

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
<b>Section 1 of RFP</b>			
1	1.1.5 Background	With respect to Section 1.1.5, is the applicant required to apply for and evaluate all Central Sector Schemes mentioned under a sector/package, or an applicant can have choice to submit application for evaluation of selected scheme(s) under given sector/package?	Please refer to RFP clause 1.2.1, which is clear and self-explanatory - the Consultant shall conduct an evaluation study of the performance of the schemes under the Umbrella CSS, in accordance with the TOR placed at Schedule I. No change is contemplated.
2	1.7 Currency Conversion	Also in the past 6 months upto Mar'19, \$ has ranged at over INR 70.It is suggested that a higher currency conversion, of over INR 70/\$ should be considered for evaluation.	Please refer to RFP clause 1.7, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
3	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	We request you to kindly extend the proposal due date by at least three weeks from date of publication of response to pre-bid queries.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
4	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	100 days' timeline is too less given the scope of work, hence, request the client to consider extending the timeline of the consultancy up to six months.	Please refer to the RFP which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
5	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	Due date 4th June: request to client to reconsider on extending the submission deadline.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
6	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	The proposal due date is only 11 days post Authority response to pre proposal queries, which is a short time. Since considerable time is required for preparing a mandate of this size, request to kindly extend the proposal due date to atleast 25 days post Authority response.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
7	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	Considering the quantum of work - a minimum of about 600 key informant interviews, about 200 focus group discussions and about 1000 household interviews should be conducted as a part of the field study, kindly extend the submission of the final evaluation report	Please refer to the RFP which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
8	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	Considering the detailed information required for Technical and Financial proposals, we request you to extend the last date of submission of proposal by about 3 weeks i.e. up to 25th June 2019.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
9	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	As the response to the queries is an important input in bid document preparation, we would request you to provide a minimum of 3 weeks of time for proposal submission after issue of pre-bid responses.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
10	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	We request to keep submission deadline at least 21 days after receiving the comments on queries to provide consultant adequate time as there are many different packages and sectors are in offering.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
11	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	As this assignment requires a diverse and large pool of experts, the time to prepare competitive bid is not sufficient. Request you to please provide extension of at-least 3 weeks post publishing of response to queries by NITI Aayog	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
12	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	Regarding Last date of Submission: The corrigendum uploaded with reference to above states the start date as 09/05/2019 and the end date as 08/07/2019 while in the separate packages it is the date stated earlier i.e 04/06/2019. We wish to know that the last date of submission is 8th July or 4th June 2019.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
13	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	Considering the detailed information required for Technical and Financial proposals, we request you to extend the last date of submission of proposal by about 3 weeks i.e. up to 25th June 2019.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
14	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	Keeping in view the scope of work and key requirements for proposal submission, we request the authority to extend the date of proposal submission at least by 3 weeks to 25th June 2019.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
15	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	Since the Pre-proposal Conference is on 20th May, and each of the proposals will need a large number of CVs, can the deadline for submission be extended for two more weeks?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
16	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	Current final date for submission of bids stands at 4th June 2019 We request by this deadline to be extended by 14 days to the 18th of June 2019	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
17	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	Given the complexity of the assignment, we believe that 3.5 months is insufficient for the assignment. Hence, we request that the timeline be extended to 6 months (168 days)	Please refer to the RFP which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
18	1.8 Schedule of Selection Process	Given the complexity of the assignment, we request an extension in the submission deadline	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
<b>Section 2 of RFP</b>			
1	2.1.1 Scope of Proposal	Clause 2.1.1 on page 13 of the RFP defines Applicant as, “the term applicant (the —Applicant) means the Sole Firm or the Lead Member (in case of a consortium), as the case may be. Does this imply that the projects listed need to be in the name of Lead Member only (in case of a consortium)? Please clarify that whether the eligible projects for other members/ sub- consultants in the consortium can be listed as part of the proposal.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.1 which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated. Also refer foot note in Form 8, Appendix I of RFP.
2	2.1. Scope of Proposal 2.2. Conditions of Eligibility of Applicants	We understand that in case of consortium of firms, the Lead Member is defined as the Applicant. Further, it is inferred that to meet Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and Key Personnel, the capabilities of Applicant (i.e., Lead Member) would be considered. In case of consortium of firms, we request you to consider combined capabilities of both Lead Member and partner member to meet the Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and Key Personnel criteria.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.1 which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
3	2.1.1 Scope of Proposal	We request client to kindly clarify as who will be the “Lead Member” of the consortium, the firm which fulfill the minimum income of Rs. 50 (fifty) crores per annum or the firm which fulfill all the eligible general assignments and eligible specific assignments?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.1 which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
4	2.1.1 Scope of Proposal	Please suggest me if I can be part of this tender as an company or individual?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (A) which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
5	2.1.1 Scope of Proposal	Whether we are eligible to submit application against your RFPs since it is restricted to Private/Public Limited Company, Partnership Firm and Expert Institutions.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (A) which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
6	2.1.1 Scope of Proposal	Is it possible to collaborate with personnel from the London School of Economics(LSE) and other international universities/centres as members of the Core team or non-core team.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.1 and 2.2.2 (A), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
7	2.1.1 Scope of Proposal	Please clarify if Joint Ventures are allowed or only consortium is allowed.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.1 which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
8	2.1.3.2 Preparation and submission of proposal	Please clarify if 2 hard copies of Financial proposal should also be submitted	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.13.2, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
9	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Currently the RFP purposes full-time deployment of core team. Can the deployment of core team be decided by consultants based on the approach and the work plan?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
10	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Full availability over the entire assignment of the key professionals would likely to be a problem and if client could reconsider.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
11	2.1.4 Key Personnel	We understand that the standard for full time deployment is typically 20 days in a month. Kindly confirm.	The project timeline of 100 days refers to 100 calendar days.
12	2.1.4 Key Personnel	We understand that the days indicated for each non-core position are minimum and mandatory to be included in the financial proposal. Kindly confirm our understanding.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
13	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Considering the commonality in the scope and some of the team positions, it is requested that the Consultants be allowed to have non-exclusive association with individual experts/sub-consultants.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
14	2.1.4 Key Personnel	We understand that the days indicated for each non-core position are minimum. We further understand that the Consultant is free to assess the requirement for each noncore personnel while maintaining the minimum input and factor the same accordingly in the financial bid. Kindly confirm our understanding.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
15	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Can the time frame for Non-core team vary from the numbers indicated in the RFP, based on requirements and A&M followed?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
16	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Based on the minimum time mentioned for the resources, can the non-core team members be shared across multiple packages?	CVs of non-core Key Personnel may be repeated in different Proposals across packages. However, each of the non-core

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
			<p>Key Personnel should be exclusively deployed on a single package. Substitution of non-core Key Personnel must take place within 2 (two) working days of the date of Letter of Award.</p> <p>CVs of core Key Personnel cannot be repeated across Proposals either at the application stage or at the award stage.</p>
17	2.1.4 Key Personnel	As the non –core team will not form part of the evaluation, is it necessary to provide their names/CV at the bidding stage?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, read with clause 2.2.2 D, clause 2.14.2, clause 3.1.4 and form 12 (Appendix I), which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
18	2.1.4 Key Personnel	i. When our Team Leader meets Essential Qualifications of two 'Key Personnel', can he discharge duties of two key personnel. For instance, our Team Leader has qualifications for Team Leader and Agriculture Lead. Can he discharge functions of both of these roles?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, 2.2.2 and 2.14.2, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
19	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Are the key experts expected to be based out of Niti Aayog office in New Delhi for 3 months? What exactly is the expectation from full time deployment of key experts?	Please refer to Schedule I, Terms of reference, Point 14 (a), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
20	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Will form 9 (Abstract of Eligible Assignments of Key Personnel), form 11 (Eligible Assignments of Key Personnel) and form 12 (Curriculum Vitae (CV) of Key Personnel) have to be filled for the non-core team as well? According to Clause 2.1.4 (Page 15 of the RFP), Key Personnel have been described as the Core Team and Non-Core Team. However non-core CVs are not being evaluated.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (C) and (D), read with clause 2.14.2, clause 3.1.4 , which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
21	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Considering that the timelines of all the evaluation programs are more or less the same, Whether the same experts can be used for bids of different sectors? For Example can a Information Technology Specialist in Package 1 - Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Sector be used for Information Technology Specialist Package 7 – Health Sector. or Core Team personnel like Team leader of one package be used as a non - core team personnel for another package?	<p>CVs of non-core Key Personnel may be repeated in different Proposals across packages. However, each of the non-core Key Personnel should be exclusively deployed on a single package. Substitution of non-core Key Personnel must take place within 2 (two) working days of the date of Letter of Award.</p> <p>CVs of core Key Personnel cannot be repeated across Proposals either at the application stage or at the award stage.</p>
22	2.1.4 Key Personnel	b) Whether the Core/Non Core team member should have the same position in the projects considered as Eligible General Assignments/Eligible Specific Assignments? Like should a Proposed	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (D), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Team leader should have worked in other eligible General/Specific assignments as a TEAM LEADER only? Or just working experience related to that project can be provided?	
23	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Can we modify the composition of the Non-core Team based on our understanding and as per the Approach and Methodology of the study, or it is mandatory to propose the same team as mentioned in the RFP?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 and 2.14.2, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
24	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Some of the Core Team Members may not be required to be involved full time. Are we allowed to propose the man-days of the core team members as per the requirement of the Approach and Methodology, or it is mandatory to provide all core team members for the full time?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4 and clause 2.2.2, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
25	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Please confirm if the same non-core team members can be proposed for more than one package as they are not expected to be deployed full-time	CVs of non-core Key Personnel may be repeated in different Proposals across packages. However, each of the non-core Key Personnel should be exclusively deployed on a single package. Substitution of non-core Key Personnel must take place within 2 (two) working days of the date of Letter of Award.  CVs of core Key Personnel cannot be repeated across Proposals either at the application stage or at the award stage.
26	2.1.4 Key Personnel	We understand that CVs of non-core team will not be evaluated as a part of the bid. Thus, we request you to kindly exclude non-core team from Key Personnel and include them in Professional Personnel. In this way, the tasks and expectations of core and non-core team will be distinguished easily and allow us to develop an effective manning schedule.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 and 2.14.2 and 2.14.6, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
27	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Can there be flexibility provided to change allocation of days for the non-core team?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, 2.2.2 and 2.14.2, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
28	2.1.4 Key Personnel	Since this is an Urban Transformation assignment, we suggest the stated responsibility to be changed to as under: ● Providing expertise on dealing with government stakeholders across the system, from city level upwards, institutional arrangements, fund flows etc.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
29	2.1.4 Key Personnel	We also understand that the days indicated for each noncore position are minimum and mandatory to be included in the financial proposal. Kindly confirm our understanding.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, 2.2.2 and 2.14.2, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
30	2.1.4 Key Personnel	As the Consultant can be selected for more than one project, can non-core team members who are not required to work full time be utilized on multiple projects? If Yes, will teams that have distinct team members be	CVs of non-core Key Personnel may be repeated in different Proposals across packages. However, each of the non-core Key Personnel should be exclusively deployed on a single

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		given higher weightage in the technical round.	package. Substitution of non-core Key Personnel must take place within 2 (two) working days of the date of Letter of Award.  CVs of core Key Personnel cannot be repeated across Proposals either at the application stage or at the award stage.
31	2.1.4. Key Personnel	We understand that non-core team are not to be evaluated at this stage and consultant could schedule them as per their own understanding, CVs are also not required at this state.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, 2.2.2 and 2.14.2, read with clause 3.1.4 and form 12 (Appendix I), which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
32	2.1.4. Key Personnel	The responsibilities for nutrition expert and communication expert look similar. Could you please confirm that the responsibilities of the communication expert and the time which s/he is expected to spend on the project are accurate? Also, if the responsibilities are similar, can either of the roles be dropped?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, 2.2.2 and 2.14.2, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
33	2.1.4. Key Personnel	We seek greater clarity on the eligibility of the deputy team leader as it is an uncommon designation and people who have played the role of a deputy team leader are not easily available.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, 2.2.2 and 2.14.2, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
34	2.2.2 (A) Technical Capacity	We would request that projects in the past 10 (ten) years preceding the PDD be considered.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (A), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
35	2.2.2 (A) Technical Capacity	It is understood from this clause that eligible assignments executed in the last three financial years are to be submitted to the Authority, in the format of Appendix-I, Form-8. The authority is requested to confirm.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (A) and 3.1.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
36	2.2.2 (A) Technical Capacity	The Applicant shall have, over the past 10 (ten) years preceding the PDD, undertaken a minimum of 3 (three) Eligible General Assignments and 1 (one) Eligible Specific Assignments as specified in Clause 3.1.4. In order to be eligible, it is mentioned that the applicant should have undertaken aforementioned minimum number of projects in last 5 years. In case the applicant is eligible based on required number of assignments in the past 5 years, is the restriction of within last 5 years further applicable to all the assignments to be listed under the proposal or can the projects prior to 5 years period be also listed under eligible assignments for the proposal? Please clarify.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (D), clause 3.1.3 and Form 10 (Appendix I), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
37	2.2.2 (A) Technical Capacity	The Applicant shall have, over the past 10 (ten) years preceding the PDD, undertaken a minimum of 3 (three) Eligible General Assignments and 1 (one) Eligible Specific Assignments as specified in Clause 3.1.4.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (A), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
38	2.2.2 (A) Technical Capacity	We request client to kindly revise the condition to the past 10 (ten) years preceding the PDD	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (A), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.



