IDRC | CRDI

International Development Research Centre
Centre de recherches pour le développement international

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ("RFP")

RFP Title: Think Tank Initiative External Evaluation	**RFP #:** 14150010
Issue Date: Thursday, July 31, 2014	**Close Date & Time:** Monday, September 22, 2014 at 11:00:00 A.M. *Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)*
Contracting Authority Division: Procurement Management *Name*: Lindsay Empey *Title*: Procurement Officer *Email:* lempey@idrc.ca **(Tel #:** 1-613-696-2150 / **Fax#:** (613) 563-9463 / **Street address:** 150 Kent Street, Constitution Square, Tower III, Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 0B2, Canada / **Mailing address**: PO Box 8500, Ottawa, Ontario, K1G 3H9, Canada)	**Originating Division:** Think Tank Initiative (TTI)

Table of Contents

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this section is to provide general information about the International Development Research Centre (“IDRC”) and this RFP.

1.1 IDRC OVERVIEW

IDRC is a Canadian Crown Corporation established by an act of Parliament in 1970.

IDRC was created to help developing countries find solutions to their problems. It encourages, supports, and conducts research in the world’s developing regions, and seeks to apply new knowledge to the economic and social improvement of those regions. IDRC aims to reduce poverty, improve health, support innovation, and safeguard the environment in developing regions.

IDRC employs about 400 people at its Ottawa, Ontario, Canada head office and at its global regional offices. For more details visit: www.idrc.ca

1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS RFP

IDRC requests proposals for the provision of an independent evaluation team to undertake an evaluation of the second phase of the Think Tank Initiative over 4.5 years. The evaluation will provide periodic, timely and actionable feedback to allow for the adaptive management of the Initiative, as well as providing rigorously documented and validated learning about the program. Requirements are described in section 3, the Statement of Work (“Services”).

1.3 DOCUMENTS FOR THIS RFP

The documents listed below form part of and are incorporated into this RFP:

- This RFP document
- Annex **A** – Results Framework
- Annex **B** – Sample Data Templates
- Annex **C** – Resulting Contract Terms and Conditions

1.4 TARGET DATES FOR THIS RFP

The following schedule summarizes significant target events for the RFP process. The dates may be changed by IDRC at its sole discretion and shall not become conditions of any Contract which may be entered into by IDRC and the selected Proponent.

Event	Dates
RFP issue date	July 31, 2014
Enquiries	August 14, 2014
RFP close date	September 19, 2014
Evaluation, selection, and notification of Lead Proponent	September/October 2014
Finalize Contract with Lead Proponent	November 2014

SECTION 2 – CONDITIONS

The purpose of this section is to inform the Proponent about IDRC's procedures and rules pertaining to the RFP process.

2.1 ENQUIRIES

All matters pertaining to this RFP are to be referred exclusively in to the Contracting Authority named on page 1.

No verbal enquiries or verbal requests for clarifications will be accepted.

Proponents should, as much as feasible, aggregate enquiries and requests for clarifications and shall submit them **in writing via email** to the **Contracting Authority** *by* ***Thursday, August 14, 2014, at 11:00:00 A.M. EDT*** in order to receive a response prior to the close date.

The Contracting Authority will provide simultaneously to all Proponents, all answers to significant enquiries received without revealing the sources of the enquiries.

In the event that it becomes necessary to revise any part of the RFP as a result of any enquiry or for any other reason, **an amendment** to this RFP will be provided.

All notifications will be provided via **the Buy and Sell website**.

2.2 SUBMISSION CLOSE DATE

IDRC will only accept proposals up the close date and time indicated on page 1.

Important note: Late proposals will not be accepted. No adjustments to proposals will be considered after the close date and time.

2.3 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Proposals must be submitted in accordance with the instructions in this section.

2.3.1 Method of Sending

The preferred method of proposal submission is electronic, via **email**, in **Microsoft Word** or in **PDF** format to the Contracting Authority named on page 1. Proponents *email subject line* should cite **"RFP #14150010, Think Tank Initiative External Evaluation**" when submitting via email.

Important Note: Email messages with large attachments can be slowed down in servers between the Proponent's email client and the Contracting Authority's email inbox. It is the Proponent's responsibility to ensure that large emails are sent sufficiently in advance to be at IDRC by the close date and time. Proponents should use electronic receipt confirmation and or contact the Contracting Authority to confirm receipt.

