



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
SERVICES FOR

***Final Evaluation for EU-IOM Joint Initiative for migrant protection and
reintegration in the horn of Africa***

BID BULLETIN

Addendum No. 1

This Addendum No. 01 is issued to extend the deadline of RFP RONBO 22-003 Services for Final Evaluation for EU-IOM Joint Initiative for Migrant Protection and reintegration in the horn of Africa posted in IOM and UNGM websites on 08 June 2022.

Also attached is the clarifications from the Preproposal Conference that took place via Teams on 16 June 2022.

A. On Instructions to Service Providers

1. Page 3 should read as follows:

The Proposals must be submitted by email to RONairobiProcurement@iom.int on or **before Friday 08 July 2022 at exactly 23:59HRS hours Kenya time**. No late proposal shall be accepted.

B. Clarifications received during the PreProposal Call

Pre-proposal conference:

1. As the pre-proposal conference will take place during a public holiday in our country, would it be possible to record this meeting and share the recording with bidders to provide fair and equal access to the information? **Yes recording can be accessed in the link https://iomint-my.sharepoint.com/:v:/g/personal/sotieno_iom_int/EWiiA6PfOdDvBtpQ3UtnSgBFHjMTZBy2jAkB8wmGbO12A**

Submission:

2. With regards to the submission via e-mail mentioned on page 3 of 27 in the RFP, is our understanding correct, that the Technical Proposal and the Financial Proposal can be submitted as separate documents in one e-mail? **Yes.**
3. Could you kindly confirm that bidders can use their own templates for this bid, as long as they follow the instructions and include the content in the provided order on page 7-8 of 27 in the RFP? **Yes bidders can use their own template as long as they submit both the Financial Proposal and Technical Proposal covering the required elements within.**
4. Given the complexity of the topic, the regional nature, and the importance of this evaluation, would it be possible to extend the submission deadline by one week? **Yes possible – 1 week with the revised submission deadline of 8th July.**

Technical Proposal:

5. On page 7 of 27 of the RFP under point 6.1 b), it states that proposed professional staff must "have the experience of at least ten (10) years". Could you kindly confirm that Bidders are free to propose evaluation teams with a variety of levels of experience in order to offer IOM the best mix of expertise and value for money in their bids, as long as the key experts with overall responsibility for the evaluation have at least 10 years of experience? **The lead evaluator/team leader must have sufficient relevant experiences (10+ years) as per the requirement. The more experiences of the supporting team members the better but can be less than 10 years,**
6. Page 17 of 27 of the RFP presents the scorecard for assessment of submitted proposals. However, there are no values added to this scorecard. Could you kindly update this, so that bidders can provide the best suited proposals in accordance with the importance of the different sections and so that bidders can have a better understanding of how the proposals will be evaluated? **IOM will update the scorecard and revert. That said, vendors can expect that the methodology section will be the most relevant important section.**
7. Would you kindly share with us a more detailed description of the projects in each country that are relevant for the evaluation. Specifically, we have the following questions:
 - a. What are the activities (being) implemented to achieve the project's objectives in each country? **All target countries (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somalia and Sudan) implement activities within the scope of the 5 pillars of action – 1) migration data and research, 2) capacity building 3) awareness raising 4) protection and return, and 5) reintegration. Many activities are harmonized such as pre-return/departure, assisted voluntary returns, reintegration at individual and community levels, which is based on the Integrated Approach to Reintegration. Variations exist where Djibouti is the transit “sending” country where there is no reintegration activity. Ethiopia, Somalia and Sudan implement reintegration activities covering economic, social and psychosocial dimensions while Somalia and Sudan are both the transit countries and countries of origin. Country variations also exist when it comes to capacity building activities as they are needs based and context specific within the overall umbrella of strengthening the protection, return and reintegration and overall migration management. Awareness raising features key common messages of dangers of irregular migration, assisted voluntary return and reintegration as an alternative, social cohesion of migrants, returnees and host communities to promote reintegration. You can find information about some of the specific activities through the [EU-IOM Joint Initiative \(migrationjointinitiative.org\)](https://eu-iom.org/) in particular under the [Countries](#) tab (and select the specific countries), [Newsletter](#) (then select Horn of Africa) and more. If you need specific activity information, please direct the questions to the procurement email. RCU will provide response.**
 - b. What are the numbers of beneficiaries targeted in each country? **Some generic information as well as M&E data are available through the [Report](#) page of the website (you will need to look for the Horn of Africa section).**
 - c. On page 12 of 27 in the RFP, it is stated that the evaluation covers the whole programme period from start of implementation in March 2017 up to date. Could you kindly elaborate on the current status of implementation in each country? **All 4 countries are moving at the same pace, closing in Sept 2022.**
8. Given that the majority of the data collection is expected to be done remotely, we have the following two related questions:
 - a. Are there existing and reliable phone numbers of beneficiaries of the programme activities that will be shared with the evaluation team? **IOM has the data about the migrant/returnee beneficiaries BUT the phone numbers available may not be working due to connectivity, wrong numbers, power, etc. which is beyond the IOM’s control. It’s important to keep in mind the unreachability, IOM will share the data within the parameter of the IOM data protection principle.**

