



July 29, 2021

Clarification Note RFPS- 9168624

Request for Proposal for Two-Pronged Evaluation on: 1. Strengthening Local Governance for Delivering Social Services and Social Protection for Vulnerable Children and Women in Cambodia and 2. Joint Programme for Supporting the National Social Protection Policy Framework in Cambodia

In line with paragraph 1.2 (Question from Proposers) in the Request for Proposal document we hereby provide clarifications to all written enquiries received by July 29, 2021.

Question 1: Given that proposals are due on 12 August, is the evaluation still planned to start in mid-August and end in February 2022? If not, what would be the estimated revised timeline?

Clarification: We will aim to start early September. However, we will not be able to extend the deadline of the evaluation beyond February 2022 due to expiry of funds that will be committed to the evaluation.

Question 2: Under paragraph 7 on Duration at page 13 of the ToR, it is indicated that the evaluation will have a total duration of 18 working weeks, but then at page 13-14 in the “Activities and deliverables” table the timeline spans from Week 1 to Week 21. Further, kindly note that Week 17 is Christmas week. Thank you for clarifying such inconsistencies in the expected timeframe.

Clarification: There are weeks that are not “working” weeks for the consultancy team but used for feedback from UNICEF team. Please note that Christmas is not celebrated widely in Cambodia and that Christmas is not a UN holiday for UNICEF Cambodia staff. If the evaluation team requires to a break during Christmas this is totally OK, as long as the activities can still be delivered on time. The team can work around with the schedule making sure key milestone deadlines can be achieved.

United Nations Children’s Fund
Cambodia Country Office
5th floor, Exchange Square, No. 19&20, Street 106, Sangkat Wat Phnom
P.O. Box 176
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Telephone: (+855) 23 260 204
Facsimile: (+855) 23 260 205
Email: phnompenh@unicef.org
www.unicef.org

Question 3: Please give more details on self-directed project. What will this comprise? Similarly, define self-directed plan.

Clarification: Participants develop their own plan as an outcome of the workshop which they individually implement.

Question 3: At page 3 of the ToR, referring to the SIDA funded LGSP, you mention “see Annex 1 for the full ToC” and again at page 5, referring to the UN Joint Programme, you mention “ToC graph is presented in Annex I”. However, in both cases, the ToR do not include such annexes. Could you please share them?

Clarification: See below after all responses.

Question 4: Concerning the ToC, we understand that we are asked to review/validate two separate ToCs (one for each programme) and not to build a new overall / common ToC. Is our understanding correct? Thanks for clarifying.

Clarification: We expect the TOC is used to guide the evaluation using a theory based approach and expect that if needed the TOC is revised and assessed against progress. We do not expect a new or separate ToC to be recreated, however, we expect the existing TOCs to be fully utilized in the evaluation design and analysis.

Question 5: Page 9 of the ToR at paragraph 3 on “Programme Area and specific IR involved”: could you please specify what does IR stand for?

Clarification: This is internal UNICEF information. Not relevant for proposal.

Question 6: At page 17 of the ToR, paragraph 9.1b on the “Narrative description of bidding institution’s experience and capacity” and 9.1b “Samples or Links to Samples of Previous Relevant Work”, it is not clear to us whether these refer only to the company or could be extended to the proposed evaluation team?

Clarification: Both. Importantly that the samples are authored by evaluation team members.

Question 7: Under 1.4 at page 8 of the ToR, last sentence, it is stated that the evaluation will collect primary information from both rights holders and duty bearers. Under 4.1 on Scope, at the end of page 9, it is indicated instead that, although the ultimate beneficiaries are rights holders, the evaluation will focus on the direct and immediate beneficiaries, i.e. government. Then, at page 11 at paragraph 4.3 under the EQ9 on Effectiveness, the sub-questions directly refer to the ultimate beneficiaries. Could you kindly specify whether direct

consultations with the ultimate beneficiaries (i.e. rights holders, women, children and vulnerable households) are expected or not? Thanks for clarifying this point, which is quite relevant for us not only from a scope and a methodological point of view, but also in terms of costs for data collection.

Clarification: Please propose what you think would work best to answer the evaluation questions in full.

Question 8: Linked to the previous question, shall we include a provision for the ethics review of the Inception Report and data collection tools in our budget?

Clarification: The TOR are clear in this regard. If children are included in the data collection ethical review is required and needs to be full responsibility of the evaluation firm.

Question 9: It is our understanding that this evaluation is aimed at underlining the two programmes' common points and cumulative effects; however, at the same time, we are asked to deliver two separate evaluation reports. It is thus not clear to us where these common points and cumulative effects should be dealt with, guaranteeing that the reports are not repetitive. Could you please clarify which are UNICEF's expectations in this regard? Thanks.

Clarification: The reason for needing two distinct reports is because each evaluation is a requirement of a different donor. However, the reports can be similar and do not need to be completely different. There are questions and areas that are distinct for each. For example, the context might be similar in both reports, however, the explanation of the object of evaluation would be distinct. The methodology would be the same in both reports. The response to each evaluation question can be similar, though we expect that nuances and specificities of each programme will come through as well. Where and as possible joint analysis is expected. The TOR are also requesting the firm to present in the proposal how this will be done, meaning, how the firm expects to do joint analysis where and as feasible and where it will do specific analysis. The overlaps are expected to be large but not absolute.

Question 10: Under the "Activities and deliverables table at page 14, it is stated that "Present draft inception". Shall thus the team present both the Draft inception report and the final inception report? Thanks for clarifying.

Clarification: One power point presentation, however, the report will require draft version(s) and a final version. However one time presentation.

Question 11: Under 1.1. the ToR specify the geographic coverage of the SIDA funded LGSP. While listing the focus provinces, the TOR states “Phnom Penh and M”. What does the M stand for?

Clarification: Typo. This should read “The geographic coverage is national, with specific activities implemented in the city region of Phnom Penh and in Kandal, Kratie, Ratanakiri and Siem Reap provinces.

Question 12: Under 5 “Deliverables”, the last bullet point (ix) describing the contents of the IR refers to “an evaluation briefing note for external communication purposes”. This is usually produced after the Final Evaluation Report. Shall we thus consider this as a typo?

Clarification: No. it is a briefing note with the evaluation purpose and plan that will serve to share with respondents so they know why they are being contacted. This will also be used in the presentation note that we will share with respondents to present the evaluation team, who they are, detailed data collection plan etc., to ensure support from national and local administration during data collection

Hope this clarifies.