



Evaluation Office

Bidders' Conference Call (UNFPA/USA/RFP/17/035)

LONG TERM AGREEMENT in regards to PROVISION OF EVALUATION SERVICES

30 JANUARY 2018

MINUTES

Present	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Lilia Velinova, Procurement Services Branch, UNFPA) Marco Segone, Evaluation Office, UNFPA) Alexandra Chambel, Evaluation Office, UNFPA) Louis Charpentier, Evaluation Office, UNFPA) Karen Cadondon, Evaluation Office, UNFPA) Mathew Varghese, Evaluation Office, UNICEF) Laurence Reichel, Evaluation Office, UNICEF
	<p>The following companies participating in the call identified themselves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">) ITAD) Econometric Colombia) ISG) EURO Health) INTA

The online bidders' conference in response to UNFPA/USA/RFP/17/035 took place on 30 January 2018 at 10:00 AM (EST) and the meeting concluded at 11:00 AM (EST).

The bidders' conference is public and written minutes will be posted publicly on the UN Global Marketplace. The purpose of the conference is to provide technical clarifications on the Request for Proposal (RFP) and the procurement process.

Lilia Velinova opened the bidders' conference and welcomed participants. Together with the Evaluation Offices of UNFPA and UNICEF, they answered bidders' questions.

Questions and Answers

Q1: This is a follow-up to the response provided for Question 65 (in the written responses to questions about the RFP). Can a bidder submit more than one CV for each profile, apart from the team leader profile (e.g. can a bidder submit two CVs for a thematic expert)? If so, will the daily rate be the same in the financial template?

A1: To clarify, UNFPA wishes to revise its response to Question 65 in the written responses to the following: Bidders may provide a maximum of three CVs (of three different candidates) for each profile which includes the team leader, thematic experts, etc., as listed in the RFP. The daily rate for each profile must be the same for all proposed candidates.

Given the significant number of questions regarding various combinations of profiles, proposed, experts, etc., UNFPA wishes to provide the graphical representation on the next page that summarizes its final answers.

The scenario below is hypothetical and is used for illustration purposes only:

Bidder A has decided to propose Mr. Smith and Mr. John for Team Leader for Lot 1. However, Bidder A believes they are also qualified to work in other roles in Lot 1 (same lot), as well as in roles in other Lots. In addition, Bidder B also wants to propose Mr. Smith as part of their team, while Mr. John himself has a company and wonders if he can submit a separate bid in addition to participating as part of Bidder A's team.

On the next page is a graphic representation of the possible combinations, indicating which are allowed.

Bidder	Lot	Profile	Proposed candidates	Is it allowed to propose Mr. Smith and/or Mr. John specifically, in addition to proposing them for the role of team leaders for Lot 1?	How many people may be proposed?
Bidder A	Lot 1	Team Leader	Mr. Smith and Mr. John	N/A	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Evaluator (Sexual and Reproductive Health)		Allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John or both.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Evaluator (Gender Equality)		Allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John or both.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Evaluator (Population Dynamics)		Allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John or both.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Evaluator (Adolescents and Youth)		Allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John or both.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
	Lot 2	Team Leader (or two co-team leaders)		Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John.	One team leader or two co-team leaders may be proposed. Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Senior thematic experts in FGM and harmful practices		Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.

		Senior thematic expert in gender equality and on social norm change		Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Team Leader		Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
	Lot 3	Evaluator (Family Planning)		Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Evaluator (Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights)		Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Evaluator (Maternal Health)		Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Evaluator (Health Systems of Developing Countries and Humanitarian Settings)		Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Evaluator (Health Logistics and Procurement)		Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Evaluator (Gender and Human Rights)		Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith or Mr. John.	Up to three CVs (of three different candidates) may be proposed.
		Lot 1			

Bidder B	Lot 2	Not allowed to propose Mr. Smith for any of the Lots (nor Mr. John)
	Lot 3	
Mr. John Enterprises	Lot 1	Not allowed to submit a separate bid for any of the Lots
	Lot 2	
	Lot 3	

Q2: Can bidders propose the same candidate as a team leader for one evaluation and as a thematic expert for another evaluation within the same lot? (Example Mr. Smith is proposed as the Team Leader in Evaluation A and Mr. Smith is also proposed as a thematic expert in Evaluation B).

A2: Note that this RFP is **not** for a specific evaluation. It is for the establishment of Long Term Agreements for evaluations in each of the three areas (Lot 1, 2, and 3). In this sense, the proposed candidates do not need to be presented in relation to a specific evaluation; rather, they need to be presented in relation to a specific profile. Once the LTAs are in place, the specific team will be drawn from the profiles included in the Long Term Agreements.

