

## Pre-bid queries and their responses

The SR consortium has received queries with respect to the RfPs for systematic reviews and evidence summary (issued on 3<sup>rd</sup> June, 2016) under the SARH Systematic Review (SR) Programme for South Asia. These are listed below along with their corresponding responses:

#	Query	Response
<b>Received till 9<sup>th</sup> June, 2016</b>		
1.	I am currently part of the team for the on-going evidence summary on XXX as a methods expert and would like to clarify if this would affect my eligibility to apply for this call?	Teams or team members already involved in conducting reviews under the programme (either competitive or training) can apply for the call. However, bidders should ensure that the proposed team should have sufficient available time to complete the review within the specific timelines. Further, bidders already engaged in the programmes will be required to provide a justification regarding how they will manage their time across multiple systematic reviews during the negotiation stage.
2.	What would count as having prior experience in conducting an SR or ES?	By 'Teams having prior experience in conducting SRs or ESs', we mean that bidders should have conducted or supported preparation of systematic reviews and evidence summaries before. This will be preferred at institutional level as well as it will be desired that some members of the team should have prior experience of conducting SRs or have attended training on SR methodology. However, this is not a qualifying criterion. Even bidders without significant experience in SRs but having done related research and reviews in the sector concerned can apply. However, they will be scored less relative to bidders demonstrating previous SR or ES experience.
3.	Can XXX apply again this time, considering that we already have an ongoing SR and ES project?	Yes, institutes or team members already conducting systematic reviews and evidence summaries under the programme can apply for opportunities under new calls launched. However, bidders should ensure that the proposed team should have sufficient available time to complete the review within the specific timelines. Further, bidders already engaged in the programmes will be required to provide a justification regarding how they will manage their time across multiple systematic reviews during the negotiation stage.
4.	As regards the Review questions and evidence summary questions, can the narrowing down of focus be done at the proposal stage itself, with due justification?	Teams can suggest narrowing down of the focus at the proposal stage if this is justified in terms of good knowledge of the literature available, or for some other justifiable reason. However, it will not be a binding upon the SR consortium to accept the proposed scope, in case the bidder gets selected. The decision of the SR consortium and DFID will be considered as final regarding scope revision.

#	Query	Response
<b>Received during 9<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2016</b>		
5.	Is it up to the team to define/ pick up an area on which review is to be done?	<p>The current call is for 2 systematic reviews questions and 2 evidence summaries questions.</p> <p>These questions are:</p> <p><b>Systematic Review Questions</b></p> <p>Question 1 - Public works programmes: How effective are public works programmes in stimulating local economic transformation in low and middle income countries?</p> <p>Question 2 - Effectiveness of police reforms: What is the impact of various police reform interventions on efficient delivery of policing services, public perception of policing services and public safety in low and middle income countries?</p> <p><b>Evidence Summary questions</b></p> <p>Question 1 – Interventions for improving civic infrastructure and amenities: How effective are interventions which seek to improve access and quality of civic infrastructure and amenities? What are the key characteristics of successful interventions in urban areas?</p> <p>Question 2 – Community Engagement/Participation approach to Health Programmes: How effective are community engagement/participation approaches for delivering better health outcomes, improving service delivery and sustaining benefits?</p> <p>Applicants interested to participate in more than one systematic review or evidence summary can do so by submitting separate proposals for each question. However, bidders from the same organisation should not submit more than one proposal for the same question.</p> <p>Please refer to "Section 3 - Systematic Review Questions" and "Appendix 4. Research briefing for evidence summary questions" of the RfP for details on research questions.</p>
6.	We have read through the RFPs and would like to check what the modality for engaging with DFID/ PWC for this review would be - are you currently	Organisations based out of Myanmar are eligible and in fact strongly encouraged to apply under the current call. You may also collaborate and form consortiums with other organisations and international experts for participating in bids.

