

Title: *the evaluation of projects from the call for proposals “technological platforms to strengthen public sector accountability and citizen engagement”*

A. AMENDMENT TO THE BID SOLICITATION

Amendment 1

In section 2. Technical Proposal – Standard Forms, **DELETE** the FORM TECH – 4 and **REPLACE** with the following:

**FORM TECH- 4 – Updated Version
Bidder Experience – Development Evaluation Assignment**

Guidance to Bidders:

Using the format below, provide information on each assignment where the Bidder and/or a Member was carrying out consulting and professional services similar to the ones requested under this RFP.

Maximum three (3) pages per assignment

A. EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT INFORMATION
Evaluation Assignment Title:
Name of Bidder who performed services:
Name of client/ funding agency:
Name, telephone number and e-mail address of contact person:

B. RESOURCES PROVIDED BY THE BIDDER		
Duration of Evaluation Assignment		Evaluation Assignment Contract value:
Start date (year/month):	Completion date (year/month):	Total Contract Value: (In CAD)
Key Staff: Name 1 Name 2 Name 3 Name 4 etc.	Functions : Team Leader Senior Evaluator X: Senior Evaluator Y: Specialist B: etc.	Level of Effort: (# of days for name 1) (# of days for name 2) (# of days for name 3) (# of days for name 4) etc.
Name of associated firm(s), if any:		No. of person-days provided by associated firm(s):

C. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT AND EVALUAND

Rationale, Purpose and Specific Objectives of the Evaluation Assignment (definition of the requirements: OECD/DAC (2010) <i>Quality Standards for Development Evaluation</i> (2010), Sections 2.1, 2.2)	
Object and Scope (definition of the requirement: OECD/DAC (2010) <i>Quality Standards for Development Evaluation</i> (2010), Sections 2.3)	
Evaluand Name: (project name or program name or group of projects within a program name)	
Brief description of the Evaluation: (for example: intervention logic; geographical area, target groups, organizational set-up; implementation arrangements; key dimensions covered by the evaluation and policy and institutional context as necessary).	
Stakeholders: Brief description of the key stakeholders of the evaluation	
Evaluand Time Period covered by the Evaluation Assignment (number of years):	Evaluand value [funds spent over the time period covered by the Evaluation Assignment] (In CAD):
From (month/year):	To (month/year):
Key Evaluation Questions (also known as issues or criteria): Summary of key questions from the Terms of Reference:	

D. SERVICES PROVIDED FOR THIS EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT
Brief Description of Services Provided for this Evaluation Assignment: (Only services provided by the Bidder should be indicated. Services provided by other partners or associated firm are to be excluded from this description.)
Brief Description of the Evaluation Assignment Methodology and its Application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach (conceptual framework): • Methodology: • Data collection and analysis methods used: • Data collection involving different types of stakeholders groups (indicate types): • Type(s) of sampling applied: • Measures used to ensure reliability and validity and methodological limitations:
Evaluation Assignment's Main Deliverables: (Only deliverables provided by the Bidder should be indicated. Deliverables provided by other partners or associated firm are to be excluded from this description.)

Amendment 2

In section 2. Technical Proposal – Standard Forms, **DELETE** the FORM TECH -6A and **REPLACE** with the following:

**FORM TECH-6A – REVISED VERSION
Curriculum Vitae for Proposed Personnel**

Guidance to Bidders:

Using the format below, provide information on Assignments where the proposed personnel was carrying out consulting and professional services similar to the ones requested under this RFP.

Maximum five (5) pages per proposed personnel

Proposed position			
Name			
Education (type of degrees received, completion dates, granting recognized institution)			
Present employer and position (if applicable)			
Length of service with current employer and status (permanent, temporary, contract employee, associate, etc.)			
Personnel Experience: (repeat the box below for each Assignment as necessary)			
Assignment # __, Title:		Role of the Proposed Individual:	
Level of effort of the proposed resource for the assignment in days:		Geographical area – country(ies) / region(s) covered:	
Assignment start date: (year/month)	Assignment end date: (year/month)	Location of field work: Country X: Country Y:	Duration of field work (in days): Days for Country X: Days for Country Y:
Assignment Description:			
References (name, title, phone and email)			