Important Note: The maximum size of an email that IDRC can receive is 10MB.

2.3.2 Number of Copies

Electronic submission should consist of **two (2) files**: one (1) for the technical proposal and one (1) for the financial proposal.

2.4 MULTIPLE PROPOSALS

Proponents interested in submitting more than one proposal may do so, providing that each proposal stands alone and independently complies with the instructions, conditions and specifications of this RFP.

2.5 PROPONENTS COSTS

All costs and expenses incurred by a Proponent in any way related to the Proponent's response to the RFP, including but not limited to any clarifications, interviews, presentations, subsequent proposals, review, selection or delays related thereto or occurring during the RFP process, are the sole responsibility of the Proponent and will not be chargeable in any way to IDRC.

2.6 GOVERNING LAWS

This RFP is issued pursuant to the laws of the province of Ontario and the laws of Canada.

2.7 CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND INDEPENDENCE

In submitting a Proposal, the Proponent must avoid any real, apparent or potential conflict of interest and will declare to IDRC any such conflict of interest.

To ensure the independence of the evaluation of Phase 2 of the Think Tank Initiative Program, Proponents must not have had any grant funding from the Program, and must not be in negotiation for future grant funding or service contracts with the Program.

In the event that any real, apparent, or potential conflict of interest cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of IDRC, IDRC will have the right to immediately reject the Proponent from consideration and, if applicable, terminate any Contract entered into pursuant to this RFP.

2.8 RIGHTS OF IDRC

Any Proposal submitted will not result in or constitute a binding agreement. It will only form the basis of negotiations, which if satisfactory to the parties, shall result in a contract.

Without limiting any other rights reserved by IDRC in this RFP, IDRC reserves the right in its sole discretion to:

a. cancel the RFP at any time, without award, and without any liability to any Proponent. Thereafter, IDRC may issue a new RFP, or take no action whatsoever;

b. reject a Proposal that fails in any respect to comply with the requirements of this RFP;

c. during the evaluation of Proposals, seek clarification or verify any or all information provided by any Proponent, either in person, or by telephone or electronic communication, including contacting the Proponent, or the named reference contacts and the proposed resources and sub-contractors;

d. reject a Proposal from a Proponent against whom Canadian Government economic sanctions have been imposed;

e. reject a Proposal from a Proponent prohibited from receiving any benefits pursuant to Canada's Anti-Terrorism Act 2001, c.41 ("ATA"), including the provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46 ("Code") brought into effect by the ATA, namely Part II.1 of the Code;

f. enter into negotiations with the selected Proponent or Proponents on any or all aspects of their Proposals or the resulting Contract;

g. accept any or all Proposals, in whole or in part, not necessarily accepting the lowest Proposal.

h. enter into negotiations with Proponents tied for the highest number of total points and award only one Contract; and

i. award one or more Contracts for any part of the Services.

2.9 RESULTING CONTRACT

In the event of satisfactory contract negotiations, the contract ("Contract") resulting from this RFP will be prepared by IDRC and will include IDRC's standard Terms and Conditions as provided at Annex **C**.

SECTION 3 – STATEMENT OF WORK

This section is intended to provide Proponents with the information necessary to develop a competitive proposal. The Statement of Work is a complete description of the tasks to be done, results to be achieved, and/or the goods to be supplied.

3.1 Background

The Think Tank Initiative (TTI or the Initiative) is a major collaborative program funded jointly by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad). Envisioned as a long-term investment, with a ten-year time horizon, TTI has completed its first 5-year phase and is about to embark on its second phase of programming ending March 2019. The overall Phase 1 budget was 113 million Canadian dollars (CAD) and Phase 2 funding is expected to be at a similar level. The Initiative is implemented by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

The Initiative was conceptualized based on the understanding that public policies work best when they are designed and implemented by local actors. Without locally generated information and analysis, public policies often do not respond to realities on the ground. However, developing country policy research institutes often do not receive the type of long-term, flexible funding they need to recruit talent, develop a strong research agenda, and plan for the future. Consequently, most policy research institutes engage in responsive research rather than proactively setting a research agenda that is aligned to locally determined needs and priorities.

