Terms of Reference (ToR)

Invitation to evaluate specific 'themes' of the programme

Additional Information No.2

February 2011

Background

The Programme has received a number of additional questions concerning the ongoing tendering. In this document the Programme will reflect on these questions to clarify the issues raised. To ensure transparency this document will be available for public download on the Programme's website, as the previous one.

Issues raised

The issues raised concern the **methodological approach, CMS of the Programme website, number of interviews for each campaign and survey, the scope of interim report , additional documentation** and the **selection and award criteria**.

On the **methodological approach:**

1) Each case study campaign and survey addresses specific sub-themes. How much freedom does the evaluator have to enlarge this thematic scope (for example to address an additional sub-theme in a case study campaign)?

Would the evaluator be free to add data collection instruments to the instruments mentioned in the Terms of Reference if he believes this would contribute to answering the research questions?

Would the evaluator be obliged to stick to the methodological approach of collecting data twice, with a period of 6 months in between, for all three case study campaigns? The reason for asking this question is because it seems like a rather short period of time to meaningfully identify progress in the issues at stake.

- The evaluation proposal should reflect the proposed thematic scope. Should your competitive bid be subject for selection by the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG), more in depth discussion can be held concerning the possibility to enlarge the thematic scope, including the development of the methodological approach of collecting data in order to contribute to the structure of the research questions. Concerning the chosen timeline with 6 months in between, for all three case study campaigns, this might also be subject for discussion upon potential selection of your evaluation business proposal.

2) Concerning the **CMS of the Programme website** it was asked what exact possibilities of this web tool as regards questionnaires and surveys, for example the possibility of "rooting" (i.e. the option to - within the overall list of questions – vary in which user is presented with which set of questions). Is there a document available in which an overview of all functions of the tool is listed?

- In terms of rooting there is the possibility to define different questionnaires for different users at the same time. Output in excel format. There is no document about the system available. However, should there be 'better' tools available with the possibility to make data electronically available to the programme, this would be negotiable.

3) Concerning the **number of questionnaires and interviews for each campaign and survey** it was asked to clarify further the exact number in relation to the proposed number of case campaigns and surveys.

- Case study campaign one: 2 questionnaires to a minimum of 10 projects + 2 revised questionnaires to a minimum of 5 projects + 2 case studies (normal projects) x 2 = 4 projects; no cluster
- Case study campaign two: 2 questionnaires to a minimum of 10 projects + 2 revised questionnaires to a minimum of 5 projects + 2 case studies (normal projects) x 2 = 4 projects and 2 clusters
- Case study campaign three: 2 questionnaires to a minimum of 10 projects + 2 revised questionnaires to a minimum of 5 projects + 2 case studies (normal projects) x 2 = 4 projects and 2 clusters
Survey one: 2 questionnaires for and interviews with programme stakeholders and programme authorities (undefined number).
Survey two: 2 questionnaires to a minimum of 15 projects (number went into the wrong row in table) and interviews with programme and project stakeholders (undefined number).

4) Concerning **the scope of the interim report**, how many pages are expected to be produced (as there are a number of interim reports to be produced)?
- There is no limitation in terms of number of pages. The main criteria is that the produced material (i.e. Interim Report) is adhering to the objective, methodology and the proposed structure of the evaluation and the terms of reference. However, a structure keeping it simple and giving a good overview about the findings and the conclusions and the background to it would be preferred. The programme wants to use the outcomes for learning, discussions and where necessary improvements The description of the overall method and structure used and which all reports could refer to could be done in a separate document or as part of the first report

5) On the **additional documentation** it was asked whether administrative documents (regarding selection and exclusion criteria) of the bidder and potential subcontractors should be provided (e.g. judicial statements, bank statements, annual turn-over statements) and so on.
- Should your competitive bid be subject for selection by the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG), these additional documentation might be relevant to be submitted first at this stage.

On the **selection and award criteria:**
6) The question was raised concerning the potential risk of being excluded should a bid only form a part of a specific evaluation be submitted; can it be the case that the overall bid is less competitive in the particular topic addressed by the selective bid?
- A competitive bid for only part of a case study campaign and / or survey; should you use the second option, you should indicate an overall budget (arguing for the best potential added value).

End of document.