Amendment 3

In section 2. Technical Proposal – Standard Forms, **DELETE** the FORM TECH -5A

Amendment 4

In section 2. Technical Proposal – Standard Forms, **DELETE** the FORM TECH -6C

Amendment 5

In section 5. Evaluation Criteria, under criteria R 1.2 **DELETE** the following words “to the requirement described in the ToR in this RFP.” and **REPLACE** with the following words: “that is:

- (i) contract value of CAD\$ 150,000 or more;
- (ii) a duration of at least six (6) months,
- (iii) an Evaluand value of CAD \$10M or more,
- (iv) an Evaluand Time Period covered by the Development Evaluation Assignment of three (3) years or more, and
- (v) where data collection involved at least three different types of stakeholder groups.”

B. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1	I see that under Details, it notes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GSIN - R019F: Consulting Services - Region of opportunity: World - Trade agreement: None As well, the maximum amount allocated is stated as \$430,000CAD. Could you please tell me whether this means that we, as an economic consulting firm based in the Netherlands are eligible to apply for this opportunity?
Answer 1	Firms outside of Canada are eligible to apply if they meet the eligibility requirements indicated in the Forms TECH 1 and 2.
Question 2	In item M2 of the evaluation grid, it states that the Team Leader must have conducted ‘two evaluation assignments of similar size, duration, scope and complexity.’ It then goes on to say ‘Each assignment must have had 1. A level of effort of at least 70 days; and, 2. Supervision of at least 3 professional staff. Could you please clarify whether the definition for similar size, duration, scope and complexity in M1 also applies here, and that the LOE of 70 days minimum and supervision of 3 staff is in addition to the similar size, duration, scope and complexity for M1, or are the only requirements in M2 that the projects have a LOE of 70 days and supervision of at least 3 professional staff.
Answer 2	The definition of “similar size, duration, scope and complexity” in M1 also applies to the assignments in M2. In addition, each assignment in M2 must have 1) a level of effort of at least 70 days, and 2) supervision of at least three (3) professional staff.
Question 3	In section R1.1 A we are asked to provide two assignments, using form TECH-6A, demonstrating inclusive governance experience. Given that this is the CV form, which is quite open-ended, and not the project experience form TECH-4, please confirm the format and information to be provided on these two assignments.
Answer 3	Please see amendment 2 above
Question 4	In section R1.1 B we are asked to provide, using form TECH-6A, at least two but no more than five completed assignments demonstrating in-country experience. Again, given that this is the CV form, our Team Leader has more than five completed assignments in the four regions. We would generally list all assignments in the CV. Is it the intention that we restrict the CV to include only 5 assignments?
Answer 4	Using TECH-6A as per Amendment 2, the proposed Team Leader CV should include reference to <u>no more than</u> five assignments demonstrating in-country experience.

Question 5	In section R1.2 we are asked to demonstrate experience of similar size, duration, scope and complexity. Does the definition of similar size, duration, scope, and complexity listed under M1 apply here as well? In other words, are the only assignments that will be rated here assignments that have a contract value of \$250K and more etc? Or does the similar size, duration, scope and complexity refer to the rated items in this section only.
Answer 5	Please see amendment 5 above.
Question 6	In Section 2 – Standard Forms, there is a Form 6C Description of Years of Experience. Is this to be completed? There is no reference in the Evaluation Grid to Form 6C.
Answer 6	Form 6C does not need to be completed. Please see amendment 4 above.
Question 7	Item 8. Language level in the Terms of Reference specifies that at least one member of the Consultant’s team must possess French at level 4. Are the Local Coordinators deemed to be part of the Consultant’s team, or is this requirement meant to refer to the Core Evaluation Team only?
Answer 7	At least one member of the Core Evaluation Team, preferably the Team Leader or Senior Evaluator, must possess the required French levels.
Question 8	We are confident that we can put together a team of experts that would deliver quality work. However, criterion M2: A level of effort of at least 70 days greatly reduces the pool of potential team leaders. Is there an opportunity for the MAC to revise this criterion downward?
Answer 8	The Team Leader must have had a LOE of at least 70 days for each evaluation assignment in M2. A large, complex evaluation such as this requires a team leader that has experience managing a contract with a high LOE and multiple team members.

C. ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.