

**RFP2021.01 – Clarification Nr. 3**

No.	RFP Section reference	Question	Answer
1	2.3	In order to have a clear visibility of available data and ensure an efficient data collection process after the Kick-off, we propose to hold a Pre-Kick Off meeting with the Unitaid team before the Kick-off with the SteerCo. Would that work with your availability?	<i>Yes, we anticipate one or more (if needed) touchpoints between Unitaid and the selected bidder prior to the kick-off with the Board Steering Committee for introductions, planning and alignment purposes.</i>
2	3.2.1	<p>"The proposed review team should meet the following requirements: Proficiency in English and French (knowledge of other UN languages an asset); final deliverables must be submitted in English."</p> <p>We understand there needs to be a balance between the ability to speak French and sufficient technical qualification in content related topics. We suggest to prioritize people's qualification over language skills to offer you the best possible expertise.</p> <p>Still the bidder's single point of contact (i.e. project lead) will ensure smooth communication as being bi-lingual (French and English). Would you still expect from all other team members (e.g. data analyst in delivery team) to speak French as well?</p>	<i>For this assignment, Unitaid does not expect all team members to speak French. The requirement is at the team level, and it is to ensure that the team has the capacity/skills in place to review documentation in French and/or hold consultations with French-speaking stakeholders. We leave it to the bidder to propose an arrangement that meets these requirements.</i>
3	Appendix 1 - TOR	<p>Based on our experience the best results are achieved by a collaborative joint approach. We understand that the external review will be overseen by the Executive Board Steering Committee, with the direct management and support by the Unitaid Secretariat. Can you give us more information about the level of involvement of Unitaid, i.e.</p> <p>- Do you envision a "hands-on" collaboration performing analyses as well or is it expected that all the analyses and report development is done by the bidder?</p>	<p><i>The analyses described in the external review ToR are to be conducted by the bidder, with Unitaid's participation being limited to: reviewing and providing input on activities and deliverables, facilitating access to relevant data and stakeholders, and managing the interaction with the Board Steering Committee. Unitaid will not be dedicating FTEs to <u>carrying out</u> analyses that form part of the external review. This is to ensure the external and independent nature of the review.</i></p> <p><i>Separately, Unitaid is conducting its own set of internal analyses in different areas to complement the assessments of the external review.</i></p>

		<p>- How many people are available within the Unitaid team?</p> <p>- How many internal FTEs will be dedicated during the project duration?</p>	<p><i>Unitaid has aimed to keep these streams of work distinct and with limited overlap.</i></p>
4	Appendix 1 - TOR - Annex 1	<p>In Annex 1 of the TOR you list the available data sources.</p> <p>- Do you expect that additional data sources will be needed to perform the analyses?</p> <p>- How much time will be needed to collect all listed data? Is our assumption of 1 week sufficient?</p> <p>- In order to close potential data gaps and validate performed analyses we perform a set of interviews. We expect to run about ~20 interviews. Is that aligned with your expectations?</p>	<p><i>Annex 1 provides an initial list. Relevant documents (those listed in Annex 1 and potentially others) will be made available following signature of the contract by the selected bidder. Stakeholders may also suggest additional relevant documents during the consultations.</i></p> <p><i>While Unitaid cannot comment on the exact number of interviews required, we expect stakeholder consultations with a diverse set of stakeholders (as listed in the ToR) to form a core component of the methodology for this type of review. As an example, 20 interviews would potentially cover only Unitaid Executive Board, Proposal Review Committee and Secretariat stakeholders.</i></p>
5	Appendix 1 - TOR - 2	<p>Would it be beneficial to include a high-level review of the operating model along with the considerations related to the guidelines for the future strategy?</p> <p>(we could embed the idea in our execution framework, as we already delivered the very same product in the context of a similar organization)</p>	<p><i>Unitaid does not expect a 360-degree review of the operating model, but rather of key aspects of it, as per the ToR (e.g., efficiency).</i></p>
6	4.15.5	<p>You mentioned that the Financial template document contains two sheets that need to be completed. Can you please confirm that there is only one sheet that needs to be filled out, namely Annex 5?</p>	<p><i>Our apologies, it is indeed only one file (Annex 5) and one sheet to be completed.</i></p>
7	3.2.2	<p>In case we have colleagues who – while not having direct conflict with respect to the criteria you outlined in the RfP – have worked directly with Unitaid Secretariat in the last two years, would you prefer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That we leverage that team and its expertise</li> <li>That we field a completely new team</li> <li>That we provide you with both options?</li> </ol>	<p><i>Given the criticality of ensuring the neutrality of the review, any firm or individual who has been involved in the development or implementation of Unitaid’s 2017-2021 strategy in any form will be considered as possessing a major conflict of interest, as the firm or individuals will be assessing their own work.</i></p>

