

RESPONDING TO EOI QUERIES:

**RESEARCH PARTNER FOR
TRANSFORMING FOOD SYSTEMS TO
IMPROVE DIET QUALITY AND RESILIENCE
FOR THE MOST VULNERABLE**



April 2022

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- 1. The EOI asks for a submission of a budget. However, we are concerned about how feasible it is to put together a budget without details of the actual evaluation design and the selected countries where the evaluation will take place out of the six. We would like to ask for clarifications on what specific activities that bidders need to budget and share costs at these stage in the EOI? We believe this will help ensure that all bidders are costing on the same specifications, as this is not clear in the EOI currently.**

We understand that it is difficult to develop a detailed budget at this early stage, however, as part of the EOI selection, we need some indication of the major costs anticipated by the research partner based on the information provided. All bidders, if selected, will be given an opportunity to submit a more elaborated budget in the full proposal phase.

Also, generally, GAIN operates as follows: Once contracting a research partner we enter an inception phase during which we co-design and amend the research proposal and approach, which generally has budgetary implications.

- 2. Page 4, contact and inquires section indicates dates in early March for solicitation questions and responses, which clash with the summary of deadlines section on the same page. Please clarify what dates the former is referring to?**

These are the correct deadlines:

SUMMARY OF DEADLINES

1. Queries to be submitted by: April 28th 2022
2. Response will be disseminated on the website by: April 29th 2022
3. Expression of Interest submission deadline: May 6 th 2022
4. Response from GAIN on acceptance or rejection of Eoi: May 23rd 2022
5. Anticipated deadline for full proposal from selected Eoi: June 14th 2022

6. Anticipated award of contract: July 15th 2022

3. **Page 5, under the technical quality of proposal – the third bullet indicates a reference to Table 1 in the EOI. There is no table 1 in the EOI, so we are not clear what example we should use. Please clarify?**

These bullets should say:

- Example of detailed approach in 1 chosen country (Kenya, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Nigeria), drawing on the *nature of services as per the Scope of Work*.

4. **Also given the 2 page limit for the EOI, we are a bit concerned whether there is sufficient space to address all points in the EOI and provide an example of a detailed approach in 1 chosen country.**

The page limit should be 4 pages. See details below:

For the expression of interest, we request a response of no more than **4 pages** (including 1 page for the financial justification) containing at least the following information:

1. Clear explanation of the bidder's understanding of the role of the proposed evaluation partner
2. Brief overview of proposed approach to meeting the 3 stated objectives
3. Overview of approach to working in collaboration with GAIN
4. Capacity statement outlining key proposed team members and overview of relevant experience
5. One page overview and justification of anticipated costs (excluding field data collection and costs to be borne by local partners)

5. **Are we correct in understanding that GAIN is seeking to publish papers and thought leadership around best-practice evaluation approaches for nutrition-focused programmes in addition to the country-level evaluations, rather than the peer reviewed papers being the country evaluations themselves?**

GAIN is seeking to publish both best-practice evaluation approaches as well as papers on evaluation findings. We anticipate that our research partner will assist with both types of publications. This is mentioned in bullets 4 and 5 of the objectives:

4. Lead, in collaboration with local research partners and GAIN, peer-reviewed papers on the findings of impact evaluations.
5. Identify opportunities for and lead in collaboration with GAIN peer-reviewed papers about evaluation frameworks, approaches, methods, and similar.

6. Are you interested in the partner assisting with research other than the impact evaluations?

The **original research** undertaken by the evaluation partner will pertain to program evaluation, including impact evaluations, process evaluations, and other relevant approaches. Other outputs will have a methodological focus, advancing theory and practice related to food systems program evaluation. See also, responses to question 5. For example, it might be deemed necessary to conduct additional research, for example on methods and metrics needed for the impact evaluation, but these would be within the scope of work outlined in the RFP.

7. What are you expecting in the overview of anticipated costs? Should this be a description of types of expected costs? It does not seem feasible at this stage to generate budget numbers without knowing the scope of the evaluation in each country.

Refer to response in Question 1.

8. The RFP seems to suggest that the evaluation partner will help with the commissioning of evaluations to local evaluation partners. How do you see the collaboration between the evaluation partner and the local evaluators after the evaluation has been commissioned? Will the evaluation partner work in close collaboration with the local partners in all aspects of the evaluation?

The role of the evaluation partner would be to oversee and/or directly support the local evaluators on all aspects of the evaluation process from design through final reporting. It is also expected that the research partner will identify local partners for joint agreement on identification, **contract them directly and be accountable for their work**. This is essentially a quality control, accountability, and alignment approach across countries and evaluators. See details below as mentioned in the Scope of Work:

- Identify a local evaluation partner in each country context and support (together with GAIN) that partner to obtain all relevant ethical approvals, access and data collection permissions as appropriate, e.g., government approvals.
- Support the local partner in the development of study protocols (including literature review, detailed methodology and justification, sampling plan (where applicable), data analysis plan, and data collection tools) for review and approval by GAIN and manage and lead on cross-country research, where identified and applicable (including meta-analyses and reporting and publications).
- Support or oversee (as agreed with GAIN) all aspects of primary data collection, quality assurance, and data entry, cleaning, management and analyses conducted by local implementing partners.
- For primary data collected, ensure that GAIN receive raw and clean datasets, accompanying codebooks, and syntax and output of all data analyses. If quantitative data are collected, data documentation must be provided using Nesstar2.
- Work with local evaluation partners (aligned with pre-defined roles and responsibilities) to draft full reports, including literature review, methods, data collection activities, results and conclusions/recommendations.

9. **Can GAIN elaborate more on the type of evaluations that will be conducted and some preliminary details about the evaluation plans? These details will be useful to address point 5 in the expression of interest regarding the overview of anticipated costs. For example, the RFP mentions that the idea is to commission process and impact evaluations. Will all the evaluations include both components? Will the impact evaluations be experimental or quasi-experimental or both? Will the evaluations include multiple rounds of data collection and therefore multiple reports?**

See answer to question 1 with reference to the budget. Also, at this stage many of these questions have not yet been decided. GAIN seeks an evaluation partner to help answer some of these questions based on their expertise and added value. We would seek rigorous “gold standard” approach, which may be revised at later stages based on budget and / or field limitations. This EOI is an opportunity to line out what you as a potential research partner might suggest at this stage, with the level of information available. Bidders will not be held accountable for the budget submitted in the EOI stage.

10. **Do you have an expected award amount in mind for this opportunity?**

See answer to question 1 and 9 for guidance on developing the budget at the EOI stage.

11. **Would it be possible to have an idea of the budget envelope for the proposed work?**

See answer to question 1 and 9 for guidance on developing the budget at the EOI stage.

12. **What crops or products do you expect to focus on in Uganda and Benin?**

At this time the activities and focus products for these countries have not been decided. The details will be decided over the coming approximately 4-6 months.