



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (“RFP”)

RFP #: 18190032	RFP Title: Evaluation on Achieving Results at Scale
Issue Date: Friday, March 15, 2019	Close Date & Time: Tuesday April 23, 2019 at 6:00 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time
RFP Authority Division: Procurement Services <i>Name:</i> Lindsay Empey <i>Title:</i> Procurement Officer <i>Email:</i> fad-ps@idrc.ca 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: -Policy and Evaluation Division

Table of Contents

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 IDRC OVERVIEW	4
1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS RFP	4
1.3 DOCUMENTS FOR THIS RFP.....	4
1.4 TARGET DATES FOR THIS RFP	4
SECTION 2 – STATEMENT OF WORK	5
2.1 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW	5
2.2 BACKGROUND.....	5
2.3 Evaluation Users, Uses and Questions	6
2.4 DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE OF WORK	7
2.5 IDRC RESPONSIBILITES, SUPPORT, AND REPRESENTATIVES	9
2.6 LOCATION OF WORK AND TRAVEL.....	9
2.7 PERIOD OF A RESULTING CONTRACT	9
SECTION 3 – PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT	9
3.1 COMMUNICATION During Assessment Of Proposals	10
3.2 Assessment METHODOLOGY	10
3.3 PROPONENT FINANCIAL CAPACITY	13
3.4 PROPONENT SELECTION.....	13
SECTION 4 – PROPOSAL FORMAT	14
4.1 GENERAL.....	14
4.2 OFFICIAL LANGUAGES	14
4.3 ORGANIZATION OF RESPONSES	14
4.4 COVER LETTER	14
4.5 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	14
4.6 FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	15
SECTION 5 – CONDITIONS	17
5.1 ENQUIRIES	17
5.2 SUBMISSION DEADLINE.....	17

5.3 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS 17

5.4 VALIDITY OF PROPOSAL..... 18

5.5 PROPONENTS COSTS 18

5.6 GOVERNING LAWS 18

5.7 CONFLICT OF INTEREST 18

5.8 RIGHTS OF IDRC..... 18

5.9 PROPOSED CONTRACT 19

ANNEX A – Proposed Contract 20

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

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

1.1 IDRC OVERVIEW

IDRC was established by an act of Canada’s parliament in 1970 with a mandate “to initiate, encourage, support, and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world and into the means for applying and adapting scientific, technical, and other knowledge to the economic and social advancement of those regions.” A **Canadian Crown corporation**, IDRC supports leading thinkers who advance knowledge and solve practical development problems. IDRC provide the resources, advice, and training they need to implement and share their solutions with those who need them most. In short, IDRC increases opportunities — and makes a real difference in people’s lives. Working with development partners, IDRC multiplies the impact of investment and brings innovations to more people in more countries around the world. IDRC offers fellowships and awards to nurture a new generation of development leaders. IDRC employs about 375 people at the head office located in Ottawa, Canada and in four (4) regional offices located in Amman-Jordan, New Delhi-India, Nairobi-Kenya, and Montevideo-Uruguay. IDRC is governed by a board of up to 14 governors, whose chairperson reports to Parliament through the Minister of International Development. For more details visit: www.idrc.ca

1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS RFP

IDRC requests proposals for a Consulting team to undertake an evaluation on achieving results at scale. Requirements are described in section 2, 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 – 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	Date
RFP issue date	See page 1
Deadline for Enquiries	See section 5.1
RFP close date	See page 1
Evaluation, selection, and notification of Lead Proponent	May, 2019
Interviews/Presentations by short-listed Proponent(s)	April 2019
Finalize Contract with Lead Proponent	May, 2019
Commencement of Services	June, 2019

SECTION 2 – STATEMENT OF WORK

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

2.1 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

IDRC’s first strategic objective in its Strategic Plan for 2015-2020 states that IDRC will “Invest in knowledge and innovation for large-scale positive change.” We committed to generating, identifying and testing scalable ideas and innovations, further supporting those with implementation potential, and connecting solutions with actors who can help advance those solutions to achieve large-scale impact. We committed to documenting our results on this objective and learning about critical success factors in scaling research results to impact that matter for development. Coming at the end of this 2015-2020 period, this evaluation will assess IDRC’s strategies and results related to this strategic objective.