Bidders may propose the same candidate for the team leader profile and/or for the thematic expert profile within the same lot. Please refer to A1 above for more information.

Q3: This is a follow-up to the response provided for Question 54 on quality assurance (in the written responses to questions about the RFP). Can bidders include an additional profile for quality assurance?

A3: Yes. UNFPA welcomes bidders to propose quality assurance systems that link to specific staff who will undertake the quality assurance role. Options of this include specific people within the entity ensuring the quality assurance process, or built into the role of the experts within the team. It is important that the bidders provide a detailed explanation in the technical offer of what the quality assurance would look like.

As a response to feedback from bidders, UNFPA has added a line for Quality Assurance **activities** to the Price Schedule Form for each LOT. We are calling it “activities”, as opposed to requesting specific, separate profile, to allow bidders to either assign a separate person, or use one of the proposed team members for this role. However, the daily rate for these activities is to be listed separately to put all bidders on the same plane, irrespective of how they choose to handle QA activities (separately or as integrated in other roles)

Q4: This is a follow-up to the response provided for Question 66 on additional roles in the financial templates. In addition to the profiles that already included in the template (e.g. team leader, thematic expert), if there is a specific person that will be assigned to quality assurance should we add a line for that role in the financial template? If so, should we include a rate for this additional profile?

A4: Please refer to A3 above.

Q5: Related to the previous question, if bidders can add additional profiles in the price schedule, how will this impact the evaluation of the financial proposal, for example, against bidders who don't add additional positions in their proposals?

A5: The financial template reflects a hypothetical scenario for a hypothetical evaluation. The purpose of this **hypothetical scenario** is to arrive at a total cost that will be comparable between bidders. UNFPA believes that the listed profiles are all the profiles that may be needed, and the listed days are a hypothetical number of days needed for each profile. If a bidder believes that additional profiles are needed, these can be added (both in the technical proposal and in the financial proposal). Adding a profile will increase the total cost on which the financial evaluation is based. With that said, bidders should keep in mind that the additional profiles may also positively affect the technical evaluation score (. It really is a balancing act between the two.

Q6: To follow-up on the previous question, to clarify the budget ranges are for fees?

A6: No, the budget ranges are for the entire contact, not just for fees. The budget ranges serve as an estimate of the amount of money to expect to undertake the work (and the total budget to work with under secondary bidding, if this secondary bidding is applied).

Q7: Can you confirm that all daily rate is inclusive of overheads?

A7: Yes.

Q8: To confirm, are the number of days allotted in the RFP per profile flexible? For example, under Lot 2, a maternal health expert is allotted 90 days. Can this expert be allotted 45 days and then remaining days be allotted to another team member?

A8: Note that this RFP is **not** for a specific evaluation. It is for the establishment of Long Term Agreements for evaluations in each of the three areas (LOTs). In this sense, the proposed candidates are not for any specific evaluation; they are for each specific profile. Once the LTAs are in place, the specific team will be drawn from the profiles included in the Long Term Agreements.

The financial template reflects a hypothetical scenario for a hypothetical evaluation. The purpose of this hypothetical scenario is to arrive at a total cost that will be comparable between bidders. Therefore, the number of days for each listed profile may not be changed for this hypothetical scenario. However, at the time of the secondary bidding for a specific evaluation, it will be up to the bidder to determine how many days for each profile will be required. Please see A5 for more details on the financial implications of adding profiles.

Q9: Given the timeframe of the LTA, what happens if the proposed expert is no longer available when the specific evaluation is to start? Would it be possible to substitute this person with a similar profile?

A9: Bidders may provide a maximum of three candidates (with their respective CVs) for each profile as listed in the RFP. Only candidates that meet the listed requirements will be included in a potential LTA (i.e. submitting three candidates does not mean all three candidates will meet the qualifications to be included in the LTA). However, if the proposed expert is no longer available when the specific evaluation is to start, at the time of secondary bidding, bidders can propose to substitute this person with a similar profile at the same daily rate. UNFPA will then assess if the proposed substitute really has the same profile and based on the result of the assessment, UNFPA will accept or not the proposed substitute.

Q10: This is a follow-up to the response provided for Question 17 (in the written responses to questions about the RFP) on subcontractors. Can you clarify if bidders need to provide administrative documents (proof of qualifications) for individuals who do not normally work for us?

A10: Subcontracting in the procurement context is when one entity signs a contract with us and then hires another entity (e.g. a business entity) to work on the project. In the context of evaluations, we understand that bidders may use various arrangements, both with business entities and with individuals, to draw from their networks (consortia, partnerships, staff on loan, etc.) In such instances, the bidder who submits the bid (i.e. who signs the bid forms)

needs to demonstrate the expertise and capabilities of the proposed team and to provide information regarding past projects and experience as requested. However, there is no need to submit financial statements, certificates of incorporation, and bid forms from all the partners the bidder will be working with.

