

## Request for Proposals (RfP): An evaluation of the Future of Global Health Initiatives (FGHI) process

	Supplier question	Wellcome response
1	Do you have a rough budget range in mind for this work?	Wellcome will be guided by the supplier as to what is a reasonable budget for this activity as we do not want limit ambition or innovation.
	What is the maximum budget allocated for this evaluation?	
	Is there an approximate budget for this evaluation you can provide?	
	Could a recommended budget range be provided for this work?	
	Is there an estimated budget range for the expected scope of work?	
	Is there an indicative budget that you're able to share with us?	
2	Is there any flex on timeline for proposals?	A shortlist will be developed from proposals received by the deadline.
	The answers to our questions are expected by September 19th, leaving candidates only 8 days to prepare their proposals before the submission deadline of September 27th, if they decide to move forward. Would it be possible to extend the deadline?	Late submissions will only be considered if an appropriate supplier can't be found from those received before the deadline.
3	Could you provide an estimate of the level of effort required from the team for this assignment?	Wellcome will be guided by the supplier as to the appropriate methodology and scale of effort to deliver the work outlined.  Please note in particular the breadth of internal and external stakeholders from whom the contracted organisation/consortium will be expected to draw inputs, and the requirement to invite feedback from FGHI/Lusaka Agenda partners as part of ways of working.
4	Do you anticipate field visits as part of the evaluation?	Wellcome will be guided by the supplier as to the appropriate methodology. In depth case studies are not expected, but attendance at relevant meetings or events during the evaluation period may provide a valuable opportunity to speak to a breadth of stakeholders.
	How much flexibility is there on the proposed analytical components? Would case studies be seen as valuable?	
	We understand stakeholders are globally dispersed, and final outputs include a webinar. Can we confirm that no in-person meetings are required, so travel costs should not be included?	
5	The ToR mentions: "Suppliers submitting proposals who are registered companies should review this document." However, the link provided appears to be invalid. Could you kindly share the document with us?	The correct link for the relevant document can be found here: <a href="#">T&amp;Cs</a>
	The linked document for suppliers who are registered companies does not work – can you please send this across?	

6	<p>Approximately how many external stakeholders (drawing from the stakeholder categories provided in the RfP) are expected to be consulted to inform Parts 1 and 2 (at minimum).</p> <p>Could you please confirm the number of stakeholders to be interviewed?</p> <p>To help with the costing, can you please give us a rough idea of the number of anticipated KIIs?</p>	<p>Wellcome will be guided by the supplier as to the appropriate sample size and methodology for consultations. However, we anticipate inputs from a minimum of around 50 stakeholders would be required.</p> <p>For context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the <a href="#">FGHI Steering Group</a> was comprised of approx. 20 members and observers</li> <li>• The <a href="#">Research and Learning Task Team</a> was comprised of approx. 30 members</li> <li>• The <a href="#">Commitments Task Team</a> was comprised of 30 members</li> <li>• There were approximately 35 participants at the Addis research consultation in June 23.</li> <li>• There were approximately 50 participants at the Wilton Park meeting in Oct 23.</li> </ul> <p>There was considerable overlap across these groups.</p>
7	<p>Approximately how many internal Wellcome stakeholders are expected to be consulted for Part 2.</p>	<p>Wellcome will be guided by the supplier as to the appropriate sample size and methodology for consultations.</p> <p>Across the lifespan of the project, approximately 12 people were involved in Wellcome’s internal FGHI project team.</p>
8	<p>In regard to external stakeholders, will Wellcome help to identify key informants that should be consulted as a priority? Second, will Wellcome provide support to make introductions to these informants.</p> <p>Will Wellcome will facilitate access to stakeholders?</p>	<p>Yes, Wellcome will help identify key informants and can facilitate access.</p>
9	<p>Considering the project overlaps with the December holiday period, when stakeholders are often less available in our experience, is there any flexibility in the timeline for the final deliverables.</p> <p>Is the timeline flexible, considering the end-of-year holidays and the extensive stakeholder interviews required?</p> <p>Can you confirm whether the end date for the project deliverables in the RfP, 27 January 2025, is correct? Given the anticipated start date is the beginning of November, we don’t think it would be possible to deliver the project within these time frames.</p>	<p>If the deadline given for final deliverables is not feasible, suppliers are invited to propose a timeline they consider realistic and appropriate.</p> <p>This will considered as part of the proposal evaluation process.</p>