- b. If direct contact via phone with beneficiaries is not possible due to lack of reliable phone numbers, with the context of the programme is it possible to have centralized locations within the local study area for study participants to travel to? **Yes it's possible to invite a group of beneficiaries for FGDs etc. Large quantities data collection is not expected. We want to focus on the qualitative data to supplement the data IOM already has from internal efforts (over 10,000 surveys done) as well as ongoing/completed research activities. Data will only be shared with the successfully chosen vendor.**
9. On page 11 of 27 in the RFP, it is mentioned that “there have been a range of monitoring and evaluation implemented under the EU-IOM Joint Initiative”. Would you kindly confirm that the successful bidder will be provided access to this existing data to complement the desk review exercise and the results for this final evaluation? **Yes.**
 10. Is the contractor expected to collect data for a quantitative dataset in the four study countries or will the RCU provide the contractor with relevant anonymised datasets for secondary data analysis? **RCU will provide the existing data; however we do not necessarily discourage additional data collection (if proven necessary and considers the cost efficiency).**
 11. Will the contractor be able to add questions to the ongoing quantitative research activities? **No. The final rounds of data collection are already planned or ongoing. The timing will not be aligned by the time the vendor is selected and on board.**
 12. Will the contractor be able to suggest additional respondents to be interviewed as part of the ongoing quantitative research activities? **No. See above. Also the respondents follow the existing protocol that is not very flexible.**
 13. Data collection is to happen remotely, is the contractor expected to facilitate FGDs remotely or is the contractor expected to carry out FGDs in the four study countries face to face?? **This depends on the pillars and the country contexts and individual preference of the key informants. Migrants are mobile and often without any tools to join data collection remotely. With some government stakeholders (esp. Ethiopia and Sudan), remote data collection may not be well received. Language barrier should also be considered. Most CSO/IP/UN partners maybe comfortable and willing to be part of remote data collection.**
 14. Where specifically in the four target countries did programme interventions take place? Please provide details on specific locations to allow for sampling. Please also provide these details to better understand logistics and compliance requirements the contractor will have to plan for in case of face-to-face data collection. **As mentioned, this depends on the pillar. For Reintegration assistance specifically, the beneficiaries are scattered¹. It can be assumed that the caseload is significantly spread out across the national territory, with Ethiopia being the country where concentration is the lowest - whereas relatively large group of beneficiaries concentrate in the urban areas of Mogadishu, Hargeisa and Khartoum.** It should be noted that it was generally deemed as logistically and economically unfeasible to administer an in-person survey on a representative sample of JI beneficiaries. In terms of community-level interventions, precise location data is still being consolidated and will be made available to the awarded service provider. It can however be assumed that the level of geographical concentration of these interventions is low. **Other categories of beneficiaries including state and non-state actors for capacity building or migration data/research are concentrated in the capital cities.**
 15. In case the contractor is expected to conduct the above-mentioned qualitative and quantitative interviews remotely, will the RCU provide contact details to the persons to be interviewed. **Yes IOM will facilitate the contact especially with non-state and government stakeholders etc.**
 16. Does the whole evaluation team need to be based in Nairobi? Could you please confirm the minimum requirement on this regard? (e.g., “Team must be available for frequent meetings, or one team member must be based in Nairobi and available to react within 48 hours to a request from the contracting

¹ Geographic coverage across Ethiopia, Somalia and Sudan with relatively higher concentration* include SNNP*, Oromia*, Amhara, Addis and Tigray for Ethiopia; Mogadishu*, Burco, Hargeysa*, Garowe, Borama and Bossaso for Somalia; and Khartoum*, El Geneina*, Saraf Omra, Um Durman, Nyala*, Umm Badda, Jabal Aulia, El Fasher, Sharq El Nile for Sudan.

authority”). No. Physical presence in Nairobi is not necessary. If there are any personnel, it does not hurt and RCU can meet in person but not required.

17. The RFP mentions that the proposed team members must have 10 years of relevant experience; considering the scale of the consultations required (across 4 countries with up to 8 stakeholder groups), would it be possible to have a team led by experts with the 10-years experience, who are supported by more junior researchers? **Yes.**
18. Teaming requirements: does “*professional staff*” include all team members? Hence, do all team members need more than 10 years of experience? **No.**
19. What is the link between this evaluation and the ITAD impact evaluation of the provision of reintegration assistance within the IOM JI? **Impact evaluation will largely inform the evaluation for the reintegration pillar, but not the rest of the pillars. In other words, we do not expect quantitative data collection with beneficiary returnees in this regard as they’re already done by ITAD.**

In the TOR: “Several research activities are expected to be completed by the time of the inception phase and reports will be available (MHPSS Lessons Learning and Research reports, Partnership analysis, Remigration discreet choice experiment, Case management study, as well as Spot Analytical Reports under IMPACT Study).”

