

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

Sl. No.	Clause and page no.	Existing text in ToR	Proposed query	Response
1	Section 2, A.1; pp. 10–15	“In Rajasthan, project will work in 1-2 block of one of the districts (in 10-15 Gram Panchayats), and in Karnataka, project will work with 2-3 MKPCs...”	Kindly share the proposed intervention districts, blocks and Gram Panchayats in Rajasthan, and the locations and membership coverage of the selected MKPCs/producer organisations in Karnataka. Please also indicate the expected number of participating women, households and SHGs in each state.	The exact intervention geography is still being finalised in consultation with the concerned government/SRLM counterparts. For Rajasthan, Alwar, Dausa and Udaipur are currently being considered as tentative districts; the final intervention district/block/GP coverage will be confirmed. For Karnataka, the district/block/MKPC coverage is being discussed with KSRLM. A minimum of two MKPCs is envisaged; their final locations and membership details will be confirmed.
2	Section 2, A.1 and D; pp. 10–15	“Assigns a unique identification number to each participant”; “endline survey using a sampling methodology comparable to the baseline...”	Kindly confirm whether a longitudinal panel of the same women/households is required or whether repeated cross-sectional samples are acceptable. If a panel is required, please clarify expectations concerning baseline oversampling, respondent tracking, attrition and replacement.	The baseline and endline are expected to use comparable sampling methodologies to enable valid measurement of change over time. A longitudinal panel of the same individual respondents is not prescribed as a mandatory requirement. The bidder may propose a panel approach where methodologically justified.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

3	Section 1; pp 3	“In India, the MoNA country measure will work in an integrated manner with the bilateral projects - Support to Agroecological Transformation Processes in India (SuATI) and the Adaptive Social Protection Project (ACVERR)”	Please provide more information on the implementation structure of the programme; including details on the roles and responsibilities of GIZ / MoRD / SRLM / SHGs / Producer Groups / other implementing partners; areas and range of intervention by GIZ; and annual workplans. Please also share the annual target coverage plans, disaggregated by State and District, by intervention typology.	Detailed implementation arrangements, workplans and roles of implementation partners are currently being operationalised. The contractor is expected to coordinate with GIZ, SRLMs, relevant government counterparts, and implementation partners as the arrangements are finalised. Existing project documents, questionnaires and relevant data available to GIZ will be shared as appropriate during inception, subject to applicable data protection and access requirements. The ToR does not require a fixed annual beneficiary coverage plan to be provided at tender stage.
4	Sections 1 and 2, A.1; pp. 3–15	“The MoNA country measure will work in an integrated manner with... SuATI... and... ACVERR”; “Reviewing the existing questionnaires from last projects.”	Kindly clarify the implementation status of MoNA and related interventions in the proposed study areas, including whether activities will commence before baseline. Will previous questionnaires, datasets, evaluations and information on beneficiaries’ exposure to SuATI/ACVERR be provided for designing the baseline and contribution analysis?	MoNA implementation arrangements are being operationalised in parallel with the MEL procurement. The baseline should therefore establish the pre-intervention situation and, where relevant, document respondents’ prior exposure to related programmes/interventions. Existing project documents, questionnaires and relevant data available to GIZ will be shared as appropriate during inception, subject to applicable data protection and access requirements.
5	Section 2, A.2, Rajasthan Study; pp. 10–	“Target groups: pregnant women, lactating mothers, mothers of children below two years, adolescent girls and	Please clarify how overlapping categories should be treated and whether one or	For the main household survey, the sampling design should ensure that one eligible respondent is selected per household, unless a

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

	15	SHG women.”	multiple eligible respondents may be interviewed per household.	specific study component requires more than one respondent for a clearly justified methodological reason. The respondent-selection rule should be clearly defined in the sampling protocol to avoid duplication and ensure consistency.
6	Section 2, A.1 and A.2; pp. 10–15	“In addition to the project baseline assessment... two complementary studies...”	Please share more information on the study objectives and / or research questions for the two Strategic State Studies. It is not clear whether the studies will inform the design and development of the current project in the two states (GIZ MoNA), or of the respective State’s health and nutritional policy. This distinction will further inform the study design, including the sampling strategy. Where locations and respondent eligibility overlap, may the Rajasthan and Karnataka strategic studies share respondents and survey modules with the project baseline?	The Rajasthan and Karnataka strategic/state studies are associated studies that complement and support the overall MoNA baseline/endline and learning agenda. They are not additional MoNA outcome indicators. The studies may be integrated with the baseline/endline methodology where this is methodologically appropriate and helps reduce respondent burden, duplication and field costs. The detailed research questions, sampling arrangements and potential integration/shared modules will be refined with GIZ and relevant state partners during inception. The Rajasthan study has a particularly strong state-government/follow-up orientation.
7	Section 2, A.1 and A.2; pp. 10–15	“Generate evidence to strengthen RAJEEVIKA's Food, Nutrition, Health and WASH (FNHW) strategy and kitchen	RAJEEVIKA’s FNHW portfolio and coverage is wide, with numerous components, including the Kitchen Garden Programme. Please clarify whether the study is expected to inform	The Rajasthan study should primarily examine the kitchen garden-related programme/intervention, dietary diversity, household nutrition and nutrition status of families while situating the findings within the

