



**Request for Proposals:
Evaluation of Community Engagement in the Global Fund Grant Cycle**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
INVITATION NOTICE**

RFP Information Table	
RFP Number	TGF-24-40
RFP Title	Evaluation of Community Engagement in the Global Fund Grant Cycle
Issue Date:	19 June 2024
Deadline for Questions:	27 June 2024
RFP Closing Date¹:	2 August 2024
RFP Closing Time¹:	17:00 (Local time in Geneva, Switzerland)
Virtual information session	There will be one virtual information session in July for this RFP Registration: Please express interest in participating to the information session by sending an email to manon.vanrijswijk@theglobalfund.org
Proposal Submission Address:	Following URL for TGF Sourcing Application: https://fa-enmo-saasfaprod1.fa.ocs.oraclecloud.com/

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the “Global Fund”) invites all potential suppliers (the “Bidders”) to submit proposals for the above-captioned RFP.

This RFP is comprised of the following sections and attachments:

- Section 1: Terms of Reference
- Section 2: Proposal Requirements and Evaluation
- Section 3: Proposal Submission
- Section 4: Criteria for Inception Report
- Section 5: Legal Matters
- Annex 1: Certificate of Conformance
- Annex 2: The Global Fund Terms and Conditions for the Purchase of Goods and Services (“Terms and Conditions”)
- Annex 3: Cost Template

SECTION 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

A. Scope of Work

Introduction

1. The Global Fund is commissioning an independent evaluation to assess which combination of interventions, processes and factors have led to meaningful community engagement (CE) across the grant cycle (comprising of the three stages: Funding Request, Grant Making, and Grant Implementation). The evaluation will be managed by the Evaluation and Learning Office (ELO) of the Global Fund under the oversight of the Global Fund Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP). The findings and recommendations are expected to generate organizational level learning, inform Grant Cycle 8 (GC8) preparations, enhance CE processes and interventions as well as inform deliberations that can support and strengthen meaningful community engagement.

Background

2. The Global Fund is a worldwide partnership to defeat HIV, tuberculosis (TB) and malaria (HTM) and ensure a healthier, safer, more equitable future for all. The Global Fund raises and invests more than US\$5 billion a year to fight the deadliest infectious diseases, challenge the injustice that fuels them, and strengthen health systems and pandemic preparedness in more than 100 of the hardest hit countries. Since 2002, the Global Fund partnership has saved 59 million lives. Engagement of communities in Global Fund processes has been a principle and practice since Global Fund was established. Furthermore, the approach and the modalities employed to facilitate and support community engagement have evolved over the years, informed by the evolution of the Global Fund.

Brief timeline of community engagement at the Global Fund

3. In the current Global Fund 2023-2028 Strategy, “Maximizing the Engagement and Leadership of Most Affected Communities to Leave No One Behind” is one of the three Mutually Reinforcing Contributory Objectives. Community Engagement (CE) is acknowledged as supporting communities to engage in decisions that impact their lives and as a factor that drives improvements in effectiveness of health interventions. The active participation of local communities, being intimately familiar with their unique needs and challenges, allows for more effective identification and mitigation of systemic barriers to HTM outcomes. The term communities is defined as people living with and/or most affected by HIV, TB and malaria. This definition of communities includes key and vulnerable populations.²

4. Strengthening meaningful CE aims to ensure that investments are evidence-driven, uphold human rights, consider age and gender disparities, and

² Source: Thematic Discussion: Communities at the Centre, 48th Board Meeting, Nov 2022 (GF/B48/9A).

foster long-term sustainability. As these epidemics increasingly affect key and vulnerable populations that are often underserved by formal healthcare systems, bolstering their engagement in the grant cycle is considered essential for optimizing grant design, promoting accountability and additionally for improving design and delivery of CE projects.

5. The thematic discussion “Communities at the Centre” in November 2022 (48th Board Meeting) elaborated that by Global Fund Strategy mid-point (2025) the ambition is to see progress in three areas: 1) Demonstrable enhancements in community engagement and leadership across grant cycle; 2) Improved Global Fund policies, process and approaches informed by evidence; 3) Clear roles, responsibilities, and accountability in the Secretariat and across the whole Global Fund Partnership. While the CE has evolved and several assessment and evaluations conducted, there is no specific baseline available that would allow for a straightforward comparison between objectives and achievements more generally.

6. As mentioned above, the establishment of CE at the Global Fund predated the current strategy. An important step was the introduction of the Country Dialogue in 2014 and meaningful participation of key and vulnerable populations was also referenced in the previous Global Fund 2017-2022 Strategy.³ The Country Dialogue instituted the opportunity for community stakeholders and civil society to engage in the Funding Request development process more formally, thereby enabling community actors to articulate priorities and needs. In addition, this enabled the Global Fund to respond to actual and changing needs of those most affected by HTM and supported relevant decisions made by Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCM).

7. The first Special Initiative with a focus on community engagement was launched in 2014 and subsequently approved as a Strategic Initiative (SI) for the implementation periods 2017-20 (Grant Cycle 5 (GC5)), 2021-23 (GC6) and 2024-26 (GC7). The GC5 SI was launched with a budget of USD 17.5 million. During this period, a SI Coordination Mechanism (including external partners) was established and continues to be implemented as part of the GC7 SI. The initial SI evolved further and was extended for GC6 (USD 17.5 million) and GC7 (USD 14 million).

8. In addition, the Global Fund launched an initiative to strengthen CCMs (a pilot in 2018-2019, and the main CCM Evolution SI in GC6) and which included the promotion of meaningful and inclusive community representation on CCMs. The corresponding performance framework of the SI is providing evidence and insights related to CE across several dimensions.

9. In 2020, the Covid pandemic disrupted the work of the Global Fund and led to new and adaptive ways of working which provided opportunities for enhanced CE: C19RM, the C19 Accelerator, and the CE SI created openings for

³ The previous Global Fund 2017-2022 Strategy included “Support meaningful participation of key and vulnerable populations and networks in Global Fund-related processes” as Operational Objective #4 (under Strategic Objective #3: Human Rights and Gender Equity).

Technical Assistance and decision-making to be localized.^{4 5} The Global Fund responded to the pandemic by adopting rapid processes and flexibilities. The C19RM experience provided lessons learned and insights that created opportunities to improve CE processes and approaches. Several audits by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) of C19RM led to a reconsideration of the C19RM process including adding new elements designed to capture community priorities and increase ownership and dialogue.⁶ The audits highlighted that these changes were positive and constructive leading to their adaptation into the current HTM funding process.

10. Corresponding to the new Mutually Reinforcing Contributory Objective “Maximizing the Engagement and Leadership of Most Affected Communities to Leave No One Behind” of the Global Fund 2023-2028 Strategy, the Global Fund introduced Key Performance Indicator (KPI) C1. The KPI measures the degree of community engagement across three key stages of the Global Fund grant cycle (Funding Request, Grant Making, Grant Implementation). It assesses the effectiveness of the Global Fund in supporting and realizing community engagement.⁷

11. The KPI C1 is based on a survey of all countries receiving Global Fund allocation in the respective period. The survey assesses the satisfaction of communities with engagement across the three stages of the grant cycle. The Community, Rights and Gender team of the Global Fund Secretariat (CRG) administered the survey for the first time between December 2023 and January 2024 and the responses are currently being analyzed. The present round of KPI C1 survey was administered in 79 countries⁷). Responses were received from individuals in 64 countries and 15 countries did not record responses. The total number of responses was 1,194 (average of 18 per country). The response rate is not reported. The preliminary result, based on survey responses from countries that submitted Funding Request in Windows 1 to 3, was a satisfaction score of 68% in engagement in this stage of the grant cycle against a target of 75%.

Interventions and processes in the current Strategy

⁴ The Global Fund's COVID-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM) is a funding stream launched in 2020 to support low- and middle-income countries in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. The C19RM provides grants for essential health services, diagnostics, therapeutics, and personal protective equipment, with a focus on mitigating the impact of COVID-19 on existing HIV, TB, and malaria programs. The mechanism emphasizes agility, transparency, and community engagement, while prioritizing investments aligned with the ACT-Accelerator partnership (described in the footnote immediately below).

⁵ The Access to COVID-19 Tools (ACT) Accelerator is a global collaboration launched in April 2020 to accelerate the development, production, and equitable access to COVID-19 diagnostics, therapeutics, and vaccines.

⁶ Office of the Inspector General Global Fund. (2022). Audit of the Covid-19 Response Mechanism 2021. <https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/oig/updates/2022-03-30-audit-of-the-covid-19-response-mechanism-2021/>. Office of the Inspector General Global Fund. (2021). Audit of the Covid-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM). <https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/oig/updates/2021-04-15-audit-of-the-covid-19-response-mechanism-c19rm/>

⁷ Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) Handbook for the 2023-2028 Strategy, April 2024: https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/12681/strategy_globalfund2023-2028-kpi_handbook_en.pdf

12. There are several entry-points for CE across the grant cycle (GC). Below is a summary of key elements which is, however, not exhaustive and will be completed during the inception phase.

13. Prior to the development of the Funding Request (FR), communities are expected to be engaged in development of national strategies for HTM, coordination of community action and identification of joint priorities. For the GC, three minimum expectations for community engagement have been formulated at the Global Fund.⁸ These expectations are projected to increase transparency, accountability, and opportunities for community engagement:

- Minimum Expectation 1: The funding request development must include transparent and inclusive consultations with populations most impacted by HIV, TB and malaria, across gender and age. This process will result in a document called “Annex of funding priorities of civil society and communities most affected by HIV, TB and malaria”.
- Minimum Expectation 2: To further their involvement in oversight, community and civil society representatives in the CCMs must have timely access to information on the status of grant negotiations and any changes to the grant.
- Minimum Expectation 3: Community and civil society representatives in the CCM have timely access to information on program implementation.

14. All coordinating mechanisms should comply with each of the below eligibility requirements, as outlined in the CCM Policy.⁹ Requirements #4 and 5 explicitly refer to communities and non-governmental members, others more indirectly when referencing transparency and inclusiveness:

Requirement 1: Carry out a transparent and inclusive funding application development process.

Requirement 2: Facilitate an open and transparent Principal Recipient selection process.

Requirement 3: Submit and follow an oversight plan for all Global Fund approved financing.

Requirement 4: Show evidence of membership of affected communities in the coordinating mechanism.

Requirement 5: Ensure representation of nongovernmental members in the coordinating mechanism through transparent and documented processes developed by each constituency.

Requirement 6: Adopt and enforce a code of conduct, and conflict of interest policy.

⁸ Community Engagement: A Guide to Opportunities Throughout the Grant Life Cycle, December 2024: https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/12649/core_community-engagement_guide_en.pdf

⁹ Country Coordinating Mechanism Policy Including Principles and Requirements., May 2018: https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/7421/ccm_countrycoordinatingmechanism_policy_en.pdf

15. Specific support and interventions provided by the Global Fund are:

- Providing peer-led short-term Technical Assistance (TA) to ensure that communities are meaningfully engaged in Global Fund processes.¹⁰
- Long-term capacity building of Key and Vulnerable Population networks supporting communities (1) to engage safely and effectively, (2) advocate for increased investment and more rights-based and gender responsive programs, and (3) adapt and use evidence-based implementation tools and guidance.
- Regional communication and coordination platforms to strengthen communication and coordination to ensure that communities are (1) utilizing quality information and communication, (2) participating in decision-making processes, and (3) accessing coordinated and harmonized TA and support.

