

### Question and Answer No. 4

#### RFP-020/19-ICRRP Final Project Evaluation (Re-advertised)

No.	Question submitted by bidders	Answer by Technical and Procurement Teams
1	Our company recognizes that no baseline nor mid-term evaluation was completed for ICRRP, however have indicators been tracked during project implementation (such as number of workshops, etc)?	Yes. Indicators have been tracked for the respective Outputs.
2	Have there been any changes to the logical framework since 2014?	Yes. The substantial amendments to the logical framework have been initiated in 2018 and currently being finalized. The draft version of results and resource framework (RRF) is make available for this purpose.
3	Which definition of resilience is being actively employed?	ICRRP is referring the definition of resilience at multiple levels: community levels, government levels, and national government. Even though at the implementation level, the project is targeting more communities which includes, Host communities, refugees, and IDPs. At the community level for instance, the project aims to increase a resilient community through: (a) social cohesion activities; (b) access to economic and livelihood opportunities; (c) access to basic infrastructure and services; (d) connection and networking among the communities themselves and beyond.
4	Given the complex, integrated and lengthy nature of activities and desired outcomes, does UNDP have a methodological framework it uses to assess and evaluate its outcomes? In other words, does UNDP have an evaluation methodology which it prefers to employ?	UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) has UNDP Evaluation Guideline that we are referencing to and no specified methodology stated. In general, UNDP suggested overall broad approach and methodology. It is expected that the methodology includes possible data sources and collection methods. Methodologies for addressing gender specific issues as well as inclusion of the SDGs should be included.

		It is worth mentioning that the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) has commissioned independent country programme evaluation (ICPE) for Iraq Country Office in early March 2019. The report is currently under-development.
5	<p>The TOR States:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Survey with sample and sampling frame—if a sample is used. This could include the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria; the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.”</li> <li>- What is meant by, if a sample is used? Are such details required at the proposal stage? If so, what is the expectation given only 12 days in country?</li> </ul>	This question is related to the proposed methodology layout by the bidders. In case sample is used, a brief description should be stated.
6	<p>Can you provide more information regarding the content of the internal database with regard to beneficiary profiles, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are all beneficiaries uniquely targeted and registered in the database under each component (where beneficiaries are targeted directly), or are their overlaps?</li> </ul>	The project is maintaining and tracking the beneficiaries as per component. There is a possibility that the beneficiaries are overlapping and double counting.
7	<p>Do you have a selection criteria for beneficiaries of each component and if so can you please share these?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If the criteria exists, does this criteria reflect the structure of the internal database?</li> </ul>	UNDP developed a minimum selection criterion for beneficiaries of each component and it varies according to the complexity and nature of the project component. The database of beneficiaries is managed by each component,

		but it also reflects the structure of internal database. The example of beneficiaries' selection under livelihood component is made available.
8	Evaluation in Arabic is mentioned in the ToR, however is any field work expected to be conducted in any Kurdish language? If so, should we assume we need contract Kurdish translators?	Yes, Kurdish language is likely to be an asset for the Evaluation Team to be able to engage with host communities in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. The Evaluation Report will be in English.
9	Who will be responsible for sourcing beneficiaries and arranging logistics of research activities on the ground, specifically for FGDs and, possibly, for surveys? Who will ensure evaluators have a neutral location to conduct these activities?	This will be the responsibility of the Consulting Company/Evaluation Team. UNDP will facilitate linkages with Responsible Parties that supported implementation to be able to reach out to/locate beneficiaries. For some components (i.e. Component 1) FGDs can potentially take place in the JCMC and/or JCC Offices themselves.
10	Can we contract out work to our local teams on the ground, especially with regard to any quantitative data gathering with beneficiaries? If so, could we also contract out qualitative work?	The answer to the question solely depends on the proposed methodology and approach. This should be clearly indicated in the technical proposal, however, the contracted consulting firm will be the ultimate responsible for the entire scope of services.
11	TOR states that consultants are responsible for after work transport and travel to the country. Does that mean all other expenses are covered by UNDP during work travel to different locations?	The Consultant Company is responsible for arranging and costing all transport/travel arrangements to/from and within the country.
12	Are there any requirements with regard to the physical presence of the team leader during the in-country visits? In other words, are team leaders expected to be present/conduct any particular type of evaluation activity or for any duration of time, or is this up to the evaluation team?	We trust that the presence of the Evaluation Team Leader in country, and the nature of the activities the Team Leader undertakes will be determined by the methodology laid out by the Consultant Company. An indicative distribution of responsibilities among the overall Evaluation team was provided in the TOR, but the details of the task responsibilities/division of labour and time etc. must be

		<p>presented in the proposal corresponding to the methodology laid out.</p> <p>It would assume however that as the Team Leader, for all actions/interviews/tasks which are deemed vital to the assignment, he/she would have a hands-on engagement.</p>
13	We would like to check whether the scope and evaluation questions can be revised and amended based on the literature and document review of the project reports i.e. during the inception phase?	The overall scope of services would not change however, there can be some scope for small and minor changes to be presented through the Inception Report. This has to be agreed and approved by UNDP.
14	The ToR indicates the need to assess relevance based on the following 3 variables: beneficiaries' assessed needs, country's policies and donor's priorities; we would like to know whether the above indicated needs, policies and priorities are documented and available for sharing, and if so in what form?	<p>To assess the beneficiaries' needs, each component performs need assessments. Its method being employed is vary depending on the activities. UNDP works with various implementing partners ranging from NGOs/INGOs, local governments, universities/research institutions who involved in conducted need assessments.</p> <p>In regards policies and priorities, the Country Program Document (CPD) has outlined country priorities of Government of Iraq and Kurdistan Regional of Iraq (KRI). CPD is annexed in the ToR.</p>