The purpose of the TTI in Phase 2 is to continue to strengthen a select group of independent policy research organizations or "think tanks" in developing countries to provide objective, high-quality research that both informs and influences social and economic policies that contribute to the development of more equitable and prosperous societies. The Initiative's theory of change is based on the conviction that providing policy research organizations the financial and technical support they need to improve research quality and organizational performance will, in turn, enable them to play a more effective role in policy debates, providing policymakers and others the objective evidence needed to develop and implement sound social and economic policies. The Think Tank Initiative is a complex global program that aims to strengthen a diverse group of think tanks by providing a combination of long-term financial support and ongoing technical assistance. Approximately 60% of Phase 2 budget will be allocated to core financial support to selected institutions. It is expected that this support will help consolidate these institutions' roles as credible development actors in their countries.

Following a rigorous and competitive assessment and selection process which was open to policy research organizations that received TTI funding in Phase 1, 43 grantee institutions have now been selected in Africa (18), Latin America (11) and South Asia (14) to participate in Phase 2 (October 2014 – March 2019).

In June 2013, an evaluation of TTI Phase 1 was completed; the scope of the evaluation included a review of the program concept and design, program implementation, and progress on the achievement of intermediate outcomes and impact, and provided suggestions for improving the design of TTI's second phase. For more details on evaluation findings and recommendations, please read the full report or the TTI summary blog.

To learn more about the Think Tank Initiative, interested proponents may visit the official website of the Initiative at www.thinktankinitiative.org

3.2 Evaluation Scope, Purpose and Objectives

The TTI's overall evaluation approach for Phase 2 balances both accountability and learning purposes. Identification of lessons learned during program implementation will provide intermittent feedback to inform management of and decision-making for the program.

In line with TTI's theory of change, and guided by its Results Framework[1] the overall aim of the evaluation is to investigate the relationship between provision of TTI support and strengthening of think tanks, as well as the relationship between strong think tanks and changes in social and economic policy.

The key objectives of the evaluation are to:

1) **Measure / Describe Change:** in terms of outcomes and impact of the Think Tank Initiative where evidence exists. The evaluation will focus on the following key areas: 1) contributions of TTI to the progress individual grantees are making against their own baselines; 2) comparative analysis of individual grantees against the average profile of their cohort by size, maturity, mission, research focus, country / region or other criteria that are critical ingredients for success; and 3) initiative or program level outcomes and impact.

2) **Assess Implementation:** process tracking will generate insights and findings that are practical and useful for the ongoing development of the Think Tank Initiative. The insights and findings of the evaluation will complement and extend beyond the tracking of progress achieved through the program's own monitoring system and will enable TTI to make concrete improvements to the program at particular moments during the implementation of this phase of the program.

3) **Generate Learning:** as a source of public learning, to be shared with a wide range of policy research organizations and interested stakeholders, on strategies for building and managing successful and sustainable think tanks.

Spanning a period of 4.5 years, it is expected that this evaluation will provide independent, periodic, timely and actionable feedback to allow for the adaptive management of TTI, as well as providing rigorously documented and validated learning about the program. The evaluation will therefore combine formative and summative approaches. Interim findings and evaluation outputs are meant to be positioned in such a way as to feed into organizational learning activities linked to key TTI events and decision moments. Since the evaluation of an initiative of this nature calls for the thoughtful application of multiple approaches and methodologies, the evaluation team will be expected to use diverse evaluation and learning tools including real-time feedback from rapid learning cycles, and long range evaluation studies for both accountability and high level learning.

[1] See Annex A: TTI Phase 2 Results Framework

Intended Evaluation Users

The primary users of this evaluation include:

- The TTI Program (TTI)
- TTI-funded grantee institutions as learning partners
- Members of the TTI Executive Committee

Other audiences include:

- Other non TTI-funded policy research institutions
- Members of the international donor community
- Other development actors with an interest in the supply of policy-relevant research

Key Evaluation Questions

Drawing on the three evaluation objectives, this evaluation includes four key questions:

Q.1: In what ways does TTI support lead or fail to lead, to stronger and more sustainable think tanks?
Q.2: Where evidence exists that TTI support contributes to the strengthening and improved sustainability of think tanks, how has this been achieved? Where evidence exists that TTI support has failed to contribute to the strengthening and improved sustainability of think tanks, what are the reasons?
Q.3: To what extent do stronger and more sustainable think tanks lead to changes in policy and practice?
Q.4: Where evidence exists that strong, sustainable think tanks lead to changes in policy and practice, how has this been achieved? If evidence does not exist that strong, sustainable think tanks lead to changes in policy and practice, what are the reasons?

