

**RFP - Mid-Term Evaluation of Making Access Possible (MAP)**

**Questions and Answers**

1. *Question: As per ToR, the net income over the past 2 years should be equal or higher than the price proposal submitted, and the current ratio should be at least 1.0 or higher.*

For net income over the past 2 years do you mean the cumulative (year 2016 + year 2017), the average or for each single year the ratio should be valid?

*Answer:* By the phrase “net income over the past 2 years should be equal or higher than the price proposal submitted, and the current ratio should be at least 1.0 or higher”, we mean that these conditions should be met EACH year, and not the cumulative 2 years period. That is, the income in 2016 should be higher or equal than the price proposal. In 2017, the income should also be higher or equal than the price proposal. The same principle applies for the current ratio. The current ratio for each of the year 2016 and 2017 should be at least 1.0 or higher.

Already published.

2. *Follow-up question: Would a letter of credit from a financial institution stating the possibility to draw on the amount requested in case of need (as per financial proposal) be a satisfactory substitute to the net income criterion.*

*Answer:* A letter of credit from a financial institution stating the possibility to draw on the amount requested in case of need (as per financial proposal) for the specific use of this exercise, would be a satisfactory substitute to the net income criterion. It would be better if such letter of credit is equal to the financial proposal submitted by the bidder, and if the said document can specifically state that the credit line is intended for this possible contract with UNCDF.

3. *Question: Is there any additional information on the maximum resource allocation/level of effort expected for this assignment?*

*Answer:* Companies are free to propose the level of effort they feel is appropriate to conduct the Mid-term Evaluation of the MAP Programme based on the Terms References referring to the programme description and implementation, as well as scope of the evaluation including indicated number of country visits, minimum day per country, minimum team composition for each country visit, and a minimum of 130 person days to complete the evaluation.

4. *Question: Could you give us an indication of the available budget or estimated size in working days?*

*Answer:* Please refer to Answer 3

5. Question : The RfP references a number of annexes that are not attached to the tender documents. Would it be possible to re-send these documents to the bidding organisations?

Answer: It has been brought to our attention that Annex 3 in the Terms of Reference is missing referring to the UNCDF Quality Grid for evaluations

#### Quality Grid for UNCDF evaluations

Following UNDP's Evaluation Policy, to which UNCDF is party, all external evaluations commissioned by UNCDF's Evaluation Unit are subject to external quality control by UNDP's Independent Evaluation Office. Bidders are requested to respect the elements of this quality assessment tool in coming up with their proposed approach for the evaluation.

|  |
|--|
|  |
| <b>TOR and Design (Weight 15%)</b>   |
| 1. Do the Terms of Reference clearly outline the focus for the evaluation in a logical and realistic manner?   |
| 2. Do the Terms of Reference detail timescales and budgets for the evaluation?   |
| 3. Does the TOR clearly outline the evaluation's planned approach?   |
| 4. Is the proposed outline of the evaluation approach and methodology clearly detailed in the ToR?   |
| 5. Does the ToR request the evaluator to include gender and vulnerable group issues within the evaluation?   |
| <b>Report and Methodology (Weight 30%)</b>   |
| <b>STRUCTURE</b>   |
| 1. Is the evaluation report well-balanced and structured?  |
| 2. Does the Evaluation report clearly address the objectives of the evaluation as outlined in the ToR?   |
| <b>METHODOLOGY</b>   |
| 3. Is the evaluation's methodological approach clearly outlined?   |
| 4. Is the nature and extent of the project/ programmes stakeholders or partnerships and their role and involvement in the project/ programme explained adequately? |
| 5. Does the Evaluation clearly assess the projects/ programmes level of RELEVANCE?   |
| 6. Does the Evaluation clearly assess the projects/ programmes level of EFFECTIVENESS?   |
| 7. Does the Evaluation clearly assess the projects/ programmes level of EFFICIENCY?  |
| 8. Does the Evaluation clearly assess the projects/ programmes level of SUSTAINABILITY?  |
| <b>DATA COLLECTION</b>   |
| 9. Are data collection methods and analysis clearly outlined?  |
| 10. Is the data collection approach and analysis adequate for scope of the evaluation?   |
| 11. Are any changes to the evaluation approach or limitations in implementation during the evaluation mission clearly outlined and explained?                      |
| <b>REPORT CONTENT</b>  |
| 12. Does the evaluation draw linkages to the UNDP country programme strategy and/ or UNDAF?  |
| 13. Does the Evaluation draw linkages to related National government strategies and plans in the sector/ area of support?  |
| 14. Does the evaluation detail programme/ project funding and provide funding data?  |
| 15. Does the evaluation include an assessment of the projects M&E design, implementation and overall quality?  |

