

**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) :**

**DELETE** and **REPLACE** paragraph 9.8b) in Section 1: *Instruction to Bidders - Data Sheet* with the following:

<b>9.8 (b)</b>	The estimated number of person-days for the team to complete the mandate is 100 days.
----------------	---

**B. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

<b>Question 1</b>	<p>I read with interest the announcement of the Formative Evaluation of the partnership between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Red Cross Society and have been in contact in the last week with a colleague.</p> <p>We are exploring options on tendering for this consultancy but face some practical constraints. My colleague is presently based in Europe working and I myself am working on a short-term consultancy in Asia. We thus would have practical difficulties in submitting hard copies of the technical and financial proposals in accordance with the deadline of 12th April. In these circumstances, would electronic copies be an acceptable alternative or are there other ways forward that you could suggest?</p> <p>Thanking you in advance for your advice.</p>
<b>Answer 1</b>	Unfortunately, as indicated in Section I: <i>Instructions to Bidders</i> , article 7 – <i>Submission and Receipt of Proposals</i> , DFATD cannot accept electronic copies of proposals.
<b>Question 2</b>	To what extent should the estimated number of person-days (Data sheet, 9.8) be seen as a limit to the offered number of person-days: Would an offer that substantially exceeds a total of 100 person-days have a negative effect on the assessment of the tender?
<b>Answer 2</b>	The estimated number of person-days determined in the Data sheet, art.9.8 is based on the scope of the mandate. It is an estimate. Bidders can proposed a different number of person-days, but it should be relatively similar to the one estimated by DFATD.
<b>Question 3</b>	We would like to seek clarification with regards to the estimated number of 100 days to complete the contract outlined in paragraph 9.8 and the data sheet. In particular, please could you confirm whether a proposal with a higher number of estimated days would be penalised, provided that the tenderer's financial proposal remains within the budget ceiling.
<b>Answer 3</b>	Please refer to answer 2.
<b>Question 4</b>	Related to the above question, provided that it is acceptable to exceed the estimated number of 100 days to complete the assignment, please could you confirm whether a proposal that includes more than 50 person-days for data collection activities would be penalised, provided that the rationale for doing this was justified in the tenderer's methodology and approach.

<b>Answer 4</b>	The methodology and approach will be evaluated according to the published evaluation grid in Section 5. As per Answer 2, it is up to the bidder to determine the best methodology and approach possible including the number of person-days.
<b>Question 5</b>	<p>Would the following situation be considered as a conflict of interest? :</p> <p>The consultant is a Canadian Red Cross (CRC) volunteer, and had a part-time casual employee contract with them last year (to conduct an evaluation of their domestic Syria refugee response).The consultant is also just starting a brief assignment with the domestic disaster management program of the CRC on a consulting contract to evaluate some aspects of the Alberta Wildfires Response.</p> <p>However, the person had no dealings with/anything to do with the GAC project and no dealings with the International Operations of the Canadian Red Cross (which operates somewhat separately). The consultant only worked with the domestic disaster management program.</p>
<b>Answer 5</b>	<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 as per TECH-2 Article 5. Conflict of Interest-Unfair Advantage.</p> <p>Potential situations of conflict of interest will be assessed on a case by case basis at the proposal evaluation stage.</p>
<b>Question 6</b>	<p>In regards to SEL 2017-D-000396-1, the RFP is in effect asking for two evaluations, one for Pillar I and one for Pillar II. The country missions seems completely aligned to Pillar II given it is active in 9 countries. Given the 50 day limit on data collection, and given that visiting 10 countries would consume at a minimum 26 days of level of effort (or approximately 36 calendar days), then it appears the country mission are the only data collection methodology permitted for Pillar II, or else there is a difference between the two pillars in terms of Level of Effort for data collection and therefore reporting. But with Pillar I representing the majority of funding that does not necessarily make sense. The question is, is there an overlap between Pillar I and Pillar II countries thereby ensuring data collection on country missions serves both evaluations? If not, is there some other rationale for what would be an apparent biased allocation of time and LoE for Pillar II?</p>
<b>Answer 6</b>	<p>As indicated in the Request for Proposal (RFP), the evaluation will be comprised of individual evaluations for each project in the Pillars, and an assessment of the contributions of each project to the Pillars' objectives. The focus of the data collection Level of Effort of 50 days is for country missions to evaluate the projects in Pillar II - building strong national societies' projects.</p>

**C. ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.**