8	3.2.1	Can we have access to Unitaid SMEs/experts in the field of HIV, Tuberculosis, malaria, etc. to support us in the review (i.e. collaborate to identify specific areas of the review or provide insights as to which external stakeholders are relevant to consult as part of the review)?	<p><i>Typically, Unitaid and the reviewers would work in tandem to finalize the stakeholder consultation list. Unitaid will propose stakeholders with whom we work on a regular basis and make introductions as needed; however, we would also look to the reviewers to complement this list to ensure a fair and inclusive consultation process.</i></p> <p><i>Unitaid also typically provides input on review activities, proposed analyses and scope during the inception phase to ensure an approach and scope that would meet Unitaid's (and, in this case, the Executive Board's needs). However, this should be viewed more as an "advisor" role, and Unitaid would rely on the bidder to define the approach and scope (as per the ToR) and identify specific areas where Unitaid guidance/input is potentially needed, in order to uphold the independent and external nature of the review.</i></p>
9	3.2.1	When describing the "impact evaluations, including assessment of value for money", do you have a specific framework such as RBM (Result Based Management) or other performance management method with relevant financial data we could have access to?	<p><i>For grant-level results, Unitaid employs the logical framework approach, with indicators and targets developed for the output, outcome and impact levels during grant development. Grant implementers report against the logframe on a semi-annual basis. Grant budgets are developed by grant output (to track against the logframe) as well as by expense category.</i></p> <p><i>To develop the impact-level indicators and targets, each grant implementer develops an impact assessment during the grant development stage, which outlines both quantitative and qualitative dimensions to public health and economic impact. For more details on Unitaid's Results Framework: <a href="https://unitaid.org/assets/Unitaid-Results-Framework.pdf">https://unitaid.org/assets/Unitaid-Results-Framework.pdf</a>.</i></p> <p><i>All relevant grant-level documents for the value for money (VfM) assessment, as well as Unitaid's VfM framework, will be made available to the successful bidder following contract signature. Bidders are also encouraged to reference other relevant VfM frameworks (e.g., DFID's).</i></p>
10	3.3.1	When describing "consultation with a broad range of internal and external stakeholders", how many interviews do you expect and what would be the geographical scope of a meaningful consultation?	<p><i>See response to Question #4 and #11, Clarification #3.</i></p>
11	TOR Part 4	Can this list be considered as a priority scope of geographies: Africa (South Africa, Cameroon, Kenya, Uganda, Mozambique, Rwanda), Asia (India), Latin America (Brazil)?	<p><i>In addition to the examples provided in the TOR, we would also add: For West Africa, Cote d'Ivoire. For Latin America, Peru. For Asia, one of Indonesia or Cambodia.</i></p>