**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
39	2.2.2 (A) Technical Capacity	In case the applicant is eligible based on required number of assignments in the past 5 years, is the restriction of within last 5 years further applicable to all the assignments to be listed under the proposal or can the projects prior to 5 years period be also listed under eligible assignments for the proposal? Please clarify.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (A), clause 3.1.4 and Form 10 (Appendix I) , which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
40	2.2.2 (A) Technical Capacity	The Applicant shall have, over the past 10 (ten) years preceding the PDD, undertaken a minimum of 3 (three) Eligible General Assignments and 1 (one) Eligible Specific Assignments as specified in Clause 3.1.4.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (A), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
41	2.2.2 (A) Technical Capacity	Does 'operations in India' mean that the applicant (or lead applicant) be incorporated/ registered in India? Can international organisations who have project experience in India but no registered office in India participate as lead of the consortium?	The Lead Firm must be registered in India.
42	2.2.2 (A) Technical Capacity	(i) Please confirm if the submission of Audited Annual Reports of the Firm (PwC PL) or certificate(s) from the Statutory Auditors stating the total revenues from professional fees, for the Financial Years 2017-18, 2016-17, and 2015-16 are sufficient as a Proof/ Evidence?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
43	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	Does the financial criteria be met by the lead applicant or by all members of the consortium? Can the financial criteria be jointly met by members of the consortium? Does the 50 crores per annum of professional fees be only from India or can it also be global consultancy fees?	Please refer to clause 2.1.1 and 2.2.2 (A) of the RFP, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
44	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	Given the strategic nature of the assignment, we request you to consider increasing the minimum income of the Applicant to Rs 100 (hundred) crores per annum.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
45	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	Given the strategic nature of this project, it requires firms of repute and experience. We therefore request you to increase the financial capacity to INR 100 Cr per annum. We suggest the clause may be modified as under:  Financial Capacity: The Applicant shall have received a minimum income of Rs. 100 (hundred) crores per annum from professional fees (excluding revenues from audit, tax, IT implementation projects) during each of the 3 (three) financial years preceding the Proposal Due Date. For the avoidance of doubt, professional fees hereunder refers to fees received by the Applicant for providing advisory or consultancy services to its clients.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
46	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	Does the financial criteria be met by the lead applicant or by all members of the consortium? Can the financial criteria be jointly met by members of the consortium? Does the 50 crores per annum of professional fees be	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.1 and 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		only from India or can it also be global consultancy fees?	
47	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	It has been mentioned that 'Applicants having comparatively larger revenues from professional fees shall be given added weightage.' We request you to please define this weightage and the scoring mechanism.	Please refer to the RFP , which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
48	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	Since the audited financial statements for FY 2018-19 would only be available by September 2019, we request that the Financial Capacity condition be made applicable for FY 2015-16, FY 2016-17 and FY 2017-18. Kindly confirm	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
49	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	Please clarify document to be submitted for annual income proof, hope CA certificate as proof of annual Income is acceptable	Please refer to the RFP Appendix I Form 5, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
50	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	It is requested to consider to kindly revise the Financial Capacity to Rs. 5.00 -10.00 crore minimum income per annum from professional fees during each of the 3 (three) financial years.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
51	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	We request you to increase the financial capacity to INR 100 cr per annum. We suggest the clause may be modified as under: Financial Capacity: The Applicant shall have received a minimum income of Rs.100 (hundred) crores per annum from professional fees (excluding revenues from audit, tax, IT implementation projects) during each of the 3 (three) financial years preceding the Proposal Due Date. For the avoidance of doubt, professional fees hereunder refers to fees received by the Applicant for providing advisory or consultancy services to its clients.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
52	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	An exemption may be provided in the criteria of minimum professional fee for government organisations that meet the Technical Capacity and are keen to compete in the bidding process or may be modified to a lower minimum as appropriate (Suggested minimum could be Rs.35.00 Crores).	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
53	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	We request to allow combine turnover from all consortium members instead of only Applicant (i.e. sole firm / lead firm).	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.1 and 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
54	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	We request that you may kindly reconsider this eligibility condition and scale the same down to ₹ 5 Crores. .	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
55	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	Whether Financial Capacity/Turnover will be strictly Rs. 50 crores ?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
56	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	Sir, while we cannot fulfil this requirement, we assure you that our research team will complete the project in 99 days with utmost rigor.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.



**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
	for Applicants)		
57	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	It is requested that the requirement of an application for the project to have an annual professional fee earnings of Rs.50 Crores per year for 3 (three) preceding years from Proposal Due Date may kindly be waived for the organization.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
58	2.2.2 (B) Financial Capacity (under Conditions of Eligibility for Applicants)	Considering the above factors, we request the DMEO, NITI Aayog to reconsider the financial capacity criteria. Our suggestion is as follows: <b>Financial Capacity:</b> <i>The Applicant shall have received a minimum income of Rs. 15 (Fifteen) crores per annum from professional fees during each of the 3 (three) financial years preceding the Proposal Due Date. For the purpose of evaluation, Applicants having comparatively larger revenues from provision of monitoring and evaluation services fees shall be given added weightage. For the avoidance of doubt, professional fees hereunder refers to fees received by the Applicant for providing advisory or consultancy services to its clients.</i>	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (B), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
59	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	1: We request client to kindly clarify that whether the cost of each Eligible General Assignment and Eligible Specific Assignment of the key personnel should be 50 and 20 lakhs respectively? 2: If Yes, than how it is possible to get in information of the projects where Freelance Consultants are involved.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
60	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Based on the approach developed by the consultants, can any additional positions not identified in the RFP be proposed Currently the RFP purposes the number of days the non-core team is to be deployed. Can the deployment of non-core team (intermittent) be decided by consultants based on the approach and the work plan?	Please refer to clause 2.2.2 (D) of the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
61	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Core /non-core team - Education qualification; He/she should have a degree from a reputed and recognized university or institution within/ outside India	Please refer to clause 2.2.2 (D) of the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
62	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	He/she should have a degree from a reputed and recognized university or institution within/ outside India	Please refer to clause 2.2.2 (D) of the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
63	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	We request you to modify the clause as under: Core Team: The Consultant shall mobilize and demobilize its Core Team with the concurrence of DMEO. The Core Team members should be physically present for a monthly meeting at DMEO.	Please refer to clause 2.2.2 (D) of the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
64	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Kindly clarify if the key personnel – both core team and non-core team can have some common personnel's across RfPs.	CVs of non-core Key Personnel may be repeated in different Proposals across packages. However, each of the non-core Key Personnel should be exclusively deployed on a single package. Substitution of non-core Key Personnel must take

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
			place within 2 (two) working days of the date of Letter of Award.  CVs of core Key Personnel cannot be repeated across Proposals either at the application stage or at the award stage.
65	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Secondly the level of experience especially on the non-core team is too high. Could there be some relaxation on years on experience?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (D), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
66	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Gender and Social Inclusion Specialist: We request you to also consider MBA/ Masters in Social Works as an eligible qualification for this position. Further, we request you to consider allowing minimum 5 years of experience for this position.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
67	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Gender and Social Inclusion Specialist: We request you to also consider MBA/ Masters in Social Works as an eligible qualification for this position. Further, we request you to consider allowing minimum 5 years of experience for this position.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
68	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Team Leader : We request you to please include the following qualifications : Master of Business Administration, Chartered Accountant Degree and Master of Public Health	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (D), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
69	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Can the same CVs/ experts be used in more than one package bid?	CVs of non-core Key Personnel may be repeated in different Proposals across packages. However, each of the non-core Key Personnel should be exclusively deployed on a single package. Substitution of non-core Key Personnel must take place within 2 (two) working days of the date of Letter of Award.  CVs of core Key Personnel cannot be repeated across Proposals either at the application stage or at the award stage.
70	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Deputy Team Leader - We request you to also consider CA as an eligible qualification for this position and allowing minimum 10 years of experience for this position. Furthermore, we suggest that the experience criteria for the key personnel should be modified as follows: a. He/she should have led 3 relevant eligible assignments b. He/she should have an experience of minimum 5 years in Urban sector	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
71	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Deputy Team Leader: We request you to clarify if a CA degree an acceptable equivalent to MBA/PGDM? Please include : Master of Public Health	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (D), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
72	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Economist - It is requested to remove preference for PhD for this position as a post graduate degree in Economics, Econometrics, or related field(s) should be a sufficient qualification for the role proposed for the position.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
73	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Economist - We request you to consider allowing minimum 7 years of experience for this position. Furthermore, we suggest that the experience criteria for the key personnel should be modified as follows: a. He/she should have undertaken economic advisory in 3 relevant eligible assignments	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
74	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Finance Specialist We request you to consider allowing minimum 5 years of experience for this position.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
75	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Information Technology Specialist: We request you to also consider Masters in Computer Science / MBA as an eligible qualification for this position.  Further, we request you to consider allowing minimum 5 years of experience for this position.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
76	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Information Technology Specialist: We request you to also consider Masters in Computer Science / MBA as an eligible qualification for this position. Further, we request you to consider allowing minimum 5 years of experience for this position.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
77	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	It is requested to allow the agriculture lead to have post-graduation in agriculture or allied sector with minimum 10 years of experience, which should be sufficient qualification for the role proposed for the position.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
78	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Monitoring and Evaluation Expert - We request you to also consider MBA/CA as an eligible qualification for this position and allowing minimum 10 years of experience for this position. Furthermore, we suggest that the experience criteria for the key personnel should be modified as follows: a. He/she should have undertaken M&E advisory in 3 relevant eligible assignments	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
79	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Monitoring and Evaluation Expert: We request you to modify the requirement to: "Postgraduate degree in International Development, Economics, Econometrics, Political Science, Statistics, Management or related field"	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (D), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
80	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Monitoring and Evaluation Expert: It is requested to consider MBA/ CA as an eligible qualification for this position and allowing minimum 10 years of experience for this position. Furthermore, we suggest that the experience criteria for the key personnel should be modified as follows:	Please refer to clause 2.2.2 (D) of the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		a. He/she should have undertaken M&E advisory in 3 relevant eligible assignments	
81	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Monitoring and Evaluation Expert: We request you to modify the requirement to: "Postgraduate degree in International Development, Economics, Econometrics, Political Science, Statistics, Management or related field"	Please refer to clause 2.2.2 (D) of the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
82	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Non-core team - Is there a flexibility to add / reduce positions based on consultant's assessment of the requirement? Whether the days indicated for each non-core position are minimum and mandatory to be included in the cost proposal?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (D), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
83	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Safeguards Specialist - We request you to consider Bachelors Degree in Urban Planning/ Environmental Engineering/ Masters in Social Work as an eligible qualification for this position. Further, we request you to consider allowing minimum 5 years of experience for this position.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
84	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Team Leader - We request you to also consider CA as an eligible qualification for this position and allowing minimum 12 years of experience for this position. Furthermore, we suggest that the experience criteria for the key personnel should be modified as follows: a. He/she should have led 3 relevant eligible assignments b. He/she should have an experience of minimum 5 years in Urban sector (urban infrastructure/planning and project Management)	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
85	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Urban Planning Lead - We request you to consider Bachelors Degree in Urban Planning/ Environmental Engineering/ Masters in Social Work as an eligible qualification for this position.  Further, we request you to consider allowing minimum 5 years of experience for this position.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
86	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	We suggest that the experience criteria for the key personnel should be modified as follows: a. He/she should have undertaken subject matter advisory in 3 relevant eligible assignments	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
87	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	We suggest that the experience criteria for the key personnel should be modified as follows: a. He/she should have undertaken subject matter advisory in 3 relevant eligible assignments b. He/she should have an experience of minimum 5 years in Urban planning and infrastructure management or in any other relevant area	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
88	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	As per the outlined criteria; the Deputy Team Leader is required to be MBA or equivalent. Can this educational criteria be extended to include post graduate degrees in Public Health/International Development-	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Development Studies/Public Policy?	
89	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	For 'Team Leader' position, the requirements should not be so specific. Rather managerial or leadership skills/experience should be solicited, as the person's key role is to lead the team and deliver the assignment. For the 'Team Leader' position, please allow persons with "Postgraduate Degree in Management" and experience in Government sector.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
90	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	It is requested to consider following length of experience for each proposed position; Core Team Team Leader- 12 years Deputy Team Leader - 10 years Monitoring and Evaluation Expert - 8 years Economist - 8 years Urban Planning Lead - 8 years Non-Core Team Finance Specialist - 8 years Statistician - 8 years Public Institution Specialist - 5 years Gender and Social Inclusion Specialist - 5 years Environment, Climate Change and Sustainability Specialist - 5 years Information Technology Specialist - 5 years Safeguards Specialist - 5 years Engineer - 8 years	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
91	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	It is requested to consider following length of experience for each proposed position; Non-Core Team Finance Specialist - 8 years Economist - 8 years Statistician - 8 years Public Institution Specialist - 5 years Gender and Social Inclusion Specialist - 5 years Environment Specialist - 5 years Information Technology Specialist - 5 years Safeguards Specialist - 5 years Social Sector Expert - 8 years Police Services Expert - 8 years Judicial Reforms Expert - 8 years	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
92	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Engineer: Request you to please amend the clause as follows: • S/He should have undertaken urban sector advisory	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
93	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	We understand that, while the Monitoring & Evaluation expert and Economist brings the data driven project related outcomes, the positions namely Team Leader, Deputy Team leader and Sector Lead(s) would bring holistic perspective on the Planning, development, institutional/governance and implementation challenges in the respective sector. Moreover, the Team Leader, Deputy Team Leader and Sector Lead(s) have much larger role in channelizing the efforts of other core Team and non-core team members for developing the study outcomes based upon the ground realities that various stakeholders confront-with while implementing the respective schemes. Thus towards striking the balanced approach for the project outcomes and with-in the project team, it is requested that authority should limit the experience of Eligible Specific Assignments to the positions of Monitoring & Evaluation expert and Economist only and experience of Team Leader, Deputy Team	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		leader and Sector Lead (s) should be limited to experience of working on the projects related to Planning, development, Project & Program management and Implementation in the sector coupled with their experience to engage with various Stakeholders at National, state and ULB level and capabilities of managing multidisciplinary teams.	
94	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	As this is an evaluation study of WCD/Health sector scheme, would it be better if Public health is one of the required educational qualifications of a public institution specialist?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (D), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
95	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Is there any weightage for scoring of “Preferred Qualifications” mentioned in core team positions?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
96	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	We request you to relax the requirement of 1 (one) Eligible Specific Assignment for each Key Personnel and Non-core team as it may be very difficult to find experts with such specific experience	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
97	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	CVs of the Non-Core Team Members will be not be evaluated. Do we still have to provide the full CVs of the Non-core Team Members, or brief description of their qualifications and experience will suffice?	Please refer to clause 2.2.2 (D) of the RFP, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
98	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	If we decide to bid for more than one packages, can we repeat some of the team members (except the Team Leader)?	CVs of non-core Key Personnel may be repeated in different Proposals across packages. However, each of the non-core Key Personnel should be exclusively deployed on a single package. Substitution of non-core Key Personnel must take place within 2 (two) working days of the date of Letter of Award.  CVs of core Key Personnel cannot be repeated across Proposals either at the application stage or at the award stage.
99	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	Team Leader – Will a candidate with Ph.D. score higher marks than some one who does not have a Ph.D., but has more relevant experience? On the other hand, will a Team Leader with more relevant experience and without Ph.D. get lower score than a Team Leader with a Ph.D. but less relevant experience?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
100	2.2.2 (D) Conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel	We request the authority to consider removal of PhD and Project Management Certification as a preference for Team Leader. Further, request to consider increasing the length of relevant professional experience to 20 years as against 15 years.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.2 (D), which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
101	2.2.3	Further, since the audited financial statements for FY 2018-19 would only be available by September 2019, we request that the	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.



