

5th June, 2018

Reference: GCF/RFP/2018/C/012

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Provision of consultancy services to support IEU's Learning Oriented Real-time Impact Assessment (LORTA) window using theory-based impact evaluation techniques.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original RFP Documents remains in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum (and Addendum 1) which is hereby made part of the RFP. Respondents shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting their Proposal.

I. Responses to requests for Clarification

No	Clarification requested	Response
1	Scope of this proposal: The request for proposals very clearly lays out the scope of the project, dividing it into three stages, which in total would be expected to last for multiple years. And Appendix 1, part IV.2 states "The contracted firm will be responsible for the following components for each of LORTA's three key contractual stages." However, in the main proposal section 3.2 states "This evaluation program is part of a multi-year program however all deliverables required for this RFP will be delivered in 2018." This makes it seem like the current RFP is only for Stage 1. We would like some clarification on this issue. Should our proposal (and budget) cover all three stages or only the first one? If this proposal only pertains to Stage 1, how will contracting and budgeting be done for the following stages?	Yes, the current RFP is only for Stage 1. However, the contract will be multi-year but in subsequent years the contract will only be extended depending on the approval by the GCF Board for the budget. The proposed budget should only cover the first stage.
2	Selection of GCF projects: We'd like some clarification on the timing of activities and outputs, specifically as relates to Stage 1. One of the outputs from Stage 1 is "Impact evaluable GCF projects identified and engaged with." From this we understood that it would be the job of the contracted firm (in consortium with the IEU) to choose which 4-6 GCF projects will move forward with evaluations. We assume that once these projects are chosen, the firm would move forward toward creating the impact assessment design document for each selected project. In face these impact assessment design documents are listed (in Appendix I, section IV.2.1.iii) as the main output of Stage I. However, in Section IV.2.2 is stated that "Once the first stage has been completed, GCF will select which projects will move on to the second stage." So we would like understand exactly when and how the projects will be selected, and whether the impact assessment design documents are meant to be an input into this decision or instead only created for selected projects. If the former, could you estimate for how many project the firm will need to complete impact assessment design documents?	The section of the project will be done in consultation with all key stakeholders including the GCF secretariat, accredited entities and implementing partners. IEU will be organizing an impact evaluation design workshop 23-25 th of July which the selected firm will be required to attend. The aim of the design workshop will to expedite this process. The winning firm will be a part of that exercise throughout. Ultimately the firm will need to complete impact assessment design documents for 4-6 projects that will be shortlisted at the end of the workshop.

No	Clarification requested	Response
3	<p>Timing of Inception Activities. The RFP mentions holding a matchmaking clinic to be held in Songdo. Our assumption is that during this clinic the firm will be expected to assess which projects are best fits for impact evaluations. Are we correct to understand that initial conversations with projects would happen during this workshop? Do you have an idea of when this workshop would happen? Also, do you expect that the impact assessment design documents would be generated from interactions at this workshop, or is the expectation that these would be generated after a follow-up visit in country. Obviously researchers can develop a more detailed and accurate plan after a visit but that requires more time. We'd be interested to understand how you are thinking of this trade-off.</p>	<p>Please see response to Q2</p>
4	<p>We are writing to seek clarification on the roles and staffing for the Contracted Firm versus the sub-contracted research teams. More specifically, do you envision that the Contracted Firm will have staff actively involved in implementing the impact evaluations -- evaluation design, data collection and data analyses -- along with local research teams, for instance? Or, alternatively, do you envision that the Contracted Firm's role is to supervise research teams who would themselves be responsible for implementation and analysis?</p>	<p>It's up to the contracting firm to arrange the details of engagement with the sub-contracted research teams. IEU will make an official agreement with the contracted firm but it will provide advice and guidance on who can be sub-contracted if necessary. We anticipate that in some cases, the selected projects will have field teams on board. In other cases, this will not be so. This is why we have included both possibilities of on the ground presence and management. In all cases the contracted firm will be responsible for the evaluation design, providing a training workshop(s), engagement, training on data collection and formative work.</p>
5	<p>“Real-time learning” experiment-based statistically attributable findings would appear a bit contrary. For example, it would generally be exorbitantly expensive to show statistical significance after just six months of implementation within an experiment design. The TOR also indicates that the assessment should “feed evaluation results back into the project and change the project mid-course to improve project end results”. Hence, could the sort of “real-time” feedback you are thinking of be based on model-based approaches and/or qualitative evidence?</p>	<p>The six-monthly real-time implementation measurement and learning report will be based on a qualitative exercise for the most part. LORTA provides support to projects in setting up the process of designing measurements and setting up designs as well as implementing them. It will provide projects high quality information on implementation fidelity. This is what will enable projects to ‘learn’ and perhaps adapt. The information that projects will use will be a combination of qualitative information and frequent monitoring information, set up to inform implementation fidelity.</p>
6	<p>What exactly is a “Matchmaking clinic”? Is it expected that the 4-6 GCF funded projects for which impact evaluations will be conducted will be identified at a single clinic or are multiple clinics anticipated? If the latter, how many clinics should bidders assume and when would these clinics take place?</p>	<p>The matchmaking clinic will take place in a single clinic through an impact evaluation design workshop. Participants will be assigned to groups to work jointly. Each group will be matched with a researcher or several researchers and the combined team will define the question to be answered with the evaluation and the method to be used.</p>
7	<p>The RFP requires “Capacity building workshop(s) for the implementing team, AE and NDA and associated GCF staff.” Please clarify the nature of the capacity-building that is to be provided—is this to familiarize the stakeholders with impact evaluation methods so</p>	<p>Yes, these are familiarization and awareness raising workshops that also enable project teams to not only support the impact evaluation effectively but also own the results.</p>

