

25 August 2022

Reference: RFP 2022-020 – *Provision of Consultancy Services for- review and rectification of GCF results and project management data and development of GCF portfolio data catalogue.*

### **ADDENDUM NO. 1**

This Addendum is issued to complement and will constitute an integral part of the Invitation Letter for **RFP 2022-020** – Provision of Consultancy Services for- review and rectification of GCF results and project management data and development of GCF portfolio data catalogue.

The original Invitation document will remain in full force and effect. Respondents shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting their proposal.

#### **I. Responses to Requests for Clarifications**

<b>SN</b>	<b>Clarifications Requested by Bidders</b>	<b>Responses by GCF to the Clarifications</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>“iPMS has worked to intake and store the majority of FA related ex-ante data (expected target and projected data)” - GCF already has a dataset for FA. What does it mean "majority" (how many FA)??</li></ul>	<p>As mentioned in the TOR, not all the FA datasets that should be in IPMS are in the system currently. For example, the datasets sitting outside of IPMS are historical datasets created in MS Excel format to monitor and track both ex-ante and ex-post results data against the initial RMF/PMFs indicators as well as historical financial data (expenditures reported by AEs) managed in MS Excel format prior to having PPMS launched.</p> <p>In addition, there are datasets to be constructed via this assignment such as new datasets of FA implementation-related schedules hence not yet in the IPMS.</p> <p>Hence majority means all data excluding the above datasets sitting outside of the IPMS. Note there are 200 approved funded activities (FAs) in our portfolio.</p>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>“Similarly, relevant documents to review against the existing readiness grants data include readiness grant proposals, interim progress reports (IPRs), completion reports (CRs), grant agreements, extension or change request documents and the past data review documents.” - This review has already been done in another consultancy. It is not clear to us what does this specific task entail. Please clarify.</li></ul>	<p>Depending on a selected contractor, the desk review exercise could take time or be shortened. The desk review is preparatory work for the selected contractor to enable them to submit the deliverables specified in the TOR, and therefore is not a deliverable itself. If a selected contractor has already undertaken the review of existing portfolio related documents and files via another contract, this process can be shortened to extract or review, and validate specific data relevant to this assignment</p>

SN	Clarifications Requested by Bidders	Responses by GCF to the Clarifications
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“To create/complete datasets for grants implementation, reporting, and disbursement-related schedules and grants information” - This ToRs mention 599 readiness grants. The previous consultancy for the Readiness 2.0 had worked with 499 grants. In order to "complete" the dataset, does this mean that it is necessary to upload the remaining readiness grants?</li> </ul>	<p>No, the dataset previously submitted by another consultant firm is the dataset that will be worked on this assignment.</p>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“list of readiness grants categorized by version of logical framework (logframe) applied” - Does the Secretariat already have this list?</li> </ul>	<p>The Secretariat has the list of logical framework versions. The categorization of grants by logical framework versions is the deliverable under this contract.</p>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deliverable 1.3: clean and rectified expenditures dataset (reported by AEs) for FAs in MS Excel format with a short summary report of proposed changes/rectifications. Note historical expenditure data for the period of 2016-2019 is in MS Excel format while the expenditure data for the period of 2020 - 20219 is available in PPMS/iPMS format which is downloadable onto MS Excel format for integrated review and rectification. Is the Secretariat also expecting to review the budget to compare with expenditure?</li> </ul>	<p>No, deliverable 1.3 is to clean and rectify expenditure dataset only, and there is no requirement to review budget and compare against expenditure.</p>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the Readiness Grants and considering that the analysis conducted by AAE on the financial data left out some financial data (only key outputs were analyzed and information extracted), thus, some financial data is missing. Could you please give us greater detail as to what do you want to review in the Fluxx system?</li> </ul>	<p>Items not mentioned in the TOR including the readiness financial data review is not required to be performed under this assignment.</p>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is stated in the TOR that another firm already developed a MS excel dataset with the list of key outputs for readiness grants. For those grants already included in this dataset is it necessary to input new data or cross-validate any information against original Readiness</li> </ul>	<p>The scope of work is to reformat the dataset already developed to enable transfer into IPMS/PPMS. Therefore, it is not necessary to input new data or cross-validate any information against original Readiness grant documents.</p>

