

Project Reference:	Request for Quotation 30000011414,2 National Research Company / Research Partner (NRP) under Enabling Actions to Address Challenges of Environmental Migration in Georgia project (GE42000000681)
Subject:	Responding to requests for clarification from interested suppliers
Clarifications:	<p>Question #1: Target groups of eco-migrants The eco-migrant database currently includes two main groups: households registered as in need of resettlement and those already resettled, each facing distinct challenges. Many registered families remain on waiting lists for years in unsafe dwellings, while resettled families often receive substandard housing on land unsuitable for livelihoods, face property transfer issues, and struggle with social integration – sometimes leading them to return to hazardous areas. Reports also note procedural problems in assessing applications, creating a third group of households whose requests were denied despite facing environmental risks. Accordingly, three groups may be distinguished as potential target populations for the study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Households that have submitted an application but were not accepted into the database; 2. Households that are registered in the database but still awaiting resettlement; 3. Households that have been resettled. <p><i>Will the planned research include all three group applicants, registered households, and resettled households—or focus only on the resettled?</i></p> <p>Answer: The study will include all three groups where feasible: (1) households that applied but were not accepted, (2) households registered and awaiting resettlement, and (3) resettled households.</p>
	<p>Question #2: Host/community households The bid bulletin specifies that results should be disaggregated to compare eco-migrant households with host/community households. If all three eco-migrant groups are included, data collection would need to cover two types of locations: origin areas, where applicant and registered households reside, and destination areas, where resettled households are located.</p> <p><i>Given that social integration within new communities is a key factor for successful resettlement, may you confirm that host/community households will be surveyed only in the destination areas?</i></p> <p>Answer: Host/community households will be surveyed in both origin and destination areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Origins: remittance-receiving households, “trapped” populations, and households that returned after disaster displacement. • Destinations: relocated eco-migrants/other in-migrants and host/community households (some also receiving remittances). This enables like-for-like comparisons between migrant and local populations in each setting.

Question #3:

Access to the Official Database

The ToR and bid bulletin both require a fresh household listing but do not specify whether access to the official eco-migrant database will be possible. Access to this database would significantly improve the statistical precision of the study by providing a reliable baseline for sampling. It would also have major implications for the budget, as the listing will be one of the most resource-intensive components.

*Can we fully exclude the possibility of accessing the official eco-migrant database for sampling purposes, or **should we plan on the assumption** that access may be granted during implementation?*

Answer:

Access cannot be guaranteed at this stage. Bidders should plan on an **independent, area-based listing/screening** approach. If full or partial database access is granted during implementation, it will be used to **improve stratification and precision** (e.g., for targeting applicants/registered households), with appropriate data-sharing and protection protocol

Question #4:

Sampling and Geographic Scope

If access to the official database is not available, a two-phase approach could be applied to ensure proper selection of target groups. In Phase 1, interviewers would visit every household in the selected area and ask one or two short screening questions to identify whether the household belongs to an eco-migrant group or to the host community. From this list, we would then randomly select the required number of eco-migrant households, along with a smaller comparison group of host households, for full interviews in Phase 2.

A fresh, full listing of all households in large PSUs may be prohibitively time-consuming and costly. To reduce effort, block listing could be applied: PSUs would be divided into smaller, fairly equal segments (blocks), from which one or two are randomly selected. Interviewers would then list and screen only the chosen block, covering every street and building within its boundaries. This ensures probability-based sampling while making the process more efficient.

Moreover, the number of PSUs - and thus cost and field time - depends heavily on the size of the implementation area. Defining the area as 1-2 municipalities instead of an entire region would mean fewer PSUs, less travel, and substantially shorter listing time, which are the main cost drivers.

Can the implementation area be narrowed to 1–2 municipalities that (a) have clear policy relevance (e.g., priority resettlement sites) and (b) show higher eco-migrant prevalence, while also applying block listing to make case identification more efficient and cost-effective?

Answer:

Yes. To balance rigor and cost, the implementation area may be **narrowed to a small set of policy-relevant municipalities** (e.g., 3–5) with higher eco-migrant prevalence and/or clear program relevance (origin and/or destination). A **two-phase, probability-based design** is envisaged:

- **Phase 1:** short **screening/listing** of households in selected Primary Sampling Units (PSUs). In large PSUs, **block/segment listing** may be used (randomly selected blocks) to keep listing feasible.
- **Phase 2:** **random selection** of eligible eco-migrant households and a smaller host comparison group for full interviews.
Municipality selection will be criteria-based (hazard/risk relevance, presence of eco-migrant groups, feasibility) and agreed at inception.