16. Civic space is a critical external factor affecting progress and achievements of CE at national level.¹¹ This is especially relevant for marginalized, excluded, and criminalized populations as well as community-led organizations. There is a general concern that civic space and freedoms of assembly, association and expression are under threat, and behavior of vulnerable groups is criminalized in some countries. Such developments risk undermining CE progress, the sustainability of achievements and may even put the safety and security of community members at risk. It is therefore suggested that civic space be considered as one potential external factor during the evaluation, acknowledging, however, that the Global Fund has limited agency to influence. Civic Space will be assessed primarily utilizing secondary data at national level, though differentiated by topic/issue. In addition, the evaluation will solicit the perceptions and experiences regarding civic space during primary data collection.

17. Some of the challenges, related to CE, shared in consultations with ELO during the scoping phase are:

- Community and civil society engagement during FR stage may not consistently translate into engagement during grant-making, nor necessarily into community priorities being reflected in the final grant design or their engagement in grant oversight during implementation.
- Limited engagement during grant-making may delay the start of effective oversight by the CCM (including communities and civil society) during the first year of implementation.

¹⁰ TA is necessarily diverse and tailored but includes providing peer-led TA to ensure that communities are meaningfully engaged in Global Fund processes; situational analysis and planning; participation in-country dialogue; prioritization and input into program design; long-term capacity strengthening of CSOs; funding request writing.

¹¹ This evaluation applies the following description of civic space by OHCHR: “Civic space is the environment that enables civil society to play a role in political, economic and social life. In particular, civic space allows individuals and groups to contribute to policy-making that affects their lives, including how it is implemented.” (<https://www.ohchr.org/en/topic/civic-space-and-human-rights-defenders>)

-
- Following the submission of the FR and grant signature, information is not consistently shared with community and civil society stakeholders by CCMs, Principal Recipients, and Global Fund Country Teams.
-

Purpose and Objectives

18. The **overall purpose** of the evaluation is to assess which combination of interventions, processes and factors have led to meaningful community engagement during the grant cycle. The findings and recommendations are expected to generate organizational level learning, inform Grant Cycle 8 (GC8) preparations, enhance CE processes and interventions as well as inform deliberations that can support and strengthen meaningful community engagement.

19. During the KPI Framework development for the current Strategy, it was acknowledged that KPI C1 will provide an important but limited snapshot of satisfaction levels among community members and that an evaluation would be able to provide rich and contextual insights and evidence into what constitutes meaningful CE processes and achievements. Hence, recognizing the criticality of CE for the achievement of the Strategy of the Global Fund, an independent evaluation was included in the Board approved Multi-year Evaluation Calendar as part of the M&E Framework for the 2023-2028 Strategy.

20. The design of the evaluation is underpinned by an outcome-focused approach with “meaningful community engagement” as the outcome. The outcome measure will be differentiated by Grant Cycle stage. Consultations with Global Fund Secretariat as part of the scoping phase indicate that community engagement is significantly differentiated by Grant Cycle stage and that outcomes associated with CE vary across the cycle. For this evaluation, the term outcome is conceived as immediate outcome resulting from Global Fund interventions and processes.¹² Both outcome and differentiation of outcome across Grant Cycle stage are key ingredients of a Theory of Change (ToC) that will be developed retrospectively in the inception phase (see also paragraph #34).

21. The Global Fund Strategy 2017-2022 explains that meaningful engagement is recognized as a necessary step towards increasing investments in evidence-based and rights-based programming which deliver greater impact on the responses to the three diseases, and which strengthen local accountability.” (p.31). At a more operational level, the Global Fund interprets meaningful community engagement as where the role of communities is consistently and continuously acknowledged in decision making and processes, and where communities’ unique expertise, perspectives and lived experiences are sought

¹² The concept of “immediate outcome” for this evaluation is similar to the use of the term in the Results-Based Management approach of Global Affairs Canada and which distinguishes between immediate, intermediate and ultimate outcomes. The latter often being considered impact:

<https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/funding-financement/results-based-management-gestion-axe-resultats-guide.aspx?lang=eng#b51>

and valued.¹³ For the purpose of this evaluation, it is suggested to conceptualize “meaningful community engagement” by combining Global Fund indicators associated with CE as a “CE Index”.¹⁴ It is emphasized that such an index serves as a springboard for the evaluation process and is not intended to be a conclusive or reductionist definition of CE at the Global Fund. The index is comprised of a range of indicators that capture key characteristics and elements of the Grant Cycle.

22. The following two **evaluation objectives** will guide the process:

1. Assessment of the effectiveness and adequacy of community engagement processes and interventions.¹⁵
2. Identification of internal and external factors and the extent to which each category enable and/or /hinder meaningful community engagement.

23. The main audience and users of the evaluation findings, lessons and recommendations are the Global Fund Secretariat teams that drive and support CE as well as country stakeholders (i.e. CCM representatives), community-led organizations as well as organizations with similar mandate and objectives. In addition, Governance Bodies and technical and bilateral partners are important audiences for this evaluation as findings and recommendations may suggest different ways of working across the Global Fund partnership. This will require that the evaluation process and communication of findings are tailored to the needs of this diverse audience.

24. Acknowledging the history and evolution of CE at the Global Fund, the starting point is 2021 and the evaluation will cover the 3.5-year period until mid-2024. This will allow for the inclusion of the adaptations to the Covid pandemic, GC6 and preparations for GC7, the CE SI (GC6) as well as changes emanating from the CCM Evolution initiative.

25. In 2024, ELO is also commissioning an evaluation on Community Responses and System Strengthening (CRSS). The main point of differentiation is that the CRSS evaluation will primarily assess the challenges and success factors in community systems strengthening that enable HTM program effectiveness, quality, and efficiency as well as the contribution of community-led responses in ensuring access to health services. The decision to separate out the two evaluations has been made through careful and consultative

¹³ This definition was adapted by the CRG team from Spieldenner, Andrew; French, Martin; Ray, Venita; Minalga, Brian; Sardina, Cristine; Suttle, Robert; Castro-Bojorquez, Marco; Lewis, Octavia; and Sprague, Laurel (2022).

¹⁴ Examples of three indicators for illustration: Does the non-state sector (Private Sector / Civil Society / Academia) account for at least 40% of the Coordinating Mechanism seats? [For the purposes of the evaluation “non-state” sector is defined according to the working definition of Country Coordination Mechanism Hub: “Non-state actors within CCMs are comprised of representatives of National NGOs, CBOs, people living with three diseases, key affected populations, private sector, academic and non-governmental institutions”]. Are non-state members actively engaged in all key committees (oversight, executive, ethics)? Does the Oversight Committee [of CCM] include Key and vulnerable populations / People living with the disease(s) representative(s)? The indicators and data associated with indicators are generated through CCMs and the business owner associated with this data is CCM Hub. The proposal to construct an index based these indicators is supported by CCM Hub and CRG Primary User (Business Owner of the CE Evaluation).

¹⁵ Adequacy is understood here as “sufficient for the purpose”.

dialogue and decision-making. Where there has been deemed to be a potential risk of overlap relevant elements of the evaluation have been removed from the scope of one of the evaluations. The CRSS evaluation includes in its scope as of May 24th the following elements that are not included in CE: (1) community-led monitoring (CLM) to enable communities to oversee and report on the quality and effectiveness of health services; (2) community-led research and advocacy to support communities to conduct research and advocate for their health needs and rights; (3) community capacity building and leadership development to strengthen the abilities of community members to lead and manage health initiatives.

Areas of Inquiry and Key Evaluation Questions

26. In reference to the expected outcome “meaningful community engagement” and the evaluation objectives, the evaluation will consider progress in Areas of Inquiry applying Key Evaluation Questions (KEQ):

Table 1: Evaluation Objectives, Areas of Inquiry and Key Evaluation Questions.

Evaluation Objectives	Areas of Inquiry	Key Evaluation Questions
1. Assessment of the effectiveness and adequacy of community engagement processes and interventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community engagement minimum expectations and adapting business processes. • Inclusive engagement and stronger civil society representations among CCM. • Country-level support to population groups and TA: community engagement SI. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective are the interventions and processes of the Global Fund in achieving or contributing to meaningful community engagement during the GC? • Are the interventions and processes of the Global Fund adequate in achieving or contributing to meaningful community engagement and are they appropriately tailored to differentiation across key Grant Cycles? • What is their relevance and reach/coverage within available resources of the Global Fund?¹⁶ • How and to what extent do the interventions of the Global Fund build on and complement each other? • How and to what extent do the interventions of the Global Fund support community expertise and knowledge (which are expected objectives of Technical Assistance)?
2. Identification of internal and external factors and the extent to which they	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination and alignment in the Secretariat. • Coherence across the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the extent to which coordination and alignment among Global Fund Secretariat entities is effective and adequate? If necessary, how could Global Fund strengthen coordination and alignment?

¹⁶ Reach and coverage will include challenges such as reaching mobile populations such as IDPs, refugees, nomadic or mobile herders etc. as well as working in countries characterized by COE (Challenging Operating Environment).

enable and/or /hinder meaningful community engagement	Global Fund Partnership. ¹⁷ • Availability of civic space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the level of coherence across the Global Fund Partnership regarding how CE is supported? If necessary, how could Global Fund strengthen coherence?¹⁸ • What role does civic space play in affecting Global Fund CE interventions and results?¹⁹ • What are the risks associated with shrinking civic space and can they be mitigated by the Global Fund?
---	--	--

27. It is important to emphasize that the impact of CE on addressing the three diseases, on service delivery at national or local level or on behavioral changes at individual level is not within the scope of this evaluation. Neither will the evaluation include an assessment of the cost-effectiveness of CE.

28. The evaluation will not explicitly incorporate C19RM in its scope as an Area of Inquiry. However, the Global Fund response to C19 and the adaptations realized by community groups and Global Fund are elements of the evolution of CE and will be reflected. Previous evaluations and assessments have indicated that the response to C19 was associated with (i) increased flexibility of design, response, and implementation; (ii) improved responsiveness in implementation; (iii) increased reliance on competencies, skills, knowledge, expertise of communities; (iv) supported bottom-up community-led prioritization.²⁰

29. The Areas of Inquiry and KEQ will be revised and finalized during the inception phase and informed by findings from recent Global Fund evaluations, previous reports by the Technical Evaluation Reference Group, relevant audit/advisory reports from the Office of Inspector General (OIG), and

¹⁷ The term coherence is applied in accordance with OECD/DAC evaluation criteria:

<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm#sustainability-block>

Coherence - The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.

¹⁸ Having a common understanding and coordinated approach that clarifies roles and responsibilities and that has joint accountabilities was presented to the 48th Board meeting as part of a step change in how the partnership approaches community engagement.

¹⁹ The evaluation will apply accepted, credible, and relevant secondary data sources to capture civic space.

²⁰ Evaluation of COVID-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM) 1.0. (2023) Technical Evaluation Reference Group. https://archive.theglobalfund.org/media/13198/archive_terg-c19rm-evaluation_report_en.pdf.

