

## QUESTION AND ANSWERS

### LRPS-2024-9195634 – Country Office Evaluation El Salvador, Honduras

#### IMPORTANT INFORMATION

We remind you the review this checklist for a successful proposal submission:

	CHECK LIST – PROPOSALS SUBMISSION.	X
01	Verify submission of <b>complete</b> technical proposal. <b>DO NOT INCLUDE PRICES in technical proposals.</b> Submit <b>BEFORE DEADLINE =&gt; 02/03/2025 23:59h (Panama time) send your technical proposal in a separate e-mail with description LRPS-2025-9195634 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL at: <a href="mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org">lacro-ops@unicef.org</a></b>	
02	Verify submission of financial proposal using provided Matrix. Submit <b>BEFORE DEADLINE =&gt; 02/03/2025 23:59h (Panama time) send your financial proposal in a separate e-mail with description LRPS-2025-9195634 FINANCIAL PROPOSAL at: <a href="mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org">lacro-ops@unicef.org</a></b>	
03	If sending by e-mail, verify to submit proposals to the <b>right e-mail address</b> <b><a href="mailto:LACRO-OPS@UNICEF.ORG">LACRO-OPS@UNICEF.ORG</a></b>	
04	<b>Anticipate the submission</b> of proposals to avoid last-minute delays or technical difficulties that may cause late deliveries and therefore <b>INVALIDATION</b> of proposals. <i>"A few seconds after deadline is considered <b>LATE</b> delivery."</i>	

Information to submit:

1. In the file **1. LRPS-2025-9195634.pdf** you will find instructions for proposal submission.
2. In the pages 3,4 and 5 of that documents you will find the **REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR SERVICES FORM** that must be submitted completed and signed in your technical proposal.
3. The file **3.MDM Template.xlsx** completed and in Excel format (focus on points 2 and 3 - VENDOR INFORMATION), should be sent in your technical proposal.

#### Q&A

Please find the responses **in red** to the following questions, received during the pre-bidding conference and the period opened that purpose:

Q1: Where do we submit our proposals?

**A1: Proposals are to be submitted to [lacro-ops@unicef.org](mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org); the financial package (your offer's quotation) must be sent in a separate email than the technical package. Make sure the emails' weight is not so much that an email may not come through.**

Q2: I can't express interest in this opportunity in UNGM.

**A2: The button to express interest in UNGM does not function; omit it. Simply submit your proposal by**

---

email to [lacro-ops@unicef.org](mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org) by the deadline provided.

Q3: Hemos enviado ya nuestra propuesta, pero no hemos recibido noticias.

A3: las propuestas no se abren hasta después de haber vencido la fecha límite para la presentación de postulaciones. Ahí inicia el proceso interno de UNICEF de valoración de las propuestas recibidas, incluyendo la verificación de su validez (si se reciben tarde o en forma incorrecta, quedan invalidadas), la fortaleza de la parte técnica de las ofertas válidas mediante un panel de expertos y la competitividad de la cotización económica de aquellas ofertas válidas calificadas por el panel técnico. Al final del proceso se notifica a los postulantes sobre el resultado del proceso.

Q4: The RFPS states not to send proposals to this email address ([lacro-ops@unicef.org](mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org)), and I haven't found a submission option on the UNGM platform. Could you please clarify where we should submit our proposal?

A4: the text in the tender document is UNICEF standard but it may admittedly feel confusing. The intended message is that no email must be sent to the individual person addresses shown through the document; instead, all communication (incl. the declaration of interest to participate, the acknowledgement of reception of this opportunity, the presentation of Q&A, the submission of the technical offer package and the submission of the financial offer) is to be channeled via [lacro-ops@unicef.org](mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org).

Q5: ¿La propuesta puede remitirse en español?

A5: Si, la propuesta especifica en torno a El Salvador y Honduras puede enviarse en español o en ingles.

Q6: ¿Se requiere alguna información adicional de la firma para participar de la conferencia previa del 17/febrero?

A6: no hay requisitos predeterminados para la participación de instituciones calificadas en este proceso, desde la presentación de preguntas en el periodo habilitado para el Q&A escrito a la participación en la conferencia previa la presentación de ofertas hasta el 2 de marzo, 23:59 hora de Panamá.

Q7: Upon reviewing the Terms of Reference, we were unable to locate specific details regarding the submission process or any indication of an information session for potential participants. We would greatly appreciate it if you could provide clarification on these points.

