

RFP I-CAN EVALUATION DESIGN CONSULTANTS QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Does GAIN expect one integrated methodology that covers both the five-year evaluation design and the light touch interim assessment, or two distinct products?

This is up to the consultant to propose, but we would expect the light-touch interim assessment to be a simplified version or subset of aspects included in the five-year evaluation design.

- What does “not extensive external interviews” mean in practice in terms of whether any external KIIs are permitted and, if so, at what scale?

Again, this is up to the consultant to propose. Some external KIIs could be included if the consultant feels it is necessary, but we would not want these to be numerous or extensive, given the assessment is meant to be light-touch.

- Which countries and I CAN supported initiatives are in scope, and should analysis remain at initiative level or extend to country and partner levels?

For the light-touch interim assessment, we only expect this to take place at the global level. For the full five year evaluation we would expect both global activity and 2-3 countries to be included.

- Which internal monitoring data, policy tracking records, and documentation will GAIN make available during the assignment?

We will make available any relevant project documentation including project workplans and annual narrative reports noting the key activities, achievements and challenges related to I-CAN work globally and in each country. We will also make available monitoring data, noting that this primarily tracks outputs. At the national level, we will make available the underlying data of any policy assessments conducted. At the global level we will also make available the data underlying the I-CAN Assessments conducted in 2023 and 2025 and any future assessments as relevant.

Does GAIN have agreed outcome definitions and baseline reference points, or should the evaluation design establish these retrospectively?

Yes, in most cases these exist.

- What is the country scope of this assignment? Would the proposed evaluation and light touch assessment include all 12 GAIN countries or a subset of project countries? If a subset, what is process for country selection?

For the light-touch interim assessment, we only expect this to take place at the global level. For the full five year evaluation we would expect both global activity and 2-3 countries to be included.

- Is the assignment to be carried out remotely for the full duration or would in country travel be expected at any point, such as for data collection or presentation of results?

Remotely.

- To better target the proposed evaluation and assessment, are all the GAIN countries implementing the same level of all pillars/activities of I-CAN in all countries or are they disaggregated by different pillars and in different countries? How is implementation structured? At the country level or only globally?

Work at the country level takes place under ‘Pillar 1’ of I-CAN, aiming to strengthen national policies for integrated country action. Work is not limited to GAIN countries, but also includes countries where I-CAN partner organisations have a presence. In some countries this is limited to assessment and evidence dissemination whereas in others more in depth stakeholder engagement and capacity building is also taking place to target specific policy gaps identified. For country-level work, this is implemented by the relevant GAIN country team, or that of an I-CAN partner, supported by the global team. For work under other Pillars this is implemented at the global level, led by both GAIN and other I-CAN partners depending on the specific activity.

- If they exist, can GAIN provide, during the proposal phase, a list of current specific and measurable I-CAN indicators (or general indicators GAIN uses) which capture the results of the program per the TOC in the RFP or is the consultant expected to develop those?

This will be provided to the successful applicant at inception, not during the proposal phase.

Is there a routine monitoring system (tools and methods) in place now for I-CAN with tools and methods? If so, can materials/resources be shared? Or is the I-CAN baseline report on the GAIN website the only data collection that has occurred thus far?

There is routine monitoring, but it is focusing mostly on tracking outputs.

- On page 3 pillar 5 is bolded red. Is this intended to communicate anything specific or different than the other pillars? If so, can you please provide clarity on what the difference is?

No, this was a formatting error.

- GAIN references ‘ensure sign off on approach with the core I-CAN partners. Is there additional detail that can be provided to bidders about the decision making and technical sign-off process by the core group regarding the evaluative approach (referenced page 4)? Does this include a signatory of each of the core global partners (per pg 3 WHO, FAO, GAIN, SUN and UNEP)? Specific donors and/or national partners?

This will be clarified in the inception phase of the project.

- Will donors and/or national partners be involved in reviewing or validating the evaluation design or interim assessment findings, or will engagement be limited to the global/core partnership level?

This will be clarified in the inception phase of the project.

- Is there any additional clarification or guidance that GAIN can provide on the role of Alliance for Transformative Action on Climate and Health (ATACH)? Is it fair to presume they will be available to engage on both aspects of the RFP work?