IDRC highly values learning from evaluation. We anticipate this study will provide important insights that will be used by IDRC’s Board of Governors, management, staff and grantees to improve our thinking and practice. Given the wide-spread importance on scaling solutions to improve the lives of people and the planet, we anticipate that the evaluation findings will be shared broadly. We are looking for a set of thoughtful, creative and energetic consultants to work with us.

OBJECTIVES

The evaluation is intended to:

- Assess results to scale the impact of research for development;
- Provide insights into the strengths and weaknesses of past and current programming in order to improve future IDRC corporate, program and project-level strategies; and
- Consolidate learning from IDRC’s experience to share with grantees and other research organizations who wish to strengthen the impact of their work at appropriate scales.

2.2 BACKGROUND

In 2018, IDRC’s Policy and Evaluation Division (POEV) led a participatory process within IDRC to identify the key uses, users and questions for this evaluation.

The evaluation builds on substantial work within IDRC and by our grantees related to this strategic objective. Central in that work is POEV’s Scaling Science study (see https://ssir.org/articles/entry/scaling_science) which helped articulate some core ideas about scale and scaling. In keeping with that study, the results focus of the evaluation will be on research for development outcomes (i.e., the influence of research on policy, practice, and technological development), and impacts when they exist (i.e., actual improvements in health and wellbeing out of those research-informed policies, practices, technological developments). Scaling any particular technology, program, practice etc. are means to those outcomes and impacts – not the ends in themselves. The evaluation will be designed in light of IDRC’s understanding that scaling impact is rarely achieved by a single project, but perhaps by a cluster of investments, or work across time and themes. Moreover, the evaluation will maintain IDRC’s critical approach to scaling: that bigger is not always better, that scaling needs to be mindful of trade-offs and potentially unintended negative consequences, that decisions to scale need to be well justified in light of evidence as well as the perspectives of those who will be affected. The inception phase of the evaluation will take the time to ensure current IDRC thinking infuses the design of this study.

In further preparation for this evaluation, POEV also mapped issues of scale and scaling in a set of 50 projects that were highlighted in IDRC's project management database as contributing "significantly" or "very significantly" to this Strategic Objective. The grant analysis provides categories of scaling objectives, further clarifies multiple pathways projects anticipated for scaling, their intended impacts, and how they defined optimal scale. The patterns that surfaced in this mapping will be provided to the selected evaluators to frame some of their analysis, and to inform potential sampling strategies.

2.3 EVALUATION USERS, USES AND QUESTIONS

This evaluation is intended to be useful to three sets of users:

1. IDRC Management

IDRC management will use this evaluation to assess how effective IDRC has been at incorporating the strategic objective into programming. It will assess results. It will provide insights across all programs about strategies and processes to support scaling, and how we have invested in research to contribute to impacts for development at various scales. Findings could be used to adjust internal processes, and inform the implementation of our next strategy, including our approach to partnerships that can help IDRC scale its impact. Learning from the evaluation will be shared with our Board of Governors, and externally as part of IDRC's contribution to international learning about scaling.

2. IDRC Programs

Under our current strategic plan, IDRC programs adjusted program-level strategies to address issues of scale and scaling. They changed ways of organizing research, incorporated "scaling up" in program-level objectives, paid more attention to the scales at which they work, changed grant criteria and who they fund. The evaluation will document these strategies, and assess their results so we can strengthen the design of programs and partnerships to more effectively achieve results at scale in future.

3. IDRC program staff and grantees

IDRC staff wish to learn about designing and implementing research projects and portfolios for scale, as well as scaling strategies, to inform current and future projects and influence strategies in different contexts.

Evaluation questions:

1. How, and how well, did IDRC programs and grants incorporate issues of scale, and scaling strategies, given their fields of research and potential influence?
2. At what scales and for what scales of impact did programs and projects organize their investments? Were those scales well justified, based on whose perspectives? Where did we miss opportunities to aim for optimal scales? How have programs balanced investments for broad, systemic change compared to scaling more targeted interventions?
3. What outcomes has IDRC achieved by integrating scale and scaling into its programming? How valuable and sustainable are those outcomes, and for whom? Have impacts been achieved?
4. How has IDRC's engagement with researchers, together with additional actors, helped achieve results at scale? What should the Centre and the researchers we support do to effectively engage with actors beyond research communities, including the private sector, in achieving impacts at scale?