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

		garden programme”	the larger FNHW aspect or only focus on the kitchen garden programme, as indicated in the title of the study.	broader FNHW context where relevant. The study is intended to generate evidence that can support state-level learning and follow-up discussions, including in relation to the broader FNHW strategy. The precise scope will be refined during inception with GIZ and relevant state stakeholders.
8	Section 2, A.2, Karnataka Study; pp. 10–15	“approximately 100 respondents, including women entrepreneurs, consumers, buyers, traders and key informants”; “Local retail markets, institutional buyers and value chain actors”.	Kindly clarify whether approximately 100 respondents is an indicative target or a minimum requirement, and whether any allocation across respondent categories is prescribed. Please also specify the geographic reach, the expected sample sizes and the district coverage for the market assessment.	The reference to approximately 100 respondents for the Karnataka market assessment is indicative. The bidder should propose an appropriate sample and respondent composition based on the research questions. The assessment may include relevant women entrepreneurs/SHGs, consumers, buyers, traders, market actors and key informants, as appropriate. The final geographical and respondent composition will be refined during inception in consultation with KSRLM/MKPCs and GIZ.
9	Section 2, A.1, C and D; pp. 10–15; Section 5; pp. 22–28	“Design quantitative and qualitative data collection tools”; “FGDs, KIIs and IDIs”; “Assess nutrition governance capacities within selected SRLM systems”.	Kindly confirm the minimum number and distribution of FGDs, KIIs, IDIs and institutional consultations across the baseline, strategic studies, mid-term assessment and endline. Please specify it by study component and stakeholder level.	The ToR intentionally does not prescribe a rigid number of FGDs, KIIs or IDIs. The bidder is expected to propose an appropriate qualitative methodology, including the number, composition and distribution of discussions/interviews, based on the research questions, geographical coverage, and required outputs. The proposed approach should be adequately justified and reflected in

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

				the financial offer.
10	Section 1, Output 2, Indicators 2.2 and 2.3; pp. 3–9	“The percentage of 200 women...”; Indicator 2.3 definition: “measures the number of women...”	Kindly confirm whether the 200 women in each state represent the entire intervention cohort, an indicator target or a required survey sample.	The 200 women referred to under Output Indicators 2.2 and 2.3 represent the defined indicator cohorts/denominators and should not be interpreted as prescribed survey sample sizes . The bidder should determine the appropriate survey sample size and sampling methodology for baseline and endline based on the indicator requirements, statistical considerations and approved evaluation design.
11	Section 1 and Section 2, B; pp. 3–15	Module objective 2 and Output 4 “do not need formal monitoring...”; “Develop indicator definition sheets for all project indicators”.	Kindly confirm whether Module Objective 2 and Output 4 are excluded only from primary surveys and routine monitoring, or also from indicator-sheet development, evidence synthesis and final evaluation. Further, please clarify how GIZ defines “anchoring nutrition security” (module objective); and whether contribution analysis is expected to be undertaken as part of the evaluation under component C (Periodic Learning and Evidence Generation) and component D (Endline	The indicators under Module Objective 2 and Output 4 remain part of the Results Matrix and should be addressed through appropriate evidence generation, documentation and assessment. However, they are not intended to be treated in the same manner as household-level outcome indicators requiring routine primary quantitative measurement . The contractor should propose appropriate approaches for assessing/documenting contributions, processes, dialogues, policy engagement and institutional changes, particularly through

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

			Assessment and Final Evaluation (2028))	learning, secondary evidence, stakeholder consultations and final evaluation. The definition of “contribution” and the evidence requirements should be operationalised during inception in line with the Results Matrix.
12	Section 2, B and C; pp. 10–15	“Develop standard operating procedures... for routine monitoring”; “Conduct periodic field verification visits to validate monitoring data”.	Kindly clarify the division of responsibilities between the contractor, GIZ, SRLMs and implementation partners for routine data collection, data entry, validation and indicator reporting.	The contractor will be responsible for developing the relevant MEL tools, SOPs, quality-assurance procedures and verification mechanisms and for supporting/undertaking data collection as specified under the respective work packages. Routine programme monitoring data will be generated and maintained through the agreed implementation/MEL arrangements involving GIZ, implementation partners and relevant government counterparts. The exact division of responsibilities will be confirmed during inception. All the field visits and monitoring visits will be done by the contractor.
13	Section 2, C; pp. 10–15	“Conduct periodic field verification visits”; “Quarterly reflection and learning processes”; “Mid-term study report”.	Kindly specify the expected number, duration and geographic coverage of field verification visits and quarterly learning sessions. Please also clarify whether the mid-term assessment requires fresh quantitative and qualitative data collection or primarily analysis of routine monitoring data with targeted verification.	The ToR does not prescribe a rigid number of field-verification visits or learning visits. The bidder should propose an efficient schedule aligned with the methodology, implementation cycle and deliverables. The mid-term assessment is primarily intended as a learning/output/process assessment and does not automatically imply a full repeat household survey. Additional primary