A7: In regards to the submission process, it consists of separate emails (technical offer received in one or more emails; financial offer received in a different email than the technical package) at [lacro-ops@unicef.org](mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org)

In regards to an information session, reference is made below to the excerpt of the published documentation for this tender:

1.4 Bid conference. A bid conference will be held on February 17th, 2025, at 10:00 am Panama time.

Link:

[https://teams.microsoft.com/join/meetup-Join/19%3ameeting\\_ZmRhMjYwMWMtYTQ0Zi00ZDAxLTlkZjMtYWl2OGJmMTI0NzI4%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%2277410195-14e1-4fb8-904b-ab1892023667%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%224cb6c1b6-14d3-438c-8f11-46a3b28fdf81%22%7d](https://teams.microsoft.com/join/meetup-Join/19%3ameeting_ZmRhMjYwMWMtYTQ0Zi00ZDAxLTlkZjMtYWl2OGJmMTI0NzI4%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%2277410195-14e1-4fb8-904b-ab1892023667%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%224cb6c1b6-14d3-438c-8f11-46a3b28fdf81%22%7d)

Meeting ID: 330 960 059 70

Passcode: cx95Kq97

The pre-bid conference session was recorded and the link to that recording was sent by email to interested entities; please reach out ([lacro-ops@unicef.org](mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org)) if not received.

Q8: After reviewing the available documentation, including the Terms of Reference (TOR), it is clear that the final deliverables must be in English and that the fieldwork will be conducted in Spanish. However, it is not entirely clear in which language the consultancy itself will be executed.

Could you confirm whether the consultancy will be primarily conducted in Spanish, with the final documentation translated into English? This clarification is crucial for us, particularly in defining the composition of our proposed team.

A8: All products are in Spanish unless otherwise specified.

One Evaluation Brief for each UNICEF Country Programme in scope of sufficient graphic and visual quality (2 total) in both English and Spanish.

The Honduras and El Salvador inception report and final evaluation reports will be in Spanish.

Q9: Mediante la presente, quisiera consultar cuál es la forma de envío de la propuesta para la consultoría: "2025-2026 Country Programme Evaluations for UNICEF El Salvador and Honduras", no hemos encontrado en la documentación descargada (1. LRPS-2025-9195634 y 2. ANNEX B 25\_01\_24 TOR Country Programme Evaluations (El Salvador and Honduras)) a qué correo electrónico, a través de qué plataforma debemos enviar nuestra propuesta.

A9: la forma de envío es por vía de correo electrónico, a la dirección [lacro-ops@unicef.org](mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org). El paquete de oferta técnica (uno o varios emails, según se considere apropiado por el peso de los adjuntos) deberá venir separado del paquete financiero (la cotización del costo del servicio), que vendrá en un email aparte del resto de la oferta para poderse considerar válido.

Q10: [REDACTED] would like to kindly request an extension of the submission deadline by two weeks. This additional time would allow us to ensure a comprehensive and high-quality proposal. Please let us know if this request can be accommodated.

A10: We have already proposed more time than usual as the deadline for responses, so an extension of the response time is not currently being considered.

Q11: We request that the qualification of "prior experience with country program evaluations of United Nations agencies" for the Lead Evaluator is a preferred (rather than required) qualification.

A11: See Table 6 in page 14. The qualification remains as it is in table 6.

Q12: We request that the requirement of “Experience in evaluation for UN agencies as a lead; previous evaluation experience with UNICEF and with country program evaluations highly appreciated” for the Lead Evaluator may be expanded to include team leadership roles outside of UN agencies.

A12: See Table 6 in page 14. The qualification remains as it is in table 6.

Q13: Is it possible to have the same person serve as Lead Evaluator for more than one country?

A13: yes, always respecting the times of deliverables.

Q14: Is there a page limit for the technical and economic proposals, respectively? If so, what is included in the page limit?

A14: No.

Q15: What is the budget ceiling for this RFP?

A15: it is not UNICEF’s policy to reveal available budgets but, instead, the aim is to have a price-blind tender to ensure the best outcome from a fully competitive tender. Reference to days of effort are provided as a proxy (table 5).

Q16: Price proposal and LTA

Is this RFPS issued through the Long Term Arrangement for Services for the Provision of consultancy Services in Conducting Country Programme Evaluations in UNICEF? If not, are we correct in assuming that, in this specific RFPS, UNICEF will not distinguish between holders and non-holders of that LTA, implying that bidders that are also LTA holders:

are not bound by the maximum fees rates agreed in the LTA, but

have to (re-)submit all administrative documents required in the RFPS, such as financial statements?

A16: this process is not linked to any already existing LTA within UNICEF; hence, technical and price proposals in this process are independent from existing LTAs.

Q17: If maximum fee rates are not determined by the LTA, are there any other UNICEF regulations on fee rates for the required profiles (Lead Evaluator, Associate Evaluator, Evaluation Analyst)?

A17: No, there aren’t.

Q18: How will reimbursable costs be treated? If this is a global price contract, meaning that firms present their assumptions on travel and other non-fee costs in the proposal, and will be paid a fixed budget agreed at contract signature? Or are these costs reimbursable in the strict sense that the contractor will have to send receipts and DSA requests to UNICEF for approval?

