Sl. No.	Questions	Answers
1	What is the preferred method for proposal submission	Online: email to procurement@ihat.in
2	Current deadline falls on Sunday, 22nd December 2024, therefore we kindly request an extension of two working days i.e. till 24th December 2024. The extension will help us in submitting a comprehensive proposal	Last date for submission has been extended to 29-Dec-2024
3	Do you need an annual turnover of a minimum of Rs 1.2 crore for this bid or a 3-year cumulative turnover of 1.2 crore?	Annual turnover - Rs.1.2
4	What will the ethics approval process be for this work? How will IHAT be able to support it? Could you clarify how the ethics approval fits into the timeline laid out in Section 2	IHAT will support the ethics approval for this study. Since this qualitative review primarily aims to inform the program, an HMSC proposal is not required.
5	Do you expect that HMSC approval would be needed for this work? If so, will IHAT facilitate this?	HMSC approval not required
6	Is the sample and methods in Section 1.8 what you are prescribing for this study?	The methods proposed are indicative, not prescriptive. The final set of methods will be collaboratively developed with the selected agency.
7	What are the activities envisaged for phase 2—'Develop gender-transformative recommendations'? The current timeline in section 2 does not include Phase 2 - so we wanted to clarify that the proposal should exclude this stage of work.	Activities for phase 2 – include data collection using vignettes informed by insights from the first phase. Analysis of this data will help in developing suggestions for/in the form of gender transformative interventions.

Timeline in the floated RFP has timelines for phase -2. As in the RFP, phase-2 starts from mid-April 2025 and the final deliverables are expected by July 2025. |
| 8 | We might have alternate approaches for data collection and co-creation, including using design methodologies that also subscribe and support the feminist approach to research mentioned in the RfP. Some of these co-design methodologies can play a vital role in including the voices of women, not only in research, but also in developing appropriate recommendations. Could we explore such alternative methods or do we have to stick to what is laid out in Table | Agreed, there is flexibility to revisit and collaboratively co-create the methods. |
| 9 | Could you confirm that this is the Gender Analysis Framework mentioned in the RfP that this work is to be based on - https://www.ihat.in/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Gender-Analysis-Framework.pdf | Yes. This is the Gender Analysis Framework that the work is to be based upon. |

10	What is the anticipated scope for the gender-transformative recommendations? How does IHAT expect to take the recommendations forward	The recommendations will be translated into interventions, which will be piloted with the potential for scaling up.
11	Survey guides: We understand that all qualitative survey guides will be developed by the IHAT team, and the selected agency will only be responsible for reviewing, finalizing the tools, and overseeing translations. Is this understanding correct?	These are indicative methods, and the tools will be collaboratively developed based on presentations by the agencies and discussions with the IHAT team.
12	Clarity on Table 2 (titled: Qualitative Methods, Topics of Discussion, and Respondents) of the RFP: The distribution of the sample of 231 interviews across the topics of discussion (as shown in Table 2 on page 4) is unclear. The numbers provided in the table do not add up to the total of 231. Could you kindly provide a clear distribution of the sample across the topics?	The methods are indicative, and the tools will be collaboratively developed based on presentations by the agencies and discussions with the IHAT team. The sample size may be adjusted based on the co-developed methods. The distribution of the sample across Table-02 is tentative, and participants in Phase-1 and Phase-2 may overlap. Therefore, when reporting the total participant headcount, each individual will be accounted for only once in the study.
13	Will the pre-testing exercise involve interviews with all the stakeholders outlined in the sample size table or is there any specific stakeholder group to be targeted? Will the IHAT team provide support in selecting villages for this exercise and seeking relevant permissions for data collection? Will the pilot exercise for the two phases be carried out separately, or can we propose a pilot to test all the tools in one single visit?	During the pre-testing exercise, the tools should ideally be tested within the community. Testing them with participants from facilities may pose challenges. However, if the team deems it necessary, pre-testing can be arranged to ensure appropriate representation where possible. The selection of villages and obtaining relevant permissions will be facilitated by the IHAT team.
14	Could you please clarify the distinction between the 2 phases? Additionally, what will be the distribution of stakeholders and sample across the 2 phases?	This distinction is clearly outlined in the RFP. In the first phase, the focus will be on developing an understanding of gender relations across various contexts, including households, communities, and health facilities, to gather critical insights in areas such as RMNCH. In contrast, Phase-2 will focus on co-creating community-informed and community-designed gender-transformative interventions.
15	Ballpark budget estimate: Is there any ballpark estimate for the budget allocated to this assignment.	Since the process will follow QCBS, the agency's profile will play a crucial role alongside the financial quote in the bid evaluation.
16	Could you kindly provide more details on how satisfactory performance will be judged? Additionally, the conditions outlined appear	Performance will be assessed based on the quality of work and adherence to timelines.

	quite stringent. Is there any possibility for these criteria to be relaxed?	
17	Could you kindly provide more details on how satisfactory performance will be judged? Additionally, the conditions outlined appear quite stringent. Is there any possibility for these criteria to be relaxed?	Performance would be evaluated on the quality and adherence to the timelines.