

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Request for Proposal (RFP): Learning & Support Partner – Community Engagement Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Framework

#	Supplier Question	Wellcome response
1	The MEL framework highlights the importance of context in indicator selection (e.g., varying political environments, institutional capacities). Would Wellcome be open to proposed context-specific indicators if we identify unique enablers or barriers during inception?	The aim of the MEL Framework is to guide any programme through development of a Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning framework that works for their context. We would therefore very much expect every programme to develop their own context specific indicators. In the process of developing the framework as it currently stands, preliminary testing in different contexts took place, allowing for a high degree of confidence. Further discussion and testing will take place, and if partners feel there is something missing in relation to this, the framework will be open for relevant iteration.
2	Is there a preferred frequency and format for providing progress updates and conducting milestone reviews with Wellcome Trust? What is the expected frequency and format of progress reports and meetings with Wellcome?	We would expect this to be methodology dependent, paired with good project management hygiene, so we will be guided by the Supplier on an initial proposal for the format and frequency. Given our collaborative approach to this work thus far, we anticipate receiving frequent, indepth reporting. We can provide steer on appropriateness and collaborate on this as part of project kick off.



3	Regarding the "5 relationship managers (internal to Wellcome)" mentioned in the RFP - what is their current role/involvement with the pilot partners?	Each of the pilot partners listed in Section 1.3 of the RFP has a Relationship Manager within the Community Engagement (CE) team at Wellcome who acts as a primary contact point with the respective Community Engagement team and work. The nature of the relationship varies for different programmes but for all there is close collaboration with regular, open dialogue. It is for this reason that it is important to engage the Wellcome CE relationship managers. This will include ensuring they are close to and confident in using and advising upon use of the MEL Framework; getting their input on appropriate interaction
4	Will Wellcome Trust offer any additional resources or tools to support global knowledge-sharing and dissemination activities?	with the pilot partners; and understanding how outputs will be used within mainstream grant reporting. There would not be additional funding available for this, as it is considered part of the existing scope. Wellcome can share what networks we have but the expectation is that the Supplier will lead on this, with input from all partners; we anticipate Suppliers will have knowledge of relevant networks. We cannot guarantee use of Wellcome's communication channels, but we can explore this later in the project as one of the ways to amplify dissemination.
5	We see that the framework encourages continuous learning and feedback loops with stakeholders. Are there specific channels or review points in Phase 2 where Wellcome anticipates interim findings to be shared—such as learning checkpoints or quarterly reflection workshops?	We would expect the methodology to identify the most effective ways to ensure that the framework can be tested and partners are able to implement it with continuous learning built in. Sharing interim findings allows us to understand the broader viability and value and so how the Supplier allows us as a set of partners to understand and consider this will be important, we leave it with the Supplier to propose specific and appropriate models for this. We also expect that interim findings and discussion of these should shape the further stages of this work.



6	What are the expected outputs for the two-year dissemination plan? Are there target audiences or regions beyond the pilot partners?	The first year, within the project timeline, will aim to get continuous feedback and learning and sense check the work beyond the pilot partners to a narrower set of similar organisations who might benefit from the framework in future and are interested in centring CE and participatory practice in global health. The second year will be about embedding the then final framework and illustrative examples of how it can be used in the broader global health ecosystem. The Supplier will be expected to add further granularity to the target audiences and propose an appropriate set of outputs as part of the dissemination plan development process.
7	Are there any expectations regarding travel to programme locations?	There are no set expectations regarding travel, however, this may be something suppliers wish to propose as part of the piloting.
8	Given the geographical spread of partners, does Wellcome have any preferences around in-person vs virtual engagement?	There is an expectation that a range of engagements and formats/modalities will be valuable across the project timeline, however, preferences for how this looks will be decided upon supplier experience/expertise, and partner input.
9	Is there scope to bring partners from different geographical regions together in person, either as part of existing interactions or via a dedicated meeting? For the latter, should the costs of doing this be included in the project budget? Does the budget outlined in the RFP should cover travel, if the supplier suggests in person meetings?	Yes, there is scope for in-person interactions (as part of existing engagement or otherwise would need to be decided as a group and what works best for project timelines). Any costings associated with such engagement (direct meeting costs, materials and Supplier travel) must be included in the project budget, with the exception of partner travel and accommodation.



