

OPEN RESPONSE TO RFP QUERIES

“CONSULTANCY FOR A DATA LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COUNTRY FOOD SYSTEMS DASHBOARD (FSD) AND ADAPTATION OF THE FOOD SYSTEMS COUNTDOWN INITIATIVE (FSCI) IN GHANA”

Indicator Selection and Data Criteria

- **Is GAIN expecting the final Ghana-adapted FSCI framework to retain a fixed number of indicators (e.g., aligned closely with the global 50-indicator FSCI set), or is flexibility encouraged to expand/reduce the set based on national relevance and data availability?**
We anticipate that the final Ghana FSCI framework will comprise approximately 50–75 indicators. This range is considered appropriate to ensure the framework remains comprehensive while still being feasible to monitor on a regular basis.
- **Should the compendium distinguish between Core indicators (recommended for immediate dashboard inclusion), and aspirational indicators (policy-relevant but currently data-constrained)?**
Yes, the compendium should clearly distinguish between core indicators, supported by currently available data, and future (aspirational) indicators, which are not yet supported by data but are considered essential for inclusion in the country FSCI framework as data availability improves.
- **Are there specific food system domains that GAIN considers priority for Ghana (e.g., nutrition outcomes, climate resilience, livelihoods, food environments, governance), beyond those already embedded in the global FSCI framework?**
Given that the objective is to contextualise the global FSCI for the Ghana country context, the approach will be to retain the existing FSCI domains as defined in the [global FSCI Framework](#), rather than introducing additional priority domains.
- **What minimum standards should be used to assess whether an indicator is “dashboard-ready” (e.g., temporal frequency, geographic coverage, public accessibility, data recency)?**
For an indicator to be included in the Food Systems Dashboard (FSD), several criteria are considered and will be shared with the selected consultant.
- **Should indicators with irregular or outdated data still be included if they are policy-critical?**
Indicators with irregular data collection may still be considered if they are essential and policy-critical to the framework. However, priority should be given to indicators for which data is collected regularly.
- **Does GAIN have preferred administrative levels for the Ghana dashboard (e.g., region, district, agro-ecological zone), or should this be determined through the data mapping exercise and stakeholder consultation?**
The Ghana Food Systems Dashboard will initially prioritise data disaggregation at the national and administrative levels for which data is available.

- **Data Production vs Data Mapping: To confirm, the consultancy focuses on mapping and framework design rather than generating new primary data—correct?**

Yes, as stated in the RFP, the assignment will focus on assessing the availability of data rather than on data collection.

Framework Alignment, Scope and Ownership

- **The scope asks for "identifying appropriate data disaggregation levels" and "determining data acquisition needs." Are we to understand that the final adapted FSCI framework will include recommendations for these elements, or is the expectation to also establish formal data-sharing agreements or protocols with source agencies as part of this consultancy?**

The expectation for the adapted FSCI framework is to provide recommendations on indicators and data sources available at different levels of disaggregation, where such data exists. Establishing formal data-sharing agreements or protocols with source agencies is not within the scope of this consultancy.

- **Should regional commitments (e.g., CAADP, ECOWAS food systems strategies) be treated as mandatory alignment layers or as secondary references where relevant?**

Alignment with regional commitments and frameworks will be determined by the food systems experts convened as part of the process, who will make the final decision.

- **How should trade-offs be handled between maintaining cross-country comparability with the global FSCI and ensuring contextual relevance for Ghana-specific decision-making?**

The primary objective is to ensure that the framework is relevant to the Ghanaian context and supports national decision-making, while drawing on regional and global food systems frameworks, including the global FSCI, where they are relevant.

- **Is the expectation that indicators be explicitly mapped to lead ministries only, or also to cross-cutting coordination bodies and decentralised governance structures?**

These indicators will be mapped by Ghana food systems experts, with input from a range of participants including civil society, government ministries, academia, and research institutions.

- **Should recommendations for strengthening the FSCI focus primarily on:**

- Indicator gaps,
- Methodological refinements,
- Institutional data systems, or
- Governance and coordination mechanisms?

