Independent External Evaluation of the Stop TB Partnership RFP
2014/HTM/TBP/001

QUESTIONS BY PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS
AND
CONSOLIDATED ANSWERS BY the Stop TB PARTNERSHIP/WHO

Question 1: The Stop TB Partnership changed its strategic direction in Jan 2013. What is the expectation with respect to measuring the effectiveness of the results of this new approach?

Answer 1: It is acknowledged that it is too early to measure the effectiveness of the new strategy so only a high level review would suffice for the period January 2013 to December 2013 indicating the progress made in the directions set out in the operational strategy being implemented since January 2013.

Question 2: What is the depth of the evaluation for the special initiative of the Partnerships?

Answer 2: The evaluation of the special initiatives is to be conducted only at a higher level. Many studies and evaluations relating to the operations of GDF and TBREACH initiatives are available as well as documents prepared for the Coordinating Board by both these initiatives. These would be made available to the Organisation undertaking the Independent External Evaluation.

Question 3: Is quantitative data and information on Partnership itself and its activities available. What is the extent and nature of quantitative data available on the Partnership's resources, activities and results since 2007? In assessing the Partnership's value for money, impact, cost effectiveness etc., we would need reliable data to be made available on a timely basis (in addition to stakeholder feedback etc.). One of the evaluation questions under Sec XI.2. of the ToR is to assess the economic return on investment of initiatives such as GDF, Challenge Facility and TB Reach? In order to inform our proposed methodology and related to the above question, what data is available to support the RoI assessment or is it expected to be a primarily qualitative assessment?

Answer 3: Quantitative data is available on partnerships resources. Income and expenditure reports for each year and donor agreements are available and will be made available to the evaluators. Annual reports are published each year and special initiatives maintain detailed reports related to patients reached out and impacted (TBREACH) and commodities (anti-TB drugs and diagnostics-GDF) delivered for their programs each year. The methodology for assessing value for money needs to be proposed by the bidding organizations. The proposed approach could have both qualitative and quantitative dimensions.
Question 4: Is the organisation selected expected to conduct field level surveys/primary data collection.

**Answer 4:** This is up to the consulting organisation submitting the proposal and the approach it proposes bearing in mind that the work to be done needs to be done in as cost effective manner as possible making maximum use of existing information and reports. Work done should, of course, be well supported by appropriate data to enable the organisation undertaking the evaluation to make an assessment bearing in mind the time available for the work and the reporting time lines given in the RFP.

Question 5: Have any baseline data studies been carried out for the Partnership's activities in the past? Given that the Partnership has been operating for several years, we are not clear on the baseline data that this evaluation is expected to address.

**Answer 5:** It should be noted that this is the first evaluation that is focused on “value for money”. However, baseline data is available in various reports and publications. In addition previous evaluation conducted will be made available to the selected Organisation conducting this evaluation.

Question 6: What is the conflict of interest policy of the Stop TB Partnership/WHO. Does previous, current or future involvement of an organization in the work of the Partnership, or being a recipient of a grant from the Partnership preclude taking on the role as an independent External Evaluator? Can a person who has previously worked on a programme/Project of Stop TB Partnership be a member of the evaluation team?

**Answer 6:** Involvement in Partnership past projects does not necessarily preclude taking on the role of an Independent External Evaluator as per the RFP (No: 2014/HTM/TBP/001) under which the bid is being made provided inter alia such an involvement has ended and has not been in the nature of a plan or strategy work for the Stop TB Partnership that falls within the review period (2007-2013) of this Independent External evaluation.

The above requirement equally applies to bidders’ holding groups, consortia, networks and their sister organizations, affiliates or members. It also applies to those organisations that have been or are recipients of grant funds from the Stop TB Partnership. Such an involvement would constitute a conflict of interest. Involvement in the proposed evaluation team of a person who has previously worked in a substantive capacity on any programme or project of the Stop TB Partnership may constitute a conflict of interest if the area of work in which that person was involved in a substantive capacity is within the period covered by the current evaluation (2007-2013).

