

FY26 Armenia Market Assessment RFP

Website Question and Answers

Q: Is there an expected minimum number of in-country or virtual stakeholder interviews for the primary research component? For reference, in similar WISHH assessments we have conducted 15–20 in-depth interviews across feed, food, and regulatory stakeholders.

A: There is no minimum number of expected interviews, so the contracted firm should determine what number is sufficient for a comprehensive market assessment.

Q: Should the assessment focus exclusively on Armenia, or should it also consider regional trade dynamics with neighboring countries (e.g., Georgia, Iran, Russia) that may influence Armenia's soy import and distribution channels?

A: The assessment should focus primarily on Armenia with due consideration given to regional trade dynamics with surrounding countries.

Q: Does WISHH have any existing contacts, in-country partners, or prior engagement history in Armenia that could be leveraged for stakeholder introductions and interview scheduling?

A: WISHH will introduce the contracted firm to any relevant in-country partners and contacts at the time of the kickoff meeting.

Q: Armenia is a member of the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU). Should the assessment specifically evaluate the impact of EAEU trade policies and tariff structures on U.S. soy competitiveness, or is this assumed under the general "trade policy factors" section?

A: The market assessment should evaluate the impact of EAEU trade policies and tariff structures on U.S. soy competitiveness and should be included in the trade policy factors section.

Q: The \$67,000 maximum budget includes professional fees, overhead, and travel. Given that Armenia requires international travel, is there flexibility on the budget allocation between travel and professional fees, or is there an expected travel cost ceiling?

A: WISHH will award the contract with a set dollar amount where it's up to the contracted firm how to allocate the travel and professional fee categories.

Q: Is in-country travel to Armenia required, or would a combination of desk research and virtual/remote interviews be acceptable? If in-country travel is required, what is the expected duration of the field visit?

A: Yes, in-country travel to Armenia is required. It is up to the contracted firm to determine how many days of in-country travel is needed for a comprehensive market assessment.

Q: Are there any restrictions on subcontracting local in-country research partners or subject matter experts to support the fieldwork and interview process?

A: There are no restrictions on subcontracting for local in-country research partners or subject matter experts.

Q: The RFP requests contact information (name, email, address, phone) for organizations and businesses in the soy value chain. Is there a minimum number of contacts expected in the final database, and should these contacts be verified through direct engagement or can they include desk-research-identified contacts?

A: There is no minimum number of contacts expected, so the contracted firm should determine what number of contacts is sufficient for a thorough and comprehensive list. The contact list needs to be verified for accuracy.

Q: Should the assessment include facilitation of introductions between identified stakeholders and ASA/WISHH, or is the deliverable limited to the report and contact database?

A: The stakeholder identification deliverable is limited to the report and contact list, with no introductions required.

Q: For the baseline and metrics section, does WISHH have an existing framework or set of KPIs that should be used for consistency with other RAPP-funded market assessments, or should the assessor propose a custom measurement framework? (We will leverage the current RAPP Assessment project where applicable.)

A: The contracted firm should develop a set of KPI's that are appropriate for the market assessment findings.

Q: The Azerbaijan market assessment RFP includes additional required components, such as (1) an infrastructure/logistics SWOT analysis of ports, rail, and road transportation, and (2) a review of biotechnology regulations and Free Economic Zones affecting import, re-export, and transit of U.S. soy products. Should the Armenia market assessment also include these same infrastructure and biotechnology/regulatory analyses, or are these requirements specific to Azerbaijan only?

A: The Armenia and Azerbaijan market assessments are separate, so please follow the information in each RFP.

Q: The RFP states that the Project Deliverables should include “One market assessment report using the required template in the SOW.” Can you kindly provide this template? Does this refer to the template provided in the RFP rather than any SOW?

A: The market assessment template is in the RFP and will be included in the SOW as well.

Q: Is the Armenia/Azerbaijan assessment intended to validate a program decision already under internal consideration, or to determine whether program deployment is justified at all? If validation, what internal hypotheses should the assessment explicitly test?

A: The market assessments will be one of the tools that WISHH will use to determine future programming in both countries.

Q: Is WISHH planning to allocate RAPP or other funding to Armenia or Azerbaijan in FY2026–2027 contingent on this assessment? If so, what specific decision milestone does this report need to inform?

A: This information is not required for the market assessments.

Q: In past RAPP market assessments, which section of the final report proved most influential in WISHH’s decision to move forward with programming?

A: WISHH will use the market assessment as one of the tools used to determine future programming in both countries.

Q: Should recommendations be structured at the level of strategic opportunity identification, or as implementation-ready program modules (including sequencing, partner types, and indicative scope for activities)? We’d like to understand whether recommendations should be diagnostic and neutral or detailed and targeted? How much detail is too much or too little?

A: The recommendations should be detailed enough and clear for WISHH to determine future programming in both countries.

Q: Is there a preferred balance between narrative reporting on the opportunity versus structured tools that support decision-making?

A: Narrative reporting in the executive summary is preferred while structured tools are preferred in the other sections.

Q: Were findings from the Georgia assessment (or other Central Asia assessments) materially influential in shaping the Armenia/Azerbaijan scopes? If so, are there specific trade, logistics, or regulatory conclusions that should be considered foundational?

A: Each market assessment is independent but regional dynamics are important to consider.

Q: In prior RAPP assessments, which proved more influential in internal decision-making: quantified data on trade potential, or qualitative stakeholder and regulatory feasibility analysis?

A: Market assessments are used in their entirety in the internal decision-making process.

Q: Does WISHH expect scenario-based projections of potential U.S. soy export volume under different intervention pathways, or is directional market sizing sufficient?

A: Both would be preferred.

Q: When proposals score similarly across the published evaluation criteria, what has historically differentiated the winning submission?

A: WISHH uses a proposal scorecard when reviewing the proposals received. The scorecard includes professional competency, proposal comprehensiveness, cost and timing

Q: In previous assessments, what consultants have consistently overemphasized relative to what ultimately proved most useful to WISHH?

A: Consumer profiles rather than market intelligence.

Q: Should proposals aim to maximize scope within the stated budget ceiling, or demonstrate efficiency below the ceiling?

A: WISHH uses a proposal scorecard when reviewing the proposals received that includes the proposal's budget.