External Evaluation of the Prospective Country Evaluations (PCEs) (2021) Technical Evaluation Reference Group.

https://archive.theglobalfund.org/media/11697/archive_terg-external-evaluation-pce_report_en.pdf

Unpublished report: Strategic Review 2023 (SR2023) Evaluation and Learning Office & Independent Evaluation Panel. <https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/updates/2023/2023-03-20-strategic-review-2023/#:~:text=The%20SR2023%20will%20provide%20an,well%20as%20hinder%20factors%20that>

available external documentation and research such as the recently (April 22nd, 2024) shared RISE report and several mid-term and endline reports by CRG.²¹ Additional key reference documents are the evaluation of Community Rights & Gender Strategic Initiative 2017 – 2019 and the final evaluation of the GC6 Community Engagement Strategic Initiative, both commissioned by CRG. A reference list is provided at the end of this document. Findings and recommendations of selected evaluations have been summarized and will inform the inception phase. Please see a section that summarizes key evaluations towards the end of the ToR following the List of Acronyms and Abbreviations section. The section is entitled “Summary of Results of Selected Evaluations”.

Methodological Considerations

30. The evaluation employs an outcome-focused approach. The evaluation design and approach are grounded in and structured by Grant Cycle stages and will be informed by the ToC which will be established during the inception phase. The evaluation is expected to give thought to the following evaluation design elements:

- a) Considering the contributory nature of CE within the Global Fund Strategy.
- b) Reflection of the significant heterogeneity and diversity among countries, grants, and population groups. Communities and civil societies are not monolithic, may be fragmented and even characterized by conflict.
- c) Insights generated through evaluation activities that involve direct engagement with communities particularly those communities that are most affected and excluded are particularly valuable and relevant within the boundaries of this evaluation.
- d) Meaningful community engagement can be achieved on different pathways and can be realized through several configurations of interventions, processes, and factors. Such pathways and configurations are expected to be explored, described, and analyzed.
- e) Identifying useful and feasible ways to involve community groups, representatives, or associations in certain phases of the evaluations process (for example inception, data collection and analysis, interpretation, and dissemination phases) and to solicit their opinion in a safe and secure manner. Opportunities to engage with PLHIV, TB survivor and malaria community networks are of specific interest.
- f) Considering gender and human rights dimensions in the selection of methods and tools, data collection and analysis as well as stakeholder mapping.

²¹ TERG evaluations: (i) Thematic Evaluation on Community engagement and Community-led responses (CL/CLR) (Secretariat-led with TERG Oversight), 2022; and (ii) Independent Multi-country Review of Community Engagement in Global Fund Grant Making and Implementation Processes, 2017. Community Engagement in Global Fund Country Coordination mechanism: Findings from the RISE Study;

RISE stands for: Representation, Inclusion, Sustainability and Equity

g) Formulation of learning opportunities and products as well as actionable recommendations within the purview of the Global Fund.

31. The suggested approach and design elements are method-neutral, i.e., they do not impose the use of particular methods or tools. Nevertheless, it is expected that the methodology and tools reflect, and are informed by, the listed design elements and that qualitative and quantitative methods and tools are applied. Furthermore, it is critical that any proposed combination of methods and tools clearly outlines how they will complement each other and allow exploring the interplay of CE interventions, processes, and factors. Data and information will have to be triangulated, and the strength of the evidence reviewed to ensure robust and comprehensive evaluation findings and recommendations. The specific data collection and analysis methods and tools will be confirmed during the inception phase.

32. The “CE Index” described in paragraph 17 informs a case-based approach (case=country) to compare and contrast two groups: A) successful/exemplary CE and B) limited progress. The Global Fund designation of Challenging Operating Environment (COE) will also be considered when selecting cases, as well as a small number of additional criteria (e.g., country portfolio categories, region, language). Advancing CE in COE has been observed as specifically challenging and hence, it is important to reflect this in the sampling approach. The intention is to select four to six countries per group. However, the number of countries per group may be larger if methodological requirements necessitate this. Country insights and information will mostly be collected virtually, though direct data collection in a small number of countries is an option if relevant and useful.

33. During the inception phase the Supplier will be expected to consult with the Secretariat and other key stakeholders, including community representatives on the CCM, community-led organizations and/or PLHIV, TB survivor and malaria community networks. Furthermore, the Supplier is expected to conduct a desk review of critical documents, reports, audits, and evaluations to further conceptualize the outcome “meaningful community engagement”, specify internal and external factors (e.g. civic space), elaborate the Areas of Inquiry and KEQ as well as review case sampling criteria and selection. The design should acknowledge and reflect that conditions such as civic space are context specific, situational, shifting and dynamic. This phase will also include further analysis of KPI C1 satisfaction survey data to explore different perceptions across heterogeneous community groups to inform the evaluation design.

34. It is important to note that there is currently no specific ToC for CE available. The current CE SI, however, does include a ToC which articulates four outcomes.²² Since implementation started in 2024 (until 2026), the evaluation can consider the design and plan of the SI, but implementation and progress is outside the scope of this evaluation. Nevertheless, the process of

²² (i) communities generate and use data to inform advocacy and decision-making; (ii) communities have capacity to mobilize and hold their representatives and decision-makers accountable; (iii) communities access timely and relevant Global Fund related information; (iv) communities drive program quality based on adoption of global guidance and sharing best practice.

developing a ToC for this evaluation will leverage key elements of the most recent CE SI, acknowledging that CE at the Global Fund encompasses a broader mandate and remit than the SI only. Furthermore, the organization-wide ToC developed within the SR2023 evaluation included CE as a “key assumption to drive results from Global Fund strategic levers”, though was not positioned as an explicit driver of change. A ToC for this evaluation will be developed retrospectively by the Supplier in collaboration with ELO and in consultation with CRG. The ToC will frame and inform the evaluation process. The ToC will be informed by a non-linear approach, i.e. reflect multiple pathways that can lead to meaningful CE, and the contributory role of CE in Global Fund. It will also integrate the three listed GC stages. It is important to emphasize that the LoE invested in developing a ToC as part of the inception phase has to be commensurate with the utility of the ToC for Global Fund during and after the evaluation.

35. The inception phase will also include a stakeholder mapping exercise to prepare for data collection and analysis and to ensure soliciting the views of multiple stakeholders. The stakeholder mapping will ensure the inclusion of most affected and/or marginalized community groups, and which is a central principle of CE at the Global Fund.

36. Evaluation activities that involve direct engagement with excluded and most affected communities, People Living with HIV (PLHIV), TB survivors and malaria communities are considered an important component of the process. Nonetheless, inclusion of excluded communities should be balanced with pragmatic considerations associated with the boundaries of evaluation in relation to time and resources. Furthermore, methodologies will be grounded in the acknowledgement that communities are heterogeneous, diverse, fragmented and at times conflictual.

Evaluation Phases 37. The Evaluation is expected to be conducted over nine months and is divided into three main phases (approximate duration in brackets):

1. Inception Phase (four weeks)

- Following the contracting of the Supplier, ELO will organize a comprehensive onboarding of the Supplier and provide and/or facilitate access to relevant documents and data, including any relevant evaluations and audits.
- During this time the Supplier will consult with key Secretariat staff as well as selected key stakeholders. The Supplier will also be introduced to members of the IEP. The onboarding will likely be conducted virtually, though if feasible, the Evaluation Team Lead might travel to Geneva during this time.
- Following, the Supplier will refine and adapt their initial technical proposal to finalize the evaluation design, modify evaluation questions if needed, outline the methodology in an evaluation framework against the evaluation objectives and questions, and define the data and information needs. The Supplier will deliver a

ToC that is structured according to GC. The ToC will be developed in collaboration with CRG, ELO and other key stakeholders.

- The Supplier will submit an Evaluation Workplan after two weeks and a comprehensive Inception Report after a total of four weeks. The Inception Report will include a ToC. ELO will facilitate access to requested Global Fund data and information.

2. Data Collection and Analysis Phase (12 weeks)

- Suppliers proceed with the independent collection and analysis of data and information as described in the Inception Report. The Evaluation Team Lead and ELO will hold regular meetings to review progress, facilitate the process if necessary and/or address any concerns.
- In addition, this phase will include learning and review touchpoints between the evaluation team, key stakeholders, and ELO to present and discuss preliminary findings.

3. Reporting Phase (eight weeks)

- The Evaluation Team Lead will submit a draft Final Evaluation Report at the start of this phase. The report will be reviewed by ELO and selected stakeholders and feedback provided to the Evaluation Team Lead.
- Following, workshop/meeting with key stakeholders will be organized by ELO (co-chaired by ELO and IEP). The Supplier will present the final analysis and draft recommendations for discussion and validation. It is expected that at least the Evaluation Team Lead will come in person for this event to the Global Fund Secretariat.
- The Evaluation Team Lead submits the Final Evaluation Report as well as an evaluation brief, considering the results of the aforementioned meeting/workshop.
- Once the final report has been accepted by ELO, the Supplier submits an Evaluation Brief and a Summative Slide Deck as the final deliverables (see following section).

Deliverables and expected timeline

38. The following deliverables and expected timeline are planned. ELO will provide templates and/or guidance for all deliverables at the start of the inception phase:

Table 2: Evaluation Deliverables and Due Dates

Deliverable	Due Date
Evaluation Workplan	Early-September 2024
Inception Report	Mid-September 2024
Preliminary Findings Workshop	Late November 2024

Draft Final Evaluation Report	Early December 2024
Final Analysis and Recommendations Workshop	Mid-January 2025
Final Evaluation Report	Late February 2025
Evaluation Brief and Summative Slide Deck	End-March 2025

Skills and Experience Required from Evaluation Consultants

39. The Supplier’s Evaluation Team will comprise a mix of experts with a balance of relevant expertise and knowledge in the following areas. In the technical proposal the Evaluation Team description should also include level of effort allocated to each team member. It is vital that organizations bidding for the evaluation are aware of expectations associated with the final evaluation report. Hence, it is suggested to review the Quality Assurance Framework when developing the technical proposal.²³

40. **Essential:**

- Advanced knowledge of and experience with complex public health organizations and programs.
- Advanced knowledge and understanding of and experience with community engagement approaches of global financing institutions.
- Familiarity with and significant experience in conducting evaluations applying the referenced evaluation approach.
- Knowledge and experience in applying case-based and configurational methodologies.
- Extensive experience with appropriate evaluation design and methods, both quantitative and qualitative including relevant research analysis skills, handling large data sets, triangulating, and synthesizing diverse information.
- Experience in evaluation/assessment/advisory on organizational and institutional change.
- In-country experience of public health programs (design and /or evaluation) and multi-stakeholder country processes
- Appropriate, responsive, and timely administrative support to the evaluation process.
- Meaningful inclusion of civil society organizations and community groups are an essential and necessary element of the team.
- Gender balance and gender qualifications in the evaluation team.
- Demonstrable record of working in a participatory manner with communities most affected by the three diseases.

²³ Global Fund’s Evaluation Function Quality Assurance Framework: https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/13794/iep_quality-assessment_framework_en.pdf. The QAF is of particular importance in report-writing stage of the evaluation process but given the centrality and importance of the final report all evaluation activities should be framed and informed by the logic and content of the QAF.

- Meaningful inclusion of civil society organizations and community groups contributing to the design, analysis, interpretation, and generation of evaluation findings.
- One or more members of the Evaluation Team personally identify with the communities most affected by the three diseases.
- Political analysis skills that provide scope to fully articulate the political dynamics and contextual factors that underpin CE processes.

