

QUESTION AND ANSWERS

LRPS-2024-9195638 – Country Office Evaluation Belize, Eastern Caribbean (ECA), Jamaica, Guyana-Suriname

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

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

	CHECK LIST – PROPOSALS SUBMISSION.	X
01	Verify submission of complete technical proposal. DO NOT INCLUDE PRICES in technical proposals. Submit BEFORE DEADLINE => 02/03/2025 23:59h (Panama time) send your technical proposal in a separate e-mail with description LRPS-2025-9195638 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL at: lacro-ops@unicef.org	
02	Verify submission of financial proposal using provided Matrix. Submit BEFORE DEADLINE => 02/03/2025 23:59h (Panama time) send your financial proposal in a separate e-mail with description LRPS-2025-9195638 FINANCIAL PROPOSAL at: lacro-ops@unicef.org	
03	If sending by e-mail, verify to submit proposals to the right e-mail address LACRO-OPS@UNICEF.ORG	
04	Anticipate the submission of proposals to avoid last-minute delays or technical difficulties that may cause late deliveries and therefore INVALIDATION of proposals. <i>"A few seconds after deadline is considered LATE delivery."</i>	

Information to submit:

1. In the file *LRPS-2025-9195638.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; 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 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), 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.

Q5: Given the large number of specialists to be identified and secured (for each CPE) we kindly ask you to postpone the submission deadline (currently set on 02 March) of at least 2 weeks.

A5: 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.

Q6: Given the scale of the evaluation and the number of specialists implied, is there a maximum budget for the mission? And/or a minimum number of estimated total man-days?

A6: Estimated number of days P12

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 allocated 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

Q7: [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.

A7: 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.

Q8: As we prepare our proposal for LRPS-2025-9195638, we want to ensure that our approach aligns with UNICEF LACRO's expectations. We have reviewed the ToR in detail and would appreciate your guidance on a few key points:

Travel Component: The ToR mentions four countries as out of scope (Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras), but based on our understanding, the expected travel is to five countries—tentatively and subject to change: Belize, Jamaica, Barbados (for ECA), Guyana, and Suriname—each for a five-day trip. Could you confirm if this is correct?

A8: Travel to five countries—tentatively and subject to change: Belize, Jamaica, Barbados (for ECA), Guyana, and Suriname. Estimated number of days P12

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 allocated 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

Q9: Systematic Review under Strategic Relevance Assessment: The ToR mentions the capacity to process large volumes of secondary documents and data, including a comprehensive and systematic review. From our experience, such an approach is not typically necessary for this type of evaluation. Would it be acceptable to propose an alternative methodology, or is the systematic review a mandatory requirement?

A9: A Strategic Relevance Assessment should be done processing and reviewing in a systematic way large volumes of secondary documents and data.

Q10: Network Analysis and External Positioning: External positioning is usually a separate assignment rather than part of a CPE. If this element is required, do you expect separate teams for both, particularly if they need to be conducted in parallel?

A10: the evaluation team proposed should also conduct the Network Analysis and External Positioning.

Q11: Additionally, would you be open to alternative approaches instead of a traditional network analysis? For instance, we recently conducted a positioning and comparative advantage assessment for WFP at both global and regional levels using a different methodology—would you be open to exploring such an approach?

A11: Is this methodology analysing the network of stakeholders (so it is a kind of network analysis) (Page 33) External coherence and positioning (network analysis). For each Country Programme, the CPEs aim to assess UNICEF's position, role, and comparative advantage in a network of stakeholders working around child and/or adolescent policies, programming, and advocacy.

Q12: Could you please clarify whether the Gender Programmatic Reviews (GPRs) referenced in the ToR are already ongoing and if they will be finalized before the evaluation begins? We note that similar programmatic reviews (e.g., mid-term reviews) have explicit timelines mentioned, and given that gender,

equity, and human rights are key cross-cutting themes in the evaluation, having finalized GPRs would greatly support our analysis.

A12: Most of the Gender Programmatic Reviews (GPRs) referenced in the ToR will not be finalized before the evaluation begins.

Q13: Could you clarify how primary data collection/sampling should be approached for multi-country programmes, particularly for the UNICEF ECA multi-country programme? Should qualitative data collection, including consultations with adolescents and youth, be conducted in all eight countries under the ECA Office, or will geographic sampling be applied to select specific territories and stakeholders for deeper analysis? Understanding this will help us design an efficient and representative data collection approach.