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

				quantitative data may be proposed where a specific research question justifies it and subject to GIZ approval.
14	Section 2, C; pp. 10–15	“Knowledge products and presentations”; “Annual evidence synthesis reports”; “Policy briefs”; “Documentation of... good practices”.	Kindly specify the minimum number of , policy briefs, case studies, learning briefs and other knowledge products. Please confirm whether separate annual reports are required for 2026 and 2028 and whether the strategic-study policy briefs count towards these requirements.	The knowledge products specified in the ToR constitute the minimum deliverable requirements. These include the relevant learning/evidence products, annual evidence synthesis reports, policy briefs, presentations and documentation of lessons/good practices as applicable to the respective work packages. Where a strategic study produces a policy brief that fulfils an agreed ToR deliverable, it may be integrated rather than duplicated, subject to GIZ approval.
15	Section 2, C; pp. 10–15	“Produce data visualisations, dashboards and analytical summaries...”	Kindly clarify whether dashboards are expected as static reporting products or as an interactive, hosted system. If an interactive system is required, please specify expected functionality, users, refresh frequency, hosting, licensing, maintenance and handover arrangements.	The ToR does not prescribe development and hosting of a separate interactive online dashboard. The contractor should provide appropriate data visualisation and reporting outputs as required under the assignment. If the bidder proposes an interactive dashboard, the scope, hosting, maintenance and associated responsibilities should be clearly specified and agreed with GIZ.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

16	Section 2, C; pp. 10–15	“Review NFHS, CNNS, NRLM and relevant state datasets...”	Will GIZ/SRLMs facilitate access to relevant non-public administrative and state datasets? Kindly confirm whether secondary analysis is to be undertaken using datasets available during the assignment, with limitations documented where access or disaggregation is unavailable.	The contractor shall analyse and use relevant datasets that can be accessed during the assignment and clearly document limitations arising from unavailable or incomplete data. GIZ cannot provide the non public data sets.
17	Section 2, milestones; pp. 16–19; Section 6; pp. 29–31	Baseline report: “4th January 2027”; Work Package A: “Within 5 months”; MEL strategy: “5th February 2027” versus “Within 6 months”; mid-term: “30th June 2027” versus “Q3 2027”.	Kindly issue a consolidated milestone schedule resolving the differences between Sections 2 and 6, and confirm which dates should govern the technical workplan and financial proposal.	The specific milestone dates in the milestone/partial works table of the final ToR shall govern . Where narrative text refers to broader periods such as “Q3 2027”, the specific milestone deadline specified in the ToR will prevail. Any formally revised dates, if applicable, will be communicated during inception.
18	Section 2, milestones and seasonal comparability; pp. 16–19	Endline database: “31st January 2028”; endline report: “29th February 2028”; final evaluation: “18th September 2028”; surveys during “the same agricultural and seasonal period”.	Kindly confirm the intended endline fieldwork window and minimum intervention exposure period. Please clarify how seasonal comparability should be maintained and whether additional data collection or indicator updates are expected between the endline report and final evaluation.	The endline is intended to be conducted during the same agricultural/seasonal period as the baseline, wherever feasible , to support comparability of dietary diversity, food security and livelihood-related indicators. Given that the baseline is planned for November–January 2026, the bidder should plan for a comparable seasonal window in the subsequent implementation period, with the final fieldwork schedule agreed based on the implementation cycle and approved evaluation design.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

19	Section 2, C and Workshops; pp. 10–19	“2 M&E workshops at state/national level”; “Stakeholder Validation Workshops (2)”.	Kindly confirm whether the two M&E workshops and two stakeholder validation workshops are separate events, requiring four workshops in total, or whether these requirements may be combined. Please specify indicative locations, duration and participant numbers for each event.	The ToR specifies one enumerator training prior to the baseline and one prior to the endline , with training to cover Rajasthan and Karnataka. Further M&E workshops and 2 stakeholder workshops are different but maximum numbers. The locations, duration and numbers will be discussed during inception. If required, additional support can be provided by implementation partners
20	Section 2, Workshops and General Provisions; pp. 16–19	“Venue... local logistics... refreshments”; “Travel, per diem and accommodation costs for the contractor’s personnel...”	Kindly clarify whether travel, accommodation and per diem for government officials, community participants and other non-contractor attendees are to be included in the contractor’s offer. If so, please provide indicative participant categories and travel assumptions.	The contractor shall include in its lump-sum offer the personnel, travel and logistical costs necessary for delivery of the assignment, including the workshops/trainings explicitly specified in the ToR. Costs relating to government officials and community participants should only be included where they fall within the workshop/logistical requirements specified in the ToR or are otherwise agreed with GIZ.
21	Section 4, II, Technical Eligibility; pp. 21–22	“...impact assessments related to nutrition in India...”	Kindly confirm whether evaluations of integrated public health, food security, food systems or nutrition-sensitive livelihood programmes qualify where nutrition constitutes a substantive component. For consortium/subcontract references, please clarify whether eligibility is assessed against the overall contract value or the bidder’s attributable	Relevant experience in integrated areas such as public health, nutrition, food security, food systems, nutrition-sensitive livelihoods and related monitoring/evaluation research may be considered where the experience demonstrates substantive relevance to the requirements of the assignment. The bidder should clearly demonstrate the relevance of the cited assignments to the evaluation scope.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