Highly desirable:

- Familiarity with the Global Fund at Secretariat level and with grant design and implementation at country level.
- Full language proficiency in English and French. Other language proficiency in the team.

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

AGYW	Adolescent Girls and Young Women
C19	COVID-19
C19RM	COVID-19 Response Mechanism
CCM	Country Coordination Mechanism
CE	Community Engagement
CLR	Community-led Responses
CoE	Challenging Operating Environment
CRG	Community Rights and Gender Department
CRSS	Community Responses and System Strengthening
ELO	Evaluation and Learning Office
FR	Funding Request
GC	Grant Cycle
HTM	HIV, TB and Malaria
IEP	Independent Evaluation Panel
KEQ	Key Evaluation Question
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NFM	The Global Fund's New Funding Model
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development / Development Assistance Committee
OHCHR	United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OIG	Office of the Inspector General
PLHIV	People Living with HIV

PCE	Prospective Country Evaluations
RISE	Representation, Inclusion, Sustainability and Equity
RBM	Results-based Management
SI	Strategic Initiative
SO	Global Fund Strategic Objective
SR2023	Strategic Review (2023)
TA	Technical Assistance
TERG	Technical Evaluation Reference Group
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
USD	United States Dollar

Summary of Results of Selected Evaluations

This section presents the results and recommendations of relevant previous evaluations. The section refers to four documents: (A) Thematic Evaluation on Community Engagement and Community-led Responses Secretariat-led with TERG oversight (CE- CLR); (B) Global Forum on MSM & HIV report of an Independent Multi-country Review of Community Engagement in Grant Making & Implementation Processes: Lessons Learned, Key principles and ways forward; (C) Community Rights & Gender Strategic Initiative 2017 – 2019: Independent Evaluation; (D) The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria: Strategic Review 2023 (SR2023).

Health Management Support Team. (2023). Thematic Evaluation on Community Engagement and Community-led Responses Secretariat-led with TERG oversight (CE- CLR).

https://archive.theglobalfund.org/media/13140/archive_terg-community-engagement-community-led-responses_report_en.pdf .

The evaluation focused on the operationalization of Global Fund’s support to community engagement (CE) and community-led responses (CLR) through country grants, multi-country grants, and SIs.

The key findings and conclusions are organized into: (i) strategic and secretariat level; (ii) country level. They include:

Strategic and secretariat level:

- There is a lack of a shared understanding of community contributions to the Global Fund’s mission.
 - Community contributions are under-recognized.
 - The partnership model is under-utilized.
 - Risk and processes trump the role of communities and undermine nuanced understanding and approaches which are mindful of complexity.
-

-
- Funding cycles do not sufficiently incentivize efforts to achieve sustainability and long-term change.
 - The gender focus is under-developed.

Country level:

- Grant architecture is not conducive to consistently elevating diverse community voices.
- An enabling environment is the key to successful Community Engagement
- Country ownership is often perceived as being synonymous with and is conflated with government ownership.

Recommendations

Recommendations relevant to the CE evaluation are presented below. Recommendations are organized into temporal categories: (i) quick wins (for roll out in NFM4); (ii) Medium term (for roll out in NFM5); (iii) Long term (to be achieved in 2023 – 2028). This summary only presents recommendations associated with “Quick wins for roll out in NFM4)” given that these recommendations are of immediate relevance to this evaluation.

Quick wins (for roll out in NFM4):

- Ensure community supported activities are linked to the Global Fund’s overarching Theory of Change for the 2023-2028 strategy to guide the institutionalization of a community-centered, human rights promoting, and gender-transformative culture.
- The Secretariat, in consultation with key partners, should continue to develop a KPI that captures community contribution to Global Fund results for the new strategy 2023- 2028, and also ensure that qualitative measures are in place to track progress towards long-term changes in capacities, enabling environments, sustainability and systems.
- Build minimum community engagement standards into consolidated guidance for each stage of the grant cycle to ensure the meaningful engagement and leadership of most affected communities, with an emphasis on rights, gender and equity considerations.

Baran, B., Messerschmidt, L., O’Connor ,M., Rafif, N.(2017). Global Forum on MSM & HIV: Independent Multi-country Review of Community Engagement in Grant Making & Implementation Processes: Lessons Learned, Key principles and ways forward.

<https://www.globalfundadvocatesnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/MSMGF-CLAC-Study-Full7.pdf> .

This independent review, commissioned by the Community, Rights and Gender (CRG) Department at the Global Fund Secretariat, shares findings, conclusions, and recommendations for enhancing the meaningful engagement of communities in all phases of Global Fund grants, with an emphasis on *grant*

making and grant implementation. The review synthesizes lessons learned and good practices for how communities engage meaningfully and identifies key principles and strategic actions the Global Fund can take to ensure greater accountability between communities, Country Coordinating Mechanisms, other key stakeholders, and the Global Fund itself. Please review the full document in particular the Executive Summary for a more detailed presentation of key findings and recommendations.

Parsons, D. (2020). Community Rights & Gender Strategic Initiative 2017 – 2019: Independent Evaluation. APMG Health.

https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/9947/crg_2017-2019strategicinitiativeindependent_evaluation_en.pdf

Background

This evaluation has been commissioned by the Community, Rights and Gender (CRG) Department of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the Global Fund), to review the results of the US\$15m investment from the 2017-2019 allocation period in the CRG Strategic Initiative.

The aim of the Final Evaluation is:

- To reflect on the overall return on the Phase 2 (2017-2019; \$15m) investment in the CRG Strategic Initiative in terms of results, management processes and learnings in supporting the meaningful engagement of communities/civil society in the Global Fund’s funding model; and
- To make recommendations for Phase 3 (2020-2022) of the CRG Strategic Initiative and potentially beyond, within the context of achieving the objectives of the Global Fund Strategy.

The CRG Strategic Initiative’s work is organized into three components:

- **Component 1** – Short-term Technical Assistance (TA): Providing peer-led TA to ensure that communities are meaningfully engaged in Global Fund-related processes.
- **Component 2** – Long-term capacity building: Networks are developing capacity to ensure that communities are (1) engaging safely and effectively, (2) advocating for increased investment and more rights-based and gender responsive programs, and (3) adapting and using evidence-based implementation tools and guidance.
- **Component 3** – Regional Platforms are strengthening communication and coordination systems to ensure that communities are (1) utilizing quality information and communication, (2) participating in decision-making processes, and (3) accessing coordinated and harmonized TA and support.

Findings

Component 1 provided civil society and community organizations with demand-driven, peer-to-peer, short-term TA to improve community engagement

in Global Fund-related processes. A total of US\$6m is dedicated to short-term TA within the CRG Strategic Initiative, making this component 40% of the overall budget.

Between 15 March 2017 and 10 April, Component 1 received 212 requests for TA and 159 requests were deemed eligible, while 111 went on to delivery. TA was delivered across 69 countries, including 17 challenging operating environment countries, and including support for HIV, TB, HIV/TB, and malaria grants. A milestone of progress was the expansion of eligible TA to cover all phases of the grant cycle, including implementation and oversight, which accounted for 46.5% of all eligible requests. Demand for TA was greatly increased relative to the Special Initiative period, highlighting improved integration of Component 1 and Component 3, whereby Component 3 Regional Platforms played a significant role in supporting communities to submit TA requests.

Component 2 aimed to strengthen long-term capacity of community groups and networks to better support the meaningful engagement of their constituencies in Global Fund-related processes. A total of US\$5m was dedicated to long-term capacity building within the CRG Strategic Initiative, making this component 33.3% of the overall CRG Strategic Initiative budget.

A notable expansion compared to the Special Initiative, under the Strategic Initiative the Component supported HIV, TB, and malaria communities, via grants to 14 grantees.

Component 3 supported civil society and community organizations to host regional communication and coordination Platforms to strengthen systems and information for meaningful community engagement in Global Fund-related processes.

Six Regional Platforms were active for the duration of the CRG Strategic Initiative. Platforms implemented a striking range of activities, touching on all elements of the extensive MEL framework. Highlights of achievement included the expansion of communications reach to a combined estimate of 32,500 constituents reached in sharing of strategic documents, implementation updates and other informational resources; as well as the support for the development of 112 unique TA requests (53% of all requests). Platforms also implemented targeted activities on the ground in 38 countries. This Component was consistently the most recognized and understood for its added value across a broad range of stakeholders surveyed for this evaluation, noting a marked improvement from the Special Initiative, under which there was a noted lack of understanding and appreciation of the role of Platforms.

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria: Strategic Review 2023 (SR2023).

The Supplier will receive access to SR2023 report when it is published. The Evaluation Function of Global Fund aims to publish the report in time for the Inception Phase of the evaluation.

List of References

Adhikari, B., Vincent, R., Wong, G., Duddy, C., Richardson, E., Lavery, J. v., & Molyneux, S. (2019). A realist review of community engagement with health research [version 2; peer review: 4 approved, 1 approved with reservations]. Wellcome Open Research, 4. <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15298.1>

Baran, C., Messerschmidt, L., & O'Connor, M. (2017). Independent Multi-country Review of Community Engagement in Grant Making & Implementation Processes: Lessons Learned, Key Principles, and Ways Forward. <https://www.nswp.org/sites/default/files/Community%20Engagement%20in%20Grant%20Making%2C%20MSMGF%2C%20NSWP%20-%202017.pdf> Cambridge Economic Policy Associates. Unpublished report: Strategic Review 2023 (SR2023) Evaluation and Learning Office & Independent Evaluation Panel. <https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/updates/2023/2023-03-20-strategic-review-2023/#:~:text=The%20SR2023%20will%20provide%20an,well%20as%20hi,ndering%20factors%20that>

Davies, A., Jao, I., Sanga, G., Namayi, R., Mwalukore, S., Mauncho, C., Mumba, N., & Kamuya, D. (2022). KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme - Community and Public Engagement 2016-2021 Evaluation Report. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6352678>

DeLuca, A. (2022). Global TB Community Advisory Board 10-Year Anniversary Evaluation Report 2011-2021. <https://www.treatmentactiongroup.org/publication/tb-cab-10-year-anniversary-evaluation-report-2011-2021-and-podcast/>

Durie, R. D. of P. and W. C. for C. & E. of H. U. of E., & Wyatt, K. C. of M. & H. U. of E. M. S. (2023). Evaluation of the WHO Community Engagement Research Initiative. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789290620082>

Gilmore, B., Ndejjo, R., Tchetchia, A., de Claro, V., Mago, E., Diallo, A. A., Lopes, C., & Bhattacharyya, S. (2020). Community engagement for COVID-19 prevention and control: A rapid evidence synthesis. *BMJ Global Health*, 5(10). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003188>

Government of Canada. (2022). Results-Based Management for International Assistance Programming at Global Affairs Canada: A How-To-Guide. https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/funding-financement/results_based_management-gestion_axee_resultats-guide.aspx?lang=eng#b51

Greenall, M. (2012). Communities, civil society and health: a literature review. Comic Relief: Community, Civil Society and Health Literature Review (March 2012).