A13: This is a methodological choice/decision by the ET, considering also the need of relevance and efficiency in the design.

Q14: We understand that this RfP is related to the implementation of four CPEs. Could you please clarify the following:

- Would it be possible to tender only for one or two CPEs? Or only 4-CPEs tenders will be accepted?
- In case, shall we present a unique technical offer independently from the number of CPEs?
- In case we bid for all CPEs, shall we present four different core teams with four different Team Leaders? Or do you expect to see only one core team with one team leader and the same core team members, while differentiating the national experts ?

A14: only 4-CPEs tenders will be accepted, with a single submission.

No need of four different core teams with four different Team Leaders. Other combinations could be valid for achieving economies (same leader and, in case, other team members for different countries), but always respecting the times of delivery.

Q15:

- Depending on the answer to the previous question, how should we organise/present our financial proposal? Do you expect to receive an overall financial proposal valid for all CPEs or would you want to receive individual financial proposals, i.e. one for each CPE?

A15: an overall financial proposal.

Q16:

- We acknowledge the indication of potential number of working days for each CPE, but we consider the number of working days envisaged for the TL (30) as being on the low side, which would risk to affect performance. Is there any flexibility? Would it be possible to increase the relevant numbers?

A16: TL 30 days is an estimation

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 allocated 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

Q17:

- The timeframe foreseen is 12 months. Would this imply that all 4 CPEs are completed within that timeframe? As this would be challenging, would you accept a more extended timeline?

A17: CPEs should be completed within that timeframe, due to the next cycle of CPD design, we cannot afford a more extended timeline.

Q18: 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.

A18: See Table 6 in page 14.

Q19: 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.

A19: See Table 6 in page 14.

Q20: Is it possible to have the same person serve as Lead Evaluator for more than one country?

A20: yes, always respecting the time of deliverables.

Q21: Is there a page limit for the technical and economic proposals, respectively? If so, what is included in the page limit?

A21: No.

Q22: What is the budget ceiling for this RFP?

A22: 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.

Q23: 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?

A23: payments to entities located outside Panama are subject to that specific jurisdiction only.

Q24: RFPS / PART II - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION PROCESS
1. Proposal Submission Schedule

1.5 Submission Deadline

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

A24: Yes, email submissions be allowed. Submission instructions addressed in points above.

Q25: 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?

A25: annex E would simply be your technical proposal, with no need to have a predefined format.

Q26: 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?

A26: 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.

Q27: Annex B TOR / 9.2. Documents to be submitted in the proposals

B. Economic proposal

On Pages 13 and 14 it states in section 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?

Q2: Is the UNICEF LACRO office exempt from paying VAT to Panamanian tax authority?

A27: UNICEF LACRO will be the contract manager. UNICEF, as a body of the United Nations, is exempted from the payment of VAT.

Q28: Annex B TOR

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

A28: No at this stage.

Q29: In line with point 1.2 of the Instruction to Tenderers (special notes) on the Proposal Submission Process, we would like to submit the following questions for clarification:

The first paragraph of section 9.1. specifies that each team should include at least 3 professionals. Does this mean that the indicated 45 working days in Table 5 should be shared between 3 experts (Evaluator, Analyst and Quality Controller)?

A29: Table 5 refers to 45 days for other team members (apart of the evaluation lead).

Q30: Is it expected that 3 team members are to visit the country of the CPE? Or some of them can perform tasks remotely?

A30: The evaluation team should do the field work in country.

Q31: Will the cost of the project manager, logistical and administrative support) as well as the cost of the Quality Controller (footnote 33) be included in the expert fee rate?

A31: Estimated number of days P12. These days are related to expert fees.

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 allocated 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

Q32: There is a requirement on page 13 (Lead Evaluator profile) to provide evidence of team leadership experience in evaluation assignments. Are we right to understand that only this experience of the Lead Evaluators should be confirmed with certificates, contracts and etc. Will evaluation reports with expert name be accepted as a proof of experience?

A32: CVs can be included, no need of certificates.

Q33: Page 18 presents an example of a financial proposal. Please advise what is meant under "item" ? Should the budget be structured per phase, per CPE or per deliverable?

A33: 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 below 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.

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

Q34: Is there a specific format of the statement of exclusivity and availability that tenderers should use (requirement of point 2.3 of special notes)?

A34: there is no specific format.

Q35: Evaluation Criteria:

Are there specific key performance indicators (KPIs) that will be applied during the project evaluation?

