

**16 October 2017**

**RFP 41139**

**Mid-Term Evaluation - Mobile Money for the Poor (MM4P) for the Poor mid-term evaluation, UNCDF**

***Question 1: If selected to make a presentation on November 1 or 2, will a specific time slot be assigned to us or will the time of the presentation be mutually agreed-upon? This will help us in our planning.***

The dates of the presentation will be confirmed in good time. We would assign you a slot if you are successful in getting to this stage and would try to accommodate your request dependent on the availability of the Selection Panel members.

***Question 2: It is clear that the financial proposal must be sent as a separate email with a password-protected attachment, but can you clarify whether the technical proposal file also needs to have a password set up?***

No, only Financial proposal needs to be password encrypted.

***Question 3: Form 2 "Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan" states that the evaluation team should attend "an annual MM4P workshop scheduled for Kathmandu the week starting November 14th". However, Section 3 Terms of Reference page 44, under footnote 19, indicates that "the visit to Nepal should include 1-2 days attendance at a multi-country workshop scheduled to start December 4th". Can you please clarify the dates for the required workshop to take place in Kathmandu, Nepal?***

Apologies for the confusion. The workshop will take place from December 4<sup>th</sup> 2017.

***Question 4: The Terms of Reference mention a "Possible workshop in Brussels" to finalize the evaluation approach. Since the workshop is only listed as 'possible', can you confirm we should include the travel costs to Brussels in our financial offer?***

Yes, bidders should include the cost of a two day visit to Brussels to finalize the evaluation approach.

***Question 5: Can UNCDF clarify why Benin, Nepal, Senegal, Uganda, and Zambia were selected to be the focus of this mid-term evaluation.***

These countries were considered to be the most important in view of the learning and accountability objectives of the evaluation.

***Question 6: Can UNCDF share the internal strategic review report from the review that was conducted in the first half of 2015?***

This will be made available after Contract signature with the Successful Proposer.

***Question 7: Is the Inception Meeting expected to be held in-person? If so, how many days should bidders budget for the Inception Meeting?***

Yes, bidders should budget for a two-day meeting in Brussels during the inception period.

***Question 8: Should bidders budget for the possible workshop in Brussels? If so, how many days should bidders budget for the workshop and what team members are expected to attend?***

Those team members with responsibility for drafting the inception report - including obligatorily the Team Leader - are expected to attend.

***Question 9: Does UNCDF have a preferred team size for the MTE?***

Bidders are invited to propose the most appropriate team composition in view of the objectives of the evaluation and the profile of team members presented in the Terms of Reference.

***Question 10: What per diem rates (for meals, accommodation and incidentals) should bidders use for budgeting for the field visit component?***

Per diem rates shall not be higher than established UN Daily Subsistence Allowance rates. Please note that one or two days of the country visits may be dedicated to visiting other towns than the capital city. This will be clarified during the inception phase of the evaluation.

***Question 11: In terms of the evaluation matrix that is expected to be included in the Technical Proposal, what indicators should bidders use for the matrix?***

Bidders are invited to propose relevant indicators from their reading of the Terms of Reference and from their experience of evaluating similar initiatives elsewhere.

***Question 12: Will UNCDF provide transportation during the field visit component or should bidder account for this cost?***

Bidders should account for this cost in their proposal.

***Question 13: Is the theory of change included in the TOR on page 50, the overarching theory of change for all MM4P programming in all countries?***

This is the overall programme theory of change yes.

***Question 14: Will all questions and answers be circulated to all bidders or posted on UNGM?***

Yes, responses will be circulated by the email and posted on <http://procurement-notice.undp.org/>

***Question 15: Does the Team Leader need to have performed a recent consulting assignment with the firm?***

Please see a recent revision to that part of the RFP wherein we clarify that ‘a maximum of 3 examples of recent evaluation assignments conducted by the firm should be provided at least one of which would preferably be completed under the supervision of the proposed Team Leader.

***Question 16: Would it be possible to get an indication of the budget for this evaluation assignment?***

This is not permitted under UNCDF procurement rules. Please refer to the estimated level of effort instead.

