

19 January, 2018

Reference: GCF/RFP/2017/C/025

ADDENDUM NO. 1

<u>Request for Proposals for Provision of consultancy services to undertake an evidence gap map and a systematic review of transformational change.</u>

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

1.0 Responses to requests for Clarification

No	Clarification requested	Response
1	Upon the publication of the RFP for the above- mentioned project, we are wondering if you can provide some clarifications about the budget. Could you please either specify the maximum budget or the anticipated level of effort (in person months) for this project?	The budget for the consultancy will not be provided. We require firms/organizations submitting proposals to provide their proposed level of effort and financial proposals for the work, with a breakdown and a justification for the costs.
2	you ask us to name the file "RFP No RFP 2017/C/ 025 – Provision of consultancy services to undertake an evidence gap map and a systematic review of transformational change. – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (name and address of proposer)". However, it is technically not feasible to assign such a long name to word/pdf documents. Could you please clarify how we are supposed to name the files.	The technical file can be named as follows: RFP 2017/C/ 025 – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (name of proposer) The financial file can be named as follows: RFP 2017/C/ 025 – FINANCIAL PROPOSAL (name of proposer)
		When submitting the email, the subject line must contain the reference to the RFP. i,e, RFP 2017/C/ 025 – Provision of consultancy services to undertake an evidence gap map and a systematic review of transformational change (name of proposer)
3	Is it possible to send our technical & financial proposal solely via E-Mail ?	A response by email is sufficient if it adheres to the guidelines laid out (separate technical and financial document files and the financial proposal password protected).



No	FUND Clarification requested	Response
4	Clarification on Evaluation Method	The Evaluation Process will be as follows (Please see
		from page 25 on the RFP):
		A reviewing committee shall be established to evaluate each technical proposal. The technical proposal is evaluated individually on the basis of its responsiveness to the technical requirements and will be assessed and scored according to the evaluation criteria set out in the RFP. Technical proposals that score at least 75 points out of 100 will be considered as qualified for the review of financial proposal. Any proposal less than that will be disqualified from proceeding to the next step and its financial proposal shall be returned unopened following the award of the contract.
		The financial proposal of all proposers which have attained the minimum score in the technical evaluation will be evaluated subsequently. The lowest evaluated Financial Proposal (Fm) is given the maximum financial score (Sf) of 100. The formula for determining the financial scores (Sf) of all other Proposals is calculated as following:
		Sf = $100 \text{ x Fm}/\text{ F}$, in which "Sf" is the financial score, "Fm" is the lowest price, and "F" is the price of the proposal under consideration.
		Consolidated evaluation The weights given to the Technical (T) and Financial (P) Proposals are:
		T = 0.70, and P = 0.30 Proposals will be ranked according to their combined technical (St) and financial (Sf) scores using the weights (T = the weight given to the Technical Proposal; P = the weight given to the Financial Proposal; T + P = 1) as following:
		$\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{St} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{T}\% + \mathbf{Sf} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{P}\%.$
		The firm achieving the highest combined technical and financial score will be invited for contract negotiations.



	FUND	D
No	Clarification requested	Response
5	We are wondering to what extent your team is interested	A broader understanding of transformational change
	in "transformational change" as a specific term, or as a	shall be examined that includes concepts such as
	broader concept. As the request for proposals suggests,	'paradigm shift'. Primarily, the review shall focus on
	transformational change has been defined in a variety of	the search for high-quality evidence of large effect
	ways throughout the literature and it is likely that	sizes along the two main attributes of
	conceptual clarity will need to be developed before the	transformational change – scale of change and
	evidence gap map proposed can be effectively	temporal sustainability of change.
	undertaken. In this case, it is important to know if you	
	anticipate restricting the study to the specific term	
	"transformational change," or rather addressing the	
	concept more broadly, including for example terms like	
	"paradigm shifting." A broader approach such as this	
	would significantly alter the scope of the work, so it is	
	critical that our team understands your needs before we	
	begin to design a methodological strategy.	
6	Relatedly, we would like to know the expected scale of	Please see response to similar question (Question 1)
	funding available for the review. At present, we have	above.
	identified several options of ways to proceed with our	
	proposal that include varying degrees of investment.	
	Clarifying our first question will assist in this, but more	
	information would help us to present a proposal that fits	
	your purposes.	
7	We would appreciate more information on the intended	The completed review is intended to be used for both
	use of the completed review. In particular, we would like	external and internal purposes. It will be used as
	to know if this work is intended to primarily inform	input for future Board Documents, and will also
	internal processes, or if the work will be externally	inform future evaluations of the IEU. In addition, it
	facing. Additionally, we are interested in knowing if this	will be published and disseminated in order to
	work will be primarily used to evaluate project	contribute to learning both within and outside of
	submissions for funding, to evaluate the success of	GCF and CIF.
	implemented projects, or both.	
8	Would there be a conflict of interest in applying given	There would be no conflict of interest.
	that our GCF accreditation application is also in the	
	pipeline?	