			share.	Eligibility of only lead bidder shall be considered.
22	Section 5, Personnel Concept; pp. 22–28	Qualifications “represent the requirements to reach the maximum number of points...”	Kindly confirm whether the stated qualifications and experience thresholds for personnel are scoring benchmarks or mandatory minimum requirements. Where an expert does not meet one benchmark, please clarify whether this results in proportionate scoring or disqualification.	The qualification requirements specified under the personnel section should be read together with the technical evaluation criteria. Where qualifications are stated as minimum requirements , they are mandatory. Where qualifications/experience are stated as criteria for technical assessment or preference, they contribute to the technical evaluation. So in conclusion, it will result in scoring based on the given CV.
23	Section 5, Short-term Expert Pools; pp. 22–28	Pool 1: “an average of the qualifications of all specified members”; Pool 2: “minimum 4, maximum 30 members”; “overview of all proposed short-term experts”.	Kindly specify the minimum and maximum size of Pool 1. As per our understanding, CVs are not required at bid stage for every proposed Pool 2 member, including enumerators, supervisors and translators. Kindly confirm this.	Short-term Expert Pool 1 is the MEL and Field Coordinator . For Pool 1, the CV of proposed pool member is required for technical assessment. Short-term Expert Pool 2 is a flexible pool with a minimum of 4 and maximum of 30 members . The contractor is expected to provide a clear overview of the proposed short-term experts and their qualifications. The ToR does not require individual CVs for every enumerator or other field personnel who may subsequently be mobilised.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

24	Section 7, Tender Format; pp. 31–32	“The complete tender must not exceed 8 pages (excluding CVs); “submit references as external content (links)”.	Kindly confirm whether the eight-page limit applies only to the technical concept or also includes the workplan, personnel deployment plan, firm profile, reference projects and eligibility documentation. Please clarify which supporting documents may be submitted separately and how external reference links should be presented.	The technical proposal (excluding CVs) must not exceed 8 pages . The page limit will be applied as stated in the tender documents. References should be submitted as external content/links in accordance with the ToR. No extension of the prescribed page limit is envisaged.
25	Section 6, Costing Requirements; pp. 29–31	Work package allocations: “105”, “10”, “60”, “120”; “approximately 310 expert days”.	The listed allocations total 295 expert days, whereas the narrative specifies approximately 310 days. Kindly confirm the intended reference total and whether it includes all enumerator, supervisor, coordinator, translation, programming and design inputs. Please also confirm that Work Package A costing includes both strategic state studies.	The expert days specified in the ToR are indicative estimates for costing and planning purposes . The milestone table provides 105 days for Work Package A, 10 for B, 60 for C and 120 for D. The ToR also refers to an approximate overall level of effort of 310 expert days. Bidders may propose their own internal allocation of expert inputs, provided that all required deliverables and milestones are achieved. The estimated expert days do not constitute fixed staffing obligations or a basis for payment.
26	Section 3, Personnel Plan; p. 20; Sections 6–7; pp. 29–32	Personnel plan to include “duration and expert days”; “A detailed allocation of expert days across activities is not required”; inputs “contractually agreed as maximum limits”.	Kindly clarify the required level of expert-day detail in the technical and financial submissions. Please confirm whether bidder-proposed inputs become contractual ceilings and how adjustments in the approved sampling design or deployment plan will be handled under	The personnel assignment plan should provide the proposed experts, assignment periods/duration, locations, expert days and allocation of relevant work steps, as required by the ToR. However, the assignment is a deliverable-based works contract with a lump-sum price . The indicative expert-day

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

			the lump-sum arrangement.	estimates are intended to support costing and financial evaluation and do not constitute fixed contractual staffing inputs.
27	Section 6, Travel and Carbon Offsets; pp. 29–31	Flights: “8 experts X 4 roundtrips”; per diem/overnight: “30” days for “4” experts; offsets included in milestone costing but also “settled against evidence”.	Kindly confirm whether travel assumptions may be revised to reflect the proposed staffing and methodology, given the differing numbers of travelling experts. Please clarify whether carbon offsets are included in the lump sum or reimbursed separately against evidence, and share any applicable limits.	The travel provided in the ToR are indicative quantities for preparation of the financial offer. The requirements relating to CO₂ compensation, evidence and applicable financial treatment should be interpreted in accordance with the applicable GIZ procurement/financial provisions.
28	Section 6, Payment and Financial Evaluation; pp. 29–31	“Payment shall be linked exclusively to... acceptance of each milestone”; “assessment... also based on the underlying daily rate”.	Kindly share the milestone-wise payment proportions and clarify whether Work Package C permits interim payments against periodic deliverables. Please explain how underlying daily rates will be assessed alongside the lump-sum price and confirm the treatment of applicable taxes in financial comparison.	The contract is a works contract. The bidder should submit the financial offer in the format and on the parameters specified in the ToR/price schedule. Per day rates shall be checked with internal fee costing and can be used as a reference for future contracts. However, the bid will be assessed in totality as per the costing requirement mentioned in TOR. These are different checks which are separately done. Comparison is done excluding GST. Work Package C may permits interim payments against periodic deliverables