20. To our understanding, the case management study RFP has been cancelled, is this still expected to be completed in time for the inception phase of this evaluation, or will an evaluation and study of case management be a part of this evaluation? **The case study results are unlikely to be ready in time. It maybe possible however to interact with the service provider working on the case management study (funded by another project).**

In the TOR: “the evaluation will employ a mixed-method approach entailing data collection, triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data”

21. Taking into account that the TOR mentions the need to not overburden the projects at this time, and that quantitative monitoring data will be made available to the evaluation team, do you foresee the need for a quantitative data collection with the beneficiaries? Or would a qualitative data collection and review of IOM’s quantitative data be deemed sufficient? **IOM does not foresee the need for large quantitative data collection. For some pillars such as migration data and research as well as capacity building, online surveys with key stakeholders maybe possible to supplement the quantitative data IOM has.**
22. What type of baseline data is available? **Reintegration Sustainability Surveys come with the baseline but monitoring and satisfaction surveys for AVR and Reintegration Assistance don’t have a baseline. As interviews were conducted over a 5-year period, comparison of earlier entries to the recent ones can be used to analyze programme performance over the years.**
23. Could you elaborate on the i) type of information collected in the harmonized M&E surveys and ii) the amount of data which would need to be reviewed (sample size, number of surveys)? **With migrants, we have data from 5 different standardized surveys – assisted voluntary return (AVR) satisfaction, AVR monitoring, Reintegration Assistance (RA)satisfaction, RA monitoring and RS surveys – amounting to roughly 10,000 individual surveys. The sample size was between 3,000-4,000 per type of surveys. With partners we have some data for standardized surveys administered in 4 countries with 60-80 partners per year. With communities we also have a standardized survey focused on community participation etc. As mentioned, the reintegration pillar is largely covered by the ongoing IMPACT Study so we do not expect you to carry out parallel analysis.**

In the TOR: “Taking into account COVID-19 considerations and security constraints in the region, most of data collection will be done remotely.”

24. Migrants, returnees and host communities are a key respondent group for the final evaluation. If such interviews are to be done remotely, could IOM confirm that contact information of migrants and returnees supported under the JI programme is available? **Yes.**

25. Considering that Altai has field presence in all the countries covered by this project, we would have the capacity to conduct those interviews in person. Is that something that IOM would be open to from a security perspective? **Yes.**
26. Can IOM share preference in terms of physical in-country visits? **Depends on the pillars and contexts but some field visits are deemed necessary.**

AVRR Framework: To what extent is IOM interested in the review of the AVRR framework as part of the final evaluation? **AVRR framework is an institutional tool, beyond the scope of the JI as a project for the final evaluation. We are open to suggestions but this is not the scope of the evaluation.**

In the Evaluation gridline: “The sample of written work provided demonstrates strong writing and analytic skills.”

- Is that expected to be the proposal? Or do you require the bidder to send past reports demonstrating such skills? **Yes as part of the supporting documents – we’d like to see the actual similar outputs that are publicly available.**

Financial Proposal:

27. Could you kindly share more information about the available funds for this assignment (such as a budget ceiling), as this would help us to provide the most competitive bid? **By protocol, IOM is unable to give the financial ceiling, but we are looking for the quality as well as value for money.**
28. Could you kindly confirmed whether the results dissemination (present the learning brief) to each of the selected countries (namely Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan and Djibouti) will be in person? **Preference is over in-person.**
29. Related to question number 11 above, would you kindly clarify if a face-to-face dissemination of results is expected for the Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) based in Kenya? **For IOM targeted RCU presentation, virtual event is appropriate.**
30. Are travel costs, daily subsistence allowance and/ or other costs (e.g., those related to subcontracting services for data collection) to be considered and detailed explicitly as reimbursable costs or should they be “loaded” into experts’ fees? **These are considered reimbursable costs. The expert costs are remuneration costs. The service provider is expected to keep track of the reimbursable costs.**
31. There does not seem to be information related to the proposed budget, are you able to give an indication of what it would be? **No.**
32. Please share the budget line so that we can prepare the best value for money **No.**
33. In the Award of Contract section, the TOR states that the winning bidder will be the one with the highest technically rated responsive proposal and within the available budget.
34. Is it possible at this time for IOM to share an estimate of the available budget for the work. **No.**

Signed By: RONairobi Procurement