	<p>We noted that the project is ~10 working weeks if we assume a short break over the holiday period in December given we assume many stakeholders are primarily out of office during those weeks. Is there any flexibility to extend this timeline if we believe a few extra weeks would be helpful?</p>	
10	<p>Is there an approximate level of effort split you would like to see between the evaluation Parts 1 &amp; 2, recognizing there are overlaps in their delivery.</p> <p>Could you clarify the expected balance between how the evaluation is intended to inform the Lusaka Agenda or other external processes, specifically, versus how it will contribute to shaping other current and future Wellcome Trust priorities?</p>	<p>We envisage the greatest weight of work (approximately two thirds) being devoted to Part 1 of the evaluation.</p>
11	<p>Is there a preference for geographic location? Is there a requirement to collaborate with Wellcome in person at any point, or is remote engagement suffice throughout? Are there any other geographic (or other diversity) considerations for the make up of the proposed team?</p>	<p>Fully remote engagement is acceptable.</p> <p>We have no particular preference on geographic location, but it should be noted that a majority of relevant stakeholders are in Africa, Europe and North America, so the team should be willing to work to a schedule that will allow effective consultation with these groups.</p>
12	<p>Are there requirements in terms of bidding team skills and experience that we should consider?</p>	<p>Proposals should outline the project team's experience and expertise, including in delivering evaluations related to global health governance/ financing and multi-stakeholder partnerships.</p>
13	<p>There are no clear evaluation criteria outlined as such – would there be an expectation that these would need to be formally applied i.e. OECD/ DAC - effectiveness, relevance, coherence etc.? And/ or develop an evaluation framework?</p> <p>Could you expand on the expectation – any specific parameters on which the evaluation should be based or can be decided by the supplier on documenting the key lessons learnt?</p> <p>Are there any specific parameters pre-decided on which to evaluate the functioning of the FGHI Co-chairs, steering group and secretariat, as well as the work of the research and learning task team?</p> <p>Is there a specified set of criteria for evaluating the extent to which Wellcome's project objectives were achieved? Should this evaluation include quantitative measures?</p>	<p>Wellcome will be guided by the supplier as to the appropriate methodology.</p> <p>The supplier will be expected to deliver an inception report, setting out proposed methodology and approach (including a framework for assessing and measuring results).</p>

14	<p>The focus seems to be largely retrospective rather than formative. Is there an expectation that the findings from this evaluation will feed into a (re)design of the FGHI process under another phase?</p> <p>Is the intent to use the evaluation's findings to help move the Lusaka Agenda forward? If so, what key decisions will the evaluation inform and is there a specific milestone that we would be working towards with the evaluation?</p>	<p>The FGHI process itself came to an end in December 2023, though efforts to ensure implementation of the Lusaka Agenda are ongoing. Various other pieces of analysis are ongoing to inform and shape these implementation efforts.</p> <p>This evaluation is seen as primarily retrospective. While it is hoped that the evaluation will draw out recommendations that can inform future collaboration, its primary purpose is to ensure there is a clear record of what was done, and the factors that worked for or against success, rather than to feed into a specific decision, milestone or new phase of work.</p>
15	<p>What secondary data is available to inform analyses on the FGHI process?</p>	<p>A supporting bibliography of key documents will be provided by Wellcome.</p> <p>As host of the former FGHI Secretariat, Wellcome can also facilitate access to a range of materials related to the FGHI process, including meeting minutes, event reports, participants lists etc.</p>
16	<p>To help with the costing, can you please give us a rough idea of the number of documents that will be included in the bibliography for review</p>	<p>We are not yet able to share a number as the bibliography is still being developed.</p>
17	<p>What size evaluation team would you envisage?</p>	<p>Wellcome will be guided by the supplier as to the appropriate team size.</p>
18	<p>Should the proposal be submitted to the point of contact, Clare Battle (<a href="mailto:c.battle@wellcome.org">c.battle@wellcome.org</a>)?</p>	<p>Yes. Proposals should be submitted to <a href="mailto:c.battle@wellcome.org">c.battle@wellcome.org</a></p>
19	<p>It is stated that “<i>Answers published to supplier questions</i>”. Please kindly let us know if the answers will be published on, for instance, Wellcome website, and not by return email.</p>	<p>Answers to all questions will be shared via the Wellcome website and by email with suppliers who have submitted questions.</p>
20	<p>Will a list of prospective suppliers be shared?</p>	<p>No</p>
21	<p>Does Wellcome have any policies / rules around using AI tools to analyse documents, interviews, and interview transcripts?</p>	<p>Wellcome does not currently have a policy on the use of AI by external partners, however we would need to have assurances around the validity of the information provided through such methods. Any use of AI would need to be discussed further if the supplier were to be successful, to ensure Wellcome understands where and how it is being used.</p>
22	<p>Definition and scope of Global Health Initiatives (GHI) as used in the RFP</p> <p>Could it be expanded on the rationality of the selection of the six organizations?</p>	<p>The FGHI process primarily focused on GHIs (i) whose governance is distinct from the core intergovernmental institutional arrangements of UN agencies and MDBs, (ii) with multi-</p>