A18: the awardee will organise its own travel, no submission of DSA requests for approval will need to happen. While the travel component has to be based on UN DSA costs, the submitter should incorporate this cost as an item of their financial proposal, disaggregating the number of days and their cost. It may

be that during the development of the contract, the need for more or less days of travel be unveiled, which would lead to a conversation and agreement between UNICEF and the contractor for amendment of the contract (if more days needed) or reduced amount of the invoicing (if less) but the idea is that the travelling and its associated cost be part of each company's proposal, clearly identified and according to the level of effort considered necessary for carrying the job.

If further clarification is required from a given financial offer at the time of financial envelope opening, UNICEF would contact the incumbent bidder.

Q19: The suggested structure of the price proposal (ToR pp.17-19) is an example and hence contains items that do not seem relevant for Country Programme Evaluations (CPEs), such as fees for 'course development' and 'course delivery'. Would you be able to provide a structure that reflects better the services delivered in CPEs?

A19: THIS IS AN EXAMPLE TO BE ADAPTED. The Price Proposal must be organized so that it reflects the inputs shown in the technical proposal and distinguishes between Fixed Costs and estimate Reimbursable Costs against approved expenses. The following level of detail is requested:

The format shown is suggested for use as a guide in preparing the Financial Proposal. The format includes specific expenditures, which may or may not be required or applicable but are indicated to serve as examples.

Q20: Regarding the price proposal, the ToR specify that "Travel and per diems will not be noted, as this will later be determined and finalized by UNICEF and the chosen bidder" (p. 18). Does this imply bidders should only present professional fees in their budget (nothing else), and that the scoring of the price proposal will only take into account these fees? Or are we expected to also estimate travel costs and per diems, and will these be considered for the financial score as well?

A20: (page 19) Please note, for travel to countries, the contractor will be responsible in administering its own travel and the cost therein should be included in the financial proposal, as per answer to question 18 above.

Q21: On page 19, the ToR mention "travel to 4 countries, tentatively and subject to possible changes: Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras for 5-day trips in each". We assume this is a mistake. Could you kindly confirm that travel will only take place to and within El Salvador and Honduras, and could you indicate the expected length of the (main) field mission in each country?

A21: this is a typo. Anticipated travel is to 2 countries: Honduras and El Salvador. Estimated number of days (page12, table 5).

Table 5. Phases and estimated working days for each CPE\*

Phases	Estimated working days allocated to each one of the Team leaders (for each CPE)	Estimated working days of other team members (for each CPE)
Inception	10	15
Fieldwork/analysis	10	20
Reporting/finalization	10	10

\*Estimated effort should vary based on each UNICEF office's programme size and other factors

Q22: Evaluation team

According to the ToR, p. 12., "The evaluation team should prioritize inclusion of team members residing

in Honduras and El Salvador, including the Lead Evaluator or the Associate/Assistant evaluator(s)". However, according to the scoring criteria Table 6, the place of residence of the team members would not affect the technical score at all. Therefore, we assume bidders can propose (an) international Lead Evaluator(s) – not based in Honduras or El Salvador – without losing any points. Please confirm this assumption is correct.

A22: yes, correct.

Q23: The overall team will have to fill three roles in each of the two countries. Can the same person cover the same role in both countries (e.g., one Evaluation Analyst for both countries together), or is it mandatory to propose  $3 \times 2 = 6$  different team members?

Section 9.1 of the ToR suggest that some of the experiences of the different team members should be "supported by contracts, certificates, or similar".

A23: The same person could cover the same role in both countries, but the the proposal should deliver the products on due time.

Q24: Is it sufficient to just include the team members' CVs in the annex of the proposal, or do you require all team members to document each relevant assignment through a certificate (which would be very difficult in practice)?

A24: It is sufficient to just include the team members' CVs in the annex of the proposal.

Q25: Technical scoring criteria

Page 8 of the ToR require tenderers to "propose a preliminary presentation of the evaluation matrix for the evaluation questions related to relevance" [following the structure in 10.2]. Could you indicate under which of the criteria listed in Table 6 this item will be scored?

A25: PROPOSED METHODOLOGY: Adequate overall evaluation design and framework, including explanation of the approach to address the evaluation questions including relevance and strategic positioning and network analysis (8 points max).

Q26: According to the ToR, p. 13, bidders are expected to include in the technical proposal "a summary self-assessment table in accordance with the below Table 6 that outlines the proposal's fulfilment of technical evaluation criteria with relevant information based on documented experience of evaluation team members and/or the firm". Please confirm we are only supposed to present our self-assessment for the dimensions "Company experience" and "Quality of the proposed" in Table 6, which can be objectively verified against facts, but not for the dimensions "Proposed methodology and process".