Where possible, and following the TTI's Results Framework (Annex A), evaluation questions should clearly address the three pillars of the TTI program: Research Quality, Organizational Performance and Policy Engagement, and be linked to the TTI Program modalities[2] including: core funding, TTI Program Officer advisory support, Matching Funds, Exchanges and Learning events and workshops.

The following table provides more detail on the four key evaluation questions by indicating how the questions map to the evaluation objectives and provides potential sub-questions to be examined as well as potential methods and data sources. We invite Proponents to reflect on these illustrative questions and propose creative / innovative approaches to address what we recognize are challenging questions.

Over the course of Phase 2, TTI will deliberately be varying program modalities and approaches to learning with different sub-sets of the TTI cohort. The intent is to learn what interventions work best, with what types of think tanks, under what conditions.

[2] The modalities shown in the table indicate a selection of those used by TTI; the evaluators may identify and add others as appropriate

Key Evaluation Questions	Objective	Illustrative Sub-Questions	Potential Methods and Sources
Q1: In what ways does TTI support lead, or fail to lead, to stronger and more sustainable think tanks (TTs)?	Measuring / Describing Progress What has changed?	1. How much change can be observed in TTI-grantees in: research quality, organizational performance (specifically financial sustainability) and policy engagement in comparison to the TTI Phase 2, year 1 baseline?[3] 2. How much change can be observed in TTI-grantees in: recruitment of female researchers, and research focusing on gender issues?	Monitoring Questionnaire / Annual Technical Reports / Project Monitoring Reports/TTI Program Officers trip reports
Q2: Where evidence exists that TTI support contributes to the strengthening and sustainability of think tanks (TTs), how has this been achieved? Where evidence exists that TTI support has failed to contribute to the strengthening and	Implementation How has change happened?	1. How useful and relevant have each of the TTI program modalities been to improvement in TT performance under the three TTI pillars, and how could these be enhanced? 2. How effective are the design and implementation of each TTI modality in supporting the improvement of performance under each of the three TTI pillars and what improvements might be suggested? 3. How effective was each modality in relation to the TT performance under each of the three TTI pillars?	See sampling approach in methodology section Multiple case studies Approaches for assessing research impact
	Learning What has been learned?	4. What lessons are emerging from the mechanisms used (narratives, causal maps etc.) to track the performance of each modality under the three TTI pillars? 5. In what ways does TTI core funding support the strengthening of TTs (or not), and how do these compare with other funding mechanisms? 6. In what ways has TTI supported grantees (or not) to overcome	Monitoring Questionnaire / Annual Technical Reports Informant interviews, grantee surveys TTI- grantees vs. non-grantees

[3] Evaluators will build on TTI's Phase 1 external evaluation.

Key Evaluation Questions	Objective	Illustrative Sub-Questions	Potential Methods and Sources
improved sustainability of think tanks, what are the reasons?		common operational / contextual challenges? 7. In what ways does TTI promote organizational and financial sustainability (or not)? 8. To what extent has TTI shared its learning about strategies for building and managing successful and sustainable TTs with a wide range of interested stakeholders and how could it do this better?	Before TTI / After TTI Multiple case studies Approaches for assessing research impact
Q3: To what extent do stronger and more sustainable think tanks (TTs) lead to changes in policy and practice?	Measuring Progress What has changed? What impacts are observable?	1. Of the TTI-funded TTs sampled, what proportion of their work achieved the level of change sought by the think tank? 2. Based on the Stories of Influence (SOI) reported by each TT, what patterns do we see in how TT influence is achieved? For example: Do TTs in general seem best positioned to improve existing policy, set new policy direction (including in relation to gender issues) or critic bad policy ideas?	Random or purposeful sampling[4] Annual Stories of Influence reported in Annual Technical Reports, longitudinal study on Stories of Influence over Phase 2. Multiple case studies Approaches for assessing research impact Validate findings with external stakeholders
Q4: Where evidence exists that strong, sustainable think tanks (TTs) lead to changes in policy and practice, how has this been achieved? If evidence does not	Learning What has been learned? What impacts are observable?	1. In what ways and through which mechanisms do TTs improve opportunities to more effectively and efficiently achieve anticipated change? 2. Based on the analysis from Q3.1 on TT successes, what key TT characteristics (leadership transition, maturity, size etc.) proved to be significant for	Monitoring Questionnaire / Annual Technical Reports / Project Monitoring

