

Addendum 1

SEL.: 2015-CC77620-META-EVAL-01

RFP Title: Meta-Evaluation of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development's Decentralized Evaluations

A. AMENDMENT TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

1. Amendment 1 to the RFP

In Section 1 *Instruction to Bidders*, page 6, Article 7 *Submission and Receipt of Proposals*, **REPLACE** Article 7.1 **WITH** the following article:

7.1 Proposals must be delivered by mail, courier or by hand to the following address:

Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada
Distribution and Mail Services – AAG
Lester B. Pearson Building
125 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0G2
CANADA

Attention: Bid Receiving Unit – SGD

2. Amendment 2 to the RFP

In Section 2 *Technical Proposal – Standard Forms*, page 22, **REPLACE** Item no. 4 **WITH** the following Item no. 4:

The Proposal is submitted by mail, courier or by hand to the following address:

Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada
Distribution and Mail Services - AAG
Lester B. Pearson Building
125 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0G2
CANADA

Attention: Bid Receiving Unit – SGD

3. Amendment 3 to the RFP – applies to the French version only

In Section 2 *Technical Proposal – Standard Forms*, page 30, **REPLACE** the title of the Form **WITH** the following title:

FORMULAIRE TECH-2
Attestations

B. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Question 1 | <p>We are interested in submitting a proposal for the 'Meta-Evaluation of the Decentralized Evaluations', ref 2015-CC77620-META-EVAL-1, and would like to seek clarification with regards to potential conflicts of interest.</p> <p>We noted clause (b) under the conflict of interest section of the terms of reference which states: "if the Bidder, any of its proposed Sub-consultants, any of its proposed Contractors including any of their respective employees or former employees conducted any international development intervention evaluation managed by DFATD or the former Canadian International Development Agency* between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2014 and/or was involved in any other situation of conflict of interest or appearance of conflict of interest."</p> |
|-------------------|--|



Addendum 1

SEL.: 2015-CC77620-META-EVAL-01

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| | <p>We wanted to explore whether this clause applies to all people who have been contracted by CIDA and DFATD. We would be particularly interested in identifying whether people with the following experience represent a conflict of interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was contracted by an organisation which had members of staffs who had conducted an evaluation managed by CIDA and DFATD within the scope of the evaluation (2009 to 2014). • Conducted training or provided technical assistance to CIDA and/or DFATD as an independent consultant between 2009 and 2014 • Played a QA role in an evaluation managed by DFATD or CIDA between 2009 and 2014 • Conducted an evaluation managed by DFATD or CIDA but not within the scope of the evaluation (2009 to 2014) |
| Answer 1 | <p>As indicated in Article 4 – <i>Conflict of Interest – Unfair Advantage</i>, where it is stipulated that DFATD may reject a proposal if DFATD determines that there is a conflict of interest, there may be a risk of conflict of interest real or perceived if the bidder, key personnel proposed by the bidder has been involved in an international development evaluation managed by DFATD or the former Canadian International Development Agency between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2014.</p> <p>Potential situations of conflict of interest will be assessed on a case by case basis at the proposal evaluation stage.</p> <p>Subject to any other information that could be considered at the proposal evaluation stage, a person who may have been involved outside the period covered by the proposed international development evaluation (from 2009 to 2014) should not be in a conflict of interest situation.</p> <p>A real or perceived conflict of interest risk exists if a former employee or sub-consultant has been involved in an international development evaluation of the MAECD from 2009 to 2014.</p> |
| Question 2 | <p>We would also like to seek clarification with regards the 585 estimated number of days to complete the contract outlined in paragraph 9.8 and the data sheet. In particular, are you able to advise whether a proposal with a reduced number of estimated days would be penalised?</p> |
| Answer 2 | <p>The estimated level of effort is indicated as a guideline for the bidder. The estimated number of days will be analysed in reference to the proposed methodology.</p> |
| Question 3 | <p>Regarding this RFP, we have two questions:</p> <p>In paragraph (b) of Clause 4 (Conflict of Interest) on Form Tech -2, it specifies that the bidder cannot have undertaken "any international development intervention evaluation managed by DFATD or the former Canadian International Development Agency* between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2014." This seems to imply that those suppliers who have conducted corporate evaluations for DFATD/CIDA are also excluded, yet the focus of the meta evaluation is on decentralized evaluations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Can you confirm if those suppliers who have conducted corporate evaluations are also excluded? (ii) Other agencies conducting this kind of meta-evaluation have simply excluded those evaluation reports carried out by the service provider OR have asked other agencies to carry out the quality review on those reports. Has this option been considered by DFATD? |

Addendum 1

SEL.: 2015-CC77620-META-EVAL-01

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Answer 3 | <p>(i) Insofar as international development project evaluations are part of the corporate evaluation, there is a risk of conflict of interest.</p> <p>Potential conflict of interest situations will be assessed on a case by case basis at the proposal evaluation stage.</p> <p>(ii) The approach currently favoured by the DFATD is considered to be the most effective operationally and it allows optimal independence for the evaluators.</p> |
| Question 4 | <p>We are interested in bidding on this contract but would need clarification on the Conflict of Interest clause and its interpretation before making a decision. Our firm has never been awarded a contract to undertake a development evaluation of any kind that would fit the criteria for this Meta-Evaluation. Similarly, none of our employees have ever worked on any such evaluations. We did in January 2015 however contract an external consultant to assist us in managing our evaluation services unit who has conducted an evaluation that would fit the criteria for this Meta-Evaluation and would be considered in conflict of interest.</p> <p>Question: Would our bid be rejected if our firm has recently engaged external consultant (not as an employee) who is in conflict of interest if the said individual is not included as a proposed resource in the bid.</p> |
| Answer 4 | <p>As indicated in Article 4 – <i>Conflict of Interest – Unfair Advantage</i>, where it is stipulated that DFATD may reject a proposal if DFATD determines that there is a conflict of interest, there may be a risk of conflict of interest real or perceived if the bidder, key personnel proposed by the bidder has been involved in an international development evaluation managed by DFATD or the former Canadian International Development Agency between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2014.</p> <p>Potential situations of conflict of interest will be assessed on a case by case basis at the proposal evaluation stage.</p> |

C. ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.