A26: The bidder is supposed to present a qualitative and quantitative self-assessment (with clear explanations) for all the dimensions of table 6 ("Company experience", "Quality of the proposed team" and "Proposed methodology and process").

Q27: se puede compartir una versión traducida al español de los términos de referencia?

A27: se facilita en pdf, junto con este mismo documento.



Q28: Can you please confirm if payments made by UNICEF LACRO (located in Panama) to nonresident firms be subject to the Panamanian government's income tax withholding rate for their country of residence?

A28: payments to entities located outside Panama are subject to that specific jurisdiction only.

Q29: Estimación del número de jóvenes y adolescentes a encuestar:

Si bien los términos de referencia establecen que el número de encuestas dirigidas a jóvenes y adolescentes se definirá en la fase inicial de la consultoría, ¿podrían proporcionarnos una estimación preliminar que nos permita considerar adecuadamente los recursos requeridos en nuestra propuesta?

Factibilidad de encuestas telefónicas para niños, jóvenes y adolescentes:

¿Existe la posibilidad de aplicar encuestas telefónicas a estos grupos, o UNICEF tiene una preferencia por encuestas presenciales o en línea?

Marco muestral para representantes de la comunidad:

Dado que los términos de referencia requieren el diseño de una muestra para la recolección de datos con personas influyentes, representantes de la comunidad o con proveedores de servicios comunitarios, ¿podrían proporcionarnos un marco muestral de referencia que nos permita desarrollar una propuesta de muestreo preliminar?

Alcance de la selección de entidades subnacionales:

Se establece que al menos dos entidades subnacionales deberán ser seleccionadas para la recolección de información. ¿Este requisito aplica exclusivamente a las entrevistas con líderes comunitarios, o también debe considerarse para otras poblaciones de interés dentro del estudio?

A29: El equipo evaluador propone el diseño de la estrategia muestral y de la evaluación (incluyendo la oportunidad de entrevistas por medios telemáticos si los considera viables).

Q30: Pueden aclararnos si es un requisito obligatorio la inclusión de miembros del equipo que residan en Honduras y El Salvador, incluyendo al Evaluador Principal o a los Evaluadores Asociados/Asistentes?

A30: No es obligatorio.

Q31: Pueden aclararnos, en la experiencia organizacional, qué abarca el término: ¿Experiencia organizacional en la implementación de evaluaciones nacionales? Y ¿Experiencia en la realización de evaluaciones en la región de América Latina?

A31: Ver Tabla 6 en página 14.

Q32:	Q18:	RFPS	/	PART	II	-	PROPOSAL	SUBMISSION	PROCESS
1.				Proposal			Submission		Schedule

1.5 Submission Deadline

Please provide the submission instructions. Will email submissions be allowed?

A32: Yes, email ([lacro-ops@unicef.org](mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org)) will be accepted.

Q33:	RFPS	/	PART	II	-	PROPOSAL	SUBMISSION	PROCESS
5.			Preparation			of		Offer

5.11 / 3.1

On Page 12 of the RFPS it states: "3. The technical proposal must be submitted free of charge and in a separate file (email) with the following information: 3.1 The technical proposal as Annex E." Annex E is not identified in the materials provided to bidders. Please provide Annex E or identify where bidders can find the document?

**A33: annex E would simply be your technical proposal, with no need to have a predefined format.**

Q34: RFPS / PART II - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION PROCESS  
5. Preparation of Offer  
5.11 / 4

On Page 12 it states in bullet 4 that "The economic proposal as Annex F in a separate file (email)" Annex F is not identified in the materials provided to bidders. Is there a standard form Proposers are required to complete?

**A34: annex F would simply be your financial (i.e. economic) proposal, with no need to have a predefined format. What is important is that it comes in a separate email from the rest of the submitted package.**

Q35: Annex B TOR / 9.2. Documents to be submitted in the proposals  
B. Economic proposal

On Pages 13 and 14 it states in section be B. Economic Proposal that "quote must be in US dollars with all taxes included"

Q1: Please confirm and clarify if the contracting and administration of this contract is with UNICEF-LACRO?

**A35: UNICEF LACRO will be the contract manager.**

Q36: Is the UNICEF LACRO office exempt from paying VAT to Panamanian tax authority?

**A36: UNICEF, as a body of the United Nations, is exempted from the payment of VAT.**

Q37: Annex B TOR

Is UNICEF able to share the theory of change for each separate country programme?

**A37: Not at this stage.**

Q38: In Table 6, on company experience, are the points awarded exclusively for the experience of the company in specific projects, or can the projects of the team members proposed to lead the evaluation also be counted?

