firm after the award of the study.
47		(3) Whether in the case of consortium submission of the bid, the lead agency and consortium members related roles and responsibilities be reflected in the technical bid or this could be highlighted during the presentation stage of the methodology and mechanism of the proposed study.	Kindly refer to Clause 1.2 of the RFP