#	Query	Response
	looking for Myanmar-based experts or international experts who would be able to conduct the systematic review for South Asia?	<p>In order to participate in the call, please send your Technical and Financial proposals to <a href="mailto:sr.southasia@in.pwc.com">sr.southasia@in.pwc.com</a> by July 18, 2016.</p> <p>You may send your proposal for one or more of the four questions (2 SRs and 2 Evidence Summaries) listed in the RFP documents.</p> <p>Please see "Section 10- Submission of Proposal" of the RFP document for details regarding the submission of the proposal.</p>
7.	Is the firm expected to provide data only from Myanmar or from other countries as well?	<p>As the programme focusses on South Asian region, we are expecting teams to search and include available studies from all low and middle income countries. Further, teams will be required to contextualise the findings of the review to South Asian region as well as to a particular country mentioned in the research briefing section of the respective questions.</p>
8.	Is the firm expected to constitute the team of only Myanmar nationals, or other nationalities as well?	<p>There is no restriction on the nationality of the proposed team members. However, as mentioned in Section 6 of the RfP, it is desired that the applicants should have experience in conducting systematic reviews relevant to South Asian countries and some members of the proposed team should be from South Asia or should have significant experience in the region (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Afghanistan and Myanmar).</p> <p>Please refer to Section 6 of the RfP document for details regarding desired team composition.</p>
9.	<p>Would the SR Team and DFID consider the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) as a Public Works Programme?</p> <p>The Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM: 2005-2014) was one of the largest urban sector initiatives in India. Its primary aim was to initiate urban sector reforms that would help open up the urban land market, improve urban governance and accountability, and enhance fiscal viability of the JNNURM city governments. The Mission had four components, viz., urban infrastructure and governance (UIG);</p>	<p>We have defined Public Works Programmes in the Research briefing for the concerned question as following (Appendix 4 of RfP, Page 32)</p> <p><b>Public Works Programmes</b> combine mechanisms for creating infrastructure with the self-targeted provision of a minimal wage to people living in poverty. The most important motivation behind public works programmes is to provide poor households with a source of income by creating temporary jobs and other employment opportunities. In addition to raising their incomes, these programmes also seek to achieve complementary objectives of generating infrastructure for the community, which may in turn lead to secondary employment/income benefits or raising welfare. Thus, public works programmes adopt a ‘pro-poor growth’ approach, wherein both poverty reduction and the need for the provision of assets and productive infrastructure are addressed simultaneously. There can be several approaches of</p>

#	Query	Response
	<p>Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns (UIDSSMT), Basic Services for Urban Poor (BSUP), and Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP), under which the Government of India released funds to 65 JNNURM cities for augmenting their infrastructure services (water supply, sanitation, sewerage and drainage, roads, and city transport), and for holistic slum development and shelter and basic services for the urban poor and slum households.</p> <p>Approximately, Rs. 21,750 crore are stated to have been released for the development of infrastructural services and another Rs. 12,730 crore for the development of basic services and shelter for the urban poor.</p> <p>The JNNURM has unquestionably contributed to the economy of the 65 cities covered by the JNNURM, although its overall impact on local economy in terms of employment and growth has not been formally assessed. The Mission has been evaluated mid-term and at the end of its initially-determined tenure of seven years. Several city-specific studies have been done to assess the working of the JNNURM.</p> <p>We hold the view that the JNNURM falls within the ambit of what you refer as “Public Works Programme”; however, given the primary aim of JNNURM which was to initiate a process of urban sector reforms, we consider it necessary to seek confirmation from your side before initiating work on the proposal.</p>	<p>implementing public works programmes which differ in terms of design and impact. Some of the public works programmes designs include Employment Guarantee Schemes, Government Employment Programmes, Short Term Work Programmes responding to temporary labour market disruptions, and Labour Intensive Infrastructure provision programmes. An appropriate approach for the public works programme depends on the nature of the labour market and poverty context, and the primary objectives of the intervention. One of the largest Public Works Programmes implemented in the developing world is the Mahatma National Rural Employment Guarantee Act.</p> <p><b>Please feel free to include JNNURM programme in your proposal</b> along with a justification of why it qualifies as a Public Work programme with reference to definition above. Our evaluation panel will assess the relevance JNNURM programme to the research theme based on justification provided by you and will accordingly evaluate experience of team and team members in the concerned sector.</p>

**Received during 16<sup>th</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup> June, 2016**

#	Query	Response
10.	How to determine an organisation's eligibility to participate in the current call?	<p>Please refer to Section 6 <b>Team Composition and Desired Expertise</b> (pg. 10) and Section 9 <b>Criteria for evaluation and award of contract</b> (pg. 12) of the RfP document. You may assess the suitability of your organisation and proposed team based on the criteria mentioned in these sections.</p> <p>Further, It is desired that some members of the proposed team should have experience in thematic areas relevant to the research question and should be familiar with Systematic Review methodology and/or have undertaken systematic reviews previously.</p>
<b>Received after 23<sup>rd</sup> June, 2016</b>		
11.	Can suggested members of the advisory group (pp6, RFP for Systematic Reviews) also form part of the main research team? For example, can the Team Leader also be named as an Advisory group member?	Proposed Members of the review team cannot be a part of the Advisory Group. The objective of the Advisory Group is to provide sector inputs, external review and feedback on the work done by the review team. Thus, it will be appropriate if the advisory group is separate from the main review team.