**A38: there is a section to reflect the experience of the proposed team members, which can include experiences previous to the current company they are in. But in the section specific for the company experience, prior team member experiences in other companies will not count.**

Q39: Regarding the distribution of the team across more than one evaluation: is it possible to deploy one or more team members (including the team leader) in more than one evaluation if the workplan is achievable and there is a rationale for the team composition in each case?



---

A39: yes, this is possible, as long as the deliverable timelines and quality are respected.

Q40: If two companies apply as a consortium, is the payment made to both or to one, or can this be agreed upon contracting?

A40: in general for this type of service, we envisage two multi-company likely scenarios: one where several companies form a consortium that holds its own legal personality and exists as such, and one where several entities come together for a joint proposal but without the formal adoption of a consortium format. In the former, the consortium is considered to be presenting the offer and the companies that are part of this consortium are not to issue their own offers or participate in other joint offer or consortium. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> case, the associated companies will nominate a lead entity, which will be the one formally presenting the offer, formally obligated in an eventual contract and getting the payments, but no member of the association may present an own offer or participate in another offer for this service.

UNICEF evaluates offers per se, technically and financially, but it doesn't evaluate subcontracting arrangements. It just needs to be informed of the association of entities or subcontractor structure that will take place, but the signatory (and, hence, the accountable entity) will either be the consortium itself or the lead entity, as explained above.

Q41 Is it possible for one of the companies to participate as part of the consortium if it did not directly receive an invitation to tender from UNICEF?

A41: not having received an invitation is no block. This is an open tender.

Q42: The ToR emphasizes leveraging UNICEF's administrative and monitoring data to inform the evaluation. Will the evaluation team have direct access to raw datasets, or will we receive pre-processed summaries from the external consultant? What data security protocols should we anticipate when handling UNICEF's internal reporting data?

A42: This will be clarified during the inception phase.

Q43: Are there any limitations on how administrative data can be used or triangulated with other sources?

A43: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal.

Q44: Beyond sensemaking sessions, does UNICEF envision validation workshops or co-creation sessions with external stakeholders?

A44: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal. But most of the deliverables must be validated.

Q45: Are there specific stakeholder engagement formats that UNICEF would find most useful for ensuring evaluation uptake?

A45: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal.

Q46: Will UNICEF provide existing stakeholder mapping or prior research to inform the network analysis,

or should this be developed entirely from scratch?

**A46: UNICEF will provide some information on stakeholders.**

Q47: While the ToR specifies Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) as a primary method, would UNICEF be open to including Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) where relevant, particularly for engaging specific stakeholder groups (e.g., adolescents, community representatives)?

**A47: yes, FGS is an option. This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal.**

Q48: The ToR encourages innovative approaches and emphasizes the ability to process large amounts of data. Would UNICEF be open to AI-based content analysis, sentiment analysis, or participatory digital storytelling as complementary methods for capturing program impact?

Are there any specific innovations UNICEF is particularly interested in testing through this evaluation?

**A48: UNICEF is open to any innovative approaches coherent with the CPE ToR. This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal.**

Q49: Will the seed sample be informed that they are part of an evaluation linked to UNICEF programs, or will the framing focus on a broader sectoral review?

**A49: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal.**

Q50: Does UNICEF have any predefined survey instruments, or should the evaluation team develop them from scratch?

**A50: UNICEF has already a predefined survey.**

Q51: What are the expected sample sizes and key target respondent groups for the online survey? Are there any specific language or accessibility requirements for survey participants?

**A51: For Spanish speaking countries in Spanish.**

Q52: Is it possible for our company to apply for both the El Salvador & Honduras evaluation and the Belize, Eastern Caribbean, Guyana and Suriname, and Jamaica. evaluation using the same core team, with the exception of locally based consultants in each country?

**A52: Yes, it depends on the real / operational capacity of the core team to deliver 6 quality CPE on time.**

Q53: Aspectos técnicos

En los TdR (numeral 4.3), se plantea como parte del alcance geográfico la visita y consulta a una muestra de proyectos de campo de los CPD. ¿Existen criterios para la selección de estos proyectos? O bien se espera que los proponentes presente una propuesta al respecto?

**A53: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal.**

Q54: En los TdR (numeral 9.1), se describen los perfiles del equipo de consultoría. ¿Por qué no se han considerado expertos temáticos de las áreas cubiertas por los CPD? ¿Tiene algún valor agregado considerar la inclusión de estos expertos como parte del equipo?

A54: Esto es parte de los criterios de la Tabla 6 en el apartado de composición del evaluation team.

Q55: El proceso de evaluación se deberá cumplir en un período de 12 meses, previsiblemente a partir del mes de marzo de 2025. ¿Cuál es el nivel de esfuerzo mensual estimado en días para el equipo de expertos considerando este período de tiempo?

A55: El número de días tentativo por CPE está en la Tabla 5.