5. What are the key strengths and weaknesses in IDRC programming that have led, or failed to lead, to achieving results at optimal scales? What should we do to strengthen future project-, program- and corporate-level strategies to enhance our impact at optimal scales?
6. How well has IDRC performed in terms of learning about scale and scaling, both within and across programs? How could we learn more efficiently and effectively in the future? What additional research is needed to understand scale and scaling?

2.4 DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE OF WORK

2.4.1 Project Scope

In Scope:

IDRC's strategic plan covers all our current programming, and the strategic objective has been incorporated into all current programs in different ways. Therefore, all current IDRC programs will be covered in this evaluation. Further, though the strategic objective was newly introduced in 2015, a lot of previous IDRC programming had considered scale and scaling. This was sometimes, but not always, described as scaling. So while some of the evaluation questions will focus primarily on the current strategy period (2015-2020), the project-level analysis will bring in programming that was developed in earlier periods, and carried forward with a scaling intent in this period. The inception phase of the evaluation will finalize the list of criteria for what programming will be included.

Anticipated Methodology

POEV will welcome thoughtful and creative proposals on how to implement this evaluation. This section lays out POEV's initial methodological guidance. We will work with the selected consultants to develop ideas from their proposal into a full methodology and workplan during the inception phase, during which they will have access to more detailed program and project documentation.

IDRC proposes the following elements in an inception phase, anticipated to be approximately 4 months:

- initial document review;
- conversations with the Policy and Evaluation Division for general orientation to IDRC and the available documentation;
- Further corporate, program and selected project level document review;
- In-person workshop at IDRC, plus individual or group interviews with IDRC staff, selected grantees and potentially external experts to refine the overall approach, methods, evaluation matrix, and workplan.

The evaluation will analyze strategies at organizational, program and project level. The majority of effort will be at program and project levels, which is where the results will be evaluated. A sampling approach, particularly at project level, will be necessary to ensure appropriate coverage of IDRC's diverse experience.

POEV assumes consultants will design an evaluation that will thoughtfully and rigorously assess the contribution of IDRC programming to results. Direct and sole attribution to results is rarely possible when evaluating research programming.

In order to be useful and efficient, the evaluation will engage IDRC staff and grantees in specific stages. For instance, in the inception phase, the evaluators could lead a participatory session with IDRC program leaders on how they interpreted and incorporated this strategic objective in their programs. This will include how they adjusted priorities, strategies, granting criteria, portfolio management strategies; and what they see as the differences in their outputs and outcomes that have arisen from this strategic objective on achieving results at scale. Additional moments for collective sense-making and engaging with emerging findings will be incorporated into the evaluation design.

Achieving results at scale requires contextually sensitive and tailored pathways between research and outcomes / impacts, as well as coordination with multiple elements and actors in specific contexts. The evaluation will have to go beyond the documentation and perspectives of IDRC staff and immediate grantees; it will need to engage research users, third parties involved in influence and scaling processes, private sector actors, potential “beneficiaries”, and other kinds of external stakeholders. It is unlikely that electronic surveys or virtual communication will be sufficient to get a thorough understanding of the complexities, results and perspectives that we wish to understand and assess. Therefore, POEV anticipates this evaluation will require field work.

The evaluation can make use of an international meeting that POEV is organizing that will draw together IDRC grantees and external stakeholders to explore existing experiences of scaling the results of research for development, and map out future directions for research and practice. The timing of that meeting (fall 2019) will be a useful moment to discuss elements of the evaluation methodology and move into data collection.

Initial data sources:

Consultants will be expected to make full use of existing data and documentation, in addition to undertaking substantial primary data collection. Existing documentation includes:

- IDRC reflections on scale and scaling (including, inter alia, [Scaling Science](#), and program synthesis outputs)
- Relevant IDRC program evaluations (the Canadian International Food Security Research Fund, Collaborative Adaptation Research Initiative for Africa and Asia, Innovating for Maternal and Child Health, among others)
- The mapping of IDRC projects about scale and scaling
- IDRC’s Strategic Plan, Detailed Implementation Plans for each program, plus selected donor partnership plans
- Progress reports to IDRC’s board of governors and donor partners
- Monitoring data from IDRC’s Trackify database
- Project level documents: Project Approval documents, grantee technical reports, project completion reports, project evaluations

We will also welcome consultants’ suggestions of other literature about scale and scaling to frame the guide the evaluation.

EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The evaluation will produce multiple outputs throughout the study, geared to internal IDRC users, IDRC’s Board, our grantees, external stakeholders and web communication. There will also be both face-to-face and virtual events for sensemaking, engagement and to facilitate use of the evaluation. Further work during the project development process, plus in the inception phase, will develop a communications and knowledge mobilization strategy that will ensure the outputs and engagement processes are timely, targeted, high quality and useful.

ANTICIPATED TEAM

IDRC anticipates this evaluation will require a team of consultants. The team should include expertise on issues of scale, scalability and scaling in addition to substantial experience implementing complex high quality evaluations. A team with members from multiple regions of the world would be particularly welcome, with substantial understanding of the contexts in which IDRC research is carried out. IDRC welcomes proposals from firms as well as groups of individuals, though the proposal must clearly identify one member as the team leader, and only one contract will be issued with the selected proponent. Please see Section 3.2 for the requirements we seek in the team.

2.4.2 Project Facts and Assumptions

The project will commence with an inception phases in which the consultant will further define the approach, detailed methodology and workplan, with data collection and analysis (including travel requirements) and timeline to be agreed upon by IDRC. Once the exact details are agreed IDRC will issue an amendment to the contract to further define these newly agreed upon details.

2.4.3 Project Budget

The budget for this work is expected to not exceed \$480,000 including taxes and travel.

2.5 IDRC RESPONSIBILITIES, SUPPORT, AND REPRESENTATIVES

IDRC will identify a **Project Authority** to whom the successful Proponent will report during the period of a resulting Contract. The Project Authority will be responsible for coordinating the overall delivery of service, providing as required direction and guidance to the Proponent, monitoring Proponent performance and accepting and approving Proponent deliverables on behalf of IDRC. The Project Authority will ensure that appropriate subject matter experts from within IDRC are available to the Proponent to discuss and provide content material, as well as facilitate cooperation with regional IDRC staff and other stakeholders, as required.

IDRC will identify a **Travel Administrative Representative**, who will manage all travel requirements approved by the Project Authority.

IDRC will identify a **Contracting Authority**, who will oversee a resulting Contract throughout its lifecycle, in conjunction with the Project Authority and the Proponent, create amendments for any changes to a resulting Contract, and answer questions on terms and conditions.

2.6 LOCATION OF WORK AND TRAVEL

Work is expected to take place primarily at the Proponent's site, some onsite at IDRC in co-ordination with IDRC's **Project Authority**, with some travel to IDRC event(s) and to project sites.

2.7 PERIOD OF A RESULTING CONTRACT

A resulting Contract is expected to commence on June 1, 2019 and conclude by December 1, 2020.

SECTION 3 – PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

This section describes the process that IDRC will use to assess Proposals and select a Lead Proponent.

3.1 COMMUNICATION DURING ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS

During Proposal assessment, IDRC reserves the right to contact or meet with any individual Proponent in order to obtain clarification of its submission or to gain insight into the quality and scope of relevant services. A Proponent will not be allowed to add, change, or delete any information during the process. IDRC is in no way obligated to meet with any or all Proponents for this purpose.

3.2 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

IDRC will use the following methodology to assess Proposals:

3.2.1 Step 1 – General Mandatory Requirements of this RFP

Each Proposal will be examined to determine compliance (pass or fail) with all IDRC's **Mandatory Requirements**. Non-compliant Proposals will receive no further consideration.

These general Mandatory Requirements will be confirmed by IDRC:

#	Mandatory Requirements	Compliant (yes or no)
Mi.	Met submission close date and time	
Mii.	Included all required files	

3.2.2 Step 2 – Statement of Work Mandatory and Rated Requirements

The Proponent Proposal **must provide detailed information relative to each mandatory requirement**, proposals which fail to meet these mandatory requirements will receive no further consideration.

Compliant Proposals will then be evaluated and attributed points according to the degree to which they meet or exceed IDRC's **Rated Requirements**.