		We do not expect the Supplier to cover travel costs of the pilot partners, Wellcome or Itad – if travel for those partners is central to your methodology approach, please highlight this is your response and we can discuss at interview
10	Could you clarify whether Wellcome has any geographic preferences for Phase 2	Geographic focus in relation to the pilot partners is dictated by each organisations national/regional focus, as indicated in the RFP. We don't have an explicit preference for Supplier geography, though extensive experience of Global South working is essential.
11	Do you anticipate any onsite working requirements with Wellcome or partner teams during the project, and if so, could you clarify the expected frequency and locations?	No, we have no set expectations in this regard. It is up to suppliers if they wish to suggest this where they feel it is of value.
12	What levels of engagement and time commitment are expected from pilot partners and Wellcome staff during the project?	There is a high degree of commitment to this work from the pilot partners. For phase 1 a dedicated capacity from each partner was preagreed but for this phase we would see scoping the depth of interaction with each partner to be a key aspect of the Supplier's role. It is likely that the time commitment and engagement from each pilot partner will differ based on capacity and need. This process will need to be taken into account in the approach proposed. There will be dedicated staff capacity at Wellcome to engage with this project.
13	Is there a format for the type and format of the various sense-making and training sessions	No, there is no preferred format - we will be looking for well justified approaches that meet the aims of the work.



14	Are suppliers able to contact Itad to discuss development of their proposed approach prior to submission of the RFP response? Is there an opportunity for introduction to the Itad team and co-development of the proposal? Will there be an opportunity to engage with Itad during the RFP process to further define roles and responsibilities and align on the budget allocation for shared activities?	Proposals should be submitted and if successful the supplier will have an opportunity to engage with itad to refine the proposal further.
15	Is the supplier chosen under this RFP expected to subcontract Itad once the contract is awarded to the supplier by Wellcome Trust?	Yes
16	Are there any additional requirements or restrictions regarding subcontracting other than Itad's role?	No, we ask that the supplier informs Wellcome who any other subcontracted parties are in order to ensure they are covered under the contracting.
17	Is ITAD eligible to apply for this RFP?	Yes, Itad is eligible to apply for the full RFP.
18	The RFP mentions that the largest piece for Phase 2 is Objective 2, with institutions in the pilot group. However, there is also a mention of a "wider set of partners". Would the supplier team be expected to identify other institutions beyond this set and develop links with them or would these by identified by Wellcome?	Apologies for the confusion. The RFP reads [section 1.2]: "Whilst there was some testing during the MEL framework development this phase will support longer term piloting across a wider set of partners." The piloting in Phase 1 took place with 2 of the partners (AHRI and OUCRU). The "wider set of partners" referred to is the list of partners in section 1.3 - so, these have already been identified, and involved in the co-



		creation of the framework, they were just not part of the piloting in Phase 1.
19	The RFP mentions that Wellcome has strategic partnerships with organisations in India but no Indian partners are listed in section 1.3. Would the work involve Indian institutions?	We would expect dissemination to include networks in India, but there is not a partner involved in the piloting in India.
20	Can the information regarding experts that are already on board or will be onboarded from Itad be provided, so that we know which experts the supplier needs to onboard?	We cannot at this stage identify the individuals from Itad who will be involved in this work.
21	Have the Wellcome partners listed in section 1.3 the RFP agreed to take part in the project?	Yes, all partners listed in Section 1.3 have been engaged in the scope and progression of this project, and more specifically in the development of this RFP and its objectives, and related activities.