	What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria deployed to select GHIs and the stakeholders?	<p>stakeholder boards, (iii) replenishment models, and (iv) that provide grant funding to low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). It also extended to agencies that do market shaping for products that are procured/ financed by them.</p> <p>The organisations in scope for the process were: The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria; Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance; the Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND); Unitaid; the Global Financing Facility (GFF); and the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI).</p>
23	Given that not all global health initiatives would focus on strengthening health system (HSS) capacities and may have varying objectives. How and why these objectives have been decided? How efficient, equitable and effective should be defined?	<p>The objectives listed on p1 the RfP were set out in the Concept Note that informed the creation of the FGHI process.</p> <p>The evaluation process will need to unpack the process by which the objectives were identified and developed, and the extent to which they were commonly understood and owned.</p>
24	Explain how balanced, coordinated, mutual accountability is defined for the purpose of this RFP?	
25	Could you expand in the alignment and coherence of all external finance and technical assistance to countries?	
26	Would the supplier be responsible for contacting all FGHI/Lusaka Agenda partners to hold a webinar, with their participation being subject to each partner's interest?	Wellcome can help facilitate outreach to FGHI/Lusaka Agenda partners and encourage participation, but participation will be subject to each partner's interest.
27	What is the expected date of submitting interim outputs?	Suppliers are invited to propose a timeline they consider realistic and appropriate.
27	Are there any specifications for the slide deck to be submitted?	Slide decks and reports should be inclusive and accessible; Wellcome will supply a checklist to support accessibility.
28	Are there any specific guidelines or expectations for the slide deck summarizing the report?	
29	What are the expectations regarding the nature of the document required for examples of the project team's previous track record? Would a summary of the work completed suffice, given that the final deliverables may be subject to confidentiality or copyright restrictions?	Wellcome will be guided by the supplier as to what information they feel it is appropriate to share to demonstrate their relevant experience and expertise.
30	How does Wellcome Trust define the useful results?	Results aligned with the objectives set out in the RfP.
31	What skills, experience, contextual understanding does Wellcome Trust consider as relevant? Would general experience of global health governance evaluations of any nature and multistakeholder partnerships of	Wellcome is opened to considering suppliers with a range of experiences relevant to global health governance/ financing and multi-stakeholder partnerships, as long as the supplier can demonstrate how their experience

	any kind under any type of project fit the evaluation criteria or is it expected to have experience similar to the RFP only?	and skills will make them well placed to deliver this work.
32	How does Wellcome Trust define value for money?	Proposals will be evaluated based on whether the budget is realistic and proportionate to the proposed delivery approach.
33	Is the 50-minute presentation part of the supplier shortlisting process and to be conducted in the RFP Evaluation Period as mentioned in the table of Section 3 Page 5?	Yes.