SN	Clarifications Requested by Bidders	Responses by GCF to the Clarifications
	<p>grant documents? or is the scope of work only to reformat the dataset already developed to enable transfer into IPMS/PPMS?</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TOR states in page 10 as part of deliverable 4 that the consultancy firm is expected to review and rectify the auto-tagged keywords for each grant to increase the accuracy of the keyword-based tagging for readiness grants. Does the work to be conducted under this workstream include reviewing the information of this auto-tagging and checking it against the original readiness grants documents as well as the MS excel dataset developed by the other company?</li> </ul>	<p>The consultancy firm will work with GCF to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Produce a list of major "project tags" including keywords related to the core deliverables of the Readiness Programme (e.g., concept note, funding proposal, country programme, entity work programme, NAP, PPF application proposal), and keywords aligned with the GCF programming strategy and RRMF.</li> <li>Put relevant tags on all the Readiness and PPF files containing project documents.</li> <li>Check all pre-existing tags on the files correct them where needed This task aims to remove irrelevant keywords automatically tagged to files of the respective grant to enable external users to search and access the correct files in their query using the tags.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TOR mentions as part of deliverables 1.1 and 1.2 "clean and reviewed results dataset" along with a "short summary report of <b>proposed</b> changes/rectifications". Does the Secretariat expect the consultancy firm to input changes directly in the datasets while conducting the review exercise and provide a short summary of changes/rectifications <u>already input</u>? Or do the proposed changes need to be reviewed by the Secretariat before inputting them into the clean dataset?</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed revisions/changes should be inputted directly into the dataset in MS Excel format. The summary report is to provide the high level information on those proposed changes submitted by the selected contractor. It is then the Secretariat's responsibility to transfer and ingest the cleaned dataset into IPMS.</p>
	<p><b>Administrative Questions.</b></p> <p>We are currently in the process of performing Client Acceptance to pursue this opportunity, is it possible to provide the following documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notarial Deed</li> <li>Financial Statement</li> <li>Legal Company Name (Green Climate Fund)</li> <li>Legal Company Addressed (Can we refer this to the address in the RFP?)</li> </ol>	<p><b>- Regarding your proposal submission for this. RFP completion of company profile form and all technical and financial forms are sufficient.</b></p>

SN	Clarifications Requested by Bidders	Responses by GCF to the Clarifications
	Is there any beauty contest after proposal submission? and will it be a shortlisted candidate only?	N/A
	For every missing, not complete, or incorrect data that fails to be gathered or rectified within the given timeline, will there be consequences or penalty we have to bear? especially when it heavily relies on the active participation of data owner/users to provide the data.	A selected contractor is expected to deliver the deliverables mentioned in the TOR. The contract management unit is to provide necessary materials and resources to support the contractor to deliver the outputs. All required terms will be outlined in the contract to be signed between the parties including the terms related to a situation where any expected responsibilities are not fulfilled by both or either of the parties.
	Is there any assigned data owner for each ex ante and ex post data to collaborate with during review, assessment and rectification process?	A selected contractor is free to utilize any tools or technology available to support the assignment. However, data validation and cleaning work is generally manual intensive.
	Does iPMS have features for Data Catalogue?	Does iPMS have features for Data Catalogue?  Please clarify and elaborate the question to help us respond. Please note the development of a data catalogue (a list of data variables) is one of the deliverables of this assignment.
	For current datasets (FA and Grants), whether metadata and business glossary has been defined?	There is glossary of terms available in our internal as well as external facing documents. Please clarify metadata and business glossary referred here to help us answer your question.
	Are there any variants in the manual data (ex-ante and ex-post data and other MS Excel/MS Word/PDF)?	Please clarify and elaborate the question, especially the term 'variants'.

Please take note of this Addendum no. 1.

Kind regards

Procurement, DSS  
Green Climate Fund