Q56: En el numeral 9.3 de los TdR, se indica la posibilidad de viajes a 4 países de días cada uno: Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala y Honduras. ¿Cuál es la razón de inclusión de estos países? ¿Por qué no se ha incluido Panamá como sede de la Oficina Regional (LACRO) de UNICEF? ¿La visita a estos países se debe considerar como adicionales a la visita mandatoria a El Salvador y Honduras, correspondientes a los CPD evaluados?

A56: Se ha explicado anteriormente: es un error; se refiere a Honduras y El Salvador.

Q57: Procedimiento de envío de propuestas

El aviso de solicitud de propuesta en la plataforma UNGM no ha desplegado los módulos para cargar los documentos de la propuesta ni el cronómetro de tiempo límite. Tampoco permite Expresar interés. ¿Podrían indicarnos qué hacer para expresar interés y cargar nuestros documentos dentro del plazo establecido?

¿Podría mejorar la claridad de las instrucciones para el envío de propuestas? En particular, respecto a lo siguiente: se pide que la propuesta técnica se presente como Anexo E y la propuesta económica como Anexo F y en ambos casos aparece entre paréntesis el término “Correo electrónico”. Esto sugiere que debe haber un documento principal de la propuesta. ¿Cuál es ese Documento? Así mismo, en el numeral 1.2 del Anexo 1, se dice que el envío por correo electrónico es motivo de exclusión. ¿Podría aclarar por favor esta aparente contradicción?

¿Existe un formato específico para la presentación de la Propuesta económica?

A57: la interacción con la plataforma UNGM puede ser omitida; por ahí ni se puede expresar interés en la oportunidad ni se carga ninguna documentación para la participación en el proceso. El envío a correos personales es el motivo de descalificación (todo el paquete debe enviarse por correo a [lacro-ops@unicef.org](mailto:lacro-ops@unicef.org) atendiendo a que la propuesta puramente financiera (la cotización) debe venir en un email separado del resto de la documentación técnica (en uno o varios emails, según se considere apropiado según el paso de los adjuntos). Respecto a los anexos E y F, esto se refiere simplemente al nombre a darle a las propuestas técnica (an. E) y financiera (an. F)).

Q58: Document LRPS-2025-9195634

Is the table included on page 6 part of the Request for Proposal for Services Form (pages 3-5) or is it part of the Price proposal?

Please confirm that each item listed in section 5.1, on page 12, should each be sent in a separate file in one e-mail message to [Lacro-ops@unicef.org](mailto:Lacro-ops@unicef.org)

On page 14, two paragraphs mention how the contract will be awarded. First, the award will be given to the proposer with the highest combined technical and price score. In the second, the award will go to the proposer with the lowest priced technically compliant proposal (which we understand are those with a score of at least 60 in the Technical Proposal). Could you please explain?

A58: the price proposal is only the quotation or pricing; the rest of documentation can be treated as technical documentation. The quotation (i.e. financial offer, economic offer, quotation) needs to be received in an email different than the rest of documentation, which will come in one or more emails, according to the bidder's consideration in terms of email sizes.

In terms of award, this tender is weighted 80% for the technical proposal and 20% for the pricing. In this sense, offers that reach the minimum technical score in the technical panel stage will have their financial envelopes opened and a weighting will be applied on the basis of 80-20, resulting in the final score with which they will compete against the rest of technically approved offers.

Q59: Annex B. Terms of Reference

Please explain what is expected to be included in the summary self-assessment table (in accordance with Table 6)?

A59: It is expected a self assessment: qualitative and quantitative, explaining why and how the proposal addresses the criteria.

Q60: In the price proposal section, on page 19, there is a note mentioning travel to 4 countries: Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, and Honduras for 5-day trips each. Is this correct? Or should it be to Honduras and El Salvador?

A60: It is a mistake, it should be El Salvador and Honduras.

Q61: En los TdR se menciona la economía de escala y la ejecución de procesos paralelos. ¿Podrían confirmarnos si la expectativa es contar con dos equipos operando simultáneamente para cada país, o si UNICEF LACRO consideraría viable que un mismo equipo realice la evaluación en etapas secuenciales, optimizando recursos y asegurando coherencia metodológica entre ambos ejercicios?

A61: Ambas propuestas son adecuadas si se asegura la ejecución en calidad y tiempo.

Q62: Notamos una diferencia importante entre el gasto total por fuente de financiamiento y el presupuesto del CPD (Figura 1 y Figura 3). Para considerar el tamaño de la oficina, ¿cuál de estos datos debería tomarse en cuenta?

A62: For the CO budget size, consider Table 9 in Annex 10.1.

Q63: ¿Podrían ampliar en qué consiste el Evaluability Assessment de El Salvador y el Realignment Exercise de Honduras?