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

29	Section 8 and Annex; pp. 32–33	Contractor to act as “an independent data controller”; annex: “Outsourcing of data processing in accordance with Art. 28 GDPR”; handover of respondent databases and recordings.	Kindly clarify the intended controller/processor roles of GIZ, the contractor and implementation partners, and the applicable data-processing agreement. Please share requirements for hosting location, approved platforms, identifiable-data transfer, access controls, retention and deletion, including treatment of respondent IDs and GPS coordinates.	The contractor will be required to comply with the applicable GIZ data-protection and data-security requirements specified in the ToR and contractual documentation. The roles and responsibilities of the parties in relation to personal data processing, storage, transfer, access, retention and deletion will be confirmed through the applicable contractual/data-protection arrangements. The contractor should incorporate appropriate safeguards into the research design, digital data collection and respondent-tracking processes.
30	Section Research Ethics; pp. 32–33	8, “Where required... obtain approval or exemption from an appropriate Institutional Ethics Committee prior to commencement of fieldwork...”	Kindly confirm whether ethics approval is expected for all primary research components, whether GIZ has a designated review mechanism, and whether one approval covering both states and survey rounds is acceptable subject to amendments. Please also clarify applicable safeguarding, parental consent and assent requirements for participants below 18, and how approval timelines should be accommodated within the inception schedule.	The contractor is responsible for ensuring that the required ethical approvals/clearances are obtained before commencement of relevant primary research, where applicable. The research design must include informed consent, confidentiality, data protection and appropriate safeguards for respondents. Where children/minors are involved in any study component, appropriate parental/guardian consent and child assent/safeguarding procedures shall be followed as applicable. The bidder should account for the relevant ethical review process in its workplan.
31	Section 6,	“The estimated total level of effort for this assignment is approximately 310 expert days	Kindly clarify whether the estimated 310 expert days represent the expected person-days to be deployed under the	The expert-day figures in the ToR are indicative estimates and are not contractual staffing allocations . The bidder may determine the

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

	Costing Requirements; pp. 29-32	distributed across the milestones above. Bidders may propose their own internal allocation of expert inputs while ensuring achievement of all required deliverables."	assignment or are provided solely as an indicative reference for costing purposes. Further, may bidders propose an alternative level of effort and expert-day allocation based on their proposed methodology and work plan, provided all deliverables are achieved?	appropriate internal allocation of expert inputs required to deliver the agreed outputs. Payment will be linked to successful completion and acceptance of the specified milestones/deliverables, not to utilisation of a particular number of expert days.
32	Terms of Reference, page no. 10 to 13	Final intervention geography and beneficiary universe	Page 10 states that in Rajasthan the project will work in 1 to 2 blocks of one district (10 to 15 Gram Panchayats) and in Karnataka with 2 to 3 MKPCs. However, the table on page 12 for the Rajasthan Food Diversity and Kitchen Garden Study requires 4 districts and 1 block per district. Kindly confirm: • whether the Rajasthan study is expected to cover 3 districts outside the project district, and whether GIZ and RAJEEVIKA or the contractor will select these districts; • the names of the final districts, blocks, Gram Panchayats and MKPCs in both states, and the estimated number of project beneficiaries (SHG women and households);	There is distinction between baseline/endline and state level studies. And that is why the details are different. For karnataka- the names of the final districts, blocks, Gram Panchayats and MKPCs in Karnataka is yet to be finalised and will be done in discussion with KSRLM. The minimum number of MKPCs to be involved is two, however, the name and members may get finalised before / during the inception phase. For Rajasthan, the study districts are still tentative and will be selected by state dept and GIZ.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

			whether verified beneficiary lists (SHG and MKPC member lists) will be shared at inception to prepare the sampling frame.	
33	Terms of Reference, page no. 10 to 13	Baseline sample size and link with the two state studies	The sample size for the main project baseline is not given, while the Rajasthan study needs at least 800 women and the Karnataka assessment about 100 respondents. Kindly confirm: whether respondents of the two state studies can form part of the main baseline sample where indicators and target groups overlap, or whether three separate samples and datasets are required; whether GIZ expects a minimum sample size, confidence level or margin of error for the main baseline, so that all bidders cost the survey on the same basis.	Sample size shall be calculated at the inception phase. Further baseline and state level studies are different and later will complement to the baseline. For the baseline and indicative indicator are mentioned for bidder to provide details of data collection. And Yes the respondents can be same if the locations are same
34	Terms of Reference, page no. 10 to 15	Control or comparison groups at baseline	The endline must include comparable control groups, but the baseline section does not mention control or comparison areas.	Baseline should also include comparable groups and GIZ will support in identification of control areas

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project**Tender No.: 7000024216**

			Kindly confirm whether the baseline must also collect data from control or comparison groups so that change can be measured in a valid way. If yes, please confirm whether GIZ and project partners will identify the comparison areas, or whether the contractor is expected to select them and secure access.	
35	Terms of Reference , page no. 5, 15, 16 & 19	Scope of the mid term study	Indicator 1.1 lists a midline output assessment as a data source. The milestone table asks for a Mid term learning report by 30 June 2027 based on an output assessment on an agreed thematic area, and the validation workshop refers to a midline study. Kindly confirm whether the mid term study needs a fresh household survey (with an indicative sample size), or whether it can be based on monitoring data, secondary data and qualitative methods (FGDs, KIs, case studies).	A fresh survey would not be required, it will be based on monitoring, secondary data and additional studies.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

