INTERNATIONAL MARKET ACCESS GRANT (IMAG) PROGRAM EVALUATION

RFP, SUBMITTED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 11/16/2026

RFP Process

Q1: Has WEDC established an anticipated budget, funding allocation, or maximum contract amount for this engagement? Additionally, would WEDC be able to share the contract value awarded for the previous Technology Development Loan (TDL) Program Evaluation or direct interested proposers to that information?

> A. WEDC will not be disclosing the budget range for this evaluation as part of the RFP process. Potential vendors are asked to please submit their best cost estimate as part of their proposal. WEDC will also not be sharing previous contract values at this time.

Q2: Given the upcoming holiday, would WEDC consider extending the proposal due date to allow sufficient time for WEDC to answer proposer questions and for proposers to prepare complete responses?

> A. To keep within the overall proposal review and contracting timeline, unfortunately, WEDC is not able to provide an extension to the original RFP due date of Nov. 24.

Q3: Does a Wisconsin-based or disadvantaged business enterprise preference apply to this procurement, as it did in the TDL evaluation RFP?

> A: Wisconsin-based businesses will receive a 5% scoring bonus, but there is not a disadvantaged business enterprise preference or bonus in scoring for this RFP.

Q4: Should the cost proposal be included in the single proposal PDF or submitted as a separate document?

> A: Please include the cost proposal within the main evaluation proposal file.

Q5: Can WEDC confirm that the references to the TDL program and early-stage business ecosystems in Section VII are intended to refer to IMAG and export development program evaluation?

> A: Yes, the “TDL” program and “early-stage business ecosystems” references were in error. The criterion is meant to reference the IMAG program instead of the TDL

program. The reference to "early-stage ecosystems" should be replaced with "export development assistance".

Q6: Is there a page limit for the proposal?

A: There is no page limit for the proposal.

Q7: RFP §III.2.c asks for examples of three relevant engagements. For a newly formed firm, may a proposer instead provide an original work sample prepared for this RFP, along with a detailed approach?

A: In this section, WEDC is primarily seeking examples of previous relevant engagements. Other supporting material about the firm's ability to complete this type of work should be included in Section III, 2b.

Q8: RFP p.4 (Expected Timeline) says the vendor shall present the final report to WEDC Leadership in person. Would a live video presentation be acceptable, or should proposers plan and price one in-person presentation in Madison?

A. An in-person presentation (at WEDC's office in Madison) is the expectation and is expected to be planned for and included as part of the total cost of the evaluation proposal.

Q9: Can WEDC provide a sample professional services agreement and clarify whether proposers may identify exceptions or propose revisions to the terms and conditions?

A: WEDC cannot provide the service agreement at this time as agreements are subject to the specific procurement. The RFP provides a timeline for such discussion of potential revisions to the service agreement in the contracting period.

Evaluation Context

Q10: Given WEDC's existing annual performance verification responsibilities, have any of the 235 awards undergone independent verification, monitoring, or compliance assessments? If so, will those findings be made available to avoid duplicating previously completed work?

A: The IMAG Program has not undergone any type of substantial independent or external evaluation process; therefore, there are no findings of this type to share.

Q11: Were any of the FY2021–25 IMAG awards supported by federal funds or other funding sources carrying specific monitoring or site-visit requirements? If applicable, is the selected consultant expected to evaluate compliance with those funding requirements, or is the engagement limited to program effectiveness, economic outcomes, and recommendations?

A: None of the awards in the analysis set were supported by federal funds or other funding sources with such requirements; therefore, they carry no specific requirements tied to funding. The consultant is not expected to evaluate compliance with funding requirements.

Evaluation Data

Q12: Will WEDC provide a consolidated dataset covering all 235 awards from FY2021–25, including recipient information, award amounts, expenditures, performance outcomes, and project completion dates, or will the selected consultant be expected to independently review and extract information from individual grant files?

A: Yes, the consultant can expect to receive this consolidated data from WEDC.

Q13: Do existing IMAG grant agreements require recipients to submit final performance reports, subsequent outcome assessments, or annual evaluations? If so, have these requirements been fulfilled for the FY2021–25 awards, and will the resulting documentation be available to the selected consultant?

A: Yes, this reporting has been received for the awards in this set, and the consultant can expect to receive the performance report data from WEDC.

Q14: Does WEDC have longitudinal data on recipient export sales, revenue growth, employment, or other business outcomes, or should the consultant anticipate collecting additional information?

A: There is limited data available of this type from IMAG recipients' post-project surveys, which are collected at the end of the IMAG project. It basically covers the data points mentioned in the question, but it is from a single point in time directly after the project concludes. No further surveying of IMAG recipients is to be conducted for this evaluation.

Q15: Does WEDC have records of IMAG applications that were considered but not contracted, which could serve as a comparison group?

A: If any applications were received, WEDC has information on whether or not the applications were contracted. This data can be made available if it fits the proposed methodology.

Q16: Would WEDC be open to a methodology using direct surveys and/or interviews with businesses that received IMAG awards? If so, would WEDC provide contact information or possibly distribute survey invitations? Are there any restrictions concerning direct contact with recipients?

A: For this program evaluation, WEDC is not interested in additional surveys, interviews, or direct engagement with current or past award recipients. Some basic post-project surveying was completed with each recipients' completed project with WEDC. This data will be available to the evaluator.

Evaluation Content – Program Structure

Q17: Does WEDC have preferred comparison states or an anticipated number of state programs to include in the benchmarking analysis?

A: WEDC would prefer that the peer states be based on similar ecosystems for this type of program and the overall economic characteristics of those states. WEDC does not have a pre-set number of states to benchmark against but is looking for a sufficient set that would provide some basis for assessing the uniqueness of the IMAG program or similarities with initiatives in other states.

Q18: Does WEDC anticipate specific statistical or economic modeling methodologies beyond descriptive outcome analysis? Additionally, is there an expected number of comparable state programs to include in the benchmarking component?

A: WEDC is not searching for specific economic modeling methodologies. WEDC primarily expects methodologies aligned with descriptive outcome analysis but would also welcome statistical models supporting outcome findings, though not strictly required. There is no pre-set number of states to benchmark against; this is left to the consultant to determine based on comparative fit.

Q19: Is WEDC seeking a formal economic impact analysis, including multiplier modeling or estimates of attributable economic benefits, or a program effectiveness assessment based on available outcomes and comparative evidence?

A: WEDC is seeking a program effectiveness assessment based on available outcome and comparative data. No impact analysis consisting of multiplier modeling or similar methods is expected.