A35: We count on a checklist that will be used in the quality assurance of Inception and final reports. This will be shared with the evaluation team during the kick off.

Q36: Communication and Coordination:

What will be the communication and coordination process between our team and UNICEF during the implementation of the project?

Will there be regular update meetings, and if so, how often?

A36: There will be efficient follow up meetings.

Q37: Data and Documentation Access:

Will we have access to all the data and documents needed to carry out the assessments effectively?

A37: Yes.

Q38: At what point will our firm have contact with the consultants responsible for the meta analysis of UNICEF's program data from the outset?

Is there a specific protocol for requesting and accessing this data?

A38: The contact will be during the inception phase.

Q39: Expectations for Collaboration with Local Partners:

Are there any expectations of collaboration with local partners or other agencies involved in the countries involved?

The terms of reference mention UNICEF's interest in National-level reach with "focus on specific territories to examine specific interventions". Will these interventions and geographies be shared with applicants to determine scope and corresponding costs? Will selection criteria for selection of sub-national level stakeholder engagement be shared?

Are there procedures or collaboration agreements already in place that we need to follow?

A39: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal.

Q40: Legal and Contractual Aspects:

Are there any additional contractual clauses that we should be aware of in addition to those mentioned in the document?

A40: UNICEF's General Terms and Conditions for contracting of services, which can be found online, are the governing legal framework.

Q41: The Instructions for Proposers note:

"1.7.2 The Proposal must be sent for the attention of unit/team and address as specified in this RFP/RFPS. Proposals not sent in this manner will be disqualified.

1.7.3 They must be clearly marked as follows:

* Outer sealed envelope:

Name of company

[RFP(S) NO.]

[NAME OF UNIT & UNICEF OFFICE ADDRESS]

* Inner sealed envelope - Technical Proposal (1 original and 2 copies): Name of company, RFP(S) number – technical proposal

* Inner sealed envelope - Price Proposal (1 original and 2 copies): Name of company, RFP(S) number - price proposal No price information should be provided in the Technical Proposal.

1.8.2 Faxed Proposals must be returned to the ONLY ACCEPTABLE FAX NUMBER for Proposals as specified in this RFP(S) Document. Proposers should note that Proposals received at any other fax number will be invalidated.

No price information should be provided in the Technical Proposal.

1.9 E-mailed Proposals (as applicable)

1.9.1 See paragraph 1.1 above concerning applicability of this paragraph.

1.9.2 All e-mailed Proposals must be submitted to the ONLY ACCEPTABLE E-MAIL ADDRESS as specified in this solicitation document. No other recipient should be "Cc" or "Bcc" in the e-mail submission. Proposals not sent in this manner will be disqualified.

1.9.3 All Proposals submitted by e-mail must be submitted as email attachments. The Technical Proposal and Price Proposal must be sent as separate attachments and clearly indicated as such in the file name (e.g. Company ABC Technical Proposal, Company ABC Price Proposal). Email links (e.g. to documents to be downloaded from cloud based folders) are not acceptable unless otherwise specifically requested. Proposals submitted as a link or through a link will be invalidated.”

However, we do not see a physical address, fax number, or email address in the RFP/RFPS or TORs. The header on page 1 has the following information:

United Nations Children's Fund

Edificio 102, Calle Alberto Te

Panama Telephone

Panama Facsimile

Email: lacro-ops@unicef.org”.

This email address is the same for submitting questions as described in 1.2 on page 9, where the instruction is:

IMPORTANT: PROPOSALS ARE NOT TO BE SENT TO THE INDIVIDUAL STATED ABOVE - ANY PROPOSALS SENT TO THE ABOVE NAMED INDIVIDUAL WILL BE DISQUALIFIED.

Can UNICEF please provide the complete instructions for proposal submission?

A41: questions above address this aspect.

Q42: Are there any page limits applicable for the technical proposal?

A42: No. Responses should be clear addressing Table 6 and Self assessment related to table 6 (qualitative and quantitative, explaining why and how the proposal addresses the criteria).

Q43: Are there any formatting requirements (e.g., font size, margins) for the technical proposal that proposers should be aware of and follow?

A43: No. Responses should be clear addressing Table 6 and Self assessment related to table 6 (qualitative and quantitative, explaining why and how the proposal addresses the criteria)

Q44: While “LPRS-2025-9195638_Caribbean.pdf” on page 13 indicates a certain structure to submit the technical and financial proposal, the sequence of Annexes seems incomplete. For organization purposes, is it allowable to submit the Technical Volume and the Financial Volume, each with all required annexes, with a different order?

