

Question from Potential Bidder	GWPO Response
<p>The TOR indicates a minimum level of effort of 130 days within a budget ceiling of €90,000, which implies an average daily rate of approximately €690 (and potentially lower if a higher level of effort is proposed).</p> <p>At the same time, the assignment requires senior profiles with high-level institutional and governance expertise, as well as demonstrated experience in evaluating complex, multi-country programmes. For such profiles, particularly when EU-based, typical fee levels tend to be higher.</p> <p>Could you please clarify how bidders are expected to reconcile these parameters?</p>	<p>The 130-day estimate and €90,000 ceiling are intended as planning parameters to guide bidders in developing technically robust and cost-effective proposals. While GWPO recognizes the need for senior expertise, bidders are expected to propose an efficient methodology, team composition, and level of effort that ensure quality delivery within the fixed budget ceiling.</p> <p>Bidders may optimize staffing structures, maximize use of remote methods, and leverage existing programme documentation including the Mid-Term Review, to enhance efficiency. The 130 days are a minimum estimate rather than a prescribed staffing model, and proposals will be assessed on both technical quality and value for money.</p>
<p>The ToR refers in several sections to desk review, secondary data analysis, online surveys, and online key informant interviews as the data collection methods for the evaluation. However, on page 9 under the design and approach section, focus group discussions are also mentioned as a guiding element for bidders' proposals, but they are not referenced elsewhere in the document.</p> <p>Could you please clarify whether focus group discussions are expected as part of the evaluation? If so, please also let us know additional details regarding their intended format and target participants.</p>	<p>Focus group discussions are optional, not mandatory. The ToR provides methodological flexibility, and it is up to bidders to determine whether FGDs would strengthen their evaluation design.</p> <p>The primary expected methods are desk review, secondary data analysis, online surveys, key informant interviews, and in-person or virtual consultative workshops. If bidders choose to include FGDs, they should clearly justify their purpose, format, participant groups, and added value. Given the scope of the evaluation, FGDs would likely be most relevant with program management team or regional or country coordination teams.</p>