Recommendations for strengthening the FSCI should focus primarily on addressing data gaps and improving the linkages between monitoring and policy to ensure the framework effectively informs decision-making.

Stakeholder Engagement and Workshops

- **Does GAIN envisage balanced representation across government, civil society, academia, and development partners, or a stronger emphasis on government decision-makers for potential institutional adoption?**

Stakeholder engagement under this RFP will be inclusive of civil society, academic institutions, and development partners, with a deliberate focus on government actors to promote institutional ownership and long-term adoption.

- **Is the workshop expected to validate a near-final indicator framework, or to co-create and significantly reshape the framework based on participant inputs?**

The aim is to have a final indicator framework that is co-created with feedback from Ghana food systems experts.

- **Post-Workshop Validation: Will there be an additional formal validation or endorsement process beyond the workshop (e.g., circulation to ministries for written sign-off)?**

This is part of our future plans, but it will not be part of this consultancy.

- **For the participatory workshop, to what extent will GAIN and its in-country partners provide a pre-identified list of key stakeholders to invite? Are there specific government ministries (e.g., MoFA, MoTI, GSS, NDPC, MoH, GHS) or agencies that are considered mandatory participants?**

The list will be drafted by one of the key ministries with support from the consultant, if needed.

- **The RFP specifies a "two-day workshop." Could you clarify the expected mode of delivery (e.g., fully in-person in Accra, hybrid, or fully virtual)? This significantly impacts logistical planning and budgeting.**

The 2-day workshop is an in-person workshop and as mentioned in the RFP, GAIN will cover the costs associated with the workshops, including venue rental, meals, workshop materials, printing, and any additional unforeseen expenses, subject to prior agreement.

RFP Language Clarifications

- **The timeline states "*Planning and preparation of the FSCI workshop... February 15, 2025.*" in addition to the ensuring service #3 March 15, 2025." These appear to be a typographical error, as the year should obviously be 2026. Could you please confirm the correct deadline for the *workshop planning deliverable*, as well as the deliverable for *Facilitation and documentation of the workshops*?**

The planning and facilitation of the workshops are expected to take place in 2026. The planning and preparation for the workshops will be due by March 15, 2026 and the workshops will take place on March 30, 2026.

Policy Brief

- **Who is the primary audience for the policy brief: senior policymakers, technical officers, development partners, or a mixed audience?**

The policy brief will be prepared primarily for policy makers, with content and messaging tailored to inform high-level policy and strategic decision-making.

- **Should the policy brief explicitly reference how the forthcoming Ghana Food Systems Dashboard could be institutionalized within government planning and review cycles?**
The policy brief will draw on the Food Systems Countdown Initiative to examine existing food systems monitoring frameworks in Ghana, support evidence-based policy planning, and highlight priority opportunities for enhancing cross-sectoral coordination. The [Food Systems Dashboard](#) platform will then host the FSCI indicator data.
- **The policy brief should synthesise "findings on the current state of food systems integration." Should the primary source of these findings be the data landscape analysis and workshop outcomes from this assignment, or is it expected to also incorporate a broader review of existing literature and policies on food systems integration in Ghana?**
The findings will be drawn primarily from the data landscape analysis and complemented by feedback received from the stakeholder workshop. These will be complemented by a set of existing literature and policy documents on food systems in Ghana to provide contextual grounding.
- **Is there a preferred length or format (e.g., 4–6 pages, executive summary, key messages), and should it be advocacy-oriented or primarily analytical?**
The policy brief is expected to be approximately four pages in length, with space for simplified graphics. It will be advocacy-oriented in tone and structured around key messages, an introduction, a main body, and clear recommendations.

Deliverable Reviews and Budget

- **How many formal review iterations should be assumed for key deliverables (indicator compendium, framework, policy brief)?**
We expect one round of revisions to be sufficient, but we will need to assess them on a case-by-case basis.
- **Is there a budget ceiling for this study that the vendor should adhere to while developing the technical proposal and which currency should be used to develop the budget?**
Budget details are withheld to ensure unbiased financial proposals. Bidders should submit a realistic, competitive budget consistent with their technical scope. Final financial discussions will take place during negotiations. The currency to be used for this budget is USD.