**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		Financial Capacity condition be made applicable for FY 2015-16, FY 2016-17 and FY 2017-18. Kindly confirm.	
102	2.2.3 Appendix – I, Form – 8	We would request that certificate issued by Chartered Accountants in lieu of Statutory Auditors certifying the fee received in respect of each of the Eligible Assignments be accepted as part of the bid submission.	Please refer to Appendix-I, Form 5 of the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
103	2.2.3	The financial statements for FY19 are yet to be finalized by statutory auditors. Therefore, it is requested to please consider three preceding financial years i.e. FY16, FY17 and FY18. Form 5 provides the format for certificate from statutory auditors stating total revenues from professional fees. We already have certificate from statutory auditor for the Turnover of the previous years in a standard firm format. Can that certificate be submitted in place of the format given in the RFP?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
104	2.2.3	1. Please clarify if both revenue and income certificate of the applicant need to be enclosed? 2. Will copy of contract along with project value of eligible assignment specified in the proposal will be acceptable in place of certificate from Statutory auditors	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
105	2.2.6	It is requested to modify the clause as follows: Applicant has not been barred by the Central Government, any State Government, a statutory authority or a public sector undertaking in India, as the case may be, from participating in any project	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.5, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
106	2.2.6	It is requested to modify the clause as follows:  During the last three years, neither the applicant has 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 applicant, nor been expelled from any project or agreement nor have had any agreement terminated for accepted breach by applicant that may have a material adverse impact on its ability to perform the services referred to in the RFP.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.2.5, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
107	2.3 Conflict of Interest	Does this clause imply implementing organisations or consulting organisations leading the PMUs for the specific programmes are excluded from bidding for the assignment?	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
108	2.3 Conflict of Interest	Considering the size and scale of operations of the firm, it is difficult to	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		confirm to the clause. We would thus request that this clause be made applicable to the team members being proposed as part of the project.	of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
109	2.3 Conflict of Interest	Can this clause be made applicable to the team members being proposed as part of the project? As, given the size and scale of operations of the firm, it may be difficult to confirm / adhere to the clause.	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
110	2.3 Conflict of Interest	We would like to know the names of organisations who can be considered to have conflict of interest.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
111	2.3 Conflict of Interest	We understand the guiding principles for identifying and addressing the Conflict of Interest. In reference to the words “directly or indirectly”, we request if this clause be made applicable to the team members being proposed as part of the project. As, given the size and scale of operations of the firm, it may be difficult to confirm / adhere to the clause. Furthermore, we are working/worked with various Central/State Ministries/Departments and city level governments on various urban transformation projects/schemes. We understand such projects will not be considered as conflict of interest.	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
112	2.3.1 Conflict of Interest	Most of the Consultants have worked or are working with government departments managing the schemes under various listed sectors. We would request that this may not constitute “Conflict of Interest”. Alternatively, this may restrict participation of firms. Kindly confirm our understanding.	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
113	2.3.1 Conflict of Interest	EY is currently/was engaged with a number of central and state government departments/entities for design, implementation and project management support for scheme(s)/program(s) being evaluated under the respective studies. Does this amount as conflict of Interest and preclude the applicant from participating in this RFP?	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
114	2.3.2 Conflict of Interest	Clarification requested: We understand that consultant or its associates working with the Ministries/ Departments involved in respective packages or providing consultancy/ program management services/ IT services for Centrally Sponsored scheme(s) at state or central level for the respective	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		package would be eligible for participation/ bidding under the package provided that team members proposed for the package are currently not working on the engagements referred above. Kindly confirm on the same. If the understanding is not correct, It is requested to clarify the scope of services being provided in a business which would entail a conflict of interest situation. Also we would request you to kindly change the clause as “The Authority requires that the Consultant provides professional, objective, and impartial advice and at all times hold the Authority’s interests paramount, avoid	Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
115	2.3.3 (f) Conflict of Interest	Kindly clarify if consultants with ongoing consultancy mandates such as PMC/ due diligence/ implementation of programs with centre/ state level bodies are allowed to participate?	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
116	2.3.3 (f) Conflict of Interest	Does this preclude the selected consultant from participating in any ongoing bids with Niti Aayog/ Central Ministries/ State Governments for scheme(s)/ program(s) which are being evaluated under this study?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.3, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
117	2.3.3 Conflict of Interest	Would request you to consider term affiliate and associate as “Affiliate in India” and “Associates in India” respectively.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
118	2.3.4 Conflict of Interest	Please confirm that the proposed 5 year moratorium does not prevent the consulting firm from applying for any future consultancy/ advisory assignments with Niti Aayog/ Central Ministries/ State Governments for scheme(s)/ program(s) which are being evaluated under this study?It is therefore suggested that Clause 2.3.4 can be removed from RFP, since the clauses 2.3.3.(f) and 2.3.3.(g) are addressing this issue.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
119	2.3.4 Conflict of Interest	Most bidders for the RFP are engaged prominently in the various business lines across various Central and State Ministries on an ongoing basis and are also engaged with several stakeholders for future assignments in related fields. It is therefore requested that the clause prohibiting restriction of services for a period of 5 (five) years from the completion of the assignment be dropped.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
120	2.4 Number of Proposals	Request you to please share the criteria for selecting applicant for only three/ five packages in case they are qualify as the selected consultant based on the combined technical score for more than five packages.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
121	2.13 – Format and Signing of Proposal	Kindly clarify whether only the cover of the printed document is to be initialled by the authorized signatory or each page?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.13.3, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
122	2.14 Technical Proposal	If client could clarify whether CVs of non-key experts are also required to	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, 2.2.2 and 2.14.2 read

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		be submitted with the proposal.	with clause 3.1.4 and form 12 (Appendix I), which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
123	2.14: Technical Proposal – 2.14.2 (d)	Since the evaluation (scoring) is to be done for core team CVs only, we request you to consider relaxing the requirement of submission of detailed CVs of non-core team and submission of only pen profiles of non-core team can be considered, including details such as Name of personnel, Qualification, Years of experience, Key experience (projects), etc. with a page limit of 1 page. Further, we request you to consider putting a page limit for core team CVs of 5 pages for each position. We also request you to suitably amend the CV format given in Appendix I – Form-12.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4, 2.2.2 and 2.14.2, read with clause 3.1.4 and form 12 (Appendix I), which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
124	2.14: Technical Proposal – 2.14.2 (d)	We understand that the key personnel proposed might be from different locations in India, thus, arranging physically signed CVs may be difficult. Thus, we would request you to relax this condition to digital signature. Alternatively, we would request that the authorized signatory's physical signature be considered sufficient for the purpose of submission of proposal.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
125	2.14.2 (g) Technical Proposal	The proposed project requires shortlisting of a number of senior personnel. Many of them are on regular travel and may not be available on a frequent basis in-person. Considering the timelines laid out in RFP for submission of proposal, request to please consider print of scanned CVs with signature of personnel. This will help in timely submission of technical proposal.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
126	2.14.2 (g) Technical Proposal	We request you to allow digitally signing the document in case physical signature is not possible. The clause may accordingly be modified as under: While submitting the Technical Proposal, the Applicant shall, in particular, ensure that the CVs have been recently signed and dated in blue ink by the respective Personnel and countersigned by the Applicant. Photocopy or unsigned / countersigned CVs shall be rejected. In case a physical signature is not possible, the applicant shall ensure that the key personnel has digitally signed the CV.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
127	2.14.2 (g) Technical Proposal	We request you to kindly consider a declaration with signature of the Authorized Signatory of the Applicant for all CVs.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
128	2.14.2 (h) Technical Proposal	It is requested to consider the undertaking with signature of the Authorized Signatory of the Applicant for all CVs. This will help to reduce paper work and in timely submission of technical proposal.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
129	2.14.2 (j) Technical Proposal	We understand that Key Personnel shall only be available for full time deployment for 100 days. We also understand that any input thereafter	Please refer to the RFP Schedule I Terms of Reference 9 Payment Schedule and Schedule II Form Agreement 7

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		shall be based on the agreed person day rates as specified in the Financial Proposal. This is also in line with Note 11 of Form 2 which specifies that additional involvement shall be based on person day rates. Please clarify.	Liquidated Damages and Penalties, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
130	2.14.4 Technical Proposal	Request you to please not allow the false declaration by any personnel to impact the applicant firm, please allow the clause to be restricted to debarring the individual only.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
131	2.14.6	We request you to kindly specify the number of Support Personnel required for the duration of the project. We suggest to deploy 6 (six) Support Personnel (one resource for each geographic zone) for the project time period with minimum qualification of a Master's degree in economics, management, urban planning, and engineering.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
132	2.14.7 Sub-consultants	An Applicant may, if it considers necessary, propose suitable Sub-Consultants in specific areas of expertise. Credentials of such Sub-Consultants should be submitted in Form-15 of Appendix-A Sub-Consultant, however, shall not be a substitute for any Key Personnel: Is that infer that key personnel can only be from the lead team/ the key professional can't be from the sub-consultant/partner/ we cannot have consultants as part of the key team. Request the client to clarify on this and if the sub-consultant can be made part of the key personnel.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.14.7 , which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated. Key Personnel need not be permanent employees of the Lead Firm.
133	2.20 Bid Security	The concerned authority/team/officer is kindly requested to share Details of PAN and TAN for NITI AAYOG- as it has been classified as mandatory requirement for issuance of demand draft by finance team of our firm.	<b>GST Registration Number may be quoted as: 07DELP01988A1D7</b>
134	2.20: Bid Security Part 2.20.4	We request you to kindly clarify the details on the duration in which the Bid Security will be returned under the circumstances mentioned in this section.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.20.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
135	2.21 Performance Security	It is not clear, request to client to provide more clarity on this.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.21, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
136	2.21 Performance Security	We request to keep it to 5% (five per cent) so make it sustainable for consultant as firm payment will be received after 3 weeks on approval of inception report. Alternatively Client may propose advance payment of 10% against the equal amount of performance security.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.21, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
137	2.21: Performance Security - 2.21.2	We request you to kindly clarify the details on the duration in which the Performance Security will be returned under the circumstances mentioned in this section.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.21 and Schedule II, Agreement Clause 7.1, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
138	2.23 Confidentiality	We request the following addendum to the clauses 'The confidentiality obligations shall survive the termination of this Contract / completion of services for a period of one (1) year.'	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.23, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
139	2.26 Substitution of Key Personnel	If there is delay in procurement and commencement of the study, substitution of Key Personnel including the team leader be allowed subject to equally or better qualified and experienced personnel being provided to the satisfaction of the Authority	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
140	2.26 Substitution of Key Personnel	Please clarify whether clause 2.26.1 is before contract signing and is 2.26.2 is after contract signing	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
141	2.26 Substitution of Key Personnel	Please confirm that substitution due to incapacity or due to health will be the only consideration for allowing substitution and will regardless be subject to deduction of 20% of the remuneration specified for the original Key Personnel. In which case, we request that under exceptional circumstances, if we have to replace a Key Personnel due to unavoidable circumstances, the deduction shall be restricted to 5% -10% (five percent) of the remuneration specified for the original Key Personnel and the penalty be applied only for the core team member as non-core team members are not being evaluated.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
142	2.26.1 Substitution of Key Personnel	We request you to amend the clause as below: Substitution will, however, be permitted if the Key Personnel is not available for reasons beyond the control of the Applicant (like resignation from the organization, any incapacity or ill health etc.) subject to equally or better qualified and experienced personnel being provided to the satisfaction of the Authority.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
143	2.26.1 Substitution of Key Personnel	Change requested: The consultant should not be penalized for substitution of resources on account of reasons beyond its control (e.g. resignation, medical reasons etc.). We request you to kindly remove the penalty clause and cap on number of substitution for replacement of resource, beyond the control of consultant, subject to equal or better qualified and experienced personnel being provided to the satisfaction of the Authority. Further we request you to cap the deduction for any replacement apart from conditions covered above at 10% of the remuneration specified for the original Key Personnel.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
144	2.26.2 & 2.26.3 Substitution of Key Personnel	Change requested: The consultant should not be penalized for substitution of resources on account of reasons beyond its control (e.g. resignation, medical reasons etc.). We request you to kindly remove the penalty clause and cap on number of substitution for replacement of resource, beyond the control of consultant, subject to equal or better qualified and experienced personnel being provided to the satisfaction of the Authority. Further we request you to cap the deduction for any replacement apart from conditions covered above at 10% of the	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.