I-CAN has formally been hosted by the Alliance for Transformative Action on Climate and Health (ATACH). Some activities under I-CAN are delivered directly through ATACH, for example developing guidance on integrating nutrition into climate and health policies, but the majority of activity is not delivered directly through the ATACH platform. Given this, we do not anticipate that engagement with ATACH is required for this evaluation, but we would be happy to facilitate relevant introductions if required.

- Does GAIN intend for the light touch interim assessment to reflect details at the global level? Is there any further clarification on what GAIN desires to see in this report at the country level?

For the light-touch interim assessment, we only expect this to take place at the global level. For the full five year evaluation we would expect both global activity and 2-3 countries to be included.

Is there an anticipated timeframe for when the full evaluation (for which this design is being developed) might be commissioned, to inform appropriate outcome trajectories and indicators?

Likely in the fifth year of the project.

- Under Deliverables & Timescales, the RFP specifies the preparation of draft and final "detailed methodology and data collection tools for five-year evaluation." Can GAIN clarify the expectations around the data collection tools that would be drafted?
 - Whichever tools are needed for data collection, according to the methodology developed by the consultant.
- Under Deliverables & Timescales, the RfP specifies the preparation of a light-touch assessment report and presentation (draft and final). This is understood to be mainly drawing on secondary materials. Can GAIN provide any additional information around what kind of data would be available for the light touch assessment, and the anticipated length of the report?

See answers above on data available.

The report can be brief so long as it conveys all the necessary information.

Engagement of I-CAN partners and stakeholders

- What level of direct engagement with I-CAN partners is expected throughout the assignment?

GAIN will lead on providing feedback and guidance to the selected service provider and will coordinate inputs from the wider group of I-CAN partners where required. Direct engagement with I-CAN partners would be required to provide 1-2 direct presentations on the proposed methodology and results of the interim light-touch

assessment and for any additional interviews or consultations proposed in the evaluation methodology.

- Is there an indicative number and profile of partners or stakeholders expected to be consulted during the methodology design and the interim assessment?

No, this is up to the consultant to propose, but we would not expect there to be many.

- Will engagement with partners be mediated by the GAIN team, or is the consultant expected to coordinate these interactions directly?

Directly, though GAIN can make connections where needed.

Access to data, documentation, and existing systems

- What types of documents and data sources will be made available at the outset of the assignment, such as annual reports, activity records, technical outputs, and monitoring data?

[See answers above]

- Does GAIN currently have a structured monitoring and evaluation system in place for I-CAN, or are data distributed across multiple sources?

Indicators are tracked in a results framework; supporting documents may be separate.

Scope and depth of the “light-touch” interim assessment

- Does GAIN have guiding criteria for what it considers a “light-touch” interim assessment, particularly regarding analytical depth and the level of evidence expected?

No, this is for the consultant to propose.

- Is there any expectation regarding the use of interviews or other forms of primary data collection, even if limited, or only secondary data will be assessed? If so, is there an indicative limit on the number of interlocutors or the analytical effort envisaged?

[See answers above]

Methodological expectations and institutional alignment

- To what extent is methodological innovation prioritised in relation to comparability with previous evaluations or donor requirements?

There are no prior evaluations of I-CAN. What matters is the appropriateness and feasibility of the methodology, whether innovative or not.

Travel, fieldwork, and in-person consultations

- Where engagement with external stakeholders is envisaged, does GAIN prioritise virtual formats, or are in-person consultations considered appropriate in specific contexts?

GAIN doesn't have a preference, as long as it works for the stakeholders. No travel is anticipated under this assignment.

- Should travel-related expenses, if deemed relevant, be included within the indicated maximum budget, or treated separately?

No travel is anticipated under this assignment. If the consultant feels it is necessary to include travel, they should include it their budget.

- **Scope and unit of analysis:** Is the five-year evaluation methodology expected to assess I-CAN primarily as a global initiative, or should it explicitly incorporate country-level and/or regional-level analytical components?

See answers above.

- **Depth versus breadth:** Given I-CAN's multi-pillar and multi-stakeholder nature, how does GAIN envisage balancing breadth of coverage across all pillars with depth of analysis in selected outcome pathways within the future evaluation?