|   |
|---|
| 16. Are all indicators in the logical framework assessed individually, with final achievements noted?   |
| <b>Crosscutting (Weight 15%)</b>  |
| 1. Are human rights, disabilities, minorities and vulnerable group issues addressed where relevant?   |
| 2. Does the report discuss poverty/ environment nexus or sustainable livelihoods issues, as relevant?   |
| 3. Does the report discuss disaster risk reduction and climate change mitigation and adaptation issues where relevant?  |
| 4. Does the report discuss crisis prevention and recovery issues, as where relevant?  |
| 5. Are the principles and policy of gender equality and the empowerment of women (GEEW) integrated in the evaluation scope and indicators, as relevant?   |
| 6. Does the Evaluation's Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved, as relevant? |
| 7. Are gender-responsive Evaluation methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques selected?  |
| 8. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation take gender equality and the empowerment of women (GEEW) aspects into consideration?  |
| 9. Does the evaluation draw linkages to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated?  |
| <b>Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Weight 40%)</b>  |
| <b>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</b>   |
| 11. Are any changes to the evaluation approach or limitations in implementation during the evaluation mission clearly outlined and explained?   |
| <b>REPORT CONTENT</b>   |
| 12. Does the evaluation draw linkages to the UNDP country programme strategy and/ or UNDAF?   |
| 13. Does the Evaluation draw linkages to related National government strategies and plans in the sector/ area of support?   |
| 14. Does the evaluation detail programme/ project funding and provide funding data?   |
| 15. Does the evaluation include an assessment of the projects M&E design, implementation and overall quality?   |
| 16. Are all indicators in the logical framework assessed individually, with final achievements noted?   |
| <b>Crosscutting (Weight 15%)</b>  |
| 1. Are human rights, disabilities, minorities and vulnerable group issues addressed where relevant?   |
| 2. Does the report discuss poverty/ environment nexus or sustainable livelihoods issues, as relevant?   |
| 3. Does the report discuss disaster risk reduction and climate change mitigation and adaptation issues where relevant?  |
| 4. Does the report discuss crisis prevention and recovery issues, as where relevant?  |
| 5. Are the principles and policy of gender equality and the empowerment of women (GEEW) integrated in the evaluation scope and indicators, as relevant?   |
| 6. Does the Evaluation's Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved, as relevant? |
| 7. Are gender-responsive Evaluation methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques selected?  |
| 8. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation take gender equality and the empowerment of women (GEEW) aspects into consideration?  |

|  |
|--|
| 9. Does the evaluation draw linkages to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated? |
| <b>Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Weight 40%)</b>   |
| <b>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</b>  |
| 1. Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of findings?                         |
| 2. Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of conclusions?                      |
| 3. Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of Lessons learned?                  |
| 4. Do the findings and conclusions relate?   |
| 5. Are the findings and conclusions supported with data and interview sources?                                     |
| 6. Do the conclusions build on the findings of the evaluation?   |
| 7. Are risks discussed within the evaluation report?   |
| <b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>   |
| 8. Are the recommendations clear, concise, realistic and actionable?   |
| 9. Are recommendations linked to Country Office outcomes and strategies and actionable by the CO?                  |

6. *Question* : We have not been able to access the open data and reports on the MAP website due to a website technical issue. Could the reports and data please be made available to bidding organisations?

*Answer:* The MAP website is up and running again and you should be able to access reports and data.