

## **Q&A: Request for Proposals**

### **Final evaluation of the EURCAP Facility Phase III**

- 1- In consideration that between 2017 and 2020, EURCAP developed three RCMS in Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka; that the e-RCMS is being piloted in Azerbaijan; and that other partner countries are involved in RCMS as well, is it possible to clarify where do you expect the team to travel?**

The service provider will be expected to conduct at least one field trip to Brussels and one trip outside Europe to one of the implementing countries. This will likely include Azerbaijan, given it's prominent role in piloting the e-RCMS platform.

- 2- Would it be possible to have access to the Final Evaluation report for Phase I and II and a sample of progress reports and/or project documents during the tendering stage, to allow us to tailor the methodology and work plan accordingly?**

Project documents such as previous evaluation reports and/or progress reports pertaining to the project implementation are indeed not to be shared with the bidder as these constitute internal project documents including sensitive information. Document-sharing will be part of the desk review once the appointment of the selected service provider will be completed. In the [EURCAP website](#) you will find more information on the project.

- 3- Could you provide an indication of the number of documents to be assessed as part of the desk review?**

In total, as a ballpark estimation, approximately thirty documents is expected to be shared for desk review. Examples of such documents are: final evaluation report from previous phases (Phase I and II), mid-term evaluation for Phase III, Description of the Action for Phase I, II and III and relevant amendments, project proposals for Support Actions, etc. It is worth noting that volume and types of documents to be shared will be coordinated during the desk review phase between the Evaluation team and the EURCAP Project Management Team to ensure quality of work and accuracy of results.

- 4- Could you provide any information or examples on the type and number of quantitative indicators reported in the documents that will be shared?**

As regards examples of quantitative indicators included in the documents to be shared, these would be, among others, number of countries supported through the EURCAP Facility, number of capacity building workshops conducted / officials trained, number of technical assessments conducted and relevant reports produced, etc.

- 5- Could you please share the estimated sample sizes for the in-depth interviews?**

The sample size is difficult to estimate in abstract, as it will depend on the type of the stakeholder involved, as well as the amount of information that needs to be obtained.

- 6- Could an expert who worked with IOM during the same period of implementation of the intervention to be evaluated be proposed as part of the evaluation team, or would there be a Conflict of Interest, even if the expert was not involved with the EURCAP facility? Also, does it represents a conflict of interest if the company is submitting a proposal to provide services for the next phase of the project?**

As per our procurement guidelines, vendors shall be considered to have a conflict of interest with one or more parties in a solicitation process, if they:

a) are, or have been in the past, associated with a firm or any of its affiliates that has been engaged by IOM to provide services for the preparation of the requirements, that is, the design, Statement of Works, Technical Specifications, Terms of Reference, cost analysis/estimation, and other documents to be used for the procurement of the goods/services/works in the concerned selection process.

b) were involved in the preparation and/or design of the programme/project related to the goods/services/works being procured.

Hence, an expert working with IOM during the same period of implementation of Phase III of EURCAP Facility, but who was **not involved** in the design of the Terms of Reference or in the project being evaluated **does not** represent a conflict of interest.

Also, it does not represent a conflict of interest the fact that the company is participating in a bid for the next phase of the project. However, if the company is selected to provide services during the implementation of phase IV, it would not be able to participate in the eventual call for the evaluation of that phase.

- 7- The ToR requires the team leader to have “Master’s degree in Development Studies, Project Planning and Management, Demography, or Development Statistics or a related field from an accredited academic institution with five years of relevant professional experience; or University degree in the above fields with seven years of relevant professional experience.” Would the following be considered a “related field from an accredited academic institution”:**
- LLM in EU law / public international law
  - LLM in international cooperation against organised crime.

As the notion of the related field of studies is quite broad, we believe that that the LLMs mentioned are related to the scope of studies required and would be co-assessed in line with the rest of the qualifications included in the ToR.

- 8- Why do you expect the service provider to assign staff fluent in French?**

The methodology might involve to do a field review, consisted of in-depth interviews conducted with IOM staff directly involved in project implementation, as well as with implementing partners (such as authorities in partner countries, etc.) and other relevant stakeholders. Given the fact that some of our projects have been/are implemented in the francophone countries, it is advisable for the evaluation staff to be able to communicate with the relevant stakeholders there in order to carry out the evaluation effectively.

**9- Do you envisage a team composed by just the TL, since you just specify the criteria for this figure?**

The team will be lead by the Team Leader who will be responsible for quality assurance at the results level and overall planning/direction of the assignment. However, it will be up to the service provider to assign as many supporting staff as needed for the successful delivery of the activities.

**10- Is the proposed timeline indicative and flexible?**

Based on the RfQ / ToR of the assignment, the work is anticipated to be delivered over the course of 12 weeks (as outlined in the ToR page 6). This timeline is finitive. The start of the assignment is envisaged as soon as the administrative formalities are finalized

**11- The depth and scope of the assignment can vary. Can you provide an estimate on the number of days you anticipate for the level of effort? This will help us gauge the intensity and detail of work required.**

As the selected methodology approach to the assignment will be determined by the service provider in their inception report, it is difficult to provide any clear estimate on the number of days to complete the work. As per the workplan outlined in the RfQ, the work is to be completed within an 8-week timeframe.

**12- Payment will be made within 30 days after receipt of services and submission of payment documentation. Can payment documentation be submitted per deliverable?**

Indeed, the payment will be done per deliverable, within 30 days after receipt of the invoice.

**13- Do you have a maximum budget ceiling for this assignment?**

The budget is confidential.

**14- Are companies located outside Belgium or the countries where the project is developed eligible to submit an offer?**

Yes. This is a global call.