Summary Table:

Rated Requirements	Weighting % A	*Points 0-10 B	Score A x B
Team section	10		
Resources section	40		
Methodology section	40		
Total %	90		

*Points Table:

Points	Points Description
0	Barely addresses any of the stated requirements and completely lacking in critical areas.
3	Adequately meets most of the stated requirements. May be lacking in some areas which are not critical.
5	Meets most stated requirements
7	Meets all stated requirements
8	Meets all stated requirements and may exceed some
10	Exceeds the stated requirements in superlative and beneficial ways.

RATED REQUIREMENTS:

Rated Requirements in Response to the Statement of Work:

#	Rated Requirements	Weight
	TEAM	10
M1.	<p>Executive Summary</p> <p>The Proponent shall include a short executive summary highlighting the following:</p> <p>a. a description of the team demonstrating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Proponent’s relevant specializations • Senior levels of experience within the team of evaluation and research • details of any sub-contracting arrangements to be proposed <p>b. a brief summary of what makes the Proponent’s team stand out from its competitors</p>	M
M2.	The Proponent’s responses shall also indicate each team members language capabilities; teams should have at least one member with language capabilities in English, French and Spanish	M
R1.	<p>Similar Services</p> <p>The Proponent must have provided similar services as described in the Statement of Work.</p> <p>In order to demonstrate the Proponent’s response should include a list with the following details:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. name and address (city and province only) of the client; b. services period, e.g. start and end dates; and c. brief description of services provided by the Proponent, and which of the proposed team members were involved. 	10
	RESOURCES	40
R2.	<p>All Proposed Resources Experience – Demonstrate Experience</p> <p>The Proponent’s response should demonstrate the quality and level of expertise of its proposed team by providing 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.</p> <p>The team should include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - senior levels of experience managing and implementing evaluations, including complex strategic or program evaluations - expert(s) on scale, scalability and scaling who will contribute at minimum to the design stage and quality assurance throughout - knowledge of research for development - experience in the geographic contexts of IDRC programming; a diverse team with members from those contexts would be an asset - skills in data collection, analysis and reporting 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proven expertise in synthesizing large volumes of data and evidence into clear findings, conclusions and recommendations - excellent communication skills, including data- and information-visualization - mechanisms for coordination to ensure a timely and high quality evaluation 	
	METHODOLOGY	40
R2.	<p>Understanding of IDRC and SOW</p> <p>The Proponent should demonstrate that it has a complete understanding of:</p> <p>a. IDRC; and</p> <p>b. the objectives and requirements in Section 2 – Statement of Work</p>	5
R3.	<p>Approach/Methodology</p> <p>The Proponent should describe its approach to successfully answer the evaluation questions and deliver the requirements detailed in the Statement of Work.</p> <p>The Proponent should provide an initial proposal for an evaluation methodology, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • methods and data sources and how they will be used to answer the evaluation questions • analytical framework and process for data analysis • A draft workplan with project schedule and timeline • Roles and responsibilities chart, including time commitments of each member • Risk management plan 	35

3.2.3 Step 3 –Presentations and References

The top **three (3) compliant and highest scoring technical proposals** will be **shortlisted** for further review. Shortlisted Proponents may be asked to prepare a presentation, and or to provide additional information prior to the final selection. The Offerors reserve the right to supply more information to those Proponents who are shortlisted. Prior to final selection references will be contacted, those with favorable references will advance to Step 5- Final score.

3.2.4 Step 4 - Financials

The Proponents' Financial Proposals will be scored. The Proponent submitting the lowest price will receive the maximum 10 points on the standard assessment scale of 0-10. All other Proponents will receive a prorated score out of 10 based on the relative proportion of their price to the lowest price submitted.

RFP Section	Rated Requirements	Weighting A	Points 0-10 B	Score A x B
4.6	Total pricing, exclusive of taxes	10		
	Total %	10		

3.2.5. Step 5 - Final Score

Scores for the shortlisted Proponents' proposals will be calculated, and IDRC may select the Lead Proposal achieving the highest total points, subject to the Offeror's reserved rights.

3.3 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. This is a pass/fail test. Pass means that Contract discussions begin. Fail means that the Lead Proponent may not enter into Contract discussions and is disqualified from further consideration. The Lead Proponent must provide this information upon 72 hours of the Offeror's request; failure to comply may result in disqualification.

