

Q&A - Mid-term Evaluation of GAIN A1 Portfolio: “Transforming food systems to improve diet quality and resilience for the most vulnerable”

This document provides answers to the queries addressed to GAIN concerning the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the mid-term evaluation of the GAIN A1 portfolio. Similar or related queries have been grouped together for simplicity.

As stated in the RFP document, responses are not confidential unless the applicant explicitly indicates that proprietary information is involved.

Questions & Answers:

1. Will the MTE involve virtual primary data collection, or will visits to selected countries (Benin, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, and Uganda) be necessary? | The evaluation questions (particularly the Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability questions) indicate the benefit of primary data collection in some of the countries of implementation at the level of the end beneficiaries: Is primary data collection with end beneficiaries in sampled countries of implementation expected? | Will there be consultations with end users? Is travel to sample countries of implementation expected?
 - A. We anticipate only virtual data collection will be needed for this MTE, therefore travel is not required. A large portion of the data will come from documents through a desk review. Primary data collection would be through virtual interviews with project implementation teams and partners and **not** with end beneficiaries. There are roughly 15 global project leads and 6 large country projects (with 3-5 key staff). Deep dives may require multiple interviews and with a larger set of stakeholders, including external partners.

2. How extensive are the virtual data collection efforts expected to be? | For a project of this nature, what is the expected or anticipated level of effort for the mid-term evaluation? | Are you able to provide an indication of how large the total key stakeholder group is?
 - A. See above.

3. Does GAIN prefer experts based in the focus countries, or is it acceptable to propose an international team with experience in focus countries?
 - A. We do not have a specific requirement.

4. Should the team section, including detailed profiles (qualifications, expertise, relevant experience) of all team members, be confined to two pages, or can additional pages be used?
 - A. It is maximum of 2 pages per individual team member.

5. Could you suggest the estimated number of days that should be budgeted for the entire team? | Would it also be possible to indicate a ceiling price for the assignment, or an indication of general level of effort for the team? | Is there an indication of the available budget?
 - A. We cannot estimate the number of days or person-days needed for this evaluation, as this will depend on the qualifications of the teams assembled and the methods proposed. We would anticipate a high level of effort given the 3-4 months to complete the work. The budget ceiling is set at \$70,000 USD. Bidders whose proposals fall under this amount will

Q&A - Mid-term Evaluation of GAIN A1 Portfolio: “Transforming food systems to improve diet quality and resilience for the most vulnerable”

receive preferential consideration in the selection process. The RFP has been updated to reflect this.

6. We request an extension for submitting a quality proposal until June 25, 2024. | Is there any flexibility with the timeline? Would there be scope for moving the start and finish dates? | Depending on agreed scope, the timeframe for the Midterm evaluation is tight. Inception, all data collection, and initial analysis is happening between August and end of September: Is the time frame negotiable and does GAIN have scope to adjust the timeframe? | Sense-making workshop is being planned quite early in the process (estimated date only 2 month after the beginning of the work and 2.5 months before final submission of report): how flexible is the date? Are there other timing constraints?

A. Yes, we can extend the deadline -for all applicants- until **June 28th, 11:59pm CET**. The RFP has been updated to reflect this. In terms of other time constraints, we have a strict deadline for a final approved report by the 15th of December. Most other deliverables are negotiable. Sense making workshops are usually helpful earlier on even if data collection is ongoing and analysis is preliminary.

7. Please can GAIN provide the MFA FNS results framework referred to in the ToR?

A. It can be found online here:

<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/binaries/rijksoverheid/documenten/publicaties/2023/01/17/subsidieprogramma-bodemvruchtbaarheid/Appendix+4+-+Results+Frameworks+FNS+and+Water.pdf>

8. The ToRs present a need for Deep dives: It would be helpful if GAIN can clarify the level of effort intended for the deep dives vis a vis other parts of the data collection.

A. See response above from question 1. Deep dives would require more intense look at 5 projects/questions within the Portfolio and interrogating them against the relevant OECD criteria. More detailed desk reviews and interviews with more stakeholders would be needed. A 2-3 page summary of each deep dive would be expected.

9. For the deep-dives, the Terms of reference speak about: “What opportunities are there to reinforce synergies between A1 and A2?” Can you provide an indication of what A2 is since there are no other references to A2 in the terms of reference or annexure.

A. The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs is financing A1 (the portfolio to be evaluated here) and A2, also known as CASCADE, as part of their nutrition strategy (2021 - 2026). CASCADE (insert link) is implemented by the consortium CARE Netherlands, CARE Intl. and GAIN and runs in parallel with A1.

More can be found here:

<https://www.gainhealth.org/impact/programmes/enabling-coherent-food-systems-policies/cascade-catalyzing-strengthened-policy>

and here:

https://www.gainhealth.org/sites/default/files/publications/documents/request_for_proposal/CASCADE%20Evaluations%20RFP_Phase%201.pdf

Q&A - Mid-term Evaluation of GAIN A1 Portfolio: “Transforming food systems to improve diet quality and resilience for the most vulnerable”

10. The Effectiveness Evaluation Questions in the ToR refer to “objectives and goals”, whilst the Impact Evaluation Questions refer to “impact goals”: At what “level of change/influence” is the Midterm Evaluation expected to report on results?

A. Since this is only a midterm evaluation at the portfolio level, and as answered in question 1, we do not anticipate primary data collection at the impact level. We would imagine the midterm evaluation would draw on updated monitoring results from the project teams to begin to assess the potential for impact of the project against its end of project targets.

11. Is there a template to submit the financial part of the proposal? Or a maximum number of pages? | Does a Table of Contents count against the page count?

A. There is no budget template. Please refer to RFP Section II. *Instructions for Responding / Budget and Format sections*. There is no page limit. The page count is only applicable for the Technical Proposal. Table of Contents is excluded from the page count.

12. How much flexibility is there in designing the methodology considering the description under 1.1?

A. We are open to considering different methods for this scope of work that would complete the assessment comprehensively and rigorously.

13. Which part of the proposal needs to be signed? The narrative? The financial proposal, or both?

A. Please sign at least the Offer of Services (RFP Section IV).

14. One of the requirements specified is "Experience in implementing food and nutrition programmes." To ensure our proposal accurately addresses this criterion, we would appreciate clarification on the scope of this requirement: Specifically, does "implementing" encompass a broader range of activities beyond direct participation in the implementation phase? For example, would experience in designing, managing, or evaluating food and nutrition programmes also be considered relevant and meet the requirement?

A. Yes.

15. How many references to vouch the agency past work would GAIN prefer to see?

A. 3 would be ideal.

16. Format of the profile, there is an overlap of detailed profiles and summaries of past experience; Please clarify difference between 2 pages per individual/agency and summary of past experience.

A. Summary of past experience allows for bidders to elaborate on past experience relevant to this scope of work, whereas detailed profiles are CVs at individual level and at the agency level. A consortium of individuals may apply and/or agencies.