**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		remuneration specified for the original Key Personnel.	
145	2.26.2 & 2.26.3 Substitution of Key personnel	We request reconsideration of penalties/ termination in case of health or any other such unavoidable and unforeseen situations which are not directly under applicants' control and equally qualified replacement should be considered	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
146	2.26.2 Substitution of Key Personnel	Deduction in the amount if the key personnel is substituted: needs clarity from the client and if this can be waived off.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
147	2.26.2 Substitution of Key Personnel	The conditions under substitution of key personnel are too stringent, considering that substitution can be made only on basis of incapacity or due to health. Request you to kindly consider substitution of two resources without any deductions.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
148	2.26.2 Substitution of Key Personnel	We request you to remove this clause altogether. In case it is not considered, we request that substitution of Key Personnel should be allowed without attracting a penal provision of deduction of remuneration, if such substitution is on account of reasons that are beyond the control of the Applicant. We request you to kindly limit the overall liability of the bidder including liquidated damages to 10%.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
149	2.26.2 Substitution of Key Personnel	While the Consultant would ensure that the selected Key Personnel are present throughout the entire duration of the project, the individual decisions (like resignation etc.) of the Key Personnel are beyond the Consultant's control. Hence, it is requested that the Consultant be not penalized for the decisions of its personnel. Request you to kindly remove the penalty clause for substitution. We would also like to clarify that the deployment of Key Personnel if required beyond the 100 days engagement duration, may be difficult and may require replacement without penalty.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
150	2.26.3 Substitution of Key Personnel	We request that substitution of Team Leader should be allowed without attracting a penal provision of deduction of remuneration, if such substitution is on account of reasons that are beyond the control of the Applicant.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
151	2.26.3 Substitution of Key Personnel	Add clause 2.26.4: The Consultant may submit profiles of its sub-contracted employees for any of the Key Personnel positions. However, the Consultant shall not subcontract the whole of the Services	Please refer to RFP clause 2.14.7, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated. Key Personnel need not be permanent employees of the Lead Firm.
152	2.26.3 Substitution of Key Personnel	substitution of key leader may lead to disqualification: if client could consider waiving off this clause.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule II, Form of Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
153	2.27 Indemnity	It is requested to modify the clause as follows:	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Indemnify the Authority for an amount not exceeding the value of the Agreement for any direct loss or damage that is caused due to any deficiency in services.	
154	2.27 Indemnity	We would request that the amount be capped to one time the fee.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
155	2.27 Indemnity	Request, to please reduce the value to 1(one) times instead of 3 times.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
156	2.27 Indemnity	Change requested: We request you to kindly change the clause to limit the amount to one time the fees paid to the consultant	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
157	2.27 Indemnity	We request the indemnity to be restricted to total professional fee paid to the Applicant.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
158	2.30 The Consultant shall commence the Services within 3 (three) days of the date of the Agreement, or such other date as may be mutually agreed	Please clarify if this is three working days	This refers to calendar days.
159	2.31 Proprietary Data	We wish to clarify the pre-existing IPR with our firm continues to be a part of our firm or not. Also, we request you to disclose proper bifurcation of the documents and property to identify the IPR.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.31, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
160	2.31 Proprietary data	Please clarify, the terms of data privacy policy to be abide with while working with multiple stakeholder(s)	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.31, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
<b>Section 3 of RFP</b>			
1	3. Criteria for Evaluation	The weightage criteria for scoring more than minimum number of eligible/ specific assignments is not given. What would be the methodology of scoring assignments? Will the number of assignments be counted first for all the bidders, and then the weightage for scoring will be defined? Please clarify.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.3, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
2	3.1: Evaluation of Technical Proposal	We request you to consider allowing at least 10 working days for replacement of key personnel.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
3	3.1.1 Evaluation of Technical Proposals	We request reducing the qualifying marks to 50. The clause may be modified as under: Evaluation of technical proposals: Only those Applicants whose Technical Proposals get a score of 50 (fifty) marks or more out of 100 (one hundred) shall qualify for further consideration	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
4	3.1.3 Evaluation of Technical Proposals	We request you to kindly make the scoring criteria more simpler and objective including removing the differentiation between general and specific assignments as follows: Parameter Max. Marks	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		<p>Criteria                      Relevant Experience of Applicant                      25                      I. Applicant's turnover (5 marks):                      (i) For 100 -150 cr - 2 marks                      (ii) For every additional 50 cr., 1 mark each subject to max. 5 marks                      II. Applicant's experience in design, implementation and evaluation of government programmes in last 7 years (10 marks)                      (i) For every project 1 mark, subject to max. 10 marks                      III. Cumulative size of projects delivered successfully (10 marks)                      (i) For 1-5 cr -2.5 marks                      (ii) For 5-10 cr – 5 marks                      (iii) For 10 – 15 cr – 7.5 marks                      (iv) For &gt;15 cr – 10 marks                      Proposed Methodology and Work Plan                      10                      Evaluation will be based on the presentation of the approach &amp; methodology                      Relevant Experience of the Key Personnel                      65                      20% of the maximum marks on the educational qualification &amp;                      6                      S. No. RFP Page #, Reference Content of RFP requiring clarification                      Queries/Clarifications/Comments                      institution (you may consider MHRD institution rankings for the same)                      80% of the maximum marks on relevant experience considering the value and complexity of the projects undertaken.</p>	
5	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	<p>Given the complexity of the assignment and its strategic policy importance, we believe the approach and methodology should be given greater weightage. Hence request you to consider a revision on the scoring criteria as follows: Relevant Experience of the Applicant :30                      Proposed Methodology and Work Plan:40                      Relevant Experience of the Key Personnel 30</p>	<p>Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.</p>
6	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	<p>The RFP mentions that for applicants the score shall be allocated on a proportionate basis. In most of the RFPs, the marks are assigned based on the range of number of assignments eligible for the proposal and marks are allocated accordingly. It is requested that a similar approach may please be considered and marking according to defined range of number of eligible projects may be done. .</p>	<p>Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.</p>

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
7	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	No specific parameters have been defined for assigning scores in respect of comparative size and quality of eligible assignments. It is requested that if this can be detailed out by the authority with certain parameters for guidance.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
8	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	We request you to please restrict the number or specify number of assignments (for 30% marks) to be presented across both the categories to avoid lengthy and out of context responses	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
9	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	Please share the break up of 70% and method for assessing the size and quality of assignments, professional income, experience and capacity of the firm	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
10	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	Further, please state how the 70% score will be apportioned between (i) assignments and (ii) overall professional income, experience and capacity of the firm	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
11	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	It is requested that in order to explain the consultant's point of view and the methods to be adopted for the study purpose, presentation by consultants should be made part of the technical qualification and the scoring should be adjusted accordingly.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
12	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	Most non-core team members are highly experienced professionals. Can a scoring mechanism be put in place to assess member quality? Alternately, if non-core members are not scored, can the preference for higher degrees such as PhD be ignored/dropped?	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
13	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	We request for a more detailed explanation on the scoring criteria for evaluating projects.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
14	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	Please specify how the quality of an assignment will be judged. Given the subjectivity in such an assessment, please delete the quality aspect and consider only the comparative size aspect.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
15	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	We understand that criteria does not provide complete clarity on evaluation and is somewhat subjective. We request you to kindly modify the criteria to make it more objective to enable a more transparent competition. Based on existing criteria, an illustrative evaluation criteria if given below for your kind reference: Number of eligible assignments (general and specific assignments combined together) – 7.5 marks (maximum 18 assignments to be showcased) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Upto 3 assignments: 0 marks</li> <li>o 0.5 marks for each additional assignment above 3 assignments</li> <li>• Average annual revenue of firm in last three years – 17.5 marks</li> <li>o Upto 50 cores: 0 marks</li> <li>o 0.5 marks for every additional slab of 50 crores Relevant experience of</li> </ul>	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>the personnel – 65 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of eligible assignments (general and specific assignments combined together) – 65 marks (maximum 16 assignments to be showcased)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Upto 3 assignments: 0 marks</li> <li>5 marks for each additional assignment above 3 assignments</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
16	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	It is understood that the authority will consider both eligible general and eligible specific assignments for the purpose of evaluation. The authority may kindly confirm.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
17	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	Please confirm if there are any specific objective benchmarks for determining the quality of the eligible assignments as otherwise determining the quality of an eligible assignment may be subjective.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
18	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	We would request you to kindly include a maximum number of projects which has to be furnished for this criteria. The number of projects may not necessarily be a reflection of expertise. We would also request you to kindly clarify how scores shall be assigned for the remaining 70%. For example, if Firm A has 10 projects of INR 10 crores value and Firm B has 25 projects of INR 1 crores value, how shall the scores be assigned to Firm A and Firm B respectively.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
19	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	Are there any additional marks for core applicant employees being a part of the time than a consultant?	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
20	3.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation	Whether the Eligible General Assignments for the Applicant Firm needs to be completed prior to PDD or could be ongoing with a Rs. 50 Lakh professional fee received for such assignment?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
21	3.1.3. Criteria for Evaluation	We request for the following modification Maximum marks: 30 Criteria: A maximum of 9 marks (30%) will be awarded basis the number of Eligible Assignments undertaken by the Applicant firm (9 marks if $\geq 30$ Eligible Assignments, 5 marks if $15 \leq 29$ Eligible Assignments, 0 marks otherwise). At least 50% of the projects should have been executed in India. The remaining 21 marks (70%) shall be awarded for: (i) the comparative size and quality of Eligible General and Specific Assignments (ii) overall professional income, size and capacity of the firm.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
22	3.1.3. Criteria for Evaluation	We believe that Approach and Methodology to given more marks as it reflects consultants understanding and approach to undertake the project. We accordingly request you to modify the clause as following: Maximum marks: 30 Criteria: Quality of the approach and methodology submitted as part of the technical bid including understanding of context / objective, proposed methodology, proprietary tools and proposed work plan	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
23	3.1.3. Criteria for Evaluation	We request for the following modification in the clause: Maximum marks: 40 Criteria: 30% of the maximum marks for each Key Personnel shall be awarded for the number of Eligible Assignments (General or Specific) the respective Key Personnel has worked on. The remaining 70% shall be awarded for the comparative size and quality of Eligible Assignments Team Leader – 12 marks Deputy Team Leader – 10 marks Monitoring & Evaluation Expert – 6 marks Economist – 5 marks Public Health Lead – 7 marks Educational Qualification of all Key Personnel: Postgraduate degree from a highly pedigreed/Tier 1 institution	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
24	3.1.3. Criteria for Evaluation	How will size of eligible assignments for key personnel be validated as the work experience for most core team members would be across multiple organisations and it will not be possible for the applicant to submit auditor certifications for assignments not executed by them?	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
25	3.1.3. Criteria for Evaluation	As per page 16, 17 and 18, there are conditions of eligibility for Key Personnel that pertain to their educational qualifications. However, please suggest how the scoring criteria will address cases where the personnel exceed this eligibility.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
26	3.1.3. Criteria for Evaluation	In cases where the organization is bidding as a consortium, it is understood that eligible assignments of both the lead member as well as the consortium member will be considered for evaluation. The authority is requested to confirm the same.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.1, footnote on Form 8 (Appendix I) which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
27	3.1.3.1 Criteria for Evaluation	We request for the following modification  Maximum marks: 30  Criteria: A maximum of 9 marks (30%) will be awarded basis the number of Eligible Assignments undertaken by the Applicant firm (9 marks if >=10 Eligible Assignments, 5 marks if 5-9 Eligible Assignments, 0 marks otherwise). At least 50% of the projects should have been executed in India. The remaining 21 marks (70%) shall be awarded for: (i) the comparative size and quality of Eligible General and Specific Assignments (ii) overall professional income, size and capacity of the firm	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
28	3.1.3.2 Criteria for Evaluation	We believe that Approach and Methodology should be given significantly more weightage, as it reflects the consulting firm's understanding and approach to undertake this seminal project.  We accordingly request you to modify the clause as following:	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.