Greenall, M., Kunii, O., Thomson, K., Bangert, R., & Nathan, O. (2017). Reaching vulnerable populations: Lessons from the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 95(2), 159–161. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.16.179192>

Gupta, P., Rouffy-Ly, B., Rohrer-Herold, K., Koch, K., Rao, N., Poulussen, C., Brearley, L., Abou-Taleb, H., & Rajan, D. (2023). Assessing the interactions of people and policy-makers in social participation for health: an inventory of participatory governance measures from a rapid systematic literature review. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 22(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-023-01918-2>

Health Management Support Team. (2022). Community Engagement and Community-led Response Evaluation. The Global Fund: A Secretariat-led Evaluation with TERG oversight.

https://archive.theglobalfund.org/media/13140/archive_terg-community-engagement-community-led-responses_report_en.pdf.

Hickey, G., Porter, K., Tembo, D., Rennard, U., Tholanah, M., Beresford, P., Chandler, D., Chimbari, M., Coldham, T., Dikomitis, L., Dziro, B., Ekiikina, P. O., Khattak, M. I., Montenegro, C. R., Mumba, N., Musesengwa, R., Nelson, E., Nhunzvi, C., Ramirez, C. M., & Staniszewska, S. (2022). What Does “Good” Community and Public Engagement Look Like? Developing Relationships With Community Members in Global Health Research. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 9.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.776940>

IOD PARC & Technical Evaluation Reference Group. (2021) External Evaluation of the Prospective Country Evaluations (PCEs) (2021)

https://archive.theglobalfund.org/media/11697/archive_terg-external-evaluation-pce_report_en.pdf

Loewenson R, Simpson S, Dudding R, Obando F, & Bezec P. (2021). Making Change Visible: Evaluating Efforts to Advance Social Participation in Health, An Implementer’s Resource.

<https://www.tarsc.org/publications/documents/MCV%20Implementers%20Resource%202022%20for%20web.pdf>

MacQueen, K. M., Bhan, A., Frohlich, J., Holzer, J., & Sugarman, J. (2015). Evaluating community engagement in global health research: The need for metrics. In *BMC Medical Ethics* (Vol. 16, Issue 1). BioMed Central Ltd.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-015-0033-9>

Mesh Community Engagement Network. (n.d.). Mesh theme looking at different methods and approaches measuring the impact of engagement.

Retrieved January 8, 2024, <https://mesh.tghn.org/evaluation/>

Moon, S., Armstrong, J., Hutler, B., Upshur, R., Katz, R., Atuire, C., Bhan, A., Emanuel, E., Faden, R., Ghimire, P., Greco, D., Ho, C. W., Kochhar, S., Schaefer, G. O., Shamsi-Gooshki, E., Singh, J. A., Smith, M. J., & Wolff, J. (2022). Governing the Access to COVID-19 Tools Accelerator: towards greater participation, transparency, and accountability. In *The Lancet* (Vol. 399, Issue 10323, pp. 487–494). Elsevier B.V.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)02344-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02344-8)

Office of the Inspector General Global Fund. (2021). Audit of the Covid-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM).

<https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/oig/updates/2021-04-15-audit-of-the-covid-19-response-mechanism-c19rm/>

Office of the Inspector General Global Fund. (2022). Audit of the Covid-19 Response Mechanism 2021.

<https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/oig/updates/2022-03-30-audit-of-the-covid-19-response-mechanism-2021/>.

Pawson R, and Tilley N. (1997). An introduction to scientific realist evaluation: Sage Publications.

Peerun, N., & Perez, S. (2023). Community-Led Monitoring for Increased Community Engagement in DSD Decision-Making and Programming.

<https://itpcglobal.org/resource/clm-for-increased-community-engagement-in-dsd/>

Pharos Global Health Advisors & Global Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group. (2023). Evaluation of COVID-19 Response Mechanism (C19RM) 1.0. https://archive.theglobalfund.org/media/13198/archive_terg-c19rm-evaluation_report_en.pdf.

Plateforme R gionale Afrique francophone, Regional Platform for Communication and Coordination on HIV/AIDS, T. and M. for A. A., Regional Platform EECA, MENA Regional Platform, Regional Platform Latin America and Caribbean, & The Asia-Pacific Platform on Communities, R. and G. (2019). Strengthening Community Engagement in Global Fund Processes through the Community, Rights and Gender Strategic Initiative. https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/10396/crg_jointregionalplatform_case_study_en.pdf

Rajan, D., Rohrer-Herold, K., Koch, K., & Soucat, A. (2021). Voice, agency, empowerment -handbook on social participation for universal health coverage. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240027794>

REAL Community Engagement Realist Review. (2021). Taking relationships seriously - Building the evidence base for community engagement in health research.

https://media.tghn.org/medialibrary/2022/03/REAL_Briefing_for_Research_Inst_funders_02Feb.pdf

Representation Inclusion Sustainability and Equity CCMs and Global Fund Grants (RISE). (2024). Community Engagement in Global Fund Country Coordinating Mechanisms: Findings from the RISE Study.

Secretariat for the Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness and Response. (2021). Centering communities in pandemic preparedness and response -Background paper 10. <https://theindependentpanel.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Background-paper-10-community-involvement.pdf>

Spieldenner, A., French, M., Ray, V., Minalga, B., Sardina, C., Suttle, R., Castro-Bojorquez, M., Octavia, L., Sprague, L. (2022). The Meaningful Involvement of People with HIV/AIDS (MIPA): The Participatory Praxis Approach to Community Engagement on HIV Surveillance. Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship.

<https://jces.ua.edu/articles/10.54656/jces.v14i2.26> .

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, T. and M. (2016a). How we engage Stories of effective community engagement on AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/1547/publication_howweengage_report_en.pdf

The Global Forum on MSM & HIV (MSMGF). (2017). Independent Multi-country Review of Community Engagement in Global Fund Grant Making and Implementation Processes. <https://www.globalfundadvocatesnetwork.org/resource/independent-multi-country-review-of-community-engagement-in-grant-making-implementation-processes/>

The Global Fund. https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/10734/ccm_communityengagement_toolbox_en.pdf (2017). Investing to end epidemics. The Global Fund. https://archive.theglobalfund.org/media/2531/archive_global-fund-strategy-2017-2022_strategy_en.pdf

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, T. and M. (2023c). Community Engagement Toolbox: Resources from Partners of the Global Fund's Community Engagement Strategic Initiative.

The Global Fund. (2020). Country Coordinating Mechanism Evolution: Summary of the Pilot. https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/9441/ccm_evolutionpilot_presentation_en.pdf .

The Global Fund. The Global Fund Strategy 2023-2028. (2023). Fighting Pandemics and Building a Healthier and More Equitable World. The Global Fund. https://archive.theglobalfund.org/media/11612/strategy_globalfund2023-2028_narrative_en.pdf .

The Global Fund. (November 2022) Thematic Discussion "Communities at the Centre". 48th Board Meeting (GF/B48/9A). https://archive.theglobalfund.org/media/12480/archive_bm48-09a-thematic-discussion-communities-centre_report_en.pdf.

The Global Fund. (November 2023). Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) Handbook for the 2023-2028 Strategy. https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/12681/strategy_globalfund2023-2028-kpi_handbook_en.pdf

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, T. and M. (2023g). Thematic Evaluation on Community Engagement and Community-led Responses Secretariat-led with TERG oversight (CE-CLR) Global Fund Secretariat Management Response, Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG) Commentary, and Final Report.

https://archive.theglobalfund.org/media/13140/archive_terg-community-engagement-community-led-responses_report_en.pdf

The Global Fund/CRG. Final Evaluation of the GC6 Community Engagement Strategic Initiative (2024), prepared by Danielle Parsons

United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. (2024). Civic Space and Human Rights Defenders.

<https://www.ohchr.org/en/topic/civic-space-and-human-rights-defenders>

UNICEF. (2020). Minimum Quality Standards and Indicators for Community Engagement.

https://www.unicef.org/mena/media/8401/file/19218_MinimumQuality-Report_v07_RC_002.pdf.pdf

van Ryneveld, M., Whyte, E., & Brady, L. (2022). What Is COVID-19 Teaching Us About Community Health Systems? A Reflection From a Rapid Community-Led Mutual Aid Response in Cape Town, South Africa. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 11(Special Issue), 5–8. <https://doi.org/10.34172/IJHPM.2020.167>

Vincent, R., Adhikari, B., Duddy, C., Richardson, E., Wong, G., Lavery, J., & Molyneux, S. (2022). 'Working relationships' across difference - a realist review of community engagement with malaria research. *Wellcome Open Research*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.17192.1>

Wellcome Trust. (2011, June). Community Engagement - Under the Microscope. https://cms.wellcome.org/sites/default/files/wtvm054326_0.pdf

B. Contract Conditions

1. Contract Duration

The Global Fund expects the work to begin on 25 August once the contracting process is completed. The duration of the contract will be 25 March 2025. The contract may be renewed, subject to the internal rules and regulations of the Global Fund and the availability of resources, and upon agreement of the parties, up to a maximum duration of 3 months

2. Contract Type

The contract that is to be awarded as an outcome to this RFP is a one-off PO.

3. Other Conditions

I. Technical Direction

The selected Supplier will work under the overall guidance of the Global Fund Evaluation and Learning Office (ELO) with oversight from the Independent Evaluation Panel (IEP).

ii. Logistics

The selected Supplier will be expected to work remotely with potential travel to Geneva at the start of the contract at times to be determined if deemed necessary by the Global Fund and, after the submission of the first draft report. The Supplier's Technical Director will be expected to attend the Early Observation Workshop which is an important moment in the trajectory of the evaluation when the Supplier, Evaluation Function and Global Fund User Group can discuss the emerging findings from the evaluation. Additionally, the team of evaluators will be expected to travel to one country from Group A and one country from Group B to perform in-country data collection visits (see paragraph #32 of the ToR). The selected Supplier will be responsible for its own logistic support and arrangements under this contract.

Should confidential or highly confidential information, as defined by the Global Fund, be sought by the selected Supplier during the performance of the Services, the selected Supplier and/or its employees or agents accessing this information may be asked to agree to specific confidentiality undertakings with respect to this information, including the execution of a Non-Disclosure Agreement.

iii. Relationship and Responsibilities

- The Global Fund and the selected Supplier will each designate one person ("Contact Individual") who will be responsible for all liaisons between the Global Fund and the selected Supplier. It is understood that neither Contact Individual shall have the authority to amend the future Purchase Order. The Global Fund Contact Individual will be the Evaluation Manager, as described below.
- The Evaluation Manager will be named in the Purchase Order.
- The Evaluation Manager will be responsible for monitoring the Supplier's performance progress and may notify the Supplier in writing of deficiencies observed during performance of the contract, and direct appropriate action to effect correction. The Evaluation Manager may also record and report to the Global Fund Supply Operations Department any incidents of faulty or non-conforming work, delays and problems.
- However, the Evaluation Manager will not be empowered to award, agree to, or sign any contract (including Purchase Orders) or amendments thereto, or in any way to bind the Global Fund.
- The selected Supplier may be informed of measures to safeguard independence and address any related concerns. Such measures and associated processes do not supersede the terms of this engagement, notably with respect to Settlement of Disputes and the terms of Code of Conduct for Suppliers.
- Should confidential or highly confidential information, as defined by the Global Fund at its discretion, be sought by the selected Supplier during the performance of the Services, the Supplier and/or its employees or agents accessing this information may be asked to agree to specific confidentiality undertakings with respect to this information.

iv. Payment Conditions

Unless access to the selected Supplier or E-invoicing Portals has been granted, all invoices should be sent electronically as attachments to TGFBilling@theglobalfund.org.