Note: In the case of a joint venture or consortium, each and all members of the joint venture or consortium must provide the information required for their legal form.

3.4 PROPONENT SELECTION

As noted in section **5.8**, 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 no later than 72 days following the award of a Contract. Upon request from an unsuccessful Proponent, IDRC will provide the reasons why that particular proposal was not selected.

SECTION 4 – PROPOSAL FORMAT

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

4.1 GENERAL

Proposals should be in 8 1/2" x 11" (letter) format, with each page numbered. Elaborate or unnecessary voluminous proposals are not desired. The font used should be easy to read and generally be no smaller than 11 points (smaller font can be used for short footnotes).

4.2 OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Proposals may be submitted in English or French.

4.3 ORGANIZATION OF RESPONSES

Responses should be organized as follows, where the sections that follow provide more details:

see RFP Section for full details	File	Contents
4.4	1.0	Cover Letter
4.5	2.0	Technical Proposal
4.6	3.0	Financial Proposal
5.9, Annex A	4.0	Objections with reasons regarding the proposed contract terms and conditions included in this RFP

4.4 COVER LETTER

The Proponent should provide *as a separate file*.

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. A statement confirming the **validity** of the proposal (refer to section **5.4**).
- d. A statement confirming the Proponent does not have a **conflict of interest** with this RFP, real or perceived (refer to section **5.7**).
- e. 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.

4.5 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

The Proponent should provide *as a separate file*.

4.5.1 Table of Contents

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

4.5.2 Response to the Statement of Work

The Proponent **must** provide detailed information relative to:

- a. Each **Mandatory and Rated Requirement** in **Section 3.2 Assessment Method**; and

The Proponent must clearly outline the work that the Proponent proposes to undertake for the provision of these Services to the Offerors.

4.6 FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

The Proponent should provide a *as a separate file*.

4.6.1 Financial Requirements

The Proponent **must** provide pricing for all of its proposed Services.

Financial Requirements
<p>a. The Proponent is to state the assumptions underlying its financial proposal.</p>
<p>b. All prices are to be quoted in Canadian dollars (CAD) and be exclusive of the Goods and services Tax (GST) or Harmonized Sales Tax (HST). The GST or HST, whichever is applicable, shall be extra to the prices quoted by the Proponent and will be paid by IDRC.</p> <p>If the Proponent will not be charging IDRC taxes, an explanation should be provided. See the Notes below for more details on taxes.</p>
<p>c. All prices must include a detailed breakdown following the response to section 2 (Statement of Work). Prices shall include all components normally included in providing the proposed services such as professional fees, disbursements, engagement support expenses, etc.</p> <p>All prices must include a detailed breakdown and include at a minimum the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. all inclusive daily rate applicable to proposed personnel who will do the work; ii. estimated total number of billable days to do the work; iii. estimated number of days to be spent in at IDRC's Ottawa office, if applicable. <p>Travel expenses (flights and per diems) should be considered when submitting the financial proposal as these costs must remain within the overall budget. These estimated travel costs should be provided as a separate breakdown from the above professional fees and expenses within the financial proposal. IDRC will not include the travel expenses in the evaluation of the proposal, these will be used as an estimation only.</p> <p>IDRC will provide standard per-diem rates and will procure all air tickets directly through its designated travel agency.</p> <p>All travel costs will be in line with IDRC's Travel Policy Guidelines (reference Attachment A: Annex B for more details).</p>
<p>d. The Proponent shall propose an invoicing schedule if other than providing one (1) invoice upon completion of all Services.</p> <p><i>Important Note:</i> IDRC's payment terms are NET 30 and IDRC will make no advance on fees.</p>

4.6.2 Mathematical Errors

If there are errors in the mathematical extension of unit price items, the unit prices prevail, and the unit price extension is adjusted accordingly.

If there are errors in the addition of lump sum prices or unit price extensions, the total is corrected, and the correct amount reflected in the total price.

Any Proponent affected by mathematical errors shall be notified by IDRC and be given the corrected prices.