No	Clarification requested	Response
	that they can interact more effectively during the impact evaluation, or is some other type of capacity-building envisaged?	
8	Please confirm that the requirement for “Six monthly real-time implementation measurement and learning reports (RoMLER) shared with IEU” refers to reports produced every six months (semi-annually), not six reports produced monthly. If this interpretation of the requirement is correct, does this imply that the envisaged time period for each impact evaluation activity is three years?	Yes, it’s reports produced twice a year. The overall impact evaluation activities may take from 3-5 years depending on the types of projects.
9	The RFP states that the “subsequent sub-stages [after the baseline] will last as long as the project lasts”. It is not quite clear what this means for when the midline would take place. For pricing it would help to know how many years out you are thinking for the midline. Could you clarify?	The requested response to this RFP does not require a costing for the second stage of LORTA. For this first stage RFP, we would like to see technical and financial proposals to conduct formative research to develop impact evaluation designs for 4-6 projects.
10	The TOR states that LORTA assessments will be “tailored to the specific project and adapted to the specific institutional context”. Does that mean that IEU is not interested in external validity? If so, what exactly is the sort of learning IEU aiming for, just to keep the project on track?	IEU is interested in both internal and external validity but IEU won’t follow a one-size-fit all approach. Methodological approaches will be chosen based on country context, the nature of projects and other factors. In all cases, however, we will make sure that approaches are rigorous and credible.
11	The RFP requires “Communication briefs, learning briefs, seminars and other relevant shared events” to be held at the end of the impact evaluation. As this encompasses a wide range of possible activities, please provide additional guidance on what dissemination activities are required or what are the specific objectives of these dissemination activities so that bidders can determine what level of activity is appropriate.	Given that the primary objective of this exercise is learning-oriented, we will make sure that we produce relevant and necessary briefs from this process. The nature of these briefs and events will be discussed with IEU at a later stage.
12	(a) The expected form of the financial proposal is unclear. The RFP states “The contract will be lump-sum based and use a fixed daily fee for the duration of the project. Lump sum payments will be made to the contractors, according to the pre-agreed daily rate, based on the number of agreed days required to complete discrete tasks. The number of days required for different tasks will vary.” Please clarify what the GCF/IEU is expecting as a financial proposal—a schedule of fixed daily fees for various labor categories or a lump sum amount to carry out the work.	The financial proposal is required for Stage 1 of the assignment only. The proposal should be as per the prescribed FIN forms ; FIN 1; the financial proposal submission form, FIN 2 detailing the cost breakdown as per cost component and per deliverables and FIN 3 which will detail the staff daily rate for proposed personnel and will be used to establish payment for possible additional services. Bidders are required to propose a work plan and level of staffing that will support the work plan proposed as well as the budget for Stage 1.
13	Please also explain how bidders are to estimate data collection costs given that the number of impact evaluations is not yet determined, the countries in which data collection is not yet known, and the required sample sizes will not be determined until the impact evaluation designs are completed. If GCF/IEU provides assumptions to bidder for the basis of preparing the financial proposal, please confirm that	The first stage of LORTA won’t involve collection of baseline and end-line data. It will involve country visits for 4-6 projects with the aim of producing formative impact evaluation designs.