36	Terms Reference, page no. 11 & 14	of Existing tools, data and templates	The ToR asks the contractor to review existing questionnaires from past projects and to prepare indicator definition sheets based on the given template. Kindly confirm whether GIZ will share at inception the existing questionnaires, past datasets, the indicator sheet template, the results framework and theory of change, and the routine monitoring data of the project.	Yes all the relevant documents will be shared.
37	Terms Reference, page no. 10, 15, 19 & 29	of Timing of endline fieldwork	The ToR places the endline in 2028 and asks that baseline and endline be done in the same agricultural and seasonal period. The baseline fieldwork falls in November and December 2026. The milestone table asks for the final cleaned endline database by 31 January 2028 and the endline report by 29 February 2028. Kindly confirm whether endline data collection is expected in November and December 2027, so that the database can be submitted by 31 January 2028, or whether a different field window is planned. Please also confirm whether the milestone dates are final or indicative.	Same response as row 18- The endline is intended to be conducted during the same agricultural/seasonal period as the baseline, wherever feasible , to support comparability of dietary diversity, food security and livelihood-related indicators. Given that the baseline is planned for November–January 2026, the bidder should plan for a comparable seasonal window in the subsequent implementation period, with the final fieldwork schedule agreed based on the implementation cycle and approved evaluation design.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

38	Terms of Reference, page no. 14, 16 and 19	Number and location of trainings and workshops	The ToR mentions one enumerator training before baseline and one before endline, and also states that trainings will be held in Rajasthan and Karnataka (one in each state). It further mentions two stakeholder validation workshops and two M&E workshops. Kindly confirm: • whether a total of two or four enumerator trainings are to be costed; • whether the two stakeholder validation workshops and the two M&E workshops are four separate events, since the validation workshop text covers baseline, midline and endline findings; • the expected location, mode (in person or virtual), duration and number of participants for each event, and whether travel of partner and government participants is to be paid by the contractor.	It is also mentioned in the query above row 9- The ToR specifies one enumerator training prior to the baseline and one prior to the endline, with training to cover Rajasthan and Karnataka. Further M&E workshops and 2 stakeholder workshops are different but maximum numbers. The locations, duration and numbers will be discussed during inception. It will be physical workshops. The govt partners will be supported by implementation partners and all others through this contract.
39	Terms of Reference, page no. 31	Page limit of the technical proposal	The ToR states that the complete tender must not exceed 8 pages (excluding CVs). Given the four work packages, two state studies, workplan, personnel assignment plan and backstopping concept that must be explained, 8 pages limits is impractical. It would allow only a surface level	There are three repetitive queries, already mentioned above. The page number is mentioned already.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

			response. We request GIZ to kindly increase the page limit to 15 to 20 pages.	
40	Terms of Reference, page no. 26, 29 & 32	CVs for the short term expert pools and CV format	Pool 1 (MEL and Field Coordinator) and Pool 2 (minimum 4, maximum 30 members) are assessed as the average of all CVs submitted. Kindly confirm: - the number of CVs expected for Pool 1; - whether submitting the minimum 4 CVs for Pool 2 is enough, or whether CVs are needed at tender stage for all enumerators, field supervisors and translators; the CV format to be used (the ToR refers to a format in the terms and conditions for application, which we could not find in the tender package). The Bidding Conditions only state that CVs should be part of the technical proposal. Please share the GIZ CV template if one is required.	Short-term Expert Pool 2 consists of a minimum of 4 and maximum of 30 members. The bidder should provide the required information/CVs in accordance with the personnel requirements and technical assessment provisions of the ToR. A flexible pool is intended to allow mobilisation of appropriate specialists/field personnel according to the needs of different work packages.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project**Tender No.: 7000024216**

41	Terms of Reference, page no. 29, 30	Total expert days	The milestone table adds up to 295 expert days: Work Package A (105), B (10), C (60) and D (120). However, the ToR later states a total of about 310 expert days. Kindly confirm which total applies for the financial evaluation, and how the remaining 15 days are to be allocated.	As mentioned above the days that this is a works contract.
42	Terms of Reference, Financial bid template, Vo2 offset guide	Travel quantities, CO2 offset and rates	The domestic flight and CO2 compensation lines show 8 experts x 4 round trips (64 one way flights), while the comment mentions about 8 flight sectors per travelling expert. The per diem and overnight lines refer to only 4 travelling experts x 30 days. As per the CO2 Offset Guide, domestic flights in India fall under Category 2.1, with a cap of EUR 50 per one way economy flight. The CO2 budget would therefore be EUR 3,200 for 8 experts or EUR 1,600 for 4 experts. Kindly confirm: - the number of travelling experts and the total round trips or flight sectors to be costed for airfare and CO2 compensation; - the exchange rate to be used to convert the CO2 cap into INR (for	The comment on flight is also mentioned already above. Finalise the number of travel, as per the ToR and planned proposal. Co2 compensation will depend upon the exchange rate of InfoEuro

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

			example InforEuro for the month of bid submission); whether the 15 x 15 local transport units cover both experts and enumerators.	
43	Terms of Reference; Financial Bid Template; Bidding Conditions; GTCC (Clauses 3.1 to 3.3)	Lump sum price versus financial bid template	The ToR states that the contract is a contract for works at a lump sum price, that payment is linked only to milestones, and that travel costs must be included in milestone costing and not quoted separately. However, the Financial Bid Template (which the Bidding Conditions say bidders can use) asks for expert fees (Table 1) and reimbursable costs (Table 2), with third party invoices for costs reimbursed on actuals. Page 32 of the ToR also refers to "Chapter 4 Quantitative requirements", which is not in the ToR, and to days and trips as maximum limits. Kindly confirm: • whether the offer should be a fixed lump sum per milestone, with Tables 1 and 2 used only to show the build up of the price; • whether travel and workshop costs will be paid as part of the lump sum or reimbursed on actuals against invoices; whether a milestone wise price table	Bidders are required to submit financial proposal according to costing requirement mentioned in page 29 & 30 of TOR. The revised financial bid template is uploaded in tender package. Financial proposal must consist of - Milestone 1 - Milestone 2 - Milestone 3 - Milestone 4 - Airfare - CO₂ compensation

