

ADDENDUM - 002

Date: 02 February 2017

Attention: Prospective Proposer

Reference: Request for proposal (RFP) Ref: # UNWHQRF105

Note:

UN Women has received some queries regarding the above mentioned **UNWHQRF105 on Request for Proposal (RFP) for Request for Proposal (RFP) for evaluation of UN Women's Fund for Gender Equality**, below are the consolidated queries and UN Women responses:

QUESTION #1: Can UN Women share the 2014-2017 and 2009-2013 Programme Documents (Prodocs) with Bidders?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: Yes, see attached to the Addendum both Prodocs (2009-2013) & (2014-2017).

QUESTION #2: We are aware grantees are responsible for monitoring and evaluation of their programs. Are there basic requirements the grantees have to include in their evaluation approach? How often are grantees required to report monitoring data (are they are required to report on to UN Women)?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: Every grantee of the Fund for Gender Equality need to undertake at least a final evaluation of their programme at the end of programme implementation. FGE provides a Draft TOR to undertake evaluations as well as many other tools and guidance that we have available to ensure gender and human rights based evaluation processes are undertaken. Grantees report every six months through a tool called Performance Monitoring Framework and report to both FGE and UN Women Focal Points.

QUESTION #3: How did the change from UNIFEM to UN Women in 2011 impact the management or approach of the Fund?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: There was not much of an impact since our programme document was valid till 2013. The two areas of work on WEE and WPP remained relevant for the organization. With the development of the second prodoc (2014-2017), FGE refined its alignment with UN Women's Strategic Plan for the same period.

QUESTION #4: Is the Fund expected continue to provide grants after 2017?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: This is currently under review. It will depend on the availability of funding as well as priorities determined in the new strategic plan for the period 2018-2021, currently under development.

QUESTION #5: Is there a theory of change that guides the fund's approach to grant making/grantee selection?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: Yes, this is included in the FGE Prodoc 2014-2017 and outlines the pathways by which its three-pillar support (grant-making, technical support and Result Based

Management) for CSOs builds towards the achievement of **Goal 1**: Women have increased leadership and participation in the decisions that affect their lives; and **Goal 2**: Women have increased economic security and rights.

QUESTION #6: We understand that UN Women will provide the reports from the mid-term and final evaluations from 2015 onwards. We assume that is in regards to the various programs that are being funded through the Fund. If so, will the selected firm also have access to any mid-term and final evaluation reports they deem necessary prior to 2015?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: Yes, we will provide all the documentation that helps the team to be as informed as possible.

QUESTION #7: We are aware that UN Women implements programming related to WEE and WPE. That said, does the Fund's supported programming overlap with any UN Women implemented programs in those two focus areas?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: The work supported by the Fund through its grant-making is fully aligned with UN Women's two impact areas on WEE and WPP at the global level. In addition, FGE seeks to build synergies between the grantee programmes and the country level programming by consulting with UN Women Country Offices at key moments of the selection process in each grant-making cycle, and by assigning Focal Points at country level that monitor/support the day-to-day implementation of grantee programmes and build connections with the overall work of the Country Office. The objective of the Fund is to serve as a complementary modality to UN Women's programming.

QUESTION #8: Are any trips to New York (UN Women's HQ) required for this evaluation? If not, can bidders include them if preferred?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: Trips to New York are not required, but the team is free to include them if they deem appropriate. Please, note that this may raise the price of the proposal.

QUESTION #9: Can UN Women provide the estimated level of effort (in days) for the evaluation? Specifically, are team members expected to be engaged full time (20 days a month) over the 8 months' duration?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: This will depend on the number of members involved in the evaluation team and with the information provided in the ToR, the team should be able to tentatively measure the level of effort and involvement in this exercise.

QUESTION #10: Can UN Women clarify what ME/MA as referenced in Section 2.1: "Brief summary of the proposed methodology for the ME/MA including the involvement of the Reference Group and other stakeholders during each step".

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: This is a typo. It should say "Brief summary of the proposed methodology for the **Evaluation process** including the involvement of the Reference Group and other stakeholders during each step".

QUESTION #11: When constructing the financial proposals, do bidders need to account for the possibility of needing translators should a country be selected for one of the field visits where the team does not speak the language?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: Yes.

QUESTION #12: Can UN Women confirm that the technical proposal is only allowed to be 5 pages? The format for the technical proposal contains several sections that require extensive information/description and we were wondering if it is feasible to provide the requested information required within the 5 pages' limit.

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: Proposals can be 7 to 10-page long. They should not exceed 10 pages.

QUESTION #13: Do bidders need to budget for local transportation or will UN Women CO provide transportation during the field visits?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: See section: Format of Financial Proposal – Price breakdown: “d. An all-inclusive amount for local travel, if applicable”.

QUESTION #14: Are the good practices mentioned in objectives section (p. 6) and the case studies referred to in the section about methodology (p. 9) meant to serve the same purpose?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: Yes, but there are other sources of information and methodologies to put in practice that will contribute to fulfilling this objective.

QUESTION #15: According to the RFP, case studies will be prepared in order to illustrate the results of grantees in each of the thematic areas. Should the case studies present the results of a specific grantee programme (while showing why this is a good practice), or present several grantee programmes and pointing out their strengths (as good practices to be followed)?

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: It will be decided once the countries are selected. In some cases, there are countries with more than one granted programme.

QUESTION #16: As regards the evaluation criteria, there seems to be an overlap between 1.1 and 1.3 in relation to the 'organisational capability'. We assume that this is to be solely addressed under 1.3.

UN WOMEN RESPONSE: The requests under criteria 1.1 and 1.3 are slightly different. 1.1 is related to the structure of the organization while 1.3 is more related to the capacities of the organization.