***Question 17: There seems to be an inconsistency in timeline between the ToRs and the datasheet. In the ToRs (pg 44) the timeline is given as end October 2017 through early March 2018 i.e. 4 months. However the datasheet (pg 24) notes a timeline of 6-8 months. Which is the timeline to follow?***

The four month period – as divided up into inception, country visits and write up – is the timeline for the evaluation that we are looking to respect.

***Question 18: Is mobilization still foreseen for November?***

We are looking to mobilize the team by the end of November 2017.

***Question 19: Would it be possible to get an indication of the amount of primary field data collection that will take place?***

We leave this to your professional judgement on the basis of the information provided.

***Question 20: What kind of logistical support from UNCDF can field teams expect (regarding organization of visits, translation, transport...)? The RFP highlights that the evaluators will be given relevant contact details for stakeholders and some basic support organizing visits (pg 42). The level of work that will need to be done by the evaluation team themselves organizing visits however has implications both in terms of team composition and the allocated budget.***

Support will be provided to the evaluation team in organizing the meetings; however, evaluation teams shall take responsibility for organizing the logistics of country visits.

***Question 21: Would it be possible to get more detailed information on what data the MM4P programme already collects as part of their monitoring activities (e.g indicator data) and to what extent these will be available as secondary data? How would the primary data expected to be collected as part of the evaluation differ from the data the programme has generated to date?***

More information on this will be provided to the successful firm during the inception phase. Please make use of information provided as well as supplementary programme information to be found on the programme website in putting together your proposal.

***Question 22: Would it be possible to get more detailed information about the expected balance between qualitative and quantitative data in this evaluation?***

Again we leave this to your professional judgement on the basis of information provided.

***Question 23: It is unclear from the RFP document when the multi-country work shop is taking place in Nepal. The footnote 19 (pg 44) of the RFP document refers to 4 December 2017, while according to the Data Sheet 2.4 section ii (pg 28) mentions the annual MM4P workshop would take place w/c 14 November 2017. As this has implications for the proposal, could you please clarify when this workshop is planned to take place?***

Apologies this is a mistake. The Nepal workshop has been rescheduled to 4 December 2017 as indicated on page 44.

***Question 24: In section 26 of the data sheet (page 24 of the RFP and the revised version), it is noted that prospective bidders are to submit an evaluation report, as part of the examples of recent assignments. Later, on page 47 of the RFP, two evaluation reports are requested as evidence of prior work. Please advise if one or two evaluation reports are to be submitted.***

Please see the revised RFP section 26 where it is requested that firms ‘submit maximum of 3 examples of recent evaluation assignments conducted by the firm should be provided at least one of which would *preferably* be an evaluation report completed under the supervision of the proposed Team Leader.’ The request for two reports on page 47 is not necessarily contradictory.

***Question 25: In page 46 of the RFP, it is noted that the technical proposal should not exceed 30 pages + annexes. Please confirm that the specified 30 page limit is not inclusive of the annexes?***

The Technical proposal shall be 30 pages maximum. Please note that Annexes to the technical proposal are not included into this number.

***Question 26: Deadline: we understand that the deadline for the submission for the tender is the 24<sup>th</sup> of October, however at page 23 of the RFP point 24 we read “October 23” as time for opening proposal. Can you please clarify the exact deadline?***

Apologies for the mistake. The deadline for the tender is 24<sup>th</sup> October 2017 at 11.59pm Eastern Standard Time.

***Question 27: Expertise of the firm: page 26 states that the firm should provide evidence of 3 reports of comparable scope and approach. However, page 24 point 26 states that “a maximum of 3 examples of recent evaluation assignments conducted by the firm with at least one of which must be an evaluation report completed under the supervision of the proposed Team Leader”. Can you please clarify whether the latter condition is binding and thus considered as a minimum requirement?***

This is also a mistake. We will be making an announcement to all firms that have expressed interest and also on our procurement page to the effect that ‘a maximum of 3 examples of recent evaluation assignments conducted by the firm’ should be provided, ‘at least one of which would *preferably* be an evaluation report completed under the supervision of the proposed Team Leader’.