SECTION 5 – CONDITIONS

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

5.1 ENQUIRIES

All matters pertaining to this RFP are to be referred exclusively to the RFP 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 **RFP Authority** by Friday, March 22, 2019, at 11:00 a.m. EDT in order to receive a response prior to the close date. When submitting, Proponents *email subject line* should cite “**RFP # 18190032 - Evaluation on Achieving Results at Scale**”.

The RFP Authority will provide **all answers to significant enquiries** received on buyandsell.gc.ca 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 issued and posted on buyandsell.gc.ca

Important note: Proponents must download all RFP documents directly from the Buy and Sell website. IDRC will not distribute RFP documents that are posted on buyandsell.gc.ca.

5.2 SUBMISSION DEADLINE

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.

5.3 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

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

5.3.1 Method of Sending

The preferred method of proposal submission is electronic, via **email**, in **Microsoft Word** or in **PDF** format to the RFP Authority named on page 1. Proponents *email subject line* should cite “**RFP #18190032 - Evaluation on Achieving Results at Scale**” when submitting via email.

Important Note: Email messages with large attachments can be slowed down in servers between the Proponent’s email and the RFP 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 RFP Authority to confirm receipt.

Important Note: The maximum size of an email that IDRC can receive is 10MB. If necessary, Proponents can send multiple emails.

5.3.2 Number of Files

The Proponent's electronic submission should consist of **five (5) files** (i.e. 5 separate documents) as noted in section **4.3**.

5.3.3 Changes to Submission

Changes to the submitted proposal can be made, if required, provided they are received as an Addendum (or an Amendment) to, or clarification of, previously submitted proposal, or as a complete new proposal to cancel and supersede the earlier proposal. The addendum, clarification, or new proposal should be submitted as per the delivery instructions outlined above, be clearly marked "**REVISION**", and **must be received no later than the submission deadline**. In addition, the revised proposal should include a description of the degree to which the contents are in substitution for the earlier proposal.

5.3.4 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.

5.4 VALIDITY OF PROPOSAL

Proposals must remain open for acceptance for **ninety (90) days** after the close date.

5.5 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.

5.6 GOVERNING LAWS

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

5.7 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

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.

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.

5.8 RIGHTS OF IDRC

IDRC does not bind itself to accept any proposal submitted in response to this RFP, and may proceed as it, in its sole discretion, determines following receipt of proposals. IDRC reserves the right to accept any proposal(s) in whole or in part, or to discuss with any Proponents, different or additional terms to those envisioned in this RFP or in such a Proponent's proposal.

After selection of preferred proposal(s), if any, IDRC has the right to negotiate with the preferred Proponent(s) and, as a part of that process, to negotiate changes, amendments or modifications to the proposal(s) at the exclusion of other Proponents.

Without limiting the foregoing, IDRC reserves the right to:

- a. seek clarification or verify any or all information provided by the Proponent with respect to this RFP, including, if applicable to this RFP, contacting the named reference contacts;
- b. modify, amend or revise any provision of the RFP or issue any addenda at any time; any modifications, amendment, revision or addendum will, however, be issued in writing and provided to all Proponents;
- c. reject or accept any or all proposals, in whole or in part, without prior negotiation;
- d. reject any proposal based on real or potential conflict of interest;
- e. if only one proposal is received, elect to accept or reject it;
- f. in its sole discretion, cancel the RFP process at any time, without award, noting that the lowest or any proposal will not necessarily be accepted;
- g. negotiate resulting Contract terms and conditions;
- h. cancel and/or re-issue the RFP at any time, without any liability whatsoever to any Proponent;
- i. award all or any part of the work to one or more Proponents based on quality, services, and price and any other selection criteria indicated herein; and
- j. retain all proposals submitted in response to this RFP.

5.9 PROPOSED CONTRACT

Annex A has been provided as part of the RFP documents so that Proponents may review and become familiar with certain specific conditions that are expected to be adhered to in connection with the provision of Services. While some of the language may be negotiated between IDRC and the successful Proponent, IDRC's flexibility to amend its standard terms and conditions may be limited.

Important note: The Proponent should outline any objections with reasons to any terms and conditions contained in this RFP and include them in its proposal (reference section **4.3**). Failure to identify objections at the proposal stage may preclude Proponents from raising these objections in the course of any future negotiations.

ANNEX A – Proposed Contract

Annex A has been posted to buyandsell.gc.ca as a separate document for retrieval by Proponents.