Question #5:

Eco-migrant data distribution

The ToR indicates that a total of 42,000 individuals (12,300 households) are classified as eco-migrants in Georgia. Could you kindly confirm whether their distribution by region is available and can be shared for planning purposes?

Answer:

The figure cited in the ToR refers to an **aggregate number**; a validated **regional breakdown is not currently available** to the project team. IOM will **request official aggregates** from the competent state agency. Until confirmed, bidders should **not assume** access to regional disaggregation and should base sampling plans on the area-based approach described above.

Question #6:

Study objective

Could you please clarify whether the primary objective of the study is to:

- *Examine eco-migrants themselves (i.e., individuals internally displaced as a result of disasters induced by climatic hazards), or*
- *Focus more broadly on entire settlements/regions that are particularly climate-vulnerable?*

Answer:

The study's primary objective is to generate **evidence on climate-related mobility**.

Accordingly, it will examine **both**:

- **Households** directly affected (eco-migrants/IDPs due to disasters, applicants/registered/waiting, resettled), and
- **Communities/settlements** in climate-vulnerable areas (origins and destinations) to understand context, services, and social dynamics (including "trapped" populations and households receiving remittances).
Instrument content will reflect both levels.

Question #7:

Research methodology requirement

Under the Scope of Work, the NRP is described as supporting the International Consultant, with deliverables including training, data collection and cleaning, data analysis, draft report, and information sheet. The first deliverable, however, is defined as "Input to the research design and tools." Could you kindly confirm whether this implies that the NRP is expected to present the proposed research methodology as part of the quotation?

Answer:

The **final research design and tools** will be developed by the **IC in close collaboration with the NRP** during the inception phase. In their quotation, NRPs should **demonstrate methodological capacity** and briefly outline a feasible approach (fieldwork organization, explaining their listing/screening capability, quality assessment and control, data security), but a full methodology proposal is **not required** at tender stage.

	<p>Question #8: <u>GIS expertise</u></p> <p><i>One of the requirements for team members notes that “demonstrated experience in GIS will be an advantage.” Could you please elaborate on the specific GIS-related tasks expected from the team member (e.g., spatial mapping of eco-migrant settlements, climate hazard overlays, or other related functions)?</i></p> <p>Answer: Spatial modeling is not expected; the focus is on clean, accurate visualization (incl. geographical representation of settlements, hazards when necessary). Therefore, GIS is considered an advantage.</p> <hr/> <p>Question #9: <u>Budgeting and workload</u></p> <p><i>To prepare a more precise financial proposal, could you provide further details on the expected workload (e.g., approximate number of interviews, sites, or regions to be covered)? At present, it is challenging to build a detailed and accurate budget without this clarification.</i></p> <p>Answer: Answer: Please price two options for the number of municipalities and two options for the survey size per municipality. The main results will be combined across all municipalities (this gives enough cases of population of interest – these might be relocated = ecomigrants, former disaster displaced, remittance recipients, trapped populations). We will still present figures per municipality, with appropriate caution. Municipality options (mix of origin and destination):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A: 3 municipalities • Option B: 6 municipalities <p>Survey size per municipality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lean (minimum for basic municipal estimates): about 240 households • Standard (more reliable municipal estimates): about 360 households <p>Illustrative totals (households):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A + Lean: ~720 • A + Standard: ~1,080 • B + Lean: ~1,440 • B + Standard: ~2,160 <p>How households are selected (simple and practical):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In rural areas, we use (randomly selected) settlements as the basic unit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Small settlements (up to ~100 households): interview all or a fixed number. ○ Large settlements: split into natural segments (streets/blocks), randomly pick one, then interview 20–25 households in that segment. • In urban areas, do the same with (randomly selected) neighbourhoods/blocks. • A short screening question identifies population of interest (see above). If population of interest households are rare, we may oversample / interview more of them in that place to ensure enough cases; the analysis will reflect this. <p>Qualitative work (budget separately): Per municipality: 12–15 semi-structured interviews (population of interest, sampled by specific criteria), 2 focus groups, and 4–6 key informant interviews (local authorities, services, resettlement agency, CSOs, community leaders, eco-migrant reps).</p> <p>Frames/registers: We do not assume access to an official household register. If it becomes available later, we will use it to make selection easier and more precise.</p>
--	--