**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		Maximum marks: 30 Criteria: Quality of the approach and methodology submitted as part of the technical bid including understanding of context / objective, proposed methodology, proprietary tools and proposed work plan	
29	3.1.3.3 Criteria for Evaluation	We request for the following modification in the clause:  Maximum marks: 40  Criteria: 30% of the maximum marks for each Key Personnel shall be awarded for the number of Eligible Assignments (General or Specific) the respective Key Personnel has worked on. The remaining 70% shall be awarded for the comparative size and quality of Eligible Assignments  Team Leader – 12 marks Deputy Team Leader – 10 marks Monitoring & Evaluation Expert – 6 marks Economist – 5 marks Public Health Lead – 7 marks  Educational Qualification of all Key Personnel: Postgraduate degree from a highly pedigreed/Tier 1 institution	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
30	3.1.3. Criteria for Evaluation	(ii)The authority may kindly clarify the mechanism of according added weightage to a bidder on the basis of larger revenues. The authority is also requested to clarify whether the weightage will be on combined professional fees of the preceding 3 Financial Years (F.Y) or by calculating average of the professional fees of 3 F.Ys	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
31	3.1.3. Criteria for Evaluation	Given the complexity of the assignment and its strategic policy importance , we believe the approach and methodology should be given greater weightage. Hence request you to consider a revision on the scoring criteria as follows: Relevant Experience of the Applicant:30 Proposed Methodology and Work Plan:40 Relevant Experience of the Key Personnel:30	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
32	3.1.4 (i) - Eligible Assignments	We have carried out various implementation projects across states for the government and NPOs/NGOs etc. Whether advisory/consultancy assignments carried out by the applicant for private Not for profit organisations (NPOs) or NGOs for programs which support the CSS of the GOI will be considered under the Eligible General Assignments? This is clarification is needed to evaluate the experience of the experts	Assignments granted by private foundations, bilateral institutions, NPOs, NGOs etc who are working on any government scheme/programmes etc. will be considered.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		(core team/Non-core team) members in the correct way before submission of the bid.	
33	3.1.4 (i) Eligible assignment	Please clarify does it mean that consultancy/ advisory assignments for evaluation only or design only or implementation only will be considered or is it required to be ALL inclusive	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
34	3.1.4 (ii) - Eligible Assignments	<p>Whether these evaluation studies carried out by the applicant need to be specific to the sector for which the bid is being submitted or they are general in nature? Also, This is clarification is needed to evaluate the experience of the experts (core team/Non-core team) members in the correct way before submission of the bid.</p> <p>Does the “eligible specific assignment(s)” need to be an evaluation program in agriculture sector for the the applicant score marks in technical evaluation?</p>	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
35	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	<p>We believe that the eligible projects to be taken into consideration should be of a nature involving deep insight, extensive analysis and of specific size. Further, the project should include only consulting assignments excluding tax, audit and IT implementation projects. The clause accordingly may be modified as under:</p> <p>Eligible Assignments · Advisory/consultancy assignments over the past 5 years granted by the government, regulatory commission, tribunal, multilateral agencies, statutory authorities, public sector entities etc. in respect of strategy, improvement, design, implementation, evaluation etc. of government programs/ divisions/ agencies shall be deemed as eligible general assignments. Ongoing projects which have been running for &gt;3 months on the proposal due date are eligible. – Professional fees of projects should be &gt; Rs. 2 Cr for duration &gt; 12 months (or proportionately for shorter duration with minimum fee &gt; Rs. 50 lakhs) " – Consultant projects exclude tax, audit and IT implementation projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programs involving generation of evidence, deep insight, extensive analysis, stakeholder alignment over the past 5 years granted by the government, regulatory commission, tribunal, multilateral agencies, statutory authorities, public sector entities etc. in respect of government programs shall be deemed as eligible specific assignments. Ongoing projects which have been running for &gt;3 months on the proposal due date are eligible.</li> </ul> <p>– Professional fees of projects should be &gt; Rs. 2 Cr for duration &gt; 12 months (or proportionately for shorter duration with minimum fee &gt; Rs. 50 lakhs)</p>	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		– Consultant projects exclude tax, audit and IT implementation projects"	
36	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	Kindly clarify if the assignment has to be sector specific?	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
37	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	Please clarify that for Eligible General Assignments any advisory/consultancy assignments in India for any government programs shall be deemed as eligible. Please clarify that for Eligible Specific Assignments any Evaluation studies for any government programmes shall be deemed as eligible.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
38	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	We request you to also consider all ongoing assignments for Eligible Assignments. Appendix I – Form-6 should also be suitable amended to reflect the changes proposed.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
39	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	We understand that the Eligible Assignments for Key Personnel should have been completed prior to PDD. We would request you to relax this requirement and allow ongoing assignments in which professional fees of at least INR 50 lakhs has been received for Eligible General Assignments and INR 20 lakhs for Eligible Specific Assignments prior to PDD.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
40	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	We request to consider international projects with similar scope of work as eligible assignments so that international firm could also take part in the selection. This will allow firm to bring knowledge of international best practices.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
41	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	Advisory/consultancy assignments in India granted by the government, regulatory commission, tribunal, multilateral agencies, statutory authorities, public sector entities etc. in respect of design, implementation, evaluation etc. of government programs shall be deemed as eligible general assignments (the "Eligible General Assignments"). Will International assignments be counted as general and specific experiences for applicant's capability as well as key personnel's?	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
42	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	Is there any limit on how old the relevant experiences for both the applicant and personnel can be?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
43	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	As the RFP is focussed on centrally sponsored schemes in the Health / WCD sector, can the eligibility criteria require general & specific assignments to be from the public healthcare sector only? Alternately will a higher weightage be given if the assignments are from the public healthcare sector?	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
44	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	Please clarify whether qualitative and quantitative research done as part of larger engagements can be cited against this criterion i.e. projects where a part of the scope involves such research.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
45	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	We request you to consider following change:(i) Advisory/consultancy	Assignments granted by private foundations, bilateral

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		assignments in India granted by the government, regulatory commission, tribunal, multilateral agencies, statutory authorities, public sector entities etc. in respect of design, implementation, evaluation etc. of government programs or donor funded programs shall be deemed as eligible general assignments (the Eligible General Assignments). (ii) Evaluation studies involving quantitative and qualitative research, household surveys etc. in India granted by the government, regulatory commission, tribunal, multilateral agencies, statutory authorities, public sector entities etc. in respect of government programs or donor funded programs shall be deemed as eligible specific assignments (the Eligible Specific Assignments)	institutions, NPOs, NGOs etc who are working on any government scheme/programmes etc. will be considered.
46	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	We request you to consider ongoing assignments provided that we have received professional fees of at least Rs. 50 (fifty) lakhs for an Eligible General Assignment and at least Rs. 20 (twenty) lakhs for an Eligible Specific Assignment.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
47	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	Eligible assignments - The definition of 'general' and 'specific' assignments talks about government programs. We understand the word 'program' is an umbrella term used for schemes, initiatives, technical support units, etc. initiated by respective Government departments.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
48	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	In case of eligible specific assignments, the RFP states that such assignments shall have been completed prior to PDD. Whereas, this is not the case for eligible general assignments. It is requested that for eligible specific assignments, projects presently under implementation may also be considered as eligible.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
49	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	Further, it is requested to consider the assignments based on contract value instead of fee received. Alternatively, the amount billed/ invoiced under the assignment may be considered instead of fee received.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
50	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	In case the above is not possible, we request to reduce the professional fees received criteria for eligible general assignments and eligible specific assignments to Rs 25 lakhs and Rs 10 lakhs respectively.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
51	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	For both Eligible General and Eligible Specific Assignments there is no sector specific project experience required or preferred. We would request that Eligible General Assignments should be from the respective sector while Eligible Specific Assignments should be open across all sectors	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
52	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	It is requested that on-going Eligible Specific Assignment also be considered for evaluation.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
53	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	Will a self-authorized completion certificate suffice to indicate completion	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		for Eligible Specific Assignment? Or does any other documentary proof need to be submitted?	No change is contemplated.
54	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	For core team members if the proposed individual is currently deployed on an on-going project (but will be re-deployed full time on proposed assignment) can the PDD be stated as completion date?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
55	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	Many Key Personnel across both Core and Non-Core may have several years of rich and relevant experience in design, implementation and evaluation in an organizational capacity i.e. nonconsulting. Please clarify if the same will also be considered for evaluation.	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.1.4, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
56	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	We understand that if an applicant has an ongoing eligible general assignment, for which professional fees of at least Rs. 50 lakhs has been received, it will be considered by the Authority as a compliance to the clause. The authority may kindly confirm the same. The Authority is also requested to consider ongoing eligible specific assignments for submission on similar principles.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
57	3.1.4. Eligible Assignments	Clause 3.1.4 Provided that the Applicant firm claiming credit for an Eligible General Assignment shall have, prior to PDD, received professional fees of at least Rs. 50 (fifty) lakhs for such assignment, and where credit is being claimed by a Key Personnel, she/he should have completed the relevant assignment prior to PDD. Does the threshold value apply to individual experts' eligible assignments also?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
58	3.1.4. Eligible Assignments	Advisory/consultancy assignments in India granted by the government, regulatory commission, tribunal, multilateral agencies, statutory authorities, public sector entities etc. in respect of design, implementation, evaluation etc. of government programs shall be deemed as eligible general assignments (the "Eligible General Assignments"). Is it mandatory for projects to be around government programs or it can be any donor/ philanthropic body supported programme as well?	Assignments granted by private foundations, bilateral institutions, NPOs, NGOs etc who are working on any government scheme/programmes etc. will be considered.
59	3.1.4. Eligible Assignments	We would like to request the client to kindly consider the on-going projects as Eligible Assignments for evaluation purpose.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
60	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	Kindly confirm whether the applicant firm can provide multiple assignments under the General Assignment category to make up to Rs. 50 (fifty) lakhs or, more in total.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
61	3.1.4 Eligible Assignments	(2). As per para 3.1.4 Eligible Assignments of Tender Notice, the Applicant firm is taking credit for an Eligible Specific Assignment, such assignment shall have been completed prior to PDD and the Applicant shall have received professional fees of at least Rs. 20 (twenty) lakhs. Kindly confirm whether the applicant firm can provide multiple	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		assignments under the Specific Assignment category to make up to Rs. 20 (twenty) lakhs or, more in total.	
62	3.3 Evaluation of Financial Proposal	As per our understanding, technical evaluation is based on experience of applicant, methodology & work plan and experience of key personnel. Kindly provide clarity on how the financials will be utilized for technical evaluation?	Please refer to the RFP clause 3.3, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
<b>Section 4,5,6 of RFP &amp; Misc</b>			
1	6.3 Miscellaneous - Liability	It is requested to consider deletion of this specific clause.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
2	6.3 (f): Mode of billing and payment	In case the project scope increases to beyond 100 days, this clause provides for the travel and personnel costs to be reimbursed at the agreed rates. Is our understanding correct? If the scope extension has been mutually agreed by the Authority and the Consultant, what would be the payment terms and schedule in this case? Can you also confirm that if the project extends to more than 52 weeks, the liability of the Consultant is limited to the performance security only. If the scope extension has been mutually agreed, will the performance security still stand revoked?	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
3	6.4 Miscellaneous	We wish to clarify the pre-existing IPR with our firm continues to be a part of our firm.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.14 and 2.22.3, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
4	Invite	Request you to please share the invite and look forward to be part of the process and contribute with our expertise on young children (below six years).	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
5	Additional Clause	It may please be noted that Consultant does not provide fairness opinions or valuations of market transactions, or legal, accounting, or tax advice that may have a bearing on our consulting services and nothing shall be construed as such. We expect that you will retain your own experts in these disciplines, as you deem necessary. At your direction, we will work together with your experts and other professional firms. We will discuss any such work, expectations and respective responsibilities with you in detail in advance, but we will not become responsible for work done by such other parties.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
<b>Schedule 1 : Terms of Reference</b>			
1	1 Background of the Sector	Kindly indicate if all the documents mentioned in the background are available in the public domain. If not, kindly provide access to all documents mentioned in the background	Please use all relevant publicly available documents, including those mentioned in Appendix IV (C).
2	2 (a) (i) Objectives of the Evaluation study	Are we required to conduct a nutritional assessment through blood sampling and physical checks, or would secondary data and primary data	No blood sampling and/or physical checks are expected.



**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		collection by analyzing MIS and reports suffice for the same?	
3	3 Approach & 4d ToR (Approach) & Scope of services (d)	Meta-analysis of secondary data do client will be providing secondary data or the same need to be procured and or collected by applicant	The Consultant may refer to public sources of information for meta-analysis.
4	3 (a) (ii)– Approach	Whether sector analysis is also supposed to include non-government initiatives? How these are relevant for the scheme evaluation?	Analysis of non-government initiatives will be required where relevant as part of overall sector contributions to understand gaps, duplication and synergies.
5	3 (b) (i) Input use efficiency	To evaluate input use efficiency and conduct a detailed fund flow analysis, will access to information be granted to Scheme specific Project Management Systems such as existing systems for SSA, RMSA, MDM and to Central Systems such as Public Financial Management System (PFMS)?	Please use all relevant publicly available documents, including those mentioned in Appendix IV (C).
6	3 (b)(i)	Most of the CSSs have a State sharing component for financing.Will the evaluation of 'Input use efficiency', which mentions evaluating utilization through expenditure tracking, signify tracking State level expenditures as	Yes.
7	3 (b) (iv)	Please clarify if data is to be considered on population basis or habitation basis for supply of piped drinking water	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives.
8	3 (b) (v)	Will the assessment include works carried out under Swachh Bharat Mission only or will works carried out under the same banner by other Ministries be also considered	All activities under the schemes mentioned in the package must be assessed.
9	3 (ii)	Kindly indicate if data collaboration with other line Ministries will be required for assessment of sanitation in community facilities	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives.
10	3 (ii) Convergence	The integration of CSS – SSA, RMSA and Teacher Education was initiated in 2018 and guidelines provided to State to undertake integrated planning and implementation in subsequent years. Is there an expectation (we recommend) that the extent, operationalization and impact of the integration is also evaluated?	Yes.
11	3 (d) (iii)	Do all 126 schemes need to be evaluated with the status reports?	Please refer to the Clause 1 of Sch. 1 TOR, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
12	3 (d) (iii) – Approach	As per the information provided in Appendix IV – References (Page 129), we understand that the evaluation is to be done for 5 CSS Schemes only. Kindly confirm.	Please refer to the Clause 1 of Sch. 1 TOR, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
13	3 (e)	Inclusion of a third parameter of (iii) no. of beneficiaries covered in rural and urban areas, would be helpful for prioritization of schemes for evaluation along with stated two parameters (i) duration of implementation, and (ii) budget allocation	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
14	4 (d) Scope of Services	Meta-analysis will require us gaining access to primary data sets for any previous studies that may have been done in related themes and allied	If raw data is not publicly available for secondary reports, then analysis may be limited to what is reported in the