For instance, can we include the forms on pages 3-5 of “LPRS-2025-9195638_Caribbean.pdf” document as annexes to the Technical Volume, and separately, the complete MDM template in excel format together with a bank proof, showing the name of the bank, the bank account number and the account holder; UNGM vendor number record, certificate of Incorporation; and two-year set of financial statements for the full financial year as annexes to the Financial Volume?

A44: Questions above address this. The financial offer (quotation) needs to come separate from all other documentation, which can come in as many emails as considered appropriate. No specific order is required.

Q45: Under the description of the economic proposal on p.18, the solicitation notes that “NOTE: since this service will have a travelling component attached to it (travel to 4 countries, tentatively and subject to possible changes: Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras for 5-day trips in each).” We imagine these countries are not correct for this CPE. Can you please clarify?

A45: This is a mistake. It refers to the Countries of the CPD and times refer to Table 5.

Q46: Would UNICEF confirm how it defines a “Consortium” or “Association”? To clarify, a bid that includes subcontractors does not necessarily mean all entities are a consortium or an association, from a legal perspective. Can UNICEF confirm this is consistent with their understanding of the terms?

A46: 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 2nd 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.

Q47: Should the offeror submit a detailed budget narrative in addition to the requirements of the economic proposal?

A47: no narrative needed with the budget, just a detailed disaggregation of the submitted quotation.

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

Q48: If the offeror needs to engage a subcontractor for a limited set of activities, should the offeror identify the subcontractor at the proposal stage? Can the offeror put a placeholder for the subcontractor and suggest a lump sum amount for the services to be provided?

A48: The profile of the evaluation team is part of the scoring criteria (Table 6). So the proposal should clearly indicate the members of the evaluation team.

Q49: If the subcontractors are identified at the proposal stage, is it necessary that they agree to only work with one offeror/bidder?

A49: 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 2nd case, the associated companies will nominate a lead entity, which will be the one formally presenting the offer, formally obligated in the 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.

Q50: Should the offeror show the cost of each deliverable per country? For example, should the offeror show the price of the draft evaluation report, the final evaluation reports with an executive summary, the PowerPoint presentation, and the evaluation brief for each country?

A50: UNICEF aims to receive a single offer/quotation, not a per-country offer.

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

Q51: When UNICEF states that key experts must sign an exclusivity statement, does this requirement extend to both consultants and subcontractors only if they are identified as key experts in the SOW?

A51: key experts must sign an exclusivity statement.

Q52: Liquidated damages: Would UNICEF clarify the applicability of this clause at the proposal stage vs. post-award?

A52: as per UNICEF's General Terms and Conditions, liquidated damages will only apply to the awardee

within the framework of a signed contract. Proposal stage doesn't apply to this.

Q53: Would UNICEF clarify the applicability of this clause at the proposal stage vs. post-award?

A53: as per the above answer.

Q54: PART III -AWARD/ADJUDICATION OF PROPOSALS, General Terms and Conditions of Contract (Services): This section states that any requests for amendments to the UNICEF Terms and Conditions “may negatively affect the evaluation of the Proposal.” May UNICEF clarify which section of the evaluation criteria this would be evaluated against?

A54: in practical terms, lack of acceptance of the by-default UNICEF General Terms and Conditions (Services) will in this case be a disqualifier.

Q55: In the context of scoring proposals as outlined in Table 6 of the TORs, will UNICEF make a distinction between what could be defined as the core evaluation team (comprised of the Lead Evaluator, Associate Evaluator(s), and Evaluation Analyst(s)) and any country-level consultants that evaluation teams may involve for specific, limited tasks?

In particular, will the scoring for technical evaluation criteria in “2. Profile of other team members for each CPE” and “3. Profile of the overall teams by each CPE” only consider the core team or the core team plus any and all consultants charged with conducting in-person interviews using guides developed by the core team?

A55: The scoring for technical evaluation criteria will consider all the team members. 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.

Q56: To help proposers deliver the most relevant and realistic technical approach possible, can UNICEF share a ballpark figure for the funding envelope that they have planned for the four Country Programme Evaluations that are being procured here?

A56: No. Use the proxy of Table 5 and the budget size of the CPDs (the number of working days should be related to the CPD budget size).

