**Responses to Queries Raised on Tender No. MCK/NBO/10/2021**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tender No : MCK/NBO/10/2021** | **Responses to queries raised by potential bidders.** |
| **Tender Name: GIRL –H EVALUATION** |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Date Issued:*** *28th June, 2021.****Deadline for Offer Submission:****8th July, 2021 11.59pm****Last Day for Questions:*** *1st July, 2.00pm****Questions will be answered by :*** *2nd July, 2021 5.00pm.* |

This provides responses to questions/concerns raised by bidders as at 1st June, 2021, which was the deadline for sending questions.

The responses are posted on the website for benefit of all potential bidders without disclosing the source of the questions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Question | Response |
| 1 | Can a firm apply to provide consultancy services for only Uganda. Since we are based in Uganda we would like to inquire  if we can write a proposal to carry out the three evaluations in Uganda only.(baseline, midline and endline) | This call is for the three countries. Firms should therefore bid for all the three countries. |
| 2 | We note that a number of counties/regions are to be covered in each country, could you provide for us the broad regional coverage of your program or the specific Counties? | * Uganda: Amudat,Moroto,Kotido and Kaabong Districts
* Kenya : Turkana, Garissa, Wajir, Isiolo, and Marasabit
* Haiti : Port-au- Prince and Cap Haiten
 |
| 3 | As you know, the number of units of analysis will impact on the sample size.  Are you happy to have for the impact element of the evaluation, impact measures combined at the national level? | We are looking for inferences by **country and gender** |
| 4 | Are you able to share more detail on the Program Plans and Components at this point?  This can assist us in the final design, and answer some of the below questions. | The SoW and response to the questions below should be sufficient to design the evaluation. We however encourage bidders to indicate any additional assumptions they have in their proposals.  |
| 5 | Will the baseline survey be conducted after recruiting beneficiaries into the program such that it will be possible to randomly select from a treatment group who will most likely remain in the program to the end? | The beneficiaries selection for the program and the sampling will use the same screening questions. As such, where the baseline is conducted prior to the implementation, the randomly selected respondent would be included as a program beneficiary. However, where the baseline is conducted after recruitment, then respondents would be randomly selected from the list of program beneficiaries. |
| 6 | If treatment has not yet been selected, is there any opportunity for randomizing the treatment? | We will not be adopting a randomized control trial for this program.  |
| 7 | Does the program have any specific activities targeted making changes amongst boys and young men | This is defined in the Statement of Work; Page 1; Paragraph 2 |
| 8 | Or boys and young men to be included in the study in terms of contextual understanding or is the program looking at measuring specific impacts amongst them? | This is defined in the Statement of Work; Page 1; Paragraph 2 |
| 9 | How strongly/concretely must the evaluation attribute change to the program activities?  Is an indication of attribution fine, or based on the context of the program is it likely that impacts in the environment or impacts from other organizations working with the girls could be confused with impacts made by MercyCorps? | Bidders should be guided by the Options presented in 3.6 and present their understanding of Impact Evaluation, and Outcome/Performance Evaluation. |
| 10 | In terms of selecting control, is it likely that control can be selected from within the very same communities but from households that are non-participants in the program, or will this need to be selected from other regions but nearby? | Control should be selected from different areas from the implementation areas. |
| 11 | Related to that, what is the rough penetration of the program expected to be within the specific areas covered within the County – is it closer to 100% of girls or closer to 0 percent of girls? | Consider the regions provided and the overall program target to deduce penetration |
| 13 | Is any element of process evaluation to be included in the evaluation – such as the effectiveness and value for money of the program verses others? | Kindly refer to SoW section 3.2 and Section 3.6 for guidance. |
| 14 | There is a mention of prevalence measure at mid-term, could you provide more detail on that please? | Section 3.2 explains what is expected during the mid-term assessment. Bidders are expected to understand various terms consistent with evaluation and research as stated within 3.2 |
| 15 | Because of the need to look at household resilience we may need to interview head of household or other key informant at household level, but we are concerned about budgetary constraints, even though adults will be consulted for ethical purposes.   Can you provide any guidance on the inclusion of adult household members? | Bidders are encouraged to design the study to best answer the objectives and questions of the evaluation. |
| 16 | Any idea on the construct or type of the key measurement variable on resilience? | Resilience is measured at both individual and household level based on globally accepted measures of resilience. Bidders should demonstrate their understanding of livelihood and resilience; and propose in accordance with the same.  |

**All other terms and conditions in the tender remain unchanged.**
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