No	Clarification requested	Response
	these data collection costs will re-negotiated once the actual data requirements are known.	
14	<p>Given that the number of impact evaluations is not yet determined and that the effort and data requirements for each impact evaluation will vary depending on the activity being evaluated, the minimum detectable effect size, and the desired statistical power, the RFP does not contain sufficient information to provide a fixed price quote for all activities. As currently structured, we do not see how a responsible financial bid can be submitted without the bidder taking on a very high level of financial risk if the contract is indeed a lump sum contract. We suggest that GCF/IEU provide a specification for an illustrative impact evaluation that can be used as a basis for evaluating financial proposals, with the understanding that the fixed daily rates would be used to develop negotiated budgets for each impact evaluation undertaken. (We suggest the initial tasks in the 6 months would be priced separately as part of the proposal submission.)</p>	See response to Q 13.
15	<p>If the form of the financial proposal is revised to allow for a more realistic pricing model, we request that sufficient time (we suggest three calendar weeks) be provided to bidders to prepare their financial proposal once the new financial proposal requirements are specified.</p>	The IEU/GCF does not anticipate revising the financial proposal template.
16	<p>Section 3.2, page 2 of the RFP, states “This evaluation program is part of a multi-year program however all deliverables required for this RFP will be delivered in 2018. This high-profile measurement and evaluation program will produce an interim report that will be shared with the GCF Board in October 2018. The terms of reference included in Appendix 1 provide details of the assignment and expected deliverables.” However, in various other places, the RFP references activities related to the design, implementation, and reporting on the selected IEs in years following 2018. Accordingly, we have the following questions:</p> <p>a) Is the firm selected through this procurement intended to also implement the selected IEs in subsequent years?</p> <p>b) If yes: a. Would that be under the same contract or a different contract?</p> <p>b. Should the cost proposal include costs for implementation of the IEs?</p> <p>c. If yes, can GCF give some general parameters in terms of sample size, number of data collection</p>	Please see answer to Q1 and Q13

No	Clarification requested	Response
	events, and geography, to ensure accurate and comparable costing?	
17	Section 7.1, under Submission of Proposals, page 3 of the RFP references that “Proposers shall submit their proposal in hard and/or soft copy.” Can GCF please confirm that proposers are allowed to submit the electronic copy via email without also submitting hard copies?	Yes, the proposer can submit only the soft copy. Please see instructions for submitting this two-part proposal via email in the RFP.
18	<p>The description of the technical approach in Form Tech 4, page 17 of the RFP states that the technical approach should include the following:</p> <p><i>To indicate the process that you will follow, kindly lay out the key elements of the evaluation matrix, the questions that you would ask for each question, the methods used to answer these questions and also the timeline. Please also indicate a proposed outline of a qualitative interview questionnaire for the survey part, as well as key agencies and people that will be contacted for benchmarking. A protocol for field work is also desirable.</i></p> <p>Can GCF please confirm that these are required given that the projects for the IEs have not yet been identified?</p>	Yes, we are interested to see at least a generic condensed form of hypothetical evaluation matrix. We don’t expect a full-blown matrix given the limitations.
19	Appendix 3, B. Acceptance of Submissions, page 27 of the RFP notes that the technical proposal should include “at least two publications to demonstrate the fulfilment of eligibility criteria.” Should these be submitted in their entirety as an annex or can they be provided as references with a hyperlink?	Yes, you can submit the paper using the link. The model contract was uploaded on the GCF website together with the RFP document. The link is https://www.greenclimate.fund/who-we-are/procurement
20	In Appendix 3 Evaluation Criteria, page 29 of the RFP, the first paragraph appears to be missing text. The second sentence reading "Some familiarity with" is unfinished. Please clarify.	Please ignore the hanging clause.
21	Appendix 6 references the contract work start date of July 1 2018, while Appendix 1, VII states that an interim synthesis report of the inception stage would be presented in October, 2018. Would GCF be amenable to allowing more time to develop this interim report??"	A presentation of key findings will be required by October 2018 (in a detailed presentation and/or a draft document). A full paper may be presented before the end of the year.
22	At multiple places, the RFP references capacity development of various stakeholders in impact evaluation. Does GCF envision stand-alone training or other capacity development measures as part of this contract?	This will be part of the package.
23	Is GCF expecting a proposal for all the three contractual phases or just for the “inception and engagement stage”, which is to be completed in 2018?	Please see responses to Q1 and 13.

No	Clarification requested	Response
24	For the second phase, the RFP states “During the second stage, the contracted firm/sub-contracted external research teams will roll out final surveys, the implementation monitoring and measurement system and the impact assessment design”. Will the selected firm be able to lead these impact evaluations in partnership with other consultants and organizations or will they only be able to conduct the selection of the external teams in charge of the impact evaluations?	The selected firm under the leadership of IEU will lead the evaluation. The sub-contracted research team will be a part of overall evaluation team (i.e., IEU, contracted firm and sub-contracted research team will make up an evaluation team)
25	Considering that the countries and programs to be evaluated have not been selected yet, how does GCF expect the contractor to budget for data collection in the financial proposal?	See answer to Q1 and Q14
26	Considering that the time period for the evaluations is not known yet, how does GCF expect the contractor to budget for the data analysis in the financial proposal?	See answer to Q1 and Q14
27	Considering that the countries for the evaluations are not known yet, how does GCF expect the contractor to budget for travel in the financial proposal	See answer to Q1 and Q14