Note, however, that any business entities or individuals the bidder chooses to partner with may not have a conflict of interest as defined in clause 2 of the bidding documents, and may not be declared ineligible in accordance with clause 2.4 of the RFP documents. Bidders are expected to ensure that their partners meet these conditions.

The bidder who submits a bid will be the one to enter into a contractual relationship with UNFPA should an LTA be awarded. The LTA holder will be entirely responsible for the delivery of the services, which includes contract management. Ultimately, the LTA holder alone will be accountable to UNFPA.

Q11: This question is in regards to work examples for individual team members. What type of evidence do you need? Would it be enough to include in the team members CV that they have contributed to publications? Do team members need to be the lead person or co-author a publication or can they alternatively be a contributor? Do you need to provide evidence of this for each team member, including local experts?

A11: Evidence of written work are needed for the team members who will be contributing to drafting of the evaluation products (e.g. final evaluation report, inception report, country notes, etc.). What would be helpful is to provide documents that were entirely or mostly written by the team member in question, which demonstrates the writing capability of said member. The EO is well aware that companies use copy-editors, however an important qualification for experts is their capacity to produce a high-quality analysis (both form and substance). It is therefore important for the bidders to ensure that the candidates they submit will be able to deliver accordingly. The work samples can be in the form of executive summaries, short briefs, articles, and/or concept notes, sections of evaluation reports. We do not need samples for local consultants under the current RFP.

Q12: Follow-up to previous question on the submission length of the work samples in lieu of the maximum size for email submission (approximately 20 MB). Can we submit an executive summary of a publication?

A12: Yes, executive summaries will be accepted. Moreover, to clarify on size of email; while there is a size limit, the proposal can be sent in several e-mails. For more instructions on sealing, marking, and submitting bids, please refer to Clause 20 of the RFP document

Q13: This is a follow-up to Section 4 of the RFP. Please clarify what is meant by “production capacity”?

A13: Production capacity is not applicable to service providers, so please respond with “Not Applicable”.

Q14: It is understood that travel costs are not included, but what about security costs (e.g. high risk insurance for the experts)? Should this be part of the expert’s fee or would this be included in the proposal at a later stage?

A14: Section IV: UNFPA Special Conditions of Contract contains a clause on security arrangements. Since we do not have specific locations for all evaluations yet, security costs will have to be submitted by LTA holders during secondary bidding.

Q15: This is a follow up to the response for Question 69, regarding the global north and global south relationship. Specifically, could you expand on the expectations of the relationship?

A15: UNFPA encourages collaboration with global north and global south. This may come in different forms - for example a consortium of a company from the global north and a company from the global south. Please also note that this is also responded to in the written responses to the questions.

Q16: For Lot 1 and Lot 3, can you clarify expectations for the data analyst role. Specifically, whether this role will be a junior or senior consultant?

A16: This is a decision to be made by the bidders depending on the ToR for of each Lot.

Q17: For Lot 3, there is one position listed as someone to provide logistical and administrative support, however this is not included in the price schedule. Please clarify.

A17: Please note this is included for Lot 3.

Q18: In the RFP, there is a requirement for having experience with previous LTAs (in Section 6 annex B/C). If this is the case, how do we demonstrate this? For example, do we provide LTA contracts or reports conducted in LTA?

A18: To clarify, there is no eligibility requirement for the legal aspect of the contractual arrangement (i.e., whether it is an LTA, contract, work agreement, etc.), rather what is important is that the bidder has the experience to undertake work of a similar scope, size and complexity. So in this case, we are looking to see if bidders can demonstrate that they have conducted evaluations of similar scope, size and complexity in the thematic areas identified in the RFP. With regard to the section that requests for a number of staff with experience with LTA (under section 6), please respond “Not Applicable”.

Q19: Is there any indication that there will be 3 evaluations per year per lot?

A19: No, at this time we cannot confirm fixed dates of the evaluations for each lot. However, we suggest bidders consult the Quadrennial Evaluation Plan which can be found on the UNFPA Evaluation Office website. See: <http://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/quadrennial-budgeted-evaluation-plan-2018-2021>. This plan has an indicative timeline for planned evaluations during 2018-2021.

Meeting concluded.

Bidders please take note that the deadline has been extended to accommodate the time needed to revise proposals as a result of this bidder conference, if needed. The extended deadline is already announced on UN Global Marketplace.