[4] See proposed sampling framework below

Key Evaluation Questions	Objective	Illustrative Sub-Questions	Potential Methods and Sources
exist that strong, sustainable think tanks lead to changes in policy and practice, what are the reasons?		achieving the targeted / expected change, and which characteristics seem not to be significant? 3. What are the relationships between identified key TT characteristics and successes in policy engagement? 4. What are the common operational and contextual challenges that TTs encounter and what mechanisms (including through use of TTI support) have they used to overcome challenges?	Reports/trip reports Multiple case studies Approaches for assessing research impact Validate findings with external stakeholders

3.3 Methodology

The mixed methods and assessment frameworks employed for this evaluation should facilitate the collection and analysis of data that addresses each of the three evaluation objectives, while ensuring rigour and making optimal use of existing data.

We invite Proponents to propose modified approaches that, in their view, would yield more timely, relevant and / or accurate findings. The following is a starting point for the design by objective:

Measuring / Describing Progress: The evaluators will provide interim findings on progress and will undertake long range evaluation studies for accountability. This will include:

- analysing monitoring data to explore trends and patterns amongst different groups of grantee institutions (based on sampling framework);
- reviewing and analyzing stories of influence and other evidence relating to policy influence
- reviewing and analyzing financial and human resource patterns relating to organizational sustainability amongst groups of grantee institutions;
- analyzing results of peer review and policy community surveys as they relate to instituted quality assurance processes for research ethics and scientific quality, external peer review of publications, policy actors opinions of quality of research and number of think tank publications by type;
- analyzing the policy community survey to assess perceptions of peers, practitioners and other policy actors of think tanks' abilities to inform and influence policy; and
- reviewing documented efforts to promote research uptake and types and extent of dissemination of research findings.

Implementation: The evaluators will provide feedback on the implementation of the TTI by:

- reviewing the TTI Phase 2 Results Framework, including indicators and targets, and also the full set of TTI monitoring tools to ensure alignment with and support of evaluation priorities;

- suggesting, as needed, adjustments to the TTI Results Framework[5], and to monitoring mechanisms and processes, in order to harmonize the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) approaches as much as possible;
- analyzing TTI monitoring data (annual technical reports, TTI Program Officer trip reports and monitoring questionnaires) to address evaluation objectives and answer evaluation questions; and
- facilitating periodic workshops with TTI Program team after each interim evaluation report to provide feedback and recommendation to strengthen/improve overall program implementation.

Throughout the evaluation, the evaluators will capture feedback on program implementation from TTI-funded grantee institutions, in particular the usefulness of TTI monitoring tools. This will include suggesting improvements for TTI monitoring tools, methods, and also recommendations for ongoing improvement to program implementation.

Learning: The evaluators will facilitate and position TTI high level learning by:

- reviewing TTI publications and communications for the wider public, and providing feedback for improvement;
- analyzing website, newsletter and twitter analytics to explore trends and patterns in visitors, downloads, referrals;
- exploring perceptions of TTI knowledge contributions amongst key stakeholders and identifying ways to improve program outreach; and
- analyzing participant feedback from TTI Exchange 2015, 2018 as well as annual TTI public engagement activities.

Sampling Framework

While it is expected that the evaluation will undertake universal coverage of think tanks based on TTI's M&E data, the purpose of a sampling framework is to guide selection of think tanks for deeper-dive look at performance. Although sampling should not be driven by regional considerations, the Proponent's submission should also ensure that the samples chosen for each aspect of the methodology reflect the regional variation within the overall TTI cohort. The evaluation should also consider possible comparisons to non-TTI funded institutions as appropriate. The following observable institutional characteristics are indicative of the types of samples that we would expect to see in the evaluation sampling strategy:

- Size
- Maturity
- Mission
- Evolution (i.e.: government affiliation)
- Research focus
- Leadership
- Total institutional budget in relation to TTI grant
- Country / region or other criteria that are critical ingredients for success

[5] As the TTI Results Framework forms the basis for the agreement amongst the TTI donor partnership, any changes would require approval by the Executive Committee

Data Sources: Evaluators will leverage available data sources[6] where possible in order to avoid creating additional burden for TTI-funded institutions. Supplemental data will be collected on an as-needed basis through key stakeholder interviews, surveys and site visits, based on the agreed-upon evaluation design.