A63: This is described in Annex 10.3.

Q64: Se indica que ninguno de los CPD ha tenido un Strategic Moment of Reflection (SMR). ¿Ha habido algún otro ejercicio de evaluación intermedia o evaluación relevante que pueda servir como fuente de información sobre el CPD vigente?

A64: esa informacion se compartira, aclarara y se utilizara durante la fase de inicio para el informe inicial de la evaluacion.

Q65: ¿El CPD de Honduras tiene una Theory of Change (ToC) integrada o está estructurada por componente?

A65: Habra que determinarlo CPE por CPE. Normalmente solo tienen ToC sectorial.

Q66: ¿Ambos países están realizando un Gender Programmatic Review (GPR)? En caso afirmativo, ¿en qué mes se estima que los resultados estarán disponibles?

A66: Gender Programtic Reviews (GPR) conducted:  
Countries that have had GPR prior to 2025: ECA, Belize, Peru, El Salvador, Jamaica, Guyane & Suriname, Honduras.  
In 2025 ECA and Jamaica will have GPR

Q67: La evaluación cubre el período 2022 a la fecha, pero su duración es de un año. ¿Se espera que se incorpore la información de 2025 (disponible en los primeros meses del 2026) dentro del análisis?

A67:Se considerara la informacion accesible y existente hasta la fecha del inception phase.

Q68: Se menciona que deben evaluarse años previos según temas políticos de interés. ¿Esto implica incorporar las acciones y planes implementados por UNICEF en esos años o se espera únicamente considerar el contexto político-social de los países?

A68: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal.

Q69: ¿Las acciones de UNICEF en El Salvador cuentan con alguna estrategia territorial definida?

A69: This is part of the CPD design (accessible online) or could be determined during the inception phase.

Q70: ¿Las oficinas de UNICEF en Honduras o El Salvador han realizado algún mapeo previo de actores que pueda servir como insumo para la evaluación?

A70: Las Oficinas Pais podran dar algunos insumos para este proceso como parte de la informacion en torno al CPD.

Q71: I want to ask whether we have to stick to the Team Composition requirement in the TORs or is there any flexibility in proposing a different composition (to factor in economies of scale) to conduct both CPEs?

A71: There are flexibilities.

Q72: Is the proposal required in English or Spanish?

A72: English or Spanish.

Q73: What specific areas in each country will be the subject of study?

A73: Consider the CPD and to be agreed during the inception phase.

Q74: Could you clarify whether the ToRs specify that the evaluation requires national sampling? If so, could you provide the approximate sample frame size (per project or intervention area) to help estimate costs?

A74: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal.

Q75: Are there any expected specific locations for field work in each country?

A75: Not at this stage.

Q76: Can the technical and financial proposal be submitted in Spanish?

A76: Yes.

Q77: On TORs page 21 TOC ELS regarding effectiveness was incorporated recently after CPD...has this been taken into consideration in their implementation process?

A77: The ELS ToC should be considered a key input of the CPE.

Q78: I would like to clarify whether the inclusion of team members residing in Honduras and El Salvador is a mandatory requirement. Specifically, does this requirement apply to the Principal Evaluator and/or the Associate/Assistant Evaluators?

A78: It is not mandatory.

Q79: In the Terms of Reference (section 4.3), the geographic scope includes visits and consultations with a sample of CPD field projects. Are there any criteria for selecting these projects, or is it expected that the proponents submit a proposal regarding this selection?

A79: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal, that will be finally agreed during the inception phase.

Q80: En relación con la estructura metodológica de la evaluación, nos gustaría aclarar si UNICEF espera una matriz de evaluación única que integre los hallazgos de El Salvador y Honduras en un solo marco de análisis, o si, por el contrario, se requiere una matriz de evaluación segregada por país, permitiendo diferenciar los indicadores, enfoques y resultados específicos de cada contexto nacional.

A80: La matriz de evaluación de Hon y ELS, tendrá muchos elementos comunes y algunos diferenciados

/ adaptados.

Q81: Agradeceríamos su apoyo brindando información más detallada sobre los grupos de población atendidos. En particular, nos gustaría conocer:

Rango etario de los beneficiarios directos e indirectos.

Contexto socioeconómico y condiciones de vulnerabilidad de los grupos atendidos.

Localización geográfica de las poblaciones objetivo, con énfasis en zonas rurales, urbanas y comunidades indígenas o afrodescendientes.

Facilidades y disponibilidad para la consulta, incluyendo posibles mecanismos de acceso a los informantes clave, restricciones logísticas o protocolos de seguridad en el trabajo de campo.

A81: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal and the existing information in the CPD (accessible online).

Q82: ¿Las actividades de evaluación en El Salvador y Honduras deben realizarse de manera simultánea, o es posible escalonarlas en función de la disponibilidad de actores y logística de trabajo de campo?