The attachments should be sent preferably in Portable Document Format (PDF) and should contain only one invoice (with supporting documents if needed) per attachment.

All invoices must cite the Purchase Order Number. Such invoices shall detail services provided as well as daily rates and unit prices. Payment will be made to the selected Supplier by reimbursement upon submission of the invoices and acceptance by the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer or his designee.

The final invoice will be paid upon satisfactory completion of the work, submission of all deliverables and acceptance by the Chief Evaluation and Learning Officer or his designee.

The selected Supplier shall not invoice the Global Fund and the Global Fund shall not be held liable to pay the selected Supplier for work not performed, for work not satisfactorily performed, or for work not performed within the performance period of the contract. Any fees and/or expenses related to work performed before or after the performance period of the related contract shall be borne by the selected Supplier.

Table 1. Deliverables, delivery dates and payment schedule

Payment will be made to the selected Supplier upon the submission and acceptance of the agreed deliverables, following the payment schedule outlined below:

Deliverables	Expected Delivery Dates	Maximum Percentage Budget (including estimated expenses)
1. Evaluation workplan and timeline	10 working days after contract signing	15% of total approved budget
2. Submission of Inception Report	23 September 2024	25% of total approved budget
3. Submission of first draft report	03 December 2024	35% of total approved budget
4. Submission of final report	28 February 2025	20% of total approved budget
5. Evaluation Brief and Summative Slide Deck	31 March 2025	5%

For other direct costs (ODC), the selected Supplier will be reimbursed on actual expense basis in accordance with the Travel Guidelines for Contractors (available on the Global Fund website)

and as amended from time to time) and upon submission of an expenditure listing and receipts for all claimed ODC which are not covered through the per diem allocation.

v. Reports and Deliverables

All reports shall be submitted in English, in electronic form where feasible, and in hardcopy as necessary and/or required. To the extent the Global Fund requires draft/inception reports, the selected Supplier will submit them to the Global Fund Evaluation Manager, as defined in (iii) above, for review within the requested timeframe. The selected Supplier will submit all reports within the timeframe agreed between the Supplier and the Global Fund Contact in advance and in writing, upon receiving feedback or comments from the Global Fund.

In addition to any stated criteria in the Terms of Reference, all Deliverables are subject to review by the Global Fund for:

- legal and operational risks, conformance with information classification and confidentiality requirements, data protection issues, and other Contract terms; and
- consistency with the Global Fund Style Guide, definitions and concepts defined in governance documents, as well guidelines provided on Key Terms and Spelling. Abbreviations and Acronyms and geographic names and regions;

with a view to ensure Deliverables may be published or otherwise distributed or licensed by the Global Fund.

The selected Supplier will deliver to the ELO and IEP learning and communication tools at different intervals of the evaluation. The selected Supplier will endeavor to provide preliminary insights as available during the conduct of the evaluation.

As a minimal requirement, the selected Supplier will also lead and produce the following learning products for the evaluation:

- Summative slide deck on final findings: A slide deck on the final findings, conclusions and recommendations will be submitted to the ELO to be presented to the IEP and Secretariat.
- An evaluation brief, following ELO's standard template, to summarize the evaluation's findings, recommendations, management response and key points from the IEP commentary;
- A storyboard proposal, developed in consultation and under guidance from ELO that can be used toward the development of an e-learning course or a multimedia video. For this deliverable, the vendor may be asked to partake in an audiovisual recording.
- The organization, planning and delivery of learning and engagement workshop(s).
- A learning brief focusing on evaluation learning topics confirmed to be of interest by ELO and the User Group. These products will be further discussed between the ELO and the selected Supplier during the inception period.

The selected Supplier will also provide themes to facilitate "early" learning and adaptation by the Global Fund Secretariat and other key stakeholders in their processes, policies, and programs.

vi. Personal Data Processing

Subject matter and duration of the Processing

Personal Data may be Processed in order to allow the Supplier to provide the Services. The Processing will take place for the duration of the contract or the relevant Purchase Order, as applicable, unless otherwise directed by the Global Fund. Such processing shall comply with the Personal Data Processing provisions of the Terms and Conditions (Annex 2)

Nature and purpose of the Processing

Using primarily qualitative and some quantitative data collection methods, data will be collected from human subjects.

Personal data (name, title/ role, organization, implementer type and location of residence) may be collected to generate data that allows for a configurational evaluation design and analytical approach. This data shall be pseudo-anonymized as part of the Supplier's processing of this data. Individuals will be assigned a unique ID number to enable pseudo-anonymization when analyzing and transferring data between the Supplier and The Global Fund.

Data will be analyzed as per related Inception Report detailed plan. Pseudo-anonymized data will be disseminated through project reports, publication, evaluation and learning products, learning events, as well as presentations at forums and workshops.

Categories of Data Subjects

The Personal Data Processed relates to the following categories of Subjects: Civil Society Organization representatives; members of community organizations; key informants (country-level).

Types of Personal Data

The Personal Data Processed will be consistent with the Services. If Sensitive Personal Data needs to be Processed additional agreements will be entered into between the Global Fund and the Supplier.

Examples of types of personal data to be collected under the contract shall include:

- A. Names
- B. Respondent unique identifier
- C. Gender
- D. Country and city of residence
- E. Position Title
- F. Organization
- G. Organization type (i.e. Civil Society Organization)

SECTION 2

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

A. Proposal Requirements

The proposal submitted by the Bidder should be in English, should be concisely presented and structured, and should explain in detail the Bidder's availability, ability, capacity and resources to provide the requested services. Proposals that are incomplete or not responsive to these criteria may not be considered in the review process.

Paragraph #32 of the ToR explained the case (=country) selection approach. Cases and in-depth in-country analysis (country visits) will be part of the evaluation process. Cases are organized into two groups (A and B). These groups are based on a process of analysis using internal monitoring data and assessment information as well as consultation with Global Fund departments with expertise in CE and with a country-facing role. Case selection will be confirmed at the start of the inception phase and will be underpinned by a set of criteria that will be shared with the Supplier.

Country insights and information will mostly be collected virtually/remotely. Four to six countries per group will be selected at the start of the inception phase, of which at least one country in each group will be subject to in-depth in-country analysis. Both technical and cost proposals should reflect this. Costs for two in-country data collection visits (14 calendar days, including travel days per country) should be calculated applying average costs and with a strong technical rationale.

Cost proposal and technical proposal must be submitted separately, as two separate documents:

a. Technical Proposal

The Bidder is required to submit a proposal not exceeding 15 pages describing:

- a) Understanding of the requirements of the evaluation (2 pages maximum)
- b) A draft ToC (presented in narrative and visual form) capturing the key elements, and contributory/configurational relationships between interventions and factors (2 pages maximum)
- c) Evaluation approach and methods (5 pages maximum)
- d) Quality assurance plan (1 page maximum)
- e) A summary of past experience and capabilities and expertise of the team relevant for this evaluation (2 pages maximum)
- f) Description of team members, their respective roles in the evaluation, and level of effort (in days) allocated to each one of them. For transparency purposes please indicate any type of previous experience and engagement in relation to the Global Fund. Provide CV of key personnel (2 pages maximum)
- g) References for similar contracts: contact details of minimum 3 former clients/referees (1 page maximum)

The Global Fund reserves the right to directly contact any institutions or persons listed in your historical performance document in order to gain a better understanding of the supplier's past track record in delivering similar services to former clients and validate the experience and credential claims by key personnel. By responding to the RFP, the Bidder grants, and warrants it is authorized to grant such rights by key personnel, the Global Fund the right to seek confirmation of this information directly from the respective individuals and academic institutions.

The Global Fund considers the composition of the team, and the respective levels of efforts for each member to be included in a contract with a successful bidder to be a material element of such contract. The contract will stipulate that, should the successful bidder request to change remove or replace, or modify the level of effort of, a team member, the Global Fund shall have the right at its discretion to reduce the corresponding daily rates or to terminate the contract without any indemnity or compensation due to the successful bidder.

b. Cost Proposal:

The Microsoft Excel file entitled "Cost Proposal" provided separately should be fully completed as part of your Cost proposal.

Cost proposals must be submitted in USD. **The maximum budget envelope for this evaluation is USD 350,000.** Cost proposals must include administration costs (if any) and estimated travel and accommodation costs (if any)²⁴ ; the total should reflect the total cost of delivery of the Project.

B. Evaluation Criteria

1. The evaluation will be divided into technical (80%) and cost (20%) factors. These factors will be evaluated relative to each other as described herein.
2. An evaluation panel, the Tender Evaluation Committee (TEC), will assess the extent to which proposals submitted in response to this RFP meet the technical criteria below.
3. Technical Evaluation criteria with its relative weightage to each other is as follows:

Category	Weighting = 80
<p>a. Technical Approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of the objectives and scope of work: The extent to which the proposal demonstrates responsiveness to the nature and scope of the work being undertaken and the environment in which the work must be performed. Robust, clear, appropriate, and coherent evaluation framework. • Approach and tools: The appropriateness and relevance of the proposed evaluation approach, data collection and analytical and methods and approaches. • Inclusive: The methods and approach that are proposed ensure that communities and community organizations that are most affected by the three diseases are engaged in a participatory and meaningful fashion. The engagement approach associated with the evaluation process ensures that community groups and civil society organizations contribute to the design, analysis, interpretation and generation of evaluation findings. • Innovative suggestions: The extent to which the applicant proposes innovative methodologies or any other elements of the work. • Learning and influence: the approach will clearly communicate how evaluation products and processes will engage key target audiences and how the process of learning, utilization and influencing key stakeholders will operate. • Feasible (detailed) workplan with timeline. 	<p>40</p>
<p>b. Past experience and capabilities</p> <p><u>Team Leader:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 15 years of demonstrated experience in implementing and evaluating strategies, programs and interventions. Has a sound knowledge and understanding of Community Engagement approaches and interventions in countries where Global Fund works. • Expertise in conducting complex, mixed-methods evaluations with a case-based and configurational focus. • Advanced university degree or comparable training in epidemiology, research methods, public health, health policy and management or a related area. • Professional proficiency in English. Professional proficiency in French is an added advantage. • Project management expertise to efficiently manage the evaluation including scope, budget, timely deliverables, and quality assurance. 	<p>30</p>

<p><u>Evaluators (cumulatively):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 15 years' cumulative experience working on Community Engagement -related approaches and programs. • At least 15 years; cumulative experience in conducting evaluations applying case-based and configurational approaches. • Advanced knowledge, understanding and experience with community engagement approaches of global financing institutions. • In-country experience of public health programs (design and /or evaluation) and multi-stakeholder country processes • Demonstrable experience of undertaking evaluations that incorporate a gender-lens and consideration in the design and approach. • Demonstrable record of working in a participatory manner with communities most affected by the three diseases. • Documented evidence of conducting evaluations related to Community Engagement approaches and programs. • Specialist skills and experience in structured synthesis of information from a broad range of source materials, secondary data and country-level studies. • Expertise in developing qualitative and quantitative methodologies to undertake evaluations underpinned by a configurational approach. • Expertise in political analysis that provides scope to fully articulate the political dynamics and contextual factors that underpin Community Engagement processes at a country and sub-national level. • In-depth knowledge of or familiarity through previous work with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (or a similar organization). • Advanced university degree or comparable training in epidemiology, research methods, public health, health policy and management or a related area. • Cumulative professional proficiency in English and French. 	
<p>c. Proposed Team Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate allocation of roles and time commitment across the team. • Diversity in the team and country representation, considering factors such as gender, cultural background, and multidisciplinary expertise. • One or more of the Evaluation Team personally identify with the communities most affected by the three diseases. • The team has an appropriate gender-balance. • The team has adequate administrative support to the evaluation to ensure that the evaluation operates smoothly and efficiently. 	<p>10</p>

The score assigned to each proposal will be of guidance in determining which proposal would provide the greatest value to the Global Fund. However, the Global Fund reserves the right not to employ raw scores in determining best value where it considers, in its sole discretion, that this would not be appropriate.