CV’s of members of the proposed team of professional and other staff should indicate all assignments during the period 2007-2012 in which they have been involved, or indeed continue to be so involved, if the assignments relate to the work for the Stop TB Partnership including its special initiatives GDF and TBREACH.
Any conflict, if not resolved, will lead to a bid being disqualified. Any decision of the selection panel on any potential conflict of interest issues or any other matters in relation to the evaluation of proposals and selection of the successful bidder will be final and Stop TB will not provide any information on the deliberations of the Selection Panel to any of the bidders.

Question 7: The ToRs refers to a detailed analysis of the Partnership's staffing structure, roles, skills, capacity, tenure and appointment process. Given our experience with similar evaluations, this is a big undertaking in its own right. Further guidance on the extent to which these issues need to be reviewed within this mandate would be helpful.

Answer 7: A detailed analysis is not expected. The Partnership went through an extensive process in developing its operational strategy and the organisation structure to deliver this strategy. So only a very brief high level review of the structure and plan(s) of work are needed to assess whether they are appropriately aligned to deliver results in the Partnership's various areas of work bearing in mind the vision and mission of the Partnership.

Question 8: The main objective/work of this evaluation is an audit of the Partnership's performance based on the parameters set out in the ToR. The consultant is expected to provide recommendations only on enhancing the value for money aspect of the Partnership's work. Is this understanding correct?

Answer 8: The reporting requirements clearly define that the evaluation is expected to:

- Answer all the questions listed in the TORs as well as those that emerge while conducting the evaluation.
- Identify areas that could be improved
- Give clear recommendations for enhancing the cost effectiveness of the Stop TB Partnership.

It is also expected that in identifying the areas that could be improved suggestions would be given on the type of improvements needed.

Question 9: Are country visits/studies expected to be included for this evaluation (as mentioned at the end of Sec X of the ToR), and if so, how many should be proposed/budgeted for?

Answer 9: it is up to the bidding organisation to suggest this and is a function of what the evaluator needs to do in the most cost effective manner to assess the performance of the Partnership from a “value for money” perspective. If country visits are to be used as per the proposed methodology then the average unit cost per country visit should be given. Also the number of country visits should be indicated clearly. The number is entirely up to the bidder but a solid justification is expected on the number and nature of the visit.

Question 10: are the following reports publicly available:

- Future Direction of GDF; and
**Answer 10:** Slides on future directions of GDF are available on the Stop TB Partnership website [www.stoptb.org](http://www.stoptb.org). The SOPs are in the final stages of finalisation and will be made available to the Organisation undertaking the evaluation.

**Question:** When can the contract be awarded and what are the key dates to be kept in mind.

**Answer 10:**

- Award of contract to the winning bidder depends on how fast the selection and contracting process unfolds, the Stop TB Partnership will try to move as fast as possible but no firm dates can be given as parts of the process depend on WHO clearance procedures.

- The final report should available four weeks before the 2015 Coordinating Board meeting possibly sometime in the early part of the first quarter of 2015. As stated in the RFP the final report is expected by early December 2014.

- A schedule of meetings will be made available to the Organisation winning the contract and it can choose to plan its work around some of them.

**Question 11:** Can guidance be given on length of proposal that needs to be submitted?

**Answer 11:** The proposal must not be more than seventy (70) pages, including a five (5) page Executive Summary.

Brief CVs of each member of the proposed team should be given indicating all academic and professional qualifications, and relevant work experience. Experience of work with the Stop TB Partnership, if any, should be indicated clearly in the CV’s. The main proposal should clearly indicate the role of each member of the proposed team in the proposed work.

The individual CV’s should be not more than three pages and should be in the Appendix. All CV’s must be accompanied with a very brief half a page summary. The relevant forms indicated in the RFP must be submitted with the proposal.

Finally it is important that the Form-1 and Form-III be properly completed, signed, dated and included in the sealed package containing the full proposal as instructed in the RFP.

**Question 12:** What are the key dates regarding meetings that could be targeted for delivery of evaluation interim documents/briefings?

**Answer 12:** The important dates are:

- **Coordinating Board Retreat:** 14 July 2014 and Board Meeting 15 July 2014. Both meetings in Seattle.

- **The Executive Committee meetings:** Every 4 to six weeks. The next meeting is scheduled for 2 June 014; evaluation is not to be discussed at this meeting.

- **TBREACH M&E Meetings:** first half of September 2014 and December 2014

- **Next Board Meeting:** first Quarter 2015, date to be decided later.
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