12	General	Will we have access to internal assessment reports (including internal control bodies if relevant)?	<i>All documents of relevance for the scope of the review will be provided to the selected bidder following contract signature.</i>
13	2	Although the mid-term review will be made available to the Contractor, could you share the high-level conclusions on this report?	<i>The mid-term review and other relevant documents can only be shared with the winning bidder.</i>
14	2.1	Could you be more specific on the additional analysis that will be performed by Unitaid Secretariat?	<i>See response to Question #3, Clarification #3.</i>
15	2.1	Can you please detail to what extent we should include COVID-19 into the scope of interest, according to the impact the pandemic has had / will have on the LMIC?	<i>COVID-19 should be included in key analyses, as specified in the ToR. For example, under Coherence and the analysis of Unitaid's complementarity, comparative advantage, visibility and value-add, we would like to have Unitaid's investments in a selection of key areas, incl. in COVID-19, mapped against those of other actors, and stakeholder perspectives of Unitaid's role and contributions explored. Under Efficiency, we would like the bidder to undertake an analysis of Unitaid's ability to make new investments in response to evolving needs – this would include in response to COVID-19.</i>
16	3.2.1	We understand that HIV, Malaria and Tuberculosis are 3 major disease areas for Unitaid. You also mention Cervical Cancer and Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health. Can you please confirm they are in the scope and how they fit in your strategy (see categories at <a href="https://unitaid.org/core-investment-areas/#en">https://unitaid.org/core-investment-areas/#en</a> )?	<i>Yes, both Cervical Cancer and RMNCH are in scope; however, in terms of proportion, grants focusing on HIV, TB and malaria still make up the bulk of Unitaid's grant portfolio. You can find more information here:</i>  <i><a href="https://unitaid.org/assets/HIV-Disease-narrative.pdf">https://unitaid.org/assets/HIV-Disease-narrative.pdf</a> (Cervical cancer is captured under the HIV co-infections scope)</i>  <i><a href="https://unitaid.org/assets/Strategic-Option-Reproductive-Maternal-Newborn-and-Child-Health-RMNCH.pdf">https://unitaid.org/assets/Strategic-Option-Reproductive-Maternal-Newborn-and-Child-Health-RMNCH.pdf</a></i>  <i><a href="https://unitaid.org/call-for-proposal/call-for-proposals-better-tools-to-prevent-and-treat-postpartum-hemorrhage/#en">https://unitaid.org/call-for-proposal/call-for-proposals-better-tools-to-prevent-and-treat-postpartum-hemorrhage/#en</a> (an example of a current Call for Proposals in RMNCH)</i>
17	3.3.4	The output of the 2017-2021 strategy review will be used as an input for the next strategy. Beyond assessment and learning, could you specify the dimensions of strategy we should build recommendations for, as part of the Presentation to the Executive Board?	<i>The specifics will be discussed with the winning bidder during the inception phase. However, findings and recommendations should respond to the key questions outlined in Part 2 of the ToR.</i>
18	4.5	In case of a Joint Proposal with a subcontractor, beyond mentioning it in the technical proposal, could you please detail	<i>The lead organization shall submit the Intention to Bid and the proposal on behalf of the consortium. As for the annexes, both lead organization and co-bidder should sign and complete Annex 2 (to be submitted on Feb 9<sup>th</sup>),</i>

		the administrative steps to follow (for Feb. 9 <sup>th</sup> and Feb. 17 <sup>th</sup> , if any)?	<i>Annex 4, Annex 6, Annex 7 and Annex 8 separately, and the lead organization submit them to Unitaid as per the process outlined in the RfP.</i>
19	TOR Part 3	Which cost base should we consider in the assessment of effectiveness: Unitaid only? Or Unitaid and implementing organizations?	<i>Assessment is expected at the grant level or for a selection of grants in the same area for intervention (e.g., HIV self-testing); therefore, the relevant cost base would be the one relevant to implementing the grant(s), i.e., the size of Unitaid's investment to achieve the sought outcomes/impact. This would not include Unitaid Secretariat costs.</i>
20	4.15.5	Does Unitaid have an estimated total number of days or a budget ceiling for the completion of this review?	<i>Please refer to Question #1 and #5 in Clarification #2.</i>
21	4.15.2	Please would you clarify if there is a page limit for the technical proposal?	<i>There is no page limit per se, but we expect the technical proposal to be concise yet comprehensive.</i>
22	General	Please would Unitaid provide a copy of the 2019 mid-term Strategy Review, if this is a public document?	<i>The 2019 Mid-Term Strategy Review Report is an internal document and will be made available to the selected bidder after the signing of the contract.</i>