Examples of existing data include:

- Monitoring questionnaires
- Annual technical reports
- Institutional visit reports
- Capacity development reports

3.4 Evaluation Governance, Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluation is being commissioned and managed by IDRC, and the evaluation team will have a single point of contact at IDRC with whom to interact on all evaluation-related matters. IDRC is managing the evaluation in collaboration with an Evaluation Steering Group composed of members of the TTI Executive Committee (EC). The EC is made up of representatives from each of the five (5) TTI funding agencies: William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad), and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). Each of the five (5) TTI EC members will delegate one representative to the Evaluation Steering Group, which will have a nominated coordinator. Steering Group representatives will coordinate evaluation inputs from their respective organizations. The Evaluation Steering Group will be responsible for:

- reviewing and approving workplans;
- participating in annual evaluation planning meetings;
- commenting on and approving evaluation deliverables as laid out below in section 3.6 including: interim and final reports, presentations and thought piece series; and
- keeping the TTI EC appraised of development and progress taking place in the TTI Evaluation.

3.5. Evaluation Ethics and Standards

Evaluators will ensure that appropriate ethical standards and guidelines have been developed and observed in the implementation of the evaluation. Quality will be assessed on the extent to which the evaluation demonstrates that it has fulfilled its purpose using four internationally recognized standards: utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy. IDRC's Policy, Strategy and Evaluation Division will provide an ongoing appraisal of the maintenance of ethical standards throughout the evaluation process.

[6] See Annex B for sample data templates from TTI Phase 1. These are illustrative as they are being updated for TTI Phase 2.

3.6 Timeline and Deliverables

Milestone	**Deliverables**	**Timing**	**Evaluation Steering Group Decision Point**
Inception Phase	Review TTI Results Framework and monitoring tools; final methodology including sample framework	October – December 2014	Requires approval
Completion of detailed evaluation design for first 18 months: Jan. 1st, 2015 to July 1st, 2016	Proposed workplan, budget, timeline, team composition	January 1, 2015	Requires approval
Reporting against the Results Framework	1st Interim Report Measuring progress, feedback on program implementation, learning	April 1, 2016	Requires approval
Workshop with TTI team	Share interim findings with TTI staff to enable corrective action and implementation of recommendations.	April / May 2016	
Planning for next 18 months: July 1, 2016 – December 2017.	Proposed workplan, budget, timeline, team composition	May 15, 2016	Requires approval
Reporting against the Results Framework progress	2nd Interim Report: Measuring progress, feedback on program implementation, learning.	October 1, 2017	Requires approval
Workshop with TTI team	Share interim findings with TTI staff to enable corrective action and implementation of recommendations.	October / November 2017	
Planning for next 18 months: January 1, 2018 – March 30, 2019.	Proposal workplan, budget, timeline, and team composition.	November 15, 2017	Requires approval
Reporting against the Results Framework progress	3rd Interim Report: Progress, feedback on program implementation, learning.	March 1, 2019	Required Approval
End of Evaluation	Comprehensive final report; synthesized presentation on key findings; series of 5 blogs	June 30, 2019	Required Approval

	on various dimensions of learning		
Workshop with Executive Committee	synthesized presentation on key findings	July 2019	

3.7 Duration of a Resulting Contract

The resulting contract is expected to be for a period of approximately 4.5 years (October 2014 to June 30, 2019). It is *estimated* that the time required for this evaluation approach would be between 600 – 800 days, with 25% of overall days allotted to the lead evaluator.

3.8 Location of Work and Travel

Work is expected to take place primarily at the Proponent's site.

In coordination with IDRC's **Project Authority**, travel will be required for:

- Visits to grantees (up to four grantee visits per period);
- Visits to events where grantees are meeting to facilitate interaction with evaluators (e.g. TTI Learning Forum, 2015; 2018);
- Visits to Regional Offices to meet program staff; and
- Visits to Ottawa (HQ): initial visit by evaluation team, plus one visit by evaluation lead per interim report for reporting purposes, plus one additional final visit for full team at time of draft final report.

SECTION 4 – PROPOSAL EVALUATION

This section describes the process that IDRC's selection committee, which may include representatives of one or more TTI funding agencies, will use to evaluate Proposals.

4.1 PROPOSAL EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The following methodology will be used to evaluate Proposals:

4.1.1 Mandatory Requirements

Each Proposal will be examined to determine compliance with all Mandatory Requirements (M) as laid out in section 6 of the RFP. Non-compliant Proposals will receive no further consideration.

