Important Notice for Organizations making a bid for the TB REACH Mid-Term Evaluation

A proposal which is not sealed and is not received by 17.00hrs Geneva time on 17 September 2012 will be disqualified straight away.

Responses to Questions Submitted by Prospective Bidders in relation to RFP 2012/HTM/TBP/0001

General Questions

General Question 1: What are the Partnership’s requirements as for physical travel to donors and grants in number of countries to visit, days per visit and in the geographies to focus on?

Response: For the purposes of preparing comparative proposals, firms may assume up to five field visits conducted in different geographic regions in which the grantees are situated. Explicit criteria for justification of these visits are required, with any assumptions clearly stated. Rationale behind any proposed travel to donor countries is to be determined explicitly by the bidding firm. The number of days per visit for the actual work itself with the grantees is a function of how well the visiting team has prepared itself for the visit; normally one or two full working days would suffice. It should be noted that this is a mid-term evaluation only and the work of the Grantees is under constant monitoring and evaluation. All monitoring and evaluation reports will be made available to the selected firm undertaking the work by the TB REACH Secretariat.

General Question 2: What level of involvement would the Partnership seek in determining which countries to visit and who to meet during these visits? Would members of your organisation join the consultants on those visits?

Response: The TB REACH secretariat has a role in determining which countries to visit. Suggestions by the evaluators would be welcome with clear reasons, but will have to be vetted by the TB REACH Secretariat. Accompaniment by staff of the Stop TB Partnership, or others involved in the governance of the initiative, is unlikely unless requested by the evaluators with good reason.

Specific Questions

Specific Question Section 2.2. Objectives of the activity states: “in connection with this, how best can TB REACH address the increasing demand…” Kindly elaborate on the usage of the word “demand” in this context.
Response: This relates to the increased demand of interested, qualified organizations applying for funding under the TB REACH initiative for undertaking innovative TB case finding projects.

Specific Question Section 3.3.1. Specific evaluation tasks 1 and 2 make reference to components. Can you please provide further detail regarding what this relates to?

Response: Components relate to the structural elements of the TB REACH initiative, including but not limited to the TB REACH Secretariat, Proposal Review Committee (PRC) and the Programme Steering Group (PSG), for example.

Specific Question Section 3.3.1, Specific evaluation tasks 7, regarding review of the contribution of human and financial resources of other Partnership bodies to the work of the TB REACH Secretariat. Please elaborate what is meant by “other Partnership bodies”?

Response: The text refers to such bodies established by and specific to the Partnership whose identity emanates from it, such as its Secretariat, composed of various functional units, its specific programmes and its Working Groups, the Coordinating Board, and so forth, and does not refer to individual partners.

Specific Question Section 3.3.1, Guiding Principles states that the evaluation will “use stakeholder views as a source of information and, in this respect, take advantage of relevant meetings e.g. the TB REACH Programme Steering Group, Proposal Review Committee...” Would you be able to share a calendar of events with us (nature of meeting, date, location) so we can factor these into our proposed work plan and budget?

Response:
The key events currently set are:

- October 17-Nov 2: PRC Review of Wave 3 and Wave 2 Year 2 Proposals (Geneva)
- Nov 5-6: M&E Review of PRC shortlisted projects (Amsterdam)
- November 7-9: PRC decision meeting on Wave 3 and Wave 2 Continuation funding (Teleconference)
- November 15: Quarterly reports from current projects due for August-September period.
- November 19-20: Coordinating Board approval of Wave 3 and Wave 2 Continuation funding (conditional to clarifications) In Kuala Lumpur

It is important to note that all meetings need not be attended by the elevators, and a justification will need to be given prior to any visit being approved.

Specific Question Section 4.14.3: Confirm if all proposed subcontractors should complete the table provided in 4.14.3, or is this table to be completed only by the lead organization submitting the proposal?
Response: The final proposal submitted by each firm should contain complete, relevant and concise information related to all aspects of the project in order for assessment on its technical and financial merits. As item 1.6. states, information related to any proposed sub-contracting arrangements should be clearly spelt out as per the RFP’s instructions.

Specific Question Section 3.3.2: mention is made that the evaluators would need to present their final report. Please elaborate further on the expectation related to this element.

Response: A presentation of the findings and recommendations of the evaluation should be anticipated to occur in Geneva, Switzerland in early 2013. The costs for this will have to be borne by the organisation making the presentation.