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		areas of interest. This will need clarification as such primary data is usually protected by IPR and unless they are ministry studies that may have been done, accessing studies done by other institutions may be a challenge. Please suggest on how specifically we must proceed in this direction.	secondary reports.
15	4 (d) MetaAnalysis	We understand that the List of key documents to be referred by Consultant as given in Annexure IV (C) would be mostly available in public domain. In cases where evaluation studies/ reports/ data are not available in public domain, we understand NITI Aayog will provide support to the consultant in accessing the same in a time- bound manner given that the findings from the meta-analysis are required to be captured in the Inception Report. Kindly confirm.	Please use all relevant publicly available documents, including those listed.
16	5 (a) (ii) Primary Data Collection Methodology	Please clarify, there will be logistical arrangement would be required to ensure absolute participation during FGD and how the same will be reimbursed.	Please refer to RFP clause 2.15.2 - All the costs associated with the assignment shall be included in the Financial Proposal
17	5 (a)(ii) Household Surveys	It entails a selected sample of household surveys shall be conducted to assess the beneficiary-level perspective of the programme(s). Do NITI Aayog would be providing the list of beneficiaries or household for selection of sample? If yes, please confirm the distribution of sample (10 HHs as mentioned) among the schemes in each sample village, it may be the case that all programme/schemes are not operational in every PSU (Rural village and Urban Ward/CEB). Since this will have operational and resource implication for the study.	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives.
18	5 (b) Primary Data Collection	Sampling design for household survey can be into 7 zones, listing Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh under Central zone	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
19	5 (b) Primary Data Collection	While selecting households under the study, will these sampled households be interviewed for a single scheme or multiple schemes under evaluation? If household is interviewed for multiple schemes, is there any cap on the number of schemes that a respondent/household can be interviewed upon.	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives.
20	5 (b) Primary Data Collection	Would each consultant be expected to develop/procure tools for capturing data and analysis? We suggest that the IT systems (tools) developed/used for all 10 projects in common and developed/provided by Niti Aayog. This will facilitate better analysis across 10 sectors.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
21	5 (b) Primary Data Collection	RFP says household survey has to be to "general purpose" in scope covering multiple topics of interest to the government. We understand that "general purpose" means for the purpose of data collection pertaining	Please refer to the RFP Appendix IV-Guidelines for Evaluation Methodology, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		to this package ONLY.	
22	5 (b) Sampling	Please clarify that whether the key sectoral performance/index to be considered will be provided by Authority for selection of districts.	Please use all relevant publicly available documents, including those listed.
23	5 (b) Sampling	Please clarify that whether the list of eligible beneficiaries will be provided by the Authority for interaction with the beneficiaries.	This data must be obtained by the Consultant in consultation with respective officials at the village/block/district/State or National level, as applicable
24	5 (b) Sampling	As per Serial No. 5 (b) of Terms of Reference (page no. 57) it is mentioned that a minimum of about 1500 household interviews should be conducted. We request for clarification on the proportion of households to be selected from urban and village area.	Please refer to the RFP Schedule I Terms of Reference 5b, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
25	5 (b) Sampling	Do non-beneficiaries need to be sampled as a part of the 1500 household interviews? Is it sufficient to include non-beneficiaries in the FGDs?	Eligible beneficiaries are to be sampled for household survey.
26	5 (b) Sampling	How is the sample size expected to be divided among beneficiaries of different schemes. For example, in the Rural Development Package, the beneficiaries are very diverse and include persons with disability, widows, old age pension holders, NREGA workers etc. Does a statistically significant sample of beneficiaries of all schemes need to be taken?	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives.
27	5 (b) Sampling	The ToR mentions coverage of both 11 and 12 states, request you to clarify how many states have to be sampled?	Please refer to the RFP Schedule I Terms of Reference 5b, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
28	5 (b) Sampling	There is requirement to conduct key informant interviews, enterprise level survey and labour survey. However, the sampling design suggests for a Household level survey? Why is the survey required to be conducted at Household level?	<b>Throughout this package, please read household survey to mean labour survey.</b>
29	5 (b) Sampling	Can the geographical spread of beneficiaries across schemes be shared for the 11 study States to decide on sample proportions across States?	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives and utilizing publicly available data sources.
30	5 (b) Sampling	Kindly clarify about the any arrangements proposed regarding security of field investigators/staff of the Consultant.	All arrangements are to be made by the Consultant including security of field investigators.
31	5 (d) (ii) Primary Data Collection Methodology	Please clarify, is the cost of the sample is included in the project or would be paid in addition to the project cost.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.15.2, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
32	5 (d) (iv) Primary Data Collection Methodology	Please clarify, whether the data needs to be maintained by Consultant. If the apps, website are to be developed and maintained by the Consultant, and the data needs to be maintained by the consultant, then the cost of development and maintenance of the app, website and data would be part of the cost of the project or it is over and above the cost of the project. If it is over and above then how the invoice should be raised.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.15.2, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
33	5 (d) Mechanisms to ensure Data Quality	As per the standard industry practice, telephonic verifications and back checks are limited to few questions in the questionnaire where unique answers are expected. Please clarify.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
34	5 (d) Mechanisms to ensure Data Quality	We will give our best efforts to collect all the data points during the survey/FGD, however our experience shows that some participants may choose not to respond to particular questions/data points due to lack of awareness or knowledge on that particular subject or unwillingness to answer because of personal reasons. Typically, such instances are not classified as missing data points.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
35	5 Primary Data Collection Methodology	We understand that the selection of samples for household surveys shall be done by the Consultant based on their own assessment. Please confirm our understanding.	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives and utilizing publicly available data sources.
36	5 Primary Data Collection Methodology	We understand that the Mid-Term Report is expected to include initial findings of the meta-analysis as well as field study. We also understand that the primary data collection is an extensive activity considering the breadth of data collection. In this context, in the 30 days available from the last deliverable, it may not be possible to include the findings from the field study in the Mid-Term Report. We would thus request you to clarify whether the Mid-Term Report should include findings from the field study or not. If yes, we request you to extend the timeline for the deliverable.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
37	5 Primary Data Collection Methodology	We understand that the selection of samples for household surveys shall be done by the Consultant and no other stakeholder would be involved. Please confirm our understanding.	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives and utilizing publicly available data sources.
38	5 Primary Data Collection Methodology	Do we need to propose a list of sample States and UT in the proposal? Or a methodology for sampling will suffice?	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives and utilizing publicly available data sources.
39	5 Primary Data Collection Methodology	Please clarify the scope of household and individual level primary data collection. Are schemespecific questions expected to be a part of the questionnaires? Are different questionnaires for beneficiaries of different CSS expected to be made?	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives and utilizing publicly available data sources.
40	5 Primary Data Collection Methodology	(i)We understand that at minimum 1 central ministry, 11 states, 1 UT, 30 districts and 90 villages have to be surveyed through primary data collection methods. Request you to please confirm whether investigations have to be done at block level as well. In such case, what kind of minimum sample size is suggested? (ii)We request you to kindly change minimum number of key informant interviews to 200.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
41	7 Time Schedule	We request you to consider extending the last date for submission of bids to at least three weeks from the date of response by NITI Aayog on pre-	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		bid queries. The date of Award of contract can also be extended accordingly.	
42	8 3 Appendix 3 Case Studies	How many case studies per scheme is expected by the Aayog	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives.
43	8 Deliverables and Timelines	Given the complexity of the assignment, we believe that 3.5 months is insufficient for the assignment. Hence, we request that the timeline be extended to 6 months (168 days)	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
44	8 Deliverables and Timelines	The overall timeline suggested for the engagement seem very ambitious, considering the extensive scope, survey coverage and analysis. Is there a provision to revise or extend the timelines of the project? Whether the days mentioned are working or calendar days? Our suggestive timelines would be - Inception report (including Meta analysis, tools, etc.) – T + 1 month Mid-term report – T+4 months Draft Evaluation report – T+6months We presume the scope of the mid-term report is limited to the field level findings. Please confirm.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
45	8 Deliverables and Timelines	Can the time for submission of Inception be changed? Submission of final Inception Report after the pilot study is complete would be good as it would help in testing and justifying the approach and methodology that would be adopted in the final study	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
46	8 Deliverables and Timelines	Since Rural Development has 6 large CSS (greater than the scale of the schemes under other packages) and will require more time to study, we suggest the total timelines for the study be extended to 150 days	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
47	8 Deliverables and Timelines	Given the exhaustive study of this nature (given the State focus for 11 States + 1 UT) for the Health sector, we suggest the total timelines for the study be extended to 150 days	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
48	8 Deliverables and Timelines	(i) Given the pan-India nature of assignment and requirement for primary field visits to multiple states, districts, blocks and villages for extensive interviews and data collection, we feel that time provided for data collection and analysis is very limited. Further, it may not possible for Key Personnel to carry out these discussions themselves given limited time available and multiple geographies to be covered. We request you to kindly extend the duration of assignment to 6 months. (ii) Kindly clarify whether T+100 days means calendar days or normal working days.	100 days here refers to calendar days.
49	9 Payment Schedule	Since the evaluation would require significant working capital allocation for conducting field surveys and travel, we would like to propose the following payment schedule which would ease working capital availability.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		Furthermore, we request the payment against deliverables to be linked to submission of reports and not to approval of the reports by Authority. Description of Deliverables Week No. Payment KD1 Inception report submission 3 30% KD2 Mid-term report submission 7 25% KD3 Draft evaluation report submission 13 25% KD4 Final Evaluation Report approved by Authority 14 20% Total 100%	
50	9 Payment Schedule	We understand that the deliverables submitted shall be approved solely by NITI Aayog (the Authority) or Committee constituted by NITI Aayog. Kindly confirm our understanding.	Please refer to the RFP Schedule I Terms of Reference clause 12, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
51	9 Payment Schedule	Since the evaluation would require significant working capital allocation for conducting field surveys and travel, we would like to propose the following payment schedule which would ease working capital availability. Furthermore, we request the payment against deliverables to be linked to submission of reports and not to approval of the reports by Authority. Key Date No. Description of Deliverables Week No. Payment KD1 Inception report submission 3 30% KD2 Mid-term report submission 7 30% KD3 Draft evaluation report submission 13 30%	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
52	9 Payment Schedule	We request you to please specify which clause this footnote refers to.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
53	9 Payment Schedule	Please elaborate on the acceptance protocol (number of days, number of reviews, number of times changes/ comments be provided etc.) for the deliverables.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
54	9 Payment Schedule	Would it be possible to elaborate the conditions under which the deliverable will be deemed acceptable by the authority? As project completion is linked to approval by authority, this would be very useful.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
55	9 Payment Schedule & Schedule 2 Form of Agreement Annex 6 Payment Schedule	We request to revise the same as per following to make is sustainable to consultant : · Advance against 10% of performance security · KD1 Inception report approved by Authority - 20% · KD2 Mid-term report approved by Authority - 30% · KD3 Draft evaluation report - 20% · KD4 Final Evaluation Report approved by Authority - 20%	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
56	General	Is AB-PMJAY also to be evaluated as part of the assignment? The scheme is not mentioned in the subsequent sections – hence clarification is needed on its inclusion / exclusion. If the scheme is needed to be included, should the sampling methodology include focus mainly on the states where the scheme is being run?	AB-PMJAY is excluded
57	General	We presume that the data of these three studies will be provided by NITI	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of



**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		Aayog, and NITI Aayog will facilitate consultations with the respective organizations that have carried out the studies. Please confirm.	methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives and utilizing publicly available data sources.
58	10 Appendix 3 Case Studies	Please clarify the number of case studies that need to be created from each state to be taken up under the evaluation	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives and utilizing publicly available data sources.
59	12 Support from NITI Aayog	Kindly share data format and availability with concerned department. Is it readily available else data collection will take time .	This must be proposed by the Consultant as a part of methodology keeping in view evaluation objectives and utilizing publicly available data sources.
60	12 C Reporting	We understand that the weekly update reports shall be a brief document highlighting the general progress, data and reports obtained and reviewed and conclusions to date. Concerns about availability/access to data, reports and other issues shall be highlighted to the Project Director for faster resolution considering the short duration of assignment. Kindly confirm our understanding.	Please refer to the RFP Schedule 1 Terms of Reference Clause 12, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
61	14 (b)	We understand that the core team shall be working in coordinating with the Authority. The mobilization and demobilization of personnel shall be as per project need. The clause accordingly may be modified as under: The Consultant shall mobilize and demobilize its Professional Personnel and Support Personnel with the concurrence of the Authority	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
62	14 Miscellaneous	Please clarify if this is applicable to core team only, as the non-core team is required for a period of 2-4 weeks over the project duration.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
63	14 Miscellaneous	It is mentioned that “all the key personnel shall be deployed at this office during the first 16 weeks” - there seems to be some anomaly. Please clarify.	This includes post report consultations.
64	14 Miscellaneous	We understand that the engagement duration is for 100 days as specified in Terms of Reference (Section 8, Page 58). Kindly confirm if it is 100 days or 16 weeks.	This includes post report consultations.
65	14 Miscellaneous	We have our own offices in Delhi/NCR. In order to leverage the infrastructure and logistics already available with the consultants, the team may be more efficient while working from this office for delivery of this assignment. This will also facilitate better value of money for the Client. This may be allowed on no cost basis. Notwithstanding above, the team will be available for any discussions/meetings in NITI Aayog. Please confirm our understanding.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
66	14 Miscellaneous	We understand that Core Team is to be deployed full time over the duration of assignment and Non-Core Team to be deployed on a need basis based on the approach and methodology adopted for the assignment. We would like to highlight that obtaining concurrence on	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		mobilization and demobilization may impede the progress of the project. Thus we would request the Authority to allow mobilisation of the team as and when required and not wait for concurrence.	
67	14 Miscellaneous	Please clarify, whether consultant firm would require separate office during this engagement or having existing office in Delhi/ NCR (with designated room if required) will suffice for project work. Please note that It is difficult to set up a separate Project Office for a duration of only three months	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
68	14 Miscellaneous	Can non-core personnel work remotely?	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
69	14 Miscellaneous	The initial 16 weeks will be the crucial weeks of various consultations with the key stakeholders, both at the Central level, and at State levels. Moreover, to this effect consultants will need to actively move. In our opinion, the CORE Team may be within the Office for the first 2-3 weeks, while the key focus will be on planning and preparing for the study - with active engagement with the authority. Beyond that period - our teams will be spread across different locations depending upon the roles assigned.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Schedule 2 : Form of Agreement**