4.1.2. Rated Requirements

Compliant Proposals will be evaluated based on the Rated Requirements (R) as laid out in section 6 of the RFP.

4.1.3. Financial Scoring

Financial Proposals will be evaluated as follows: the lowest compliant Financial Proposal will be assigned a percentage of the total possible points arrived at by dividing that Proponent's total price by the lowest submitted total price. For example, if the lowest total price is $120.00, that Proponent receives 100% of the possible points (120/120 = 100%), a Proponent who submits $150.00 receives 80% of the possible points (120/150 = 80%), and a Proponent who submits $240.00 receives 50% of the possible points (120/240 = 50%).

4.1.4. Final Score

Total points will be calculated and IDRC may select the Lead Proposal or Proposals achieving the highest total points, subject to IDRC's reserved rights.

4.2 EVALUATION TABLE

IDRC will score Proponent's proposals based on the following, where a detailed breakdown of the technical and financial proposal evaluation criteria is provided in section **6 and 7:**

Section	Description	Score
6	Technical proposal	70
7	Financial proposal	30
	Total Score	**100**

4.3 PROPONENT FINANCIAL CAPACITY

IDRC reserves the right to conduct an assessment of the Lead Proponent's financial capacity. IDRC may request that the Lead Proponent provide proof of financial stability via bank references, financial statements, or other similar evidence. The Lead Proponent must provide this information upon 72 hours of IDRC's request. Failure to comply may result in disqualification.

4.4 PROPONENT SELECTION

As noted in section **2.9**, acceptance of a proposal does not oblige IDRC to incorporate any or all of the accepted proposal into a contractual agreement, but rather demonstrates a willingness on the part of IDRC to enter into negotiations for the purpose of arriving at a satisfactory contractual arrangement with one or more parties.

Without changing the intent of this RFP or the Lead Proponent's proposal, IDRC will enter into discussions with the Lead Proponent for the purpose of finalizing the Contract. In the event no satisfactory contract can be negotiated between the Lead Proponent and IDRC, IDRC may terminate negotiations. In such event, if IDRC feels that the Proponent with the second highest score may meet the requirements, IDRC will continue the process with the secondary Proponent, and so on.

Announcement of the successful Proponent will be made to all Proponents following the signing of a Contract.

SECTION 5 – PROPOSAL FORMAT

Proposal responses should be organized and submitted in accordance with the instructions in this section.

5.1 GENERAL

Proposals should be max. 25 pages, excluding annexes (8 1/2" x 11" format) with each page numbered. Elaborate or unnecessary voluminous proposals are not desired.

5.2 OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Proposals may be submitted in English or French.

5.3 ORGANIZATION OF RESPONSES

Responses should be organized in the following format, where the sections that follow provide more details:

File	Section	Contents
1.0	5.3.1	Cover Letter
	5.3.2	Table of Contents
	6	Technical Proposal
2.0	7	Financial Proposal

5.3.1 COVER LETTER

A one (1) page covering letter on the Proponent's letterhead should be submitted and should include the following:
a. A reference to the RFP number and RFP title.
b. The primary contact person with respect to this RFP: the individual's name, address, phone number and email address.
c. The letter **signed** by person(s) duly authorized to sign on behalf of the Proponent and bind the Proponent to statements made in response to the RFP.

5.3.2 TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Proponent should include a table of contents that contains pages numbers for easy reference by the evaluation committee.

SECTION 6 – EVALUATION CRITERIA (TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS)

In their Technical Proposal, Proponents must explain and demonstrate how they propose to meet the Statement of Work requirements and clearly outline the work that the Proponent proposes to undertake for the provision of the Services to IDRC.

Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the following Mandatory (M) and Rated (R) requirements. Proposals failing to meet Mandatory Requirements will be considered non-compliant and excluded from further consideration.

