

RESPONSE TO PROPOSAL QUERIES:



RESEARCH PARTNER FOR GAIN

WORKFORCE NUTRITION PROGRAMME:

TEA ESTATES 2020- 2022

January 2019

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- 1. The project KPIs indicate that self-reported food consumption in the last day and week needs to be collected among the workers/farmers and their families. Does it imply that the food consumption data has to be collected at individual level for the workers/farmers as well as for each member in their family?***

The food consumption data needs to be collected at the individual level for the worker/farmer and we would recommend the use of standard validated indicators. In the [past](#), we have used USAID's Dietary Diversity for Women (and MDD-W) as many tea pluckers are women, and therefore only collected data amongst reproductive aged women in each household (as workers or as wives of workers). We suggest the use of MDD-W (including the methodology) for comparability based on past programmes, but welcome additional suggestions to fully capture dietary changes in the broader worker population. We do not expect that additional information on family members needs to be collected.

- 2. Would the list of workers/farmers in India (Assam), Kenya and Malawi be provided to the research agency by GAIN/Partner agencies for sampling purposes or the research agency has to prepare/procure this list for the respective countries.***

The list will be provided by GAIN / partner agencies to the research agency for sampling purposes.

- 3. The deliverable section of the RfP states that the research agency has to carry out three rounds of survey (Baseline, Midline and End line) in each of the 3 countries. Does GAIN require longitudinal data among the same cohort of farmers/workers and their families in all three rounds of survey or the Baseline, Midline and End line will involve cross sectional surveys at three points of time.***

We suggest three cross-sectional surveys for baseline, midline, and endline. In the past, we have conducted longitudinal studies but the loss to follow up was problematic, however, we welcome your recommendations for a strong and reliable research design.

- 4. As mentioned in RFP the Key Performance Indicators are already decided or are in process of finalisation for this BCC campaign. Our question is, Are we as Research partner expected to just measure and monitor or are expected to deliver indicative Strategic routes for communication development as well?***

The Key Performance Indicators have already been agreed, however, they can be adjusted with consensus among partners. We also anticipate there will be additional indicators. The Behaviour Change Communications campaign has been developed out of formative research. The expectation of research partners is to measure outcome and impact indicators and integrate existing monitoring data collected by implementation agencies to inform course correction by the implementation agencies. Some monitoring indicators we would expect to be validated by the research team through surveys, i.e. message comprehension, and willingness to consume promoted foods, among others.

5. **Page 12, in the Demand block within the Points of Intervention block, our query is as follows.... There are some points or occasions of interventions mentioned, Is the research partner expected to partner GAIN in these activations and on ground interventions as well or is it not part of the Research Partner's SOW.**

We anticipate the research partners are independent evaluators and are not involved in any implementation activities of the programme.

6. **Page 7, Budget - one is advised to provide the budget in US Dollars. Please revert, whether a standard business account will suffice to receive the money payment or FCRA (Foreign Contribution Regulation Act) account is a requirement.**

The budget is in dollars for comparability, but the payment can be issued in any currency. We would recommend a Foreign Contributions Regulation Act account to receive the payment, although this is not a requirement.

7. **For baseline/ midline/ endline evaluations, is it expected to provide a comparative analysis of participating tea-estates?**

We expect the research agency to collect sufficient data on tea estate characteristics to support the analysis and interpretation of any significantly differing outcomes.

8. **What is the expected level of improvement (in percentage points) in the indicators as per the programme.**

Please refer to our [former work](#) and impact which may provide some estimates for anticipated improvements.

9. **Whether we can bid for only Assam, India; and whether you will have any objection if we hire the services of a local NGO of repute. In this case, whether we would be required to carry out due diligence as per any prescribed format.**

As indicated in the RFP a partner can bid for one, two, or three countries. Our preference is to work with one partner for all three countries. We would anticipate that local research partners or enumerators would be hired in each location, and the local partners be identified upfront in the bid, to provide sufficient confidence in the overall bid. We do not have a prescribed due diligence format but would want some assurance of trusted partners. Regardless, we assume the prime bidding agency will be accountable for all sub-contracted partners and their performance.

10. **The RFP mentioned conducting three surveys in each country at baseline, midline, and endline, but did not state whether a comparison group would exist to facilitate obtaining valid impact estimates. Would GAIN be open to an impact evaluation study design which involves identifying and surveying a comparison group in addition to those receiving the intervention? If so, has this already been accounted for in the design of the intervention itself? The existence of this would allow us to provide causal estimates of program impact, avoiding the significant biases associated with simply comparing outcomes for the tea workers before and after the intervention.**

We agree that an impact evaluation would be the most rigorous and reliable study design. Unfortunately, in this context comparison groups are extremely difficult to access and establish even with a phased approach. Therefore, the implementation design is not set up to accommodate a comparison group.