Q&A document

TW6: Humanitarian Assistance Thematic Window

Request for Qualifications: impact evaluations of programmes targeting moderate acute malnutrition in humanitarian situations

Deadline for applications: 23.59 GMT, 10 March 2015

Q1: We are working in Mozambique, in the area of Beira, where conflicts due to internal war were ongoing up to few months ago. We believe this can be considered a humanitarian situation, and therefore it seems that this setting will qualify for the call. Is our interpretation correct?

A1: Yes. Conflicts due to internal wars are considered humanitarian situations.

Q2: The call is not completely clear on which type of programmes can be included.

- Is it any programme targeting moderate acute malnutrition (MAM)?

- Does testing of programmes to improve health care provision within the national programme for treating MAM qualify for a proposal within this call?

- Do interventions different from provision of foods (in different type/quality/modality), for example, community mobilisation, qualify?

A2: Any programme targeting prevention and/or treatment of MAM would qualify for this call. The intervention need not specifically be provision of food.

Q3: Do the World Food Programme (WFP) interventions target adults (as well as children)? Could the evaluation team suggest an intervention by other organisation which targets adults?

A3: MAM treatment and prevention programmes target children. Any intervention being evaluated must include a component of MAM treatment and/or prevention.
Q4: Is there any preferred humanitarian situation that you will give priority for this application? For example, from Bangladesh perspective we could address situation related to flood (natural disaster) or recent oil spill disaster in Sundarbans forest area (accidental/manmade disaster). Will you consider this kind of situation that might cause MAM among the affected population?

A4: Natural disasters such as floods would qualify as humanitarian situation, but not an oil spill.

Q5: Will this impact evaluation application support situation analysis phase of a disaster’s impact on human health?

A5: Any impact evaluation will be expected to take external and internal factors affecting the programme into account through a theory of change. To that extent, situation analysis would be included in the context and design of the study. This call will fund impact evaluations that quantitatively measure the causal change in outcome(s) due to a policy or intervention. Please see 3ie’s definition of a rigorous impact evaluation.

Q6: Is there any example materials available on previous impact evaluations targeting humanitarian situation that we could access or that is publicly available?

A6: Please see: http://www.3ieimpact.org/en/publications/3ie-scoping-paper-series/3ie-scoping-paper-1/ for reference to impact evaluation in humanitarian contexts. This scoping paper incorporated a wide array of methods to assess available evidence, including an online survey of participants, interviews with humanitarian sector experts, and extensive literature reviews of humanitarian studies and strategy documents of major humanitarian organisations. It also includes an evidence gap map that presents the results of a thorough search for completed, ongoing and planned impact evaluations of humanitarian interventions.

Q7: According to section 3.2 of the RFQ, study teams should indicate the top three countries in which they would be interested in working and then you state that ‘WFP programmes in other countries that meet the terms of reference (see Appendix A for programme and country details) will also be considered’, but going to Appendix A the only countries included are again Niger, Chad, Somalia and Sudan, so should we only choose from those four options?

A7: For WFP, priority countries are Niger, Chad, Somalia and Sudan. Teams interested in working in any of these four countries should indicate upto three countries (in decreasing order of preference) that they would like to work in. In case the team wants to work with a WFP programme in a different country, they would have to show evidence of prior engagement with the WFP country office or programme in that country.

Q8: The fact that each organisation should choose three priority countries, does it imply that we provide three team options so the country expertise is covered? Also, should we include three different local partners? And in this case should we send the information in three different emails, or how should the process of application be?

A8: A research team interested in WFP programmes should indicate its most preferred country, and provide two alternatives. The team will be scored based on relevance to their most preferred country. Research organisations are allowed to submit multiple qualifications with
different team compositions, in separate emails. In this case, each of the qualifications will be scored independently.

**Q9: What does “fifteen research teams will receive preparation grants (PG)” mean? Does that imply that if we present three good teams (as for the selection criteria) for three different countries, could we be awarded with three grants? Or that only one team would be selected by organisation?**

A9: All teams will be scored independently and fifteen research teams will receive preparation grants. It is possible for two different teams from the same research organisation to receive preparation grants.

**Q10: Also in section 2.2 you say that “3ie’s intent, although not a guarantee, to fund eight to ten of the proposed evaluations” if there are only four priority countries for WFP what would be the other four to six evaluations?**

A10: Research teams are invited to submit qualifications and propose evaluations of programmes implemented by other agencies in the humanitarian and nutrition space.

**Q11: Is it possible to know the budget ceiling for the second phase proposal? Could we assume that it would depend on the country? As the context, expertise and quality of data would influence it inevitably?**

A11: The budgets sent in by teams will be compared and scored based on context and expertise. Given the size of the window, the cap for each impact evaluation is USD 300,000.