A	Company Profile and Experience	Mandatory(M)/ Rated (R)	Total Points 15
1	**Executive Summary** The Proponent shall include a **short executive summary** highlighting the following: **a**. a description of the company outlining: • the Proponent's business and specializations • the location of its head office and other offices (specify city and province only) • the total number of years the Proponent has been in business • the number of full-time employees • details of any sub-contracting arrangements to be proposed **b.** a brief summary of what makes the Proponent's organization stand out from its competitors	M	n/a
2	Statement of Independence from the Think Tank Initiative (TTI) program under review - refer to section 2.7.	M	n/a
3	The Proponent must have completed a minimum of seven (7) consecutive years of similar services	M	n/a
a)	**Similar Services- *Demonstrate*** In order to demonstrate that the Proponent has **completed seven (7) consecutive years of similar services**, the Proponent's response must include **three (3) examples** of similar services. Specifically these examples should demonstrate experience in: • Management and coordination of complex, ***global initiatives*** (in developing countries) involving diverse stakeholders such as multiple funders, grantees and intermediaries. • Collaboration with program stakeholders on complex, large scale, multi-site ***evaluations***. • Feedback capture and monitoring methodology • Improvement to program implementation • Facilitating and positioning high-level feedback Each example should include with the following details: **a.** name and address (city and province only) of the client; **b.** services period, e.g. start and end dates;	R	15

A	Company Profile and Experience	Mandatory(M)/ Rated (R)	Total Points 15
	c. description of sub-contracting and/or resources team and the extent of previous collaboration with proposed sub-contractors and resources; and **d.** brief description of services provided by the Proponent.		
4	The Proponent must provide a sample evaluation report.	M	n/a

B	Personnel Profile and Experience	Mandatory(M)/ Rated (R)	Total Points 20
1	**All Proposed Resources** The Proponent shall outline the proposed lead resource and all other proposed resources to be used in providing the services (including any subcontracting relationships that are required) and include: **a.** name, title, telephone #, email address, location (city and province/state only); and **b.** their roles , structure and reporting relationships.	M	n/a
2	**All Proposed Resources Experience - *Bio*** The Proponent's response should demonstrate the quality and level of expertise of its proposed team by providing the following: a one to maximum two page up-to-date bio of each proposed resource that includes relevant work experience, education, and all relative professional designations and certifications. The following should be represented within the team : • Extensive knowledge of research program evaluation design and methods • Strong knowledge and experience with institution strengthening and organizational development • Strong qualitative and quantitative research skills • Good knowledge and understanding of research influence pathways and how research can best contribute to policy and practice • Strong analysis, report writing and communication skills • Knowledge management and communications expertise including familiarity with assessing quality of online communications materials • Gender inclusivity	R	20
3	**Language of Work** Proponents must have English, French and Spanish Language proficiency within the team	M	n/a

C	Methodology / Approach / Schedule	Mandatory(M)/ Rated (R)	Total Points 35
1	The proponent must be available to complete the services within the Statement of Work by June 30, 2019.	M	n/a
2	The Proponent must **demonstrate its Evaluation Approach** to successfully deliver the requirements detailed Section 3 - Statement of Work.	M	n/a
a)	Demonstrate an understanding IDRC, TTI, and the *objectives* and requirements in Section **3** - Statement of Work;	R	5
b)	*Methodology* - how the Proponent will go about conducting the evaluation – include: • achievement of the evaluation objectives; • ethical standards and guidelines; • details of its sample framework; • data collection, sampling, and analysis; • a detailed timeline (including proposed travel); • timeliness, relevance and accuracy of findings; • monitoring mechanisms and processes; and • roles and responsibilities chart.	R	25
c)	*Project Risk Management Plan* **-** Describe any contingencies that may hinder the progress or outcome of the project and suggest how you would mitigate them.	R	5

SECTION 7 - FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

The Proponent must submit a Financial Proposal including a cost summary of the Services as follows:

Mandatory Requirements	Total Points 30
a. The Proponent must state the assumptions underlying its financial proposal.	
b. All prices are to be quoted in Canadian dollars (CAD) and taxes (i.e. 13% HST) are to be provided as a separate item. If taxes are not to be charged, provide an explanation as such.	
c. All prices must include a detailed breakdown following the response to section **3** (Statement of Work), as outlined in section **6. C** (Methodology / Approach / Schedule). Each requirement should outline the timeline being proposed with daily rates provided per resource. Prices shall include all components normally included in providing the proposed services such as professional fees, disbursements, engagement support expenses, etc.	

Travel expenses must **NOT** be included in price estimates as IDRC will provide standard per-diem rates, and will procure all air tickets directly through its designated travel agency. IDRC will not be billed for travel time to and from any work site, for any purpose. Cost of such time will be the sole responsibility of the selected proponent.
d. The Proponent shall propose an invoicing schedule. *Important Note:* IDRC's payment terms are NET 30, and IDRC will not make advances on fees.