



# Technical Assistance Partnership– Expert Deployment Mechanism (TAP-EDM)

RFP Reference Number: 105343

## Questions and Answers # 3 – November 17, 2020

**Question 1:** Is there a template form for the Bidder's proposed methodology/Approach to implementing the project?

**Answer 1:** Except for the forms and financial tables in Annex E of the RFP, there is no template for the proposed methodology/approach to implementing the project. The only other formatting requirement is to respect the 12-page limitation in filling out this section. As with the entire Technical Proposal, Bidders should use the headings and numbering system detailed in Annex D- Evaluation Criteria. To avoid duplication, Bidders should use cross-referencing by referring to specific paragraphs and page numbers in different sections of their Proposals where the subject topic has already been addressed.

**Question 2:** Is the logic model in Appendix A complete? In other words, will all proposals use the logic model as it appears in the appendix, or is this merely an example of a successful logic model?

**Answer 2:** The logic model in Appendix A is complete for the bidders to prepare their proposal.

**Question 3:** Regarding the EDM-TAP's proposed Ultimate Outcome, would DFATD/CCC consider simplifying the statement down to the following: "Improved well-being of the poorest, most marginalized and vulnerable people in ODA-eligible countries". This amended version will be more specific and measurable and will allow bidders to more easily craft relevant indicator content for this ultimate outcome as per Requirement B(viii).

**Answer 3:** DFATD accepts this suggestion to streamline the ultimate outcome statement that should now be read and understood as follow: Improved well-being of the poorest, most marginalized and vulnerable people in recipient ODA-eligible countries while projecting Canada's leadership. **An amendment to the RFP will be issued shortly.**

**Question 4:** Outcome statements 1200 and 1210 both appear to express two types of change: "participation in and support from Canadians" (1200), and "increased awareness and knowledge of Canadians as global citizens" (1210). We would suggest that only one type of change be included in each case, which will increase their measurability and facilitate the preparation of appropriate indicators.

**Answer 4:** DFATD appreciates this clarification and agrees that participation and support from Canadians are two distinct intermediate outcome results. However, we maintain that the two need to be measured distinctively as a progress measure in the public engagement continuum. The same logic



prevails at the immediate outcome results on increased awareness and knowledge. For the purpose of the RFP requirement, we accept that bidders submit their proposed approach for only one type of change of their choice at both the intermediate and immediate outcome level.

**An amendment to the RFP will be issued shortly.**

**Question 5:** Also, regarding immediate outcome 1210, it is not clear ‘among whom’ EDM-TAP will seek to “increase awareness and knowledge of Canadians as global citizens.” Could this be clarified? Doing so would enhance bidders’ ability to propose effective communications methodologies and facilitate the preparation of appropriate indicators under Requirement B (viii).

**Answer 5:** The Statement of Work provides a sufficient description of the expected scope and characteristics of the Canadian audience the project communication and public engagement plan should target.

**Question 6:** What is the envisioned process for drafting TORs? The question is unclear.

**Answer 6:** Please resubmit the question with more context and precision for DFATD to answer.

**Question 6 (CLARIFIED)** We had situations in the past where we staffed similar positions for Global Affairs Canada for different embassies worldwide and they all had a different way of coming up with the Terms of Reference. For some of them, the requesting authority would already have a draft, it would then be pre-cleared with the embassy and sent to us to add the finishing touches. For the others, the process of negotiation would have to be much more detailed where we would be directly in touch with the requesting authority and we would have to actually try to work out the details on what is it that they really need and how would that work out. Because many people don’t have experience drafting Terms of Reference on the side of the requesting authority, and so sometimes what happened in the past is they would sit and try to write the Terms of Reference for an ideal person, so you would have to have a PhD with 20 years of experience, and speak 6 languages, only to find out that none of this is a must. There are 2-3 that are a must and everything else is a nice to have. It can create all kinds of issues. My colleague is actually a recruitment officer, so this is top of his priorities to make sure that we are not put in a situation where we have to do recruitment for positions that are not necessary in some ways.

**Answer 6:** DFATD understands your position and experience, and the constraints you might be facing doing this kind of mandate. This is exactly where, during implementation it would be possible for the Contractor to work and to improve some of the documents that are being processed upstream. Let’s say DFATD will send the Contractor something like a concept note describing the request, but in terms of mandate, the Contractor’s mandate is to refine that concept note in collaboration with the recipient, which is the national level entity.