The main objective of the evaluation is to assess progress towards I-CAN's overall aim to bring nutrition and climate action closer together rather than an in-depth evaluation of each pillar.

- **Status of the Theory of Change:** Is the I-CAN Theory of Change included in the Annex considered final, or does GAIN expect the evaluation design process to critically interrogate and potentially refine elements of the Theory of Change? Further, does GAIN have an established log frame for the I-CAN initiative currently or this is expected to be developed/refined?

GAIN does not expect the Theory of Change to change through this assignment. I-CAN has a results framework elaborated.

- **Scope of the light-touch interim assessment**
Could you clarify whether the light-touch interim assessment may include limited primary data collection (such as key informant discussions with core partners), or whether it is expected to rely exclusively on secondary data sources?

It may include limited primary data collection if the consultant feels this is needed / helpful.

- **Partner engagement and validation**
At what stages does GAIN expect engagement with I-CAN partners (such as WHO, FAO, SUN, and UNEP) during the evaluation design and interim assessment, and will GAIN facilitate these interactions?

See responses above.

- **Level of detail expected for the five-year evaluation design:** For the final five-year evaluation methodology, is GAIN expecting a high-level conceptual design, or a near "ready-to-deploy" methodology with detailed tools, indicators, and protocols for future evaluators to implement?

The latter.

- **Framing of Contribution vs Attribution:** Given I-CAN's role as a multi-stakeholder, convening and agenda-setting initiative, does GAIN envisage the eventual five-year evaluation to be framed primarily as a contribution assessment rather than an attribution-focused impact evaluation?

This is up to the consultant to propose based on their expertise.

- **Expectations Around Counterfactuals:** Does GAIN anticipate the use of theory-based counterfactual approaches (e.g. contribution analysis, process tracing, outcome harvesting) as the primary strategy for assessing I-CAN's contribution, rather than experimental or quasi-experimental designs?

This is up to the consultant to propose based on their expertise.

- **Focus Across the Five Strategic Pillars:** Are all five I-CAN pillars expected to receive equal analytical depth in both the interim assessment and the five-year evaluation design, or does GAIN anticipate differentiated emphasis based on pillar maturity, data availability, or strategic priority?

See responses above

- **Geographic Scope of Analysis:** Does GAIN expect the evaluation design to include country-level analysis or illustrative country case studies, or should the focus remain primarily at the global and regional levels?

See responses above

- **Definition of "Light-Touch" Interim Assessment:** Could GAIN clarify whether the "light-touch" interim assessment may include limited primary engagement (e.g. internal staff consultations or partner sense-making discussions), or whether it should rely strictly on secondary data sources?

See responses above

- **Access to Partner-Generated Data:** To what extent should the proposed methodology assume access to data, reports, or monitoring outputs generated by I-CAN partners (e.g. WHO, FAO, UNEP, SUN), and will GAIN facilitate such access where relevant?

The scope will be limited to data available from GAIN or secondary publicly available sources, or collected through primary data collection by the consultant.

- **Intended Users of the Five-Year Evaluation:** Who are the primary intended users of the eventual five-year evaluation (e.g. donors, global partners, country governments, internal strategy and learning), and how should this influence the evaluation design and reporting formats?

The primary intended users are I-CAN partners and those who may implement or support similar initiatives in the future. How this influences the evaluation design and reporting is up to the consultant to propose based on their expertise.

- **Balance Between Learning and Accountability:** How does GAIN view the balance between learning-oriented insights and accountability-focused assessment within both the interim assessment and the five-year evaluation design?

Both are important, but the interim assessment should be primarily learning oriented.

- **Use of Findings to Strengthen Evaluability:** Is GAIN open to the evaluation design including recommendations to refine or strengthen current monitoring and data systems, where gaps relevant to future evaluability are identified?

Yes, if this makes sense.

- **Expectations for the Indicative Five-Year Evaluation Budget:** For the indicative workplan and budget for the five-year evaluation, does GAIN expect: a high-level cost envelope, or a more detailed, method-linked budget outlining phases, tools, and resource assumptions?

A more detailed budget.