4. A two-stage procedure will be utilized in evaluating the proposals, with evaluation of the technical submission being completed prior to any cost proposal being considered; and cost evaluation will only be undertaken for technical submissions that obtain a minimum of **56 points out of 100**. A submission which fails to achieve the minimum technical threshold may not be considered further. Cost proposals will be evaluated in terms of best value to the Global Fund. For technically acceptable proposals, the assessment of best value for money will consider two components: the lowest average daily rate (total professional fee budget divided by Level of Effort in days) and the lowest cost proposal.
5. To assist in the examination, evaluation and comparison of proposals, the evaluation panel may, at its discretion, ask Bidders for a clarification of their proposals, or organize interviews, further discussions or presentations.
6. The Global Fund conducts integrity due diligence on its suppliers as a matter of course, including screening against international watchlists and adverse media databases. By responding to this RFP, the Bidder acknowledges that risk-based due diligence measures, including personal data processing, where relevant, form a part of the Global Fund supplier selection and management. Integrity issues identified through due diligence may be raised during selection or subsequently and will normally be managed by requesting departments with support of Ethics Office, e.g. through mitigation measures. Global Fund may not retain suppliers that have been sanctioned by the UN, international financial institutions and major donors. A Bidder's integrity profile (beyond sanctions) may additionally be included as an explicit evaluation criterion, in which case it is specified above.
7. The Global Fund may allow for observers to the proposal's evaluations process by the TEC, notably to enable the oversight role of the Independent Evaluation Panel.

SECTION 3 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

1. The Global Fund may award one or more contracts on the basis of the submitted proposals, generally without further submissions, clarifications, discussions or negotiations. Therefore, each proposal submitted by the Bidder within the RFP Closing Date and Time should already contain the Bidder's best technical and commercial terms.
2. Unless otherwise indicated, all proposals must be denominated in US Dollars and submitted in English, in their original version in PDF. In addition to the original version of the technical and costs proposals, the Global Fund may request Bidders to submit a duplicate copy in Microsoft Word, Microsoft Power Point, or Microsoft Excel, as the case may be. In case of a conflict between the original version and the duplicate copy, the original version shall govern.
3. The Certificate of Conformance (Annex 1) must be signed by an authorized representative of the Bidder and returned in a PDF format/enclosed to the Proposal.
4. Proposal submissions and all communication should be sent through the TGF Sourcing Application.
 - a) Bidders are required to submit their proposals in the following URL for Sourcing Application: <https://access.theglobalfund.org/>.
 - b) Please use the Guidance Notes – “Responding to an RFP/RFQ/RFI in the TGF Sourcing Application, SUPPLIER INSTRUCTIONS” available at <https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/business-opportunities>.
 - c) Bidders should have a Supplier ID in TGF Sourcing Application to be able to participate in the RFP.
 - d) In case a Bidder does not have a Supplier ID in TGF Sourcing Application, it should send an email at least 48 hours before the RFP Closing Time to **manon.vanrijswijk@theglobalfund.org** with the following title in the subject: *“TGF-24-40 - Request for login user ID creation in TGF Sourcing / iSupplier portal – “Bidder’s organization name”* and the following details: Bidder full name: <organization name>
Contact person name: <Last Name, First Name>
Title: <Mr./ Mrs./ Ms./ Dr.>
Email: <email id>
Phone: <phone>
Address: <Address line 1; Address line 2; Address line 3; City; Postal code; Country>

e) Bidders shall submit their proposals in two separate folders, one containing the cost proposal and one containing the technical proposal.

The attachments must be labelled as follows:

- TGF-24-40 –Organization name – technical proposal
- TGF-24-40 –Organization name – cost proposal

f) All communications with regard to this RFP, including clarification questions, shall be in writing and sent through the TGF Sourcing Application using the online discussion. Should the Global Fund deem it necessary to revise the RFP as a result of a clarification, it shall do so as an amendment to the RFP available on the Global Fund's website.

g) Any communication between a Bidder and the Global Fund regarding this RFP, which is not through the designated channel (<https://access.theglobalfund.org/>), may invalidate such Bidder's proposal to this RFP.

5. The Sourcing application will automatically close this RFP at the exact Closing Time stated above, and past this time the uploading of documents (even partially uploaded) will no longer be possible. It is therefore strongly advised that the uploading of submissions be fully finalized at least 30 minutes before the RFP's Closing Time as there are always risks of having network, internet or uploading issues. For the avoidance of doubt, the Closing Time stated in the RFP will always be Geneva, Switzerland, time. This may be CET or CEST, depending on the time of year. For clarification on the time in different time zones please check on www.timeanddate.com.
6. After the RFP Closing Time, no further additions to, or modifications on submitted proposals shall be allowed unless it is proven to be a *bona fide* typographical error or omission. Such additions or modifications may only be effected with prior written approval from the Global Fund.
7. All Bidders must complete, sign and return the Certificate of Conformance (Annex 1) to confirm their compliance with the requirements of the RFP, as well as their acceptance of the Global Fund's Terms and Conditions of Purchase of Services (see link provided in Section 5). Reservations or requests for amendments to the Global Fund's Terms and Conditions of Purchase of Services must be submitted by Bidders as part of their proposal and may be considered by the Global Fund. These reservations or requests for amendment will be taken into account in the overall evaluation. The Global Fund has no obligation to agree to these reservations or requests for amendment.
8. At a Bidder's request, the Global Fund and the Bidder will sign a Confidentiality Agreement. In such case, the Bidder acknowledges and agrees that such Confidentiality Agreement will be based on the Global Fund Confidentiality Agreement template.

9. Full proposals or partial proposals received after the RFP Closing Date and Time indicated on the TGF Sourcing Application shall be declared late and may be rejected.
10. Proposals should be valid for a period of 90 calendar days from the RFP Closing Date.

SECTION 4 ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA FOR INCEPTION REPORT

The Global Fund will only pay the Supplier for services which have fulfilled the minimum acceptance criteria defined for each Deliverable during the Inception Phase. Acceptance criteria will be defined by the Global Fund, following consultation with Supplier. Acceptance criteria will define a minimum set of quality standards and requirements regarding both substance and form for the Deliverables.

For acceptance criteria on the first deliverable, please see the Inception Report below:

List of Content	Sub-section	Expected Content	Page length (max)
0. Executive Summary		<i>Summary of background, contract objectives/questions, problem, methodological approach, and timeline (key milestones)</i>	2
1. Introduction		<i>Brief description of contract purpose and implementation modality (commissioning agency, vendor)</i>	0.5
2. Background & Context		<i>Brief description of relevant context (i.e. evidence, concepts and frameworks pertaining to Community Engagement in the Global Fund. This section should make reference to Community Engagement relevant Board decisions and Global Fund existing programs, Strategic Initiatives and the Grant Life Cycle process.</i>	3-5
3. Project Approach	<i>Objectives and Evaluation Questions</i>	<i>Summary of evaluation objectives and Key Evaluation Questions including proposed changes or reinterpretations – if any - and justifications for doing so.</i>	2-3
	<i>Theory of Change (TOC)</i>	<i>Explain relevance and role of ToC in activity's design, data collection and analysis, spanning inputs, outputs (program activities and outputs), outcomes (short, mid-term and long-term), as well as assumptions and external factors. A ToC in visual and narrative form is expected as a complementary deliverable.</i>	2
	<i>Workstreams</i>	<i>Detailed description of each proposed workstream under the contract activity, including underlying assumptions and program theories or contribution claims (in reference to ToC), data sources and key stakeholders/respondents.</i>	15

	<i>Methodology</i>	<p>Description and justification of overall methodological approach (e.g., theory-based, configurational, Realist); highlighting innovative approaches, where applicable.</p> <p>Methodology must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed areas of inquiry for the current project, per component. 	5
	<i>Methods and tools</i>	<p>Detailed description of proposed data collection and analytical methods and tools, their sequencing and complementarity, and how data will be triangulated and consolidated to arrive at conclusions.</p> <p>Other key aspects to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlight innovative approaches, How independence and impartiality is ensured during data collection. 	20
	<i>Engagement and Communication</i>	<p>Description of engagement approach and types for inclusive consultations thereby maximizing business opportunities for stakeholder and Secretariat; commitment to ensure independence and impartiality of the process and timely communication with Department in case of actual or perceived risks to independence and impartiality; description of proposed communication products.</p>	2
4. Evaluation Framework		<p>Important part of the Inception Report integrating Key Evaluation Questions, workstreams, methods & tools, measures or indicators (e.g, KPI), and adding data sources and respondents (stakeholders, interviewees) for a comprehensive overview of the contract design.</p> <p>This section should also include an evaluation framework, indicating how the project will answer the key questions through all sources of data, data collection methods and analytical approaches. The following details should be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key Evaluation Questions Proposed method(s) Data source(s) Data collection instruments and supporting details for each of these. Data analyses to be carried out for these. Expected robustness of evidence, and Risks/ limitations <p>It is expected that the Evaluation Framework clearly associates methods and tools with proposed workstreams.</p>	5
5. Evaluation Workplan	<i>Timeline and Deliverables</i>	<p>Comprehensive workplan indicating activities and deliverable as well as timing and milestones; a Gantt Chart should be used to visualize the workplan.</p>	10

		<i>This section should include: a description of the phases of work, and a timeframe for all activities.</i>	
	<i>Coordination with Relevant focal point</i>	<i>Description of proposed coordination mechanism with the relevant focal point, e.g., progress updates etc.</i>	2
	<i>Quality Assurance</i>	<i>Description of the quality assurance mechanism applied for deliverables and more specifically for ensuring data quality, safe data storage and confidentiality of data collection and the protection of interviewees (esp. vulnerable populations)</i>	2
	<i>Limitations and Risks</i>	<i>Description and assessment of the potential limitations and risks and proposed mitigation measures</i>	4
	<i>Ethical considerations</i>	<i>Address and describe all ethical considerations for which the team will be accountable, including confidentiality, anonymity, protection of personal data, as well as other data and information regulations.</i>	.5
Annexes to Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Terms of Reference</i> • <i>Revisions to the Key Evaluation Questions questions (if applicable)</i> • <i>Role and contribution of evaluation team members</i> • <i>Stakeholder mapping</i> • <i>Case selection and country visit selection</i> • <i>Data collection tools, e.g., questionnaires (if available)</i> • <i>List of datasets</i> • <i>List of background documents</i> • <i>Proposed outline of Final Report</i> • <i>Quality assurance approach</i> 		<i>open</i>

During the contract phase, acceptance criteria will be developed and shared with the Supplier that will capture the key expectations of the draft and final report. Additionally, the acceptance criteria for the draft and final report, together with the acceptance criteria for the inception report, will be inserted in the contract.

