

Queries and Clarifications on Baseline Study for Megha LAMP (Livelihoods and Access to Markets Project) under IBDLP (Integrated Basin Development and Livelihoods Programme), Meghalaya being funded by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) for Meghalaya Basin Management Agency(MBMA)

This has reference to the aforementioned Baseline Study for Megha LAMP, the queries received by MBMA till April 14, 2016 and their respective clarifications.

At the outset, it may please be noted that this is not an EOI (Expression of Interest), it is a RFP (Request for Proposal).

1. **Query: Page 18, Point 2 – Qualifications of the proposed consultants** - Seven (7) positions of Key Experts have been specified. We understand that we have to propose one professional for each of the positions. Please clarify whether the bidder can propose more than one professionals for "Position 6: Computer Specialists", and "Position 7: Fieldwork Experts". If more than one professionals are proposed for these positions, will the marking scheme of 5 points be divided equally amongst the number of individuals taken on board for each position?

Clarification: If more than one professional is proposed for these positions, the points against the position will be proportionately divided for each position.

2. **Query: Page 20, Quality and cost-based selection method** - Above point mentions, "Documentary proof of relevant studies carried out by consultant in past (best three) as complete copies and one page per study is to be attached in support of their proposal". On the other hand, Page 41, 2B-Survey Agencies Experience (2nd para) mentions that information provided for each assignment undertaken by SA should not take more than 5 pages. Kindly clarify whether the one page per study is to be given for all the credentials listed by us in the table given in page 41, or for the best three assignments as suggested in Page 20, or for five assignments – one page per assignment as per the format given in Page 42.

Clarification: Firstly, the SA would need to submit evidence of undertaking at least 3 projects (Baseline, Mid-term and End-term studies) in the last 5 years along with this proposal (including completed and ongoing projects). This has also been mentioned in point 1.12 of Data Sheet. This point has been repeated on page 20. Secondly, for the technical proposal, the SA needs to submit five assignments, as mentioned on page 41 and as per the format provided on page 42.

3. **Query: Page 40, Point 6 (iv) – To demonstrate their capacity**, it would be useful if agencies could provide copies of reports of 2 or 3 of these studies - The above point is contradictory to page 19, Point 3, which says: "Quality of Methodology Proposed - Before the presentation, a copy of recent survey reports done by the agency to be provided to the client". Please clarify whether we have to submit the reports of other

studies with the proposal or before the presentation. On this, we would also like to enquire whether submission of reports of other studies is a mandatory requirement and whether non-submission of such reports will negatively affect the technical score. The documents prepared by PwC for any client are the property of the client, and cannot be shared with third party without prior written permission from the respective client. Therefore, it is against our organisational policies to provide such reports to third parties.

Clarification: We are fully aware that a report is a property of the client or there may be a confidentiality clause which may refrain the SA from sharing a study report. The purpose of requesting for a copy of the report is to learn about the quality of work undertaken by SAs. The submission of a copy of the report is voluntary and not mandatory. It would be good to have a copy of the report along with the proposal, which would be returned to SA at the time of presentation. Alternatively, before the presentation, a copy of recent survey reports done by the agency to be provided to the client.

4. **Query:** Is there any provision for revisiting the payment terms as it is too stringent (20% payment provided before draft report of 40% and final report of 40%)

Clarification: The proposed terms of payment have been mentioned in the RFP on page 36 (section 10). It is mentioned in the section that "MBMA proposes the following terms of payment for this assignment. This may be finalized at the time of signing the agreement". The applicant may accept these terms or propose alternate terms, which would be finalised at the time of signing the agreement.

5. **Query:** RFP do not contain detailed contract whether agencies can submit the BID with their own contract terms , which shall be discussed during contract negotiation stage

Clarification: The agreement will be issued by MBMA, Government of Meghalaya. After the selection of the agency, the client will issue its own agreement to the selected agency.

6. **Query:** As per financial format in page 58 we need to attach pay slips of the experts listed; please confirm whether freelance consultants associated with our organisation can submit self-attested pay slips.

Clarification: Experts or consultants engaged with the agency may submit a copy of their agreement/contract with the firm. Employees of the firm may submit the pay slips attested by the auditor/accounts department.

7. **Query:** Association with other organisations for submission of this RFP - page 14, 1.13 of EOI states that "Association with other NGOs/Organizations or using other NGOs/organizations as sub-NGOs to participate in this RFP is not allowed". However, in the other section it has mentioned about Joint venture. We would

request your kind clarification whether joint venture is allowed or not. If JV is not allowed, we would request your kind consideration to allow consortium/joint venture for the EOI.

Clarification: Section 1 (Instruction to Bidders), sub-section 3.3 (a), page 7 of the RFP mentions that such an association/joint venture is permissible for submission of this RFP. Further, point 1.13 of data sheet (page 14) mentions that an association with NGOs or using other NGOs as sub-NGOs to participate in this RFP is not allowed.

8. **Query:** Eligibility criteria of average annual financial turnover of Rs.2 Crores in the last 5 years for participation in this RFP - We would also be highly obliged if the average financial turnover eligibility can be reduced to INR 0.5 Crore.

Clarification: This criteria has been included after detailed deliberations and it is not possible to change it.

9. **Query:** Calculation of Sample Size - In para no. 3.3 (Approach to data collection), three points have been mentioned regarding selection of clusters, villages and households (please refer to 3.3.a, 3.3.b and 3.3.c). In the subsequent para 3.4 in the same section, the confidence interval of at least 90% has been specified for calculating total size of the sample.

The calculation of sample size can be done by applying specifications mentioned in 3.3 and 3.4 para individually. As per our calculations, the sample size as per criterion 3.3 and 3.4 varies to a great extent, which would further impact financial estimations for the study.

Clarification: Section 2 of the RFP (TOR), sub-section 3.3 (a, b, c) pertains to the stratification and clusters of the sample, as explained in the previous sub-section 3.2. Sub-section 3.4 pertains to the total size of the sample using statistical methods namely confidence level and intervals. The total sample size calculated in sub-section 3.4 would need to be spread across project blocks and villages as mentioned in sub-section 3.3, using methods of stratification.

As suggested in the RFP, the consultant would need to propose the sample size and coverage based on the aforementioned points.