

Queries against RFP-BD-2016-021

Sl. No.	Particular	Reference comments/Remarks from bidders		Answer
1.	<p>References Two references must be provided by the contractors from the Firms' previous work that has been undertaken. These should be from the past two years and should relate to the projects on which proposed team members worked</p>	<p>Page 32; Section M: Recommended presentation of the Proposal; Bullet No. 8 under technical proposal</p>	<p>It is expected that the references proposed should be related to both the firm and the experts. In case the proposed experts are not full-time employees of the firm it is likely that the references may not related to the expert. We request you to kindly relax this requirement allowing independent references for either a) Firm and/or b) Proposed team members.</p>	<p>Kindly provide references of two previous work completed by the firm. This is only relevant to the firm.</p>
2.	<p>Expertise of Research Team</p>	<p>Section K (Qualification of the Successful Contractor); Page 29 Section N (Evaluation); Page 31</p>	<p>The expertise of the research team – the international quantitative expert & team leader indicated under Evaluation Point Criteria and Section K (Qualification of the Successful Contractor) are different. Request you kindly specify the expected expertise for this position.</p>	<p>The Evaluation Point Distribution in page no. 24 is to be replaced by the evaluation criteria mentioned in the Page no.33.</p>
3.	<p>Expertise of the GIS and Database expert and City coordinators</p>	<p>Section N (Evaluation); Page 31</p>	<p>These positions are not mentioned in the list of minimum eligibility criteria mentioned in section 24 and in Section N. Kindly clarify if the CVs of the GIS experts and City-coordinators are required to be submitted and if they would be evaluated.</p>	<p>Please follow page no.18-19 to see the minimum eligibility criteria for the Research team. As mentioned above, the evaluation criteria mentioned in page no.33 will prevail.</p>

4.	Describe the criteria laid down for institutional criteria in section N)	Section N (Evaluation); Page 31	The institutional criteria laid out under section N is different from the matrix provided under the evaluation point distribution section. Kindly clarify.	
5.	Evaluation Point Distribution: <i>From the document: At least 3 year of experience with focus on community based participatory mapping and assessment</i>	1) Evaluation Point Distribution, page 21 2) Section N (Evaluation), page 33	Given that the scope of work primarily entails design and delivery of an MLE framework, can this expertise (which is mostly associated with a method of collecting and monitoring data) be sourced in by sub-contracting local firms or individual experts? Is this criteria a mandatory evaluation criteria for the lead firm. Kindly clarify.	The Evaluation Point Distribution in page no. 24 is to be replaced by the evaluation criteria mentioned in the Page no.33.
6.	Proposal Evaluation	General	The RFP allows the proposing organization to innovate on the approach and methodology for designing the study. Since design of the delivery and the associated number of person days to be proposed is not fixed, technical proposals of proposing firms may not be comparable. It is requested that the proposing firms be allowed to present their approach and methodology highlight the innovations in design and approaches to UNDP through a technical presentation and the	Kindly note, UDNP will conduct a thorough evaluation based on the technical criteria. If necessary, evaluation committee will communicate with the qualified bidders for further demonstration.

			score towards the technical presentation could be adjusted in the overall evaluation score.	
	Minimum eligibility criteria for the research team	Terms of Reference Page: 29	<p>What are the conditions of selecting an International Quantitative Expert/ Consultant? Who can be an International Quantitative Expert/ Consultant?</p> <p>What are the documents requirement for this credential?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience leading large-scale integrated qualitative-quantitative evaluations with rigorous attribution strategies; • Extensive experience with governance, poverty reduction and/ or climate resilience programmes (at least 10 years), and the monitoring and evaluation of such programmes. • Substantial experience (through field missions) in Bangladesh/ South Asia with monitoring and evaluating programmes similar to NUPRP. • Educated to at least Masters level in a relevant field.
	Deadline of Proposal Submission	DATA SHEET (DS no 20) Page: 17	The deadline for the proposal submission -The RFP mentions the deadline as 5 November 2016 while the Atlas system mentions the deadline as 7 November. Please confirm the correct date and time for	The Deadline of Proposal Submission will be 7 December 2016

			submission of the proposal.	
	Preferred currency of Proposal	DATA SHEET (DS no 15) Page: 16	In the DATA SHEET (DS no 15) it says: United States Dollars (US\$) or local currency (Bangladeshi Taka) while the ToR (Serial number M) says: "The Financial proposal shall specify a total delivery amount (in USD and BDT) including fees and associated costs ...". Please confirm the currency for proposal submission.	USD or Local Currency (Bangladeshi Taka)
	Joint Venture, Consortium or Association	Section-2 B. Contents of Proposal Cluse-19 Page-8	Do you expect that a) an international firm has to be a lead agency or b) a national firm may lead the assignment with the technical assistance from an international firm who will deploy the international consultants or c) a local firm may submit proposal independently by recruiting international consultants.	Any of these options is acceptable.
	Scope of work and overall objectives	Terms of Reference Pgae-24	It is said that phase 3 surveys will be conducted annually but in other part of the TOR it is said that the timing of the surveys will needed to be considered that NUPRP's annual review will take place during December each year and also	The timing of any annual surveys will need to factor in reporting obligations. Six monthly follow up surveys are likely to be too expensive. Therefore for some reporting obligations data might be a little

			<p>the project is obligated to report on progress against outcome indicators during the months of May and November each year. So whether the follow-up surveys should be carried out six monthly to cover the NUPRP's reporting requirements or the reporting requirements in the month of May will be fulfilled from the projects internal data sources.</p>	<p>older than we wish (but not older than 12 months).</p> <p>We will need to be inventive and this will require further debate and discussion during the methodology design.</p>
	Scope of work and overall objectives	Terms of Reference Pgae-24	<p>It says "Whilst NUPRP would like to maintain the same contractor for each of the above phases, the Programme has the right not to progress with subsequent phases e.g., due to poor performance or other unforeseen circumstances. " May we request what are the unforeseen circumstances NUPRP are anticipating other than the poor performances that might force the programme to discontinue the contract.</p>	<p>The programme may not be extended during the second phase</p>
	Financial proposal	Terms of Reference M: Recommended Presentation of Proposal Page-32	<p>We would like some clarification on whether we would need to budget for baseline, follow-up and endline data collection in our proposal?</p>	<p>The budget should cover everything i.e. method design, baseline, follow ups including endline.</p>