

Title: Formative Evaluation of the Government of Canada – Canadian Red Cross Society Strategic Partnership to Enhance Humanitarian Assistance

A. AMENDMENTS TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) :

This addendum 2 does not provide any changes to the RFP SEL: 2017-D-000396-1.

B. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1	<p>Would a former employee of the CRCS be considered in conflict of interest in any case?</p> <p>If not, since quitting the CRCS, how many years should pass by before a person is no longer considered in conflict of interest?</p> <p>Would a former employee of the CRCS who was not involved in any part of the programme / projects (including planning and implementation) to be assessed be in conflict of interest?</p>
Answer 1	<p>DFATD cannot respond to specific conflict of interest questions at this stage of the RFP process. It is up to Bidders to determine if they are in a conflict of interest situation.</p> <p>Potential situations of conflict of interest will be assessed on a case by case basis at the proposal evaluation stage.</p>
Question 2	<p>Given that the assignment is expected to last 8 months, why data collection must not exceed 50 calendar days?</p>
Answer 2	<p>The duration of the contract can be a maximum of 8 months; however, the Bidder can choose to complete the mandate in a shorter timeframe.</p>
Question 3	<p>Is it possible to obtain a more detailed breakdown of the evaluation timeframe (e.g. start / end dates of each phase such as inception, data collection, analysis and reporting)?</p>
Answer 3	<p>DFATD anticipates awarding the Contract in June 2017. The estimated number of person-days for the team to complete the mandate is 100 days. It is up to the Bidder to determine the evaluation timeframe, as long as the mandate is completed within 100 days.</p>
Question 4	<p>Is it correct that between 8 and 10 countries, besides Canada, should be visited?</p>
Answer 4	<p>Correct.</p>
Question 5	<p>At page 17 of the RFP point 13.1 (c) you mention the security requirements associated to the RFP. According to the same point at page 21 of the Data Sheet, it's stated that the bidder is not subject to security requirements. Does this point refer to the TECH -5, where it's requested the number of Personal Security Clearance for the proposed experts? Could you, please, confirm the relation between point 13.1(c) and the TECH 5?</p>

Answer 5	Paragraph 13.1 c) specifies ‘If required in the Data Sheet’. The Data Sheet stipulates that no security requirement required for this contract. Bidders can therefore omit the information in form TECH-5.
Question 6	In case there is no relation between point 13.1(c) and the TECH 5, is it compulsory for the personnel to have a Personal Security Clearance Number at the moment of the tender submission? Would it be sufficient to include in the offer the Security Clearance Form (properly filled-in) or a proof that the process to obtain a Security Clearance Number has been initiated?
Answer 6	Security clearance is not compulsory for this tender submission. Bidders can therefore omit the information in form TECH-5.
Question 7	Regarding page 5 of RFP – Point 1.5.4 (d), is it correct to include in our proposal the certificate of judicial records of our company, to prove that our organization has never been convicted according to our national legislation? Would it be enough to prove the absence of foreign and domestic criminal charges? Would it be enough to prove the eligibility of sub-contractors as well?
Answer 7	If article 1.5.4 d) does not apply to the Bidder, the Bidder should provide a completed Integrity Declaration Form declaring that section 2 is not applicable.
Question 8	If we have never been convicted, should we also send to the specified address the Integrity Declaration form and declare that Section 2 is not applicable?
Answer 8	Yes.
Question 9	Section 1, paragraph 9.5 (page 9) mentions “TECH-5 Methodology”, while Section 2 (page 33) Section 1, paragraph 9.5 (page 9) mentions FORM TECH-5 Curriculum Vitae. Can you please clarify?
Answer 9	TECH-5 Methodology is not used in the RFP. Bidders are requested to use the form TECH-5 <i>Curriculum Vitae for Proposed Personnel</i> to answer requirements M1, C1.1 and C1.3.
Question 10	Section 1, paragraph 9.5 (page 9) mentions TECH-4 Bidder’s experience and paragraph 11.11 refers to work experience of the bidder as well. In section 2, FORM TECH-4 refers to Proposed Personnel’s Experience and asks to “provide information on each project where the Bidder and/or a Team Member was carrying out consulting and professional services similar to the ones requested under this RFP”. To our understanding, we shall include in FORM TECH 4 the Bidder’s (i.e. the company) relevant experiences. Can you kindly confirm this is correct?
Answer 10	The form TECH-4 <i>Bidder’s Experience</i> has been replaced with form TECH-4 <i>Proposed Personnel Experience</i> . Bidders should refer to ‘Guidance to Bidders’ information included in the form before completing it.
Question 11	What does DFADT mean with “mandate” in FORM TECH-4 (page 33)? How is mandate distinguished from “intervention”?

Answer 11	For this RFP, Mandate and Evaluation Mandate are the same. A definition is included on page 65 – Section 5 – <i>Evaluation Criteria, 5.1 Definitions.</i>
------------------	---

C. ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.