Q57: Is it necessary to break down costs by country in the proposal, or can we present a consolidated budget?

A57: Consolidated (and it could be broken down, this should be coherent to the number of working days by country depending on their budget CPD size).

Q58: Are there any restrictions on data collection methods depending on the country, or does the consulting firm have flexibility to adapt the methodological approach?

A58: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team's proposal, that will be finally agreed during the

inception phase.

Q59: It remains unclear from the ToR (cf: Table 6) whether experts can be repeated between CPEs or if UNICEF is expecting a different team for each CPE?

A59: The experts can be combined / repeated.

Q60: Please clarify the expected location of the project office.

A60: The proposals should be sent to the proposed email.

Q61: When presenting our interest in participating, we contacted LACRO as indicated last Friday but received no reply. Should we expect any?

A61: No.

Q62: The ToR mentions the capacity to process large volumes of secondary documents and data, including a comprehensive and systematic review. From our experience, such an approach is not typically necessary for this type of evaluation. Would it be acceptable to propose an alternative methodology, or is the systematic review a mandatory requirement?

A62: The terminology “comprehensive and systematic review” is generic meaning any review that is comprehensive and systematic.

Q63: More than that, about external positioning is usually a separate assignment rather than part of a CPE. If this element is required, do you expect separate teams for both, particularly if they need to be conducted in parallel? Additionally, would you be open to alternative approaches instead of a traditional network analysis? For instance, we recently conducted a positioning and comparative advantage assessment for WFP at both global and regional levels using a different methodology—would you be open to exploring such an approach?

A63: Yes, if this complies with the ToR requirements / expectations on positioning and network analysis.

Q64: Could you clarify how primary data collection/sampling should be approached for multi-country programmes, particularly for the UNICEF ECA multi-country programme?

A64: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team’s proposal, that will be finally agreed during the inception phase.

Q65: Should qualitative data collection, including consultations with adolescents and youth, be conducted in all eight countries under the ECA Office, or will geographic sampling be applied to select specific territories and stakeholders for deeper analysis? Understanding this will help us design an efficient and representative data collection approach.

A65: This is a decision and part of the evaluation team’s proposal, that will be finally agreed during the inception phase.

Q66: the ToR mentions four countries as out of scope (Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras), but based on our understanding, the expected travel is to five countries—tentatively and subject to change: Belize, Jamaica, Barbados (for ECA), Guyana, and Suriname—each for a five-day trip. Could you confirm if this is correct?

A66: this is a mistake; it should instead refer to Belize, Jamaica, Barbados (for ECA), Guyana, and Suriname.

Q67: Could you please clarify whether the Gender Programmatic Reviews (GPRs) referenced in the ToR are already ongoing and if they will be finalized before the evaluation begins? We note that similar programmatic reviews (e.g., mid-term reviews) have explicit timelines mentioned, and given that gender, equity, and human rights are key cross-cutting themes in the evaluation, having finalized GPRs would greatly support our analysis.

A67: Conducted GPR

2023: Belize & Guyana and Suriname

2025: ECA & Jamaica

Q68: In the context of scoring proposals as outlined in Table 6 of the TORs, will UNICEF make a distinction between what could be defined as the core evaluation team (comprised of the Lead Evaluator, Associate Evaluator(s), and Evaluation Analyst(s)) and any country-level consultants that evaluation teams may involve for specific, limited tasks?

In particular, will the scoring for technical evaluation criteria in “2. Profile of other team members for each CPE” and “3. Profile of the overall teams by each CPE” only consider the core team or the core team plus any and all consultants charged with limited activities such as conducting and documenting in-person interviews using guides developed by the core team?

A68: The scoring for technical evaluation criteria will consider all the team members.

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.

Q69: And are there any page limits and formatting requirements (e.g., font size) applicable for the technical proposal?

A69: No. But the proposal should be clearly responding Table 6, and the related self assessment.

Q70: How are internal quality assurance days accounted for by the evaluation company?

A70: 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).

Q71. How do the ratings in Table 6 apply to personnel of the evaluation team apart from the main profiles?

A71: 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.

Q72: How will coordination happen with UNICEF in case of different evaluation teams?

A72: The evaluation company will coordinate among the different evaluation teams or team members for internal efficient coordination and coordination with UNICEF.

Q73: Do you also consider the evaluation team experience in multilateral development banks (MDBs) evaluations?

A73: 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)...

Q74: where is the recording of the pre-bid conference session?

A74: 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) if not received.