**Question 7:** Regarding Requirement B (viii), can DFATD confirm that it expects both a written narrative response as well as a completed Form 4? If so, can DFATD also confirm that Form 4 will not be considered part of the 12-page maximum for Requirement B?



**Answer 7:** DFATD confirms that Form 4 is not considered part of the 12-page limit for Requirement B, and the requirement is for the Bidder to provide a short narrative description of its proposed approach to Results Based Management (RBM) and reporting for results.

The requirement should now be read and be understood as follow: In responding to this criterion, the Bidder should provide a short narrative description of its proposed approach and complete the attached Form 4 (Performance Measurement Framework) in Annex E of this RFP with one corresponding indicator for each of TAP-EDM's outcome statements, along with the identification of their baselines, targets, sources of information, data collection methodology, frequency and responsibility.

The Bidder's proposed approach will be assessed on its appropriateness and clarity. Form 4 is not considered part of the 12-page limit for Requirement B.

Appropriate means that the proposed indicators are SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time-bound).

Clarity means structured and logical.

**An amendment to the RFP will be issued shortly.**

**Question 8:** Also regarding Requirement B (viii) and Form 4, the evaluation criteria indicate that the Bidder should propose indicators in Form 4 "along with the identification of their baselines, targets, sources of information, data collection methodology, frequency and responsibility." However, in the template for Form 4 included in the RFP, the column for Baseline Data is greyed out, implying that it is not required. Can DFATD confirm which columns must be completed as part of Form 4?

**Answer 8:** Thank you for highlighting this oversight. The columns should not have been greyed out. The requirement should now be read and understood as follow: In responding to this criterion, the Bidder should complete the attached Form 4 (Performance Measurement Framework) in Annex E of this RFP with one corresponding indicator for each of TAP-EDM's outcome statements, along with the identification of their baselines, targets, sources of information, data collection methodology, frequency and responsibility.

**An amendment to this RFP will be issued shortly.**

**Question 9:** Finally, Form 4 also greys-out the Ultimate Outcome; however, Requirement B (viii) indicates that "3 points will be awarded for each appropriate outcome indicator (5 outcome indicators)." If the Ultimate Outcome is not applicable, this would leave only 4 indicators in the Form 4 template for bidders to complete (for a maximum score of 12 rather than 15). Can DFATD confirm whether bidders should prepare an indicator and associated data for TAP-EDM's Ultimate Outcome?

**Answer 9:** DFATD recognizes this oversight which does not appear in the French version. The Ultimate Outcome should not be greyed-out. Bidders are expected to propose one corresponding indicator at the Ultimate Outcome, along with the identification of its baselines, target, source of information, data collection methodology, frequency and responsibility.

**An amendment to this RFP will be issued shortly.**



**Question 10:** Lastly, in the same PMF document, Output 1122 (and its indicator) appears to be largely the same as Output 1124, while Output 1121 (and its indicator) appears to be largely the same as 1123. To simplify the PMF and clarify TAP-EDM's theory of change for all bidders, would DFATD/CCC consider combining these outputs (1122/1124, 1121/1123)?

**Answer 10:** DFATD appreciates that the output statements 1122/1124 and 1121/1123 may appear similar, but the difference lies between developing/integrating policies or systems and implementing/improving policies or systems. DFATD maintains outputs 1121, 1122, 1123 and 1124 as they appear in the RFP.

**Question 11:** Following up on a question posed during the Bidders Conference, additional clarity is requested on the eligibility criteria for project references under Requirement A. Specifically, if Project A started in 2012 and was 100% completed by 2017, can GAC confirm that Project A is eligible because:

- a) It was 'executed' (understood to mean that project activities were undertaken) during the required period 2013-2020.
- b) Project A is 100% complete and therefore meets the requirement to be 60% complete.

If this interpretation is incorrect, could GAC please explain which element is incorrect.

**Answer 11:** Project A would be eligible as long as at least 60% of its activities (based on project budget execution) were executed within the 2013-2020 period. The key to understand this criterion is to focus on the budget execution that, in essence, is tied to project activity execution. To be an eligible project, sixty per cent (60%) of the project budget needs to have been disbursed between 2013 and 2020. So a project completed in 2012 would not count. For a project that started in 2011 and ended in 2014, only the portion executed in 2013 and 2014, would count in calculating the amount of dollars spent.

**An amendment to the RFP will be issued shortly.**

### **END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS # 3**