1	Agreement 2.9.2 - Termination By the Consultant	This clause may be amended to include the following; Consultant may terminate this agreement or any particular services, immediately upon written notice to the client if the consultant reasonably determines that the consultant can no longer provide the services in accordance with applicable law or professional obligations	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
2	Agreement 3.11 - Substitution of Key Personnel	We request you to remove this clause altogether. In case it is not considered, we request that substitution of Key Personnel should be allowed without attracting a penal provision of deduction of remuneration, if such substitution is on account of reasons that are beyond the control of the Applicant. We request you to kindly limit the overall liability of the bidder including liquidated damages to 10%.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
3	Agreement 3.12 - Accuracy of Documents	Since this RFP requires us to base findings on data from other agencies. Findings are dependent on the accuracy of the secondary data, which the consultant cannot be liable for. So, we request that this clause be dropped or restricted to primary data which has been collected by the consultant.	Please refer to the RFP Schedule 2:clause 3.12, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
4	Agreement 3.12 Accuracy of Documents	We would request you to kindly remove this clause.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
5	Agreement 3.12 Accuracy of Documents	It is suggested to delete this clause. that to the extent provided in the proposal, Consultant shall be permitted to subcontract the services	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		without any prior consent from the Client.	
6	Agreement 3.12 Accuracy of Documents	Request to please consider deletion of “at its own cost and risk”.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
7	Agreement 3.2 Conflict of Interest	Need more clarity regarding the conflict of Interest clause. Whether carrying out monitoring and evaluation programs of various CSS constitute conflict of interest. We have executed Swachh Survekshan 2018 & 2019 for Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, also implementation of SOS devices in automobiles under Nirbhaya Fund, digitization of PDS at state level etc. Will these programs constitute as conflict of Interest under the respective sector’s bid?	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
8	Agreement 3.2.2 conflict of Interest	Change Requested: We request you to restrict the requirement to the engagement team deployed on the project. And change the term “Affiliates” to “Affiliates in India” “Associate” to “Associates in India”	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
9	Agreement 3.2.3 (B) - Prohibition of conflicting activities	This point is too broad, we request that this be deleted or reworded to limit the scope of conflicting activities. We believe that points (a) and (c) adequately prevent conflicting activities from being undertaken	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
10	Agreement 3.2.3 conflict of Interest	Change Requested: We request you to restrict the requirement to the engagement team deployed on the project.	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
11	Agreement 3.2.5	In reference to the words “directly or indirectly”, we request if this clause be made applicable to the team members being proposed as part of the project. As, given the size and scale of operations of the firm, it may be difficult to confirm / adhere to the clause.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
12	Agreement 3.3 - Confidentiality	The clause may be amended to include the following; Except as otherwise permitted by this Agreement neither of the parties may disclose to third parties the contents of this Agreement or any information provided by or on behalf of the other that ought reasonably to be treated as confidential and/or proprietary. Parties may, however, disclose such confidential information to the extent that it: (a) is or becomes public other than through a breach of this Agreement (b) is subsequently received by the receiving party from a third party who, to the receiving party’s	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		knowledge, owes no obligation of confidentiality to the disclosing party with respect to that information, (c) was known to the receiving party at the time of disclosure or is thereafter created independently, (d) is disclosed as necessary to enforce the receiving party's rights under this Agreement or (e) must be disclosed under applicable law, legal process or professional regulations. These obligations shall be valid for a period of 3 years from the date of termination of this Agreement.	
13	Agreement 3.3 Confidentiality	It is suggested to amend this clause such that except as required by law, no reference may be made to Consultant in any prospectus, proxy statement, offering prospectus, proxy statement, offering materials prepared for public distribution.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
14	Agreement 3.4 Liability of the Consultant	It is suggested to amend this clause such that the liability, including indemnity obligations, of the Consultant shall be limited to the fee paid to the Consultant without any reference to the insurance taken out by the Consultant.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
15	Agreement 3.4.1 Liability of the Consultant	It is requested to consider deletion of this specific clause.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
16	Agreement 3.4.2 Liability of the Consultant	It is requested to consider deletion of this specific clause.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
17	Agreement 3.4.3	We propose that the term "gross negligence" be defined as follows: For the purpose of this contract, "gross negligence" means the Consultant's conduct of so high a degree as to amount to a wilful and consciously reckless disregard of agreed professional duty.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
18	Agreement 3.4.3 - Liability	The clause may be amended to include the following; The Client (and any others for whom Services are provided) shall not recover from the consultant, in contract or tort, under statute or otherwise, any amount with respect to loss of profit, data or goodwill, or any other consequential, incidental, indirect, punitive or special damages in connection with claims arising out of this Agreement or otherwise relating to the Services, whether or not the likelihood of such loss or damage was contemplated. The Client (and any others for whom Services are provided) shall not recover from the consultant, in contract or tort, including indemnification obligations under this contract, under statute or otherwise, aggregate damages in excess of the fees actually paid for the Services that directly caused the loss in connection with claims arising out of this Agreement or otherwise relating to the Services.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
19	Agreement 3.4.3 Liability of the Consultant	Change Requested We request you to kindly delete this part of the clause "or (b) the proceeds the Consultant may be entitled to receive from any	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		insurance maintained by the Consultant to cover such a liability in accordance with Clause 3.5.2, whichever of (a) or (b) is higher.”	
20	Agreement 3.4.3(ii) Liability of the Consultant	We request the client to remove linkage of the liability cap to the insurance policy, as mentioned in part (b) of this section and keep the liability capped at the fees paid, as mentioned in part (a)	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
21	Agreement 3.4.4	We would request you to kindly change the liability amount to 1 times the value of the Agreement which is standard norm acceptable to all professional services firms.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
22	Agreement 3.4.4	We understand that the prescribed limitation of liability shall not cover damages to Third Parties. We would like to bring to your notice that the actions and consequences of third parties are beyond the influence and control of Consultants. Further, it is a common practice for third parties to undertake due diligence before reliance on any outputs / deliverables submitted by the Consultants. Therefore, we request you to modify this clause to the effect that the Consultants shall not be responsible for any consequential damages suffered by third parties	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
23	Agreement 3.4.4	We request the client to keep the overall liability capped at the lump sum professional fees made or expected to be made to the Consultants. The liability cap of one times the fees payable to Consultants is a standard norm acceptable to all professional services firms.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
24	Agreement 3.4.4 Liability of the Consultant	It is requested to consider deletion of this specific clause.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
25	Agreement 3.4.4 Liability of the Consultant	Change requested: We request you to kindly change the clause to “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 one time the fees paid to the consultant”	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
26	Agreement 3.4.4: Liability of the consultant	The proposed penalty is very high. We submit that this be equal to the agreement value	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
27	Agreement 3.5 Insurance to be taken out by the Consultant	This is to inform you that DTTILLP has appropriate and required insurance policy having standard terms and conditions which may be accepted	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
28	Agreement 3.5 Insurance to be taken out by the Consultant	We wish to clarify that as part of our company policy we have appropriate and required insurance policy, however not on the terms and conditions mentioned in this section. We understand that it should be acceptable.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
29	Agreement 3.5.1 (a)	We would like to clarify that we subscribe to a firm level insurance policy to cover for our engagements with various Clients at our terms and	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		conditions. This is a standard practice being adopted by consulting firms in the country and globally and acceptable to Government Clients in India. We therefore request that the phrase “but on terms and conditions approved by the Client” to be deleted.	
30	Agreement 3.5.1. (a): Insurance to be taken out by the Consultant	Is it possible for us to submit a global insurance policy?	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
31	Agreement 3.5.2	Under this category, we subscribe to the Commercial General Liability (CGL) Insurance which provides cover for any third party claims with respect to property damage and bodily injury. We request you to accept this against the Third Party liability insurance sought for.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
32	Agreement 3.5.2	We subscribes to the (1) Group Personal Accident Policy insurance coverage depending upon the category of the staff and (2) Personal Medical Insurance for all staff. We would like to clarify that Workers Compensation Insurance is not applicable to professional services firms engaged. We request the Client to consider the above with respect to the provisions of the said clause	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
33	Agreement 3.5.2 (b) Insurance to be taken out by the Consultant	DTTILLP has Group Personal Accident Policy insurance coverage depending upon the category of the staff and Personal Medical Insurance coverage depending upon the size of the employee’s family.  It is to be noted that the worker’s compensation insurance is not applicable to DTTILLP.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
34	Agreement 3.5.2 (b) Insurance to be taken out by the Consultant	We wish to inform you that as per our company’s policy, Group Personal Accident Policy insurance coverage depending upon the category of the staff and Personal Medical Insurance coverage depending upon the size of the employee’s family is already in place.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
35	Agreement 3.6 (b) Accounting, inspection and auditing	We understand that only documents pertaining to this project along with the project office only shall be subjected to audit/ inspection by the client, if required. We would request you to confirm the same.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
36	Agreement 3.6 Accounting, inspection and auditing	It is suggested to amend this clause to include:Notwithstanding the foregoing, any such audit shall be conducted at reasonable times, not more than once annually during the term of this Contract and the auditors shall be instructed by the Client to maintain the confidentiality of the information gathered consistent with the terms contained herein. Nothing under this provision shall obligate the consultant to disclose to the Client any documents or other material relating to the profitability or internal profit and loss/balance sheets associated with the consultant’s business,	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.



**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		payroll information, or information or material that constitute legally privileged documents or confidential information. Except as otherwise expressly set forth in these terms, the consultant makes no express warranties of any kind. The consultant hereby expressly disclaims, to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, on its own behalf and on behalf of its third party suppliers, all express, implied and statutory warranties, including, but not limited to, any implied warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, reliability, timeliness, quality, suitability, availability, accuracy or completeness and title. This section will survive the termination or expiry of any applicable statement of work.”	
37	Agreement 3.6 Accounting, inspection and auditing	Consideration Requested We request you to kindly consider following as part of this clause: Any audit shall be subject to the following: (i) the audit shall be restricted to the engagement and shall be conducted with prior reasonable notice (ii) Authority or its authorized representatives shall execute a Non-Disclosure Agreement before such audit which shall govern the conduct of audit and any results thereof; (iii) the auditors or the representatives of Authority for the audit shall not be bidder’s competitors; (iv) the audit shall not be conducted more than once in a calendar year and twice in entirety; and (v) any findings during the audit, shall be shared with Authority and be discussed and agreed mutually with Authority and bidder for its closure.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
38	Agreement 3.6 and 3.11 Providing access to the Project Office and Personnel	We wish to clarify and propose below clauses: 1) We propose that the client visits the project offices and audit the relevant documents. 2) Audit of our office and system is not acceptable as our company will have data / information of other clients and it would be breach of confidentiality in case we allow the client to audit our office / system.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
39	Agreement 3.7 Consultant’s actions requiring the Authority’s prior approval & 4. Consultant’s Personnel and Sub-Consultant	It is suggested to amend this clause such that to the extent provided in the proposal, Consultant shall be permitted to subcontract the services without any prior consent from the Client.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
40	Agreement 3.9 - Documents prepared by the Consultant to be property of the Authority	The clause may be amended to include the following; The consultant may use data, software, designs, utilities, tools, models, systems and other methodologies and know-how (“Materials”) that the consultant owns in performing the Services. Notwithstanding the delivery of any Reports, the consultant shall retain all intellectual property rights in the Materials (including any improvements or knowledge developed while performing the Services), and in any working papers that the consultant compiles and retains in connection with the Services (but not Client Information reflected in them). Upon payment for the Services, Client may use any	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		Materials included in the Reports, as well as the Reports themselves as permitted by this Agreement.	
41	Agreement 3.9 Documents prepared by the Consultant to be property of the Authority	We wish to clarify the pre-existing IPR with our firm continues to be a part of our firm.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
42	Agreement 3.9 Documents prepared by the Consultant to be the property of the Authority	It is suggested to amend this clause such that: 1. Ownership of only final versions of the deliverables will be granted to the Client. Further, 2. Consultant will retain ownership of its pre-existing IP. "Pre-existing Intellectual Property" means any Intellectual Property owned by a Party, or licensed to such Party (other than by the Client), as at the commencement date of the Agreement. 3. Redistribution of deliverables to third parties shall be with prior consent from Consultant and/ or on non reliance basis. Regarding indemnity, Consultant agrees to indemnify for third party IP breach only.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
43	Agreement 3.9.1	We would like to clarify that any pre-existing Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) of the Consultant (on elements such as methodology, tools, techniques and databases exclusive to the Consultant) shall remain with the Consultant. We request you to kindly add the below sentence to clause 3.9.1: "Any pre-existing Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) of the Consultant (on elements such as methodology, tools, techniques and databases exclusive to the Consultant) used during the course of the Services shall remain with the Consultant".	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
44	Agreement 3.9.3 Documents prepared by the Consultant to be property of the Authority	It is requested to please consider deletion of this specific clause.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
45	Agreement 4.4 Substitution of Key Personnel	It is requested to remove this clause as sometimes substitution may be required due to reasons beyond the control of the consultant. The RFP mentions that in case of substitution of a key personnel, an equally or better qualified and experienced personnel being provided to the satisfaction of the Authority. This should be sufficient to maintain the quality of the personnel.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule 2, Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
46	Agreement 4.4: Substitution of Key Personnel	As the clause already allows for substitution only in unforeseen circumstances, we request that the penalty prescribed is applicable only if a replacement of similar stature is not available. The Consultant is likely to pay the replacement a remuneration higher than the previously agreed remuneration terms.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.26 and Schedule 2, Agreement clause 4.4, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
47	Agreement 4.6 - Resident	Can a core / Non-core team member be nominated as the project	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.4 along with Schedule 2,