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

			should be added to the financial proposal.	
44	Bidding condition	Consortium Guidelines	The bidding conditions permit consortium arrangements and engagement of freelance consultants, while also stating that subcontracting to another agency is not allowed without prior written approval from GIZ. Kindly clarify the distinction between consortium partners, freelance consultants, short-term experts and subcontractors for the purpose of this assignment. Kindly confirm whether specialised field data collection agencies, survey implementation firms or local research organisations engaged to support activities such as household surveys, FGDs, KIs, translation or data collection would be considered subcontractors under this clause. Given the scale of field implementation envisaged under the assignment, we request GIZ to permit engagement of specialised field survey and research	A consortium is formed for the joint implementation of the assignment, with the consortium members jointly contributing to the delivery of the required services. It is not mandatory that all experts working on the assignment be employees of the bidding entity. Freelance experts may also be engaged. However, the bidding entity remains fully responsible for the proper implementation and delivery of the assignment. Subcontracting refers to the outsourcing of a specific part or limited scope of the assignment to a third party. In such cases, the bidding entity remains fully responsible for the performance and delivery of the subcontracted work. Where subcontracting is proposed, the bidder shall submit a separate request for approval, clearly indicating the name of the proposed subcontractor/agency and the scope and distribution of work to be assigned to it. Whether the assignment is implemented through a consortium or involves subcontracting, the lead

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

			agencies, under the overall responsibility and quality assurance framework of the lead contractor, subject to prior disclosure and approval where required. In the event that specialised agencies are required during implementation, kindly clarify the process, timeline and conditions for obtaining GIZ's approval for subcontracting specific components of the assignment.	bidder remains responsible for the overall implementation of the assignment. The eligibility and qualification of only lead bidder is assessed in accordance with the requirements specified in the tender documents.
45		Criteria for Eligibility of Firms - Technical Eligibility Assessment At least 2 reference projects related to baseline and endline evaluations, impact assessments related to nutrition in India in the last three years with minimum commission value of Euro 30,000	For the requirement, does the "last three years" refer to a. Financial Year or Calendar Year? b. We kindly request if this can be converted to last 5 FY- 2025-26, 2024-25, 2023-24, 2022-23, 2021-22. or c. In such above case, would the project eligibility be defined by (i) project completion date, (ii) contract award date, (iii) any period of implementation falling within the last three years, or (iv) We kindly request that definition (c)—i.e. the firm's minimum years of business in	It refers to last 3 financial years. The assessment shall be done only as per criteria defines and submission of documents against it. Eligibility on reference project shall be defined by project completion date.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

			the specified technical areas/domains - be considered, so that strong credentials and long-standing institutional experience may be duly recognised.	
46	Terms Reference	ofCriteria for Eligibility of Firms Reference Projects Years of Eligibility	-We understand that for all technical experience criteria requiring a minimum year-based criteria (i.e. 2, 3, 5 years), the firm's minimum years of business in the specified technical areas/domains is considered i.e., the firms are expected to submit at least one of projects older than the respective years. To ensure criteria permit including multiyear evaluations and impact assessments (which is also the scope of this work), we request that criteria requiring 5 years be relaxed to 10 years, and those requiring 2 years be extended to 5 or 7 years to help include highly relevant and robust projects. The eligibility criteria are such that a single assignment is cited against multiple experience requirements where the scope demonstrably covered , i.e. for e.g. across MEL systems, surveys, evaluation, nutrition, livelihoods and women's empowerment. We understand that this is permissible.	These change requests cannot be considered.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

			How many projects per criterion are required for evaluating the bidder, since no minimum number is prescribed in the ToR.	
47	Bidding condition	Consortium Guidelines	The bidding conditions specify that the lead consortium partner must independently satisfy the eligibility requirements under the GAEF. Once these eligibility requirements have been met, may the technical experience, credentials and past project experience of consortium partner(s) also be considered as part of the technical evaluation and scoring of the proposal?	Lead partner/agency should provide the documentary evidence of its own to meet all the criteria defined under Grid for assessing eligibility of firms.
48	Terms of Reference	Baseline Assessment - Implementation Scale	Could GIZ confirm the final project geography (districts, blocks, GPs, MKPCs) expected to be covered under the baseline and endline? If these are yet to be finalised, may bidders make pricing assumptions based on the ranges provided in the ToR?	All the updated details are mentioned in the ToR and further in response to queries above. The bidders are expected to propose accordingly.
49	Terms of Reference	Endline Assessment and Final Evaluation	The ToR mentions inclusion of "comparable control groups" in the endline survey. Kindly clarify whether control groups need to be established during the baseline stage itself and whether	

