

RFP-2015-09 - Midterm Review for UNAIDS Regional AIDS Response
Answers to questions submitted by potential bidders
28-April-2015

1. **Question:** I am writing to inquire if there is any flexibility in the timing related to either the proposal submission or project start date. We are very keen to apply to this opportunity to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the UNAIDS Regional AIDS Response for South and East Africa. However, we are currently committed to a number of other evaluations, including significant time abroad. If there is a possibility to begin the work after mid-August, we would be able to consider bidding, particularly if the submission window could be extended, as the necessary staff are preparing to conduct evaluations out of country and have limited time to respond in the next 1-2 weeks.

Answer :

- For the proposal submission, and considering the delay in providing answers to the queries, UNAIDS is providing exceptional extension up to Sunday, May 10, 2015 (one week extension maximum).
- On the project start date: the start date can be slightly moved – however, we are under the imperative to provide a final approved/validated MTR document by September 15, 2015. The delay in starting the MTR should not infringe on the final date for the submission of the MTR and scope for moving the starting date is therefore very limited.

2. **Question:** We understand that this assignment includes the review of 21 countries, with 3-4 country visits. We therefore believe that such an assignment would be most efficiently delivered through a team rather than individual. As such, please can you clarify whether the 35 days are the total number of days for the entire team or whether there is some flexibility in this number of days for the assignment? In general, based on the objectives and scope of the review as well as the review criteria/ questions and proposed methodology, we do not view 35 days of input as adequate to deliver an effective and comprehensive mid-term review and hence would be grateful for more guidance on number of days of input.

Answer : The 35 days are only indicative – if the proposal foresee the working of a team more staff could be assigned to a specific staff with an increase of overall working days. Since increase in the number of working days will have budget implications the technical gains will be weighed against the increased cost.

3. **Question:** We note in paragraph 1.2.5 that all staff should work on the midterm review on a full-time basis, but also note that in paragraph 1.3.1.11 that the assignment should be conducted for 35 days over a period of three months. Please can you clarify whether staff are indeed intended to be full-time for this assignment?

Answer : What UNAIDS wants to avoid is overcommitted multitasking consultants that will not be available to deliver within the short time frame. Consultants should have at least 35 full time days (or corresponding hours) to dedicate to the implementation of the project, having the MTR as a matter of priority during those days.

4. **Question:** Please can you clarify whether primary data collection would be based on stakeholder consultations alone or do you envisage any additional primary data collection?

Answer: Mainly stakeholder consultations – however it is up to the firms to propose methodologies that could possibly go beyond the consultations.

5. **Question:** We would like to request the following background documents for this project, which have been referred to in the RFP to assist in development of the technical proposal:
- 2014 First Annual Review
 - 2013 & 2014 Annual Reports
 - Project planning documents

Answer: These documents will be shared with the selected bidder at the time of preparation of the inception report for the consultancy.

6. **Question:** If the information is not included in the documents requested above, please can you provide clarifications on:
- Which partners provide funding for the RST ESA UNAIDS support programme aside from Sida.
 - The funding amounts provided for each country.

Answer: Other funding includes UNAIDS allocation of core and extra-budgetary resources received at the global level and allocated to regions. Sida is the major funder for ESA. Details can be provided at the time of development of the inception report for the selected bidder.

7. **Question:** Please can you clarify which are the “fast track countries” referred to in the RFP.

Answer: Please refer to:

http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2014/JC2686_WAD2014report

8. **Question:** Primary data collection is required for 3-4 countries. As such, please can you clarify whether international travel is permitted for this assignment or whether all primary data collection is expected to be carried out by in-country partners?

Answer: Some international travel is allowed to guide/accelerate data collection in the selected 3-4 countries.

9. **Question:** Please can you clarify:

- Who the primary audience of this review is.
- The roles and responsibilities of both Sida and UNAIDS in this review, in terms of being either a contractor or informant or both.

Answer:

a. primary audience for this review is UNAIDS (Country offices in the ESA Region, RST ESA, HQ) and Sida. Other intended users are: UNAIDS co-sponsors; other donors and development partners; the African Union and Regional Economic Communities (SADC, EAC); Governments and AIDS authorities in ESA countries; Civil society organisations and community based organisations.

b. UNAIDS will be the contractor while Sida will be an informant and also be a member of the review Steering Committee, in charge of oversight.