SECTION 5 LEGAL MATTERS

1. This RFP is in line with and subject to the following documents:

- a. The Global Fund's **Procurement Policy (2008, as amended from time to time)** and the **Procurement Regulations (2020, as amended from time to time)**, which may be found at <https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/business-opportunities/>.
- b. The **Code of Conduct for Suppliers (2021, as amended from time to time)**, which may be found at: https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3275/corporate_codeofconductforsuppliers_policy_en.pdf
- c. The **Sanctions Panel Procedures Relating to the Code of Conduct for Suppliers (2020, as amended from time to time)**, which may be found at https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/6015/corporate_sanctionsprocedures_policy_en.pdf <http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/documents/governance/>;
- d. The **Global Policy on Conflict of Interest (2020, as amended from time to time)**, which may be found at https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/6016/core_ethicsandconflictinterest_policy_en.pdf; and
- e. The **Global Fund Terms and Conditions for the Purchase of Goods and Services (May 01, 2023, as amended from time to time)**, which will also be an integral part of any contract resulting from this solicitation, and which may be found at https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3269/corporate_globalfundservices_termsconditions_en.pdf (also attached to the TGF Sourcing Platform).

2. Personal data (i.e. any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person) will be treated in compliance with Global Fund's policies, the Terms and Conditions of Purchase of Goods and Services and the Privacy Statement for the Global Fund Procurement Process (as amended from time to time) https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3271/corporate_procurement_privacy_en.pdf.

3. By submitting a proposal for this RFP, including the Certificate of Conformance contained in Annex 1, the Bidder warrants that it has all the necessary power and legal capacity to submit a proposal and eventually enter into a Contract. The Bidder also agrees to the terms and conditions of all documents referred to herein and to the following terms:

- a. The Global Fund makes no offer of a contract by posting this RFP or evaluating any proposals submitted in response to it, and there is no legal agreement or relationship, whether in contract (express, implied or collateral) or tort, created by this RFP process between the Global Fund and any bidder, with the sole exception of the provisions of this Section 5. This RFP in no way obligates the Global Fund to award a contract.
- b. The Global Fund may, at its discretion, withdraw or cancel this RFP process and/or its sourcing strategy, amend this RFP and any of its attachments (including the Statement of Work or Terms of Reference), or change the RFP Closing Date and RFP Closing Time, at any time and for any reason, without liability or penalty to any party, by issuing an amendment to this RFP. All Amendments to this RFP will be posted on the Global Fund website at <https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/business-opportunities>. It is the Bidder's responsibility to consult the Global Fund's website to ensure that it is aware of amendments to, and additional information for, this RFP.
- c. If Bidders submit several or amended proposals, the latest proposal received before the RFP Closing Time will be considered for the evaluation. Bidders will have to inform the Global Fund of their intention to withdraw from the process before the RFP Closing Time.
- d. The Global Fund may invite Bidders to make oral presentations in English or to participate in a pre-proposal conference. The date, time and place of such presentation or pre-proposal conference will be formally communicated by the Global Fund to all Bidders or pre-qualified Bidders, as relevant. Any statement made during these meetings shall not in any way amend or modify the RFP, unless it is issued as an amendment to the RFP.
- e. The Bidder shall bear all costs associated with the preparation and submission of its proposal, and the Global Fund shall not be responsible or liable for those costs, whether direct or indirect, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the RFP, nor if the RFP is cancelled, altered or postponed for any reason. This includes, but is not limited to, any and all costs incurred for the pre-proposal conferences, clarifications, oral presentations, site visits, visits to the Global Fund, functional demonstrations, and subsequent meetings and negotiations.
- f. The Global Fund will not reveal or discuss with any Bidder how a proposal was assessed or provide any other information relative to the selection process.
- g. Bidders whose proposals are not selected will be notified in writing of this fact and shall have no claim whatsoever against the Global Fund for any kind of compensation.
- h. Any attempt by a Bidder to influence the Global Fund in the examination, evaluation and comparison of proposals, or the recommendation of contract award, or to obtain information thereof through unofficial means, may result in the rejection of its proposal, without prejudice to other rights available to the Global Fund.
- i. At any time prior to contracting, the Global Fund reserves the right to: (a) award a contract to the Bidder whose proposal has been determined to be the best evaluated proposal that represents value for money to the Global Fund; (b) reject any or all proposals or price submissions; (c) accept for award a proposal or price submission

other than the lowest cost proposal or price submission; (d) accept more than one proposal or price submission; (e) accept alternate proposals or price submissions; (f) accept part of a proposal or price submission; (g) waive informalities and minor irregularities in proposals or price submissions received; or (h) withdraw an award in case of changed circumstances.

- j. There are no other arrangements or understandings between any Bidder and the Global Fund with respect to this RFP other than the text contained herein.
- k. Through its participation to the RFP process, the Bidder acknowledges and warrants that it complies with internationally recognized standards for human rights, labor, the environment, anti-money laundering and anti-corruption. The Bidder also acknowledges and warrants that they will neither use or engage in, nor allow their employees or other persons engaged by them to use or engage in sexual exploitation and abuse, and sexual harassment.
- l. The investigative, decision-making, and sanctions policies and processes of the Global Fund, including the activities of its Inspector General, the Global Fund's Code of Conduct for Suppliers, and consideration of any findings of fraud or abuse by the Global Fund Sanctions Panel, should the Global Fund in its sole discretion choose to refer the matter to the Sanctions Panel, shall apply to this RFP and any resulting contract, and these processes may include, without limitation, public disclosure at the Global Fund's full discretion of any findings and/or decisions.
- m. The Bidder acknowledges that the Global Fund has full discretion to investigate any potential conflict of interest, fraud or abuse, whether occurring in the past, present or future, associated with the RFP or any resulting contract, and the Global Fund at its full discretion may publish the findings of such investigations; through participation in this RFP process, the Bidder acknowledges these processes and shall not challenge in any setting the investigation by the Global Fund of potential fraud or abuse associated with this RFP or any resulting contract, the dissemination of investigation findings and the responses undertaken by the Global Fund to findings of fraud or abuse, in all cases whether occurring in the past, present or future.
- n. Through its participation in the RFP process, the Bidder acknowledges and confirms that the Global Fund has the right to require that a provision be included in its contracts, requiring suppliers, Suppliers, contractors and/or consultants to permit the Global Fund or its representative to inspect their accounts, records and other documents relating to the proposal submission and the contract, and to audit them or have them audited by auditors appointed by the Global Fund.
- o. The Bidder acknowledges and agrees that pursuant to the Global Fund policies and procurement procedures, the Global Fund may publish certain information consistent with its public status and commitment to transparency. As such, should the Bidder be awarded a contract, the Bidder acknowledges and agrees that the Global Fund may notably publish, or distribute or license:

- i. certain information relating to procurement contract awards, including without limitation the Bidder's name, as disclosed on its website;
 - ii. deliverables, adaptations and derivative work thereof on its website, in whole or in part, as well as commentaries, and responses to, the services by the Global Fund. For the avoidance of the doubt, such publication, distribution or license may be through the Global Fund website or through other means, and subject to the applicable terms and conditions at the discretion of the Global Fund;
 - iii. any trademarks included at the discretion of the Bidder in the final report, subject to the terms of section 14.3 of the Terms and Conditions (Annex 2); and
 - iv. any personal information of the Bidder's employees or agents included at the discretion of the Bidder in the final report. The final report may not contain personal information about any other individual(s).
- p. Any dispute, controversy, claim, or issue arising out of this RFP or surrounding this process, shall be finally settled by arbitration conducted in accordance with the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Arbitration Rules in force at the time of the commencement of the arbitration. The appointing authority shall be the Secretary-General of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The case shall be administered by the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. There shall be one arbitrator. The place of arbitration shall be Geneva, Switzerland. The language to be used in the arbitral proceedings shall be English. All awards of the arbitral tribunal shall be final and binding upon the Parties.
- q. Nothing contained in this RFP may be construed as a waiver, express or implied, of the privileges and immunities accorded to the Global Fund, whether as of the date of this RFP or thereafter.

TGF-24-40
ANNEX 1
CERTIFICATE OF CONFORMANCE

Bidders are required to return, as part of their proposal, a version of this Certificate in PDF format **completed** and **signed** by an Officer of their organization with the authority to undertake contractual obligations on behalf of the organization.

As a duly authorized Officer of the organization listed below (the “Organization”), I confirm, acknowledge, and agree, on behalf of the Organization, that:

1. To my knowledge, there are no actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest, and no ethical, contractual or legal issues preventing the Organization from submitting the Organization’s proposal to RFP TGF-24-40 and, if awarded a contract, providing the services per the terms submitted in the proposal at a future date.
2. The Organization has obtained the consent of all experts mentioned in the proposal to be included in the proposal and there are no actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest, or other reservations or limitations, with respect to the provision of the services by these experts.
3. The Organization will comply with: (i) the Global Fund’s [Code of Conduct for Suppliers \(as amended from time to time\)](#), and (ii) all the terms contained or referred to in the RFP, including Section 5: Legal Matters.
4. The Organization complies with internationally recognized standards for human rights, labor, the environment, anti-money laundering and anti-corruption.
5. The Organization has read the Privacy Statement for the Global Fund Procurement Process (https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/3271/corporate_procurement_privacy_en.pdf) and certify to have the right to provide personal data to the Global Fund.
6. The Organization is financially sound and is not subject to any activity, either initiated by itself or by any other organization (including, but not limited to, a change of ownership), that may materially affect its ability to provide accurate information about the services included in its RFP submission.
7. The services proposed in the proposal have been priced according to the technical specifications as defined in the RFP.
8. Unless otherwise specified, the prices quoted shall remain fixed for the entire duration of the awarded contract.

9. By submitting its proposal, the Organization unconditionally accepts the Global Fund's Terms and Conditions for the Purchase of Goods and Services (the "Terms and Conditions"), attached as Annex 2 to the present RFP, unless otherwise provided herein.

10. The Organization's proposal remains valid for 90 calendar days from the RFP Closing Date.

If your Organization has any reservations, clarifications or other descriptive information in connection with this Certificate, including with any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest; or reservations, clarifications or amendment requests with regard to the Terms and Conditions (Annex 2), you may provide that information in the box below, or, as necessary, on additional pages, and submit that supplemental information as part of the signed version of this Certificate. Only amendments to the Terms and Conditions submitted as part of the Organization's proposal may be considered by the Global Fund. The reservations or amendment requests may be taken into account in the overall evaluation of the Organization's proposal. The Global Fund has no obligation to agree to these reservations or amendment requests. You should note that the following provisions of the Terms and Conditions reflect the status of the Global Fund as an international organization and Global Fund's suppliers are expected to agree to these provisions: Status, Privileges and Immunities of the Global Fund; Records and Audit; Settlement of Disputes; and compliance with the Global Fund's Code of Conduct for Suppliers.

Name of the Organization _____	
Signature of Official / Authorized Signatory _____	
Name	_____
Title	_____
Date	_____

Comments (if any)

ANNEX 2
THE GLOBAL FUND TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF PURCHASE OF SERVICES
01 MAY 2023

[Attached separately]