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

			identification/access support will be facilitated by GIZ and project partners	
50	Terms Reference	of Strategic State Studies - Rajasthan Study	Are the 800 respondents specified for the Rajasthan study inclusive of baseline survey respondents, or should this study consider a standalone, separate sampling and data collection?	Separate standalone sampling and data collection, can also be integrated in the same locations.
51	Terms Reference	of Strategic State Studies - Karnataka Study	Similarly, can data collection for the Karnataka Nutrition-Dense Food Enterprise and Market Assessment be integrated with baseline activities where methodologically appropriate, or is GIZ expecting a separate standalone study WITH separate sampling groups?	Separate standalone sampling and data collection, can also be integrated in the same locations.
52	Terms Reference	of Secondary Data Analysis and Evidence Synthesis	Could GIZ indicate the expected frequency and approximate scope of contextual analyses, evidence synthesis products and dashboards during implementation?	It is mentioned well in ToR
53	Terms Reference	of Periodic Learning and Evidence Generation	The ToR refers to a "Mid-term study report" and later mentions "output assessment completed on agreed thematic area". Kindly clarify the expected methodology, sample scope and thematic coverage of the mid-term assessment.	It is mentioned above in one of the query.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

54	Terms Reference	of Workshops, Events and Trainings	For stakeholder validation workshops, will GIZ facilitate participant mobilisation and government nominations and logistics, while the consultant manages delivery?	The consultancy will manage the delivery.
55	Terms Reference	of Costing Requirements	The ToR provides indicative expert days and travel assumptions. Kindly confirm that bidders may propose alternative team compositions and expert-day allocations	It is also already indicated above
56	Terms Reference	of Personnel Concept - Short-Term Expert Pool 1	Could GiZ confirm whether more than 1 resource is to be proposed in Expert Pool 1? If yes, is there a specific number in consideration, as defined for Expert Pool 2?	The minimum and maximum are mentioned in Tor and response above
57	Terms Reference	of Personnel Concept - Short-Term Expert Pool 2	The ToR requires a minimum of 4 and maximum of 30 members in Short-Term Expert Pool 2. Kindly confirm whether CVs are required for all proposed pool experts at this stage or only for those being presented for technical evaluation scoring.	Response is already provided above.
58	Terms Reference	of Requirements on Format of Tender	The technical proposal is limited to 8 pages excluding CVs. Kindly confirm whether organisation credentials, project sheets and annexures submitted as supporting evidence are excluded from the	This is a repetitive query, response is already provided above.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

			8-page limit. If not, we kindly request GiZ to provide a relaxation on the proposal page limit.	
59	Grid assessing eligibility	for Part B - Section III: Weighted Criteria	Under the weighted criteria, each criterion is scored on a scale of 0-10 and then weighted. Could GiZ kindly clarify the scoring methodology and benchmarks applicable to each criterion. Specifically, what score is awarded for meeting the minimum requirement, and how are higher scores determined (e.g., based on years of experience, number of assignments, value of assignments, relevance, or other factors)? We propose the following scoring criteria for the sake of simplicity: 1 project 3 marks 2 project 6 marks 3 projects 10 marks	There is a standard criteria to measure it and not to shared with bidder. And any proposal on how to conduct the scoring is not acceptable.
60		The deadline for submission of proposals	To adequately consider the clarifications provided through the pre-bid query process and to prepare a robust, comprehensive, and responsive technical and financial proposal aligned with the requirements of the assignment, we kindly request an extension of the proposal submission deadline by two weeks from the current deadline.	Extension of submission is not possible.

Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project

Tender No.: 7000024216

61			Evaluation Design: Is a quasi-experimental design (with counterfactual) required, or pre-post design would suffice? "comparable control groups" is mentioned once (Section D) but not detailed in baseline design;	The mid-term assessment is intended as a learning and progress assessment, including review of implementation, outputs, emerging outcomes, processes, challenges and adaptation needs. It is not automatically intended as a full baseline/endline-style survey. The bidder should propose an appropriate methodology and level of primary data collection based on the agreed learning questions.
62			Midline scope: ToR mentions a "mid-term assessment"/"midline study" but gives no sample size or deliverable detail, unlike baseline/endline. How many midline rounds are expected, is it a full quantitative survey or a lighter output/process check and what sample size (if any) should we plan for?	The ToR envisages one mid-term assessment in Q3 2027, focused on implementation progress, learning, processes and emerging results. It is not intended as a full repeat of the baseline/endline survey. No fixed sample size is prescribed; the bidder should propose an appropriate mixed-method approach, with any quantitative component justified in the technical proposal.
63			Workshop venue standard: Costs for dissemination/validation workshop venues (baseline & endline, up to 50 pax, Delhi/project states) are to be included in our lump-sum, but no venue category is specified. Should we budget for government/institutional venues or commercial conference facilities, and are there any GIZ per-participant cost norms to reference?	It will be part of costing estimate under milestones. The contractor should make realistic provisions for workshop venues and related logistics within the lump-sum financial offer, in accordance with the requirements of the ToR and applicable GIZ standards. There is no requirement for a specific venue category unless expressly stated.



Sub: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning (MEL) and Evidence Generation for the Modular Nutrition Actions (MoNA) India Project
Tender No.: 7000024216

64	General		It is requested to kindly extend the deadline for submission of bid	The deadline is hereby extended until 14 th October 2026
----	---------	--	---	---