A82: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal. The approach should assure delivering on time and quality.

Q83: Todos los outcomes del programa tienen una teoría de cambio??

A83: Si, en principio.

Q84: ELS implementation has exceeded its budget ....if so, how are they financing current activities? Will this impact the evaluation process?

A84: No impact in the evaluation process.

Q85: any quick points on the countries? any specified regions.

A85: See Annex 10.1.

Q86: En los TdR se menciona que se considerarán dos territorios subnacionales por país. ¿Podrían precisar qué territorios han sido preseleccionados o si la selección será parte del diseño metodológico propuesto por los oferentes?

A86: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal.

Q87: bajo que criterio se clacularon los dias de trabajo del evaluador y del equipo?

A87: Based on experience and considering economies of scale of 2 CPEs.

Q88: sobre el registro de las firmas interesadas se enviara un correo respuesta de parte de UNICEF confirmando? y sobre las respuestas de las preguntas se compartira mediante la plataforma?

A88: el Q&A respondido, junto con las grabaciones de las sesiones pre-bid conference, se comparten con



todas las instituciones que hayan mostrado interes. UNICEF no enviara correo personalizados confirmando recepcion de documentacion.

Q89: Hay alguna medida de seguridad específica para viajes dentro de la consultoría? o son a criterio de los consultores.

A89: a criterio de los consultores.

Q90: could you please elaborate on the governance structure of the project (i.e. the involvement of the HND and ELS COs vis a vis LACRO Office).

A90: Governance structure will involve HND, ELS COs (sometimes together and others separately) and LACRO Office.

Q91: Mencionaban un acuerdo de disponibilidad para el periodo de consultoría. Hay un “template” para esto? O solo Requiere estar expreso en CV y con firma?

A91: de parte de UNICEF, no hay un acuerdo de disponibilidad especifico.

Q92: las entrevistas a informantes clave puede proponerse realizarse en linea o telefonica? Finalmente sobre las encuestas cuando se menciona en linea es que sea autoadministrada?

A92: Si puede haber entrevistas en linea. Hay un modelo de encuesta que UNICEF comparte y sera gestionada por el equipo evaluador.

Q93: En TDR se indica que el periodo de evaluación es el ciclo de vigencia de los CPD. Sin embargo, también se indica que este periodo puede ampliarse dada la coyuntura de los países que serán evaluados. Si el equipo de evaluación decide ampliarlo para reflejar el contexto, se debe considerar evaluar años adicionales (fuera del CPD vigente)?

A93: El periodo de evaluacion es el del CPD o de sus extensiones. Se puede hacer una valoracion retrospectiva previa pero el objeto de evaluacion es el CPD actual

Q94: Are you expecting inicial draft reports by october?

A94: Yes.

Q95: Hay un formato para para el checklist de aseguramiento de calidad? debe entregarse con la propuesta?

A95: El formato de Quality Assurance sera compartido por UNICEF en el kickoff.

Q96: si hay un comité de calidad interno se podría convocar a un miembro de UNICEF para hacer parte de las reuniones?

A96: The internal quality control is not a responsibility of UNICEF.

---

Q97: How are internal quality assurance days accounted for by the evaluation company?

A97: Bidders or evaluation companies should account for and differentiate internal quality assurance days apart from the days specifically indicated as necessary for the execution of the CPE by the evaluation team. Internal quality assurance is understood as the quality assurance of the evaluation company. It is assured and is the responsibility of the bidder or evaluation company, regardless of by whom it is carried out in practice (by the evaluation team itself, the evaluation lead, another person from the evaluation company or another person). This internal quality assurance of each of the deliverables will be reflected in a checklist that UNICEF will provide from the kick off of the evaluation and will be shared with UNICEF for each deliverable (inception and final reports)

Q98: How do the ratings in Table 6 apply to personnel of the evaluation team apart from the main profiles?

A98: The need or requirement of the technical evaluation criteria in Table 6 in relation to Quality of the proposed team in terms of years of education, experience or skills only apply to the main profiles (evaluation lead, evaluation associate or evaluation analyst). If there are additional members (e.g. field interviewer) not all of these requirements would be necessary.

Q99: How will coordination happen with UNICEF in case of different evaluation teams?

A99: The evaluation company will coordinate among the different evaluation teams or team members for internal efficient coordination and coordination with UNICEF

Q100: Do you also consider the evaluation team experience in multilateral development banks (MDBs) evaluations?

A100: In table 6. In relation to Quality of the proposed team, considering the previous work experience (employed or consultancy) of the team lead with UNICEF/UN system. It will be considered in a larger sense, considering UNICEF/UN system and multilateral development banks (MDBs) - including e.g. World Bank (WB), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the African Development Bank (ADB), the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB)...