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Team Leader and Project Manager	manager? Or is this a separate position (additional team member)?	Agreement 4.6, which are clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
48	Agreement 6.3 (f) - Mode of billing and payment	In case the project scope increases to beyond 100 days, this clause provides for the travel and personnel costs to be reimbursed at the agreed rates. Is our understanding correct? If the scope extension has been mutually agreed by the authority and the consultant what would be the payment terms and schedule in this case? Can you also confirm that if the project extends to more than 52 weeks, the liability of the consultant is limited to the performance security only. If the scope extension has been mutually agreed, will the performance security still stand revoked?	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
49	Agreement 7 Liquidated Damages and Penalties	It is requested to limit the upper limit of the entire clause to 10% of the agreement value. The liquidated damages/ penalty clauses should trigger only if the [delay]/ [performance issues] is determined to be on account of reasons solely attributable to the bidder.  It is requested to please incorporate that “the liquidated damages will be applicable only for the reasons solely attributable to the Consultant/ Applicant”.	Please refer to the RFP Schedule 2: Form of Agreement Point 7, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
50	Agreement 7. Liquidated damages and penalties	Considering the nature of services, Consultant does not give a warranty on the deliverables to be deficiency/ error free or fit for purpose. It is suggested to delete this clause. For the purposes of the project, Client and Consultant will set up joint teams working together closely. The client representatives will be apprised, on an ongoing basis, regarding Consultant's progress and will assist in the developing deliverables. The specific liabilities of the Consultant under the contract have been agreed to/ provided herein. Penalty clause cannot be generally made applicable to the Consultant under the contract considering the nature of engagement Further, Consultant agrees to be liable under section 7.2.2 if such delay can be solely attributable to the consultant.	Please refer to the RFP Schedule 2: Form of Agreement Point 7, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
51	Agreement 7.2 & 7.3 - Liquidated Damages and Penalties	request the client to provide clarity.	Please refer to the RFP Schedule 2:Form of Agreement Point 7, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
52	Agreement 7.2.2	We would request you to kindly limit the liquidated damages for delay to be subject to a maximum of 5% of the Agreement Value.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
53	Agreement Additional clause suggested	It may please be noted that Consultant does not provide fairness opinions or valuations of market transactions, or legal, accounting, or tax advice that may have a bearing on our consulting services and nothing shall be construed as such. We expect that you will retain your own experts in	Please refer to the RFP Schedule 2:Form of Agreement Point 7, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		these disciplines, as you deem necessary. At your direction, we will work together with your experts and other professional firms. We will discuss any such work, expectations and respective responsibilities with you in detail in advance, but we will not become responsible for work done by such other parties.	
54	Agreement Annex-7: Bank Guarantee for Performance Security	Is it possible to exempt the institute from the requirement of furnishing Bank guarantee for Performance Security(Annex 7) as the institute does not provide the same for Consultancy project.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
<b>Schedule 3: Guidance Note</b>			
1	Schedule 3 Guidance Note on conflict of Interest	Clarification requested: We understand that consultant or its associates working with the Ministries/ Departments involved in respective packages or providing consultancy/ program management services/ IT services for Centrally Sponsored scheme(s) at state or central level for the respective package would be eligible for participation/ bidding under the package provided that team members proposed for the package are currently not working on the engagements referred above. Kindly confirm on the same. If the understanding is not correct, It is requested to clarify the scope of services being provided in a business which would entail a conflict of interest situation.	With reference to clause 6 of the Guidance Note on Conflict of Interest, any personnel who is currently engaged in design, implementation, PMC/PMU etc. of any of the Centrally Sponsored or Central Sector Schemes under the Umbrella CSS within the respective package cannot be engaged as Key Personnel.
<b>APPENDIX I</b>			
1	Form 1 Letter of Proposal	It is requested to modify the clause 10 as follows:  In regard to matters other than security and integrity of the country, we or any of our Associates providing services under the RFP have not been convicted by a Court of Law in India or indicted or adverse orders passed by a regulatory authority in India which would cast a doubt on our ability to undertake the Consultancy for the Project <u>or which relates to a grave offence that outrages the moral sense of the community.</u>	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated
2	Form 1 Letter of Proposal	It is requested to modify the clause 6 as follows:  In the last three years, we or any of our Associates providing services under the RFP have neither failed to perform on any contract, as evidenced by imposition of a penalty by an arbitral or judicial authority or a judicial pronouncement or arbitration award in India against the Applicant, nor been expelled from any project or contract by any public authority in India nor have had any contract terminated by any public authority for accepted breach on our part, that may have a material adverse impact on its ability to perform the services	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		referred to in the RFP.	
3	Form 1 Letter of Proposal	It is requested to modify the clause 12 as follows:  No investigation by a regulatory authority in India is pending either against us or against our Associates providing services under the RFP that may affect our ability to provide services under this RFP.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated
4	Form 1 Letter of Proposal	Clarification/change requested We understand the term director here refers to “Board of Directors” and not designation director. We also request you to change the clause as “ I/We further certify that no investigation by a regulatory authority is pending either against us or against our Associates in India or against our Directors”	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated
5	Form 2 Particulars of the Applicant 1.7	We request you to delete these clauses, which may prohibit the consultants and personnel to participate into any future downstream work. We suggest that if required, it shall be modified suitably and participation shall be restricted only in case of conflict of interest.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated
6	Form 2	Form 2 (point 1.4), particulars of the applicant. Please clarify what is meant by principal place of business?	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated
7	Form 2 – Financial Proposal and Form 3 Estimate of Personnel Costs	Kindly clarify what is the difference between a ‘Resident Professional Personnel’ and “Resident Support Personnel’ – do these terms refer to the Core and Non-core team members.	Please refer to the RFP Clause 2.14.6, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
8	Form 3 Statement of Legal Capacity	Is this part applicable only if the authorized representative is not same as the authorized signatory? In case both are same, then do we still need to fill up this section?	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
9	Form 4 Power of Attorney	Can Power of Attorney be different for different packages being submitted by the same firm	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
10	Form 5	Furthermore, given that, obtaining a separate certificate from the statutory auditor is a cumbersome and time-consuming task, we suggest that applicants should be allowed to submit relevant extracts of the audited financial statements as evidence.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
11	Form 5 Financial Capacity of the Applicant Certificate from the Statutory Auditor	Kindly allow audited financial report and figures instead of certificate as per form-5 as this take long time to get. Alternatively may allow certificate from Chartered Account with supporting of Audited Financial Figures for firm having statutory auditor.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
12	Form 5 Financial Capacity of Applicant	Is it fine if we provide a consolidated statement that we share with the HRD/CAG regarding our Annual Revenue instead of the format specified in form 5, appendix1?	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
13	Form 5 Financial Capacity of the Applicant	The table in form 5 mentions annual revenues and the certificate requires to certify the fee received. It is requested to please clarify that the	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

S. No.	Clause Number of RFP	Query	Response
		certificate from statutory auditors is required for annual revenues or the fees collected.	
14	Form 5 Financial Capacity of the Applicant	We are required to submit financial details for the past 3 financial years. Most audited statements are likely to be available only by September 2019. We submit that audited statements be necessary only for FY 2016-17 and FY 2017-18, and a self declared statement be mandated for FY 2018-19.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
15	Form 7 Proposed Methodology and Work Plan	The RFP demands TOR including approach, methodology, sampling, criteria for State/UT selection, Gantt chart, and a quality assurance plan, therefore, it will be difficult to cover all information in 4 pages. Request to increase the page limit to minimum 10- 12 pages	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
16	Form 8 10 11 regarding eligible assignments ref clause 3.1.4 of RFP	We have signed confidentiality agreements with our clients that limit our ability to disclose their names & the contracts / work orders with them. While we shall be happy to disclose the same where we are legally permitted to, we request you to accept the certificate with a brief description of our client (without disclosing their names), the nature of services we performed for them, the duration of the project and a tentative contract value duly certified by MD of the firm.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
17	Form 8 9 10 11	What do we need to share under “Estimated capital cost of project (in Rs. crore/US \$ million)” in below mentioned form? · forms 8 and 9 (no specific pointer) · form 10 point 7 · form 11 point 9	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
18	Form 8 Abstract of Eligible Assignments of the Applicant	We request you to allow self certification by MD of the firm. The clause may be modified as: Certificate from the Statutory Auditor/Chartered Accountant/Self Certification by the MD of the firm (or MD of lead member of the consortium): This is to certify that the information contained in Column 5 above is correct as per the accounts of the Applicant and/ or the clients.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
19	Form 8 Abstract of Eligible Assignments of the Applicant	Since it will be very difficult & time consuming to get the Certificate from the Statutory Auditor for each individual project, we request you to consider allowing submission of self-declaration by Authorized Signatory of Applicant along with the Work Order of the projects, as evidence.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
20	Form 8 Abstract of Eligible Assignments of the Applicant	In accordance with the format, it may not be possible to obtain authorized certificate from statutory auditor for all the projects within the limited duration of proposal submission. It is requested that the information in desired format duly signed and attested by authorized signatory of the company may be accepted. Work order copies would also be submitted in support of the same.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
21	Form 8 Abstract of Eligible	We request you to kindly clarify whether projects of consortium members	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.1 and footnote of Form 8



**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Assignments of the Applicant	can be provided as eligible assignments or not.	(Appendix I) which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
22	Form 8 Abstract of Eligible Assignments of the Applicant	Request to consider the assignments based on contract value instead of professional fees received.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
23	Form 8 Abstract of Eligible Assignments of the Applicant	We request to consider contract signed with client / work order / completion certificate as proof for eligible assignment. The certificate from statutory auditor / chartered account will take lots of time.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
24	Form 8 Abstract of Eligible Assignments of the Applicant	We request you to clarify whether the Consultant can showcase assignments undertaken in a consortium as member firm.	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.1.1 and \$ footnote of Form 8 (Appendix I) which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
25	Form 8 Abstract of Eligible Assignments of the Applicant	We would request that certificate issued by Chartered Accountants in lieu of Statutory Auditors certifying the fee received in respect of each of the Eligible Assignments be accepted as part of the bid submission.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
26	Form 9 Abstract of Eligible Assignments of Key Personnel	We request you to delete column no. 4 and column no. 8. Many projects may not have any component of capital cost. Further, it is difficult to accurately estimate number of days spent by each expert on each assignment in given time period for bidding.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
27	Form 9 and Form 11 Eligible Assignments of Key Personnel	General/ Specific assignments have been defined based on the fee received for the assignment. It is requested that this requirement (i.e. eligibility based on fee received) be removed in case of key personnel.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
28	Form 9 and Form 11 Eligible Assignments of Key Personnel	The capital cost will not be applicable for the relevant consultancy/ advisory projects. It is requested to remove the requirement of capital cost from the forms.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
29	Form 10 Eligible Assignments of Applicant	Please clarify, whether the form should be signed by the authorised signatory or any key personnel mentioned for the project should sign Form 10?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
30	Form 10 Eligible Assignments of Applicant	Request to consider signature of authorised signatory as sufficient.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated
31	Form 11 Eligible Assignments of Key Personnel	The details required in form 11 will also be part of the CVs of key personnel, which will be submitted separately. Hence, it is requested to remove the requirement of form 11 from the RFP. This will help in reducing the paper work and timely submission of technical proposal.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated
32	Form 11 Eligible Assignments of Key Personnel	We request you to delete said form-11 as same information is getting repeated in form-9 and form-12. It will lead to redundancy and may cause confusion, in case of any human error. In case any additional information is solicited, same may be incorporated into form-12.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated
33	Form 12	We request you to clarify the details required in this section. Do we need	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
	CV of Key Personnel	to mention the duties to be carried out under the proposed project?	No change is contemplated.
34	Form 12 Curriculum Vitae (CV) of Key Personnel	Further, we request you to consider putting a page limit for core team CVs of 5 pages for each position. We also request you to suitably amend the CV format given in Appendix I – Form-12.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
35	Form 12 Curriculum Vitae (CV) of Key Personnel	The reference to form 8 seems to have been mentioned by mistake. The form for key personnel is form 9 and hence should confirm to the same. Please confirm if the understanding is correct.	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
36	Form 12 Note 3	As team are being mobilised from various parts of country, signing the proposal in ink on each possible looks challenging. Can we use scanned signature of experts?	Please refer to Corrigendum III of the respective package.
37	Form 13	Does the number and effort (days) of non-core Key Personnel need be indicated in Form-13 -Deployment of Personnel?	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
38	Form 13	Time period of 3 months and number of weeks written in Form 13 (total 20 weeks are mentioned in the format) and Form 14 (total 19 weeks are mentioned in the format) are inconsistent. Please clarify	The Applicant may add/remove columns for number of weeks depending upon their proposed approach and manning schedule.
39	Form 15 Proposal for SubConsultant(s)	Does the consultant need to mention all agencies/contractors to be engaged for data collection or any other purposes in the proposal?	Please refer to the RFP clause 2.14.7, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
<b>APPENDIX II</b>			
1	Appendix II Form – 2	We understand that a 'Resident Professional Personnel' and "Resident Support Personnel" refer to the Core and Non-core team members respectively. Kindly confirm our understanding.	Please refer to the RFP Clause 2.14.6, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
2	Appendix II: Financial Proposal	Need more clarity on Point number 7 of the Note in Appendix II of the package related to Financial Proposal Form 2.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
3	Appendix-II, Form 2	We understand that Key Personnel shall be available for full time deployment only for 100 days. We understand that any input thereafter shall be additional, based on the agreed person day rates as specified in the Financial Proposal. This is also in line with Note 11 of Form 2 which specifies that additional involvement shall be based on person day rates. Please clarify.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
4	Appendix-II, Form 2 - Financial Proposal	Please clarify, whether the 120 person days are relating to one professional or all professionals cumulatively.	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
5	Appendix-II, Form 2 - Financial Proposal	We assume this is 'GST' and to be applied at 18% by all bidders. Please confirm	Please refer to the RFP, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
6	Appendix-II, Form 2 - Financial Proposal	Please confirm if the following costs related to surreys and investigation need to be included under B- V (Surveys & Investigations) Cost Head of Appendix-II, Form-2 or does it need to captured as part of any other line item: - Cost of resources for conducting primary data collection - Cost of	Please refer to RFP clause 2.15.2.

**Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog**

**Consultancy for Evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes under 10 Packages – Responses to Queries of Bidders**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Clause Number of RFP</b>	<b>Query</b>	<b>Response</b>
		logistics (air travel, stay, per diems, other costs) for primary data collection- Cost for IT systems for primary data collection.	
7	Appendix-II, Form 2 - Financial Proposal	Will the reimbursable expenditure payment be made on a monthly basis on production of statement? Please clarify as it is currently not included in the payment schedule.	Please refer to the RFP Schedule 2: Agreement Clause 6.3, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
8	Appendix-II, Form 2 - Financial Proposal	We request you to clarify under which head costs for accommodation, subsistence and local travel for site visit have to be accounted.	Please refer to the Notes for Form II - Financial Proposal, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.
<b>APPENDIX IV</b>			
1	Appendix-IV References, Section 2,ii,8 Scope of the Study	Please clarify, which all schemes will be required to be evaluated, how many, and comparison needs to be done on which parameters.	Please refer to RFP, Schedule 1 TOR, which is clear and self-explanatory. No change is contemplated.