Justification for Survey Firm Selection

IDinsight Process

IDinsight sent Terms of Reference (TORs) to four Nigerian survey firms on Monday, May 22nd for pre-RCT piloting and scoping field activities. We next sent TORs for the full cluster RCT on Wednesday, May 24th. We received pre-RCT proposals Friday, May 26th and full RCT proposals Wednesday, June 7th.

On Wednesday, June 7th, two IDinsight staff members with African survey firm experience formally graded the proposals, and we decided to shortlist Hanovia and Binomial Optimums Limited. Given the consistent scoring and that there were two clear stand-out proposals, we did not ask a third team member to grade the proposals. We next held calls with each firm to clarify outstanding questions from their estimates and negotiate their costs. We also spent time Thursday checking their references. This follow-up work led us to decide to move forward with contract negotiations with Hanovia.

Hanovia's budget for the pre-RCT work is higher than expected which will require a $16,281 budget increase. A major reason for this increase in cost is Hanovia's desire to mirror the larger field team structure of the main survey as closely as possible which we believe is advantageous. Our initial budget scope had planned for a smaller team.

Rubric for Evaluating Proposals

Evaluation Criteria	Inadequate 3-4	Satisfactory to Good 5-6-7	Excellent 8-10
Large-scale survey experience	Absence of any experience in conducting large surveys (with 6000 HH)	Conducted at least 2 large surveys	Considerable (5-6) experience in conducting large surveys
Data collection tools	Always used paper-based tools; no or little experience in electronic data collection tools	At least 1-2 large survey experience in using electronic data collection tools	Extensive experience in using electronic data collection tools (at least 3-4 projects)
Staff experience	Fairly new/freshly appointed staff or fairly new organization	Experienced staff having conducted at least 1-2 RCTs	Highly experienced staff having conducted 5-6 RCTs; established organization
Understanding of implementation workplan	Limited experience in understanding the activities entailed for the pilot and RCT	Good understanding of activities entailed with details provided	Excellent understanding of activities entailed with details provided and buffers kept in mind
Technical Rigor	Limited or no technical rigor (quality checks)	Satisfactory technical rigor (quality checks)	A good number of quality checks budgeted
Cost	Quotation matches or is above the budget Pilot - ($33,000) Full RCT – ($330,000)	Quotation is 10% below the budget	Quotation is 20% below the budget

Proposal Scoring *(average scores provided in bold)*

Evaluation Criteria	Hanovia	Binomial Optimus Limited	eHealth Africa	AFRINET NSTOP
Large-scale survey experience	**8.5:** Several large surveys and a number of smaller ones including RCTs and Coverage Surveys	**6:** Several medium sized recent survey projects and a few larger ones, but no coverage surveys.	**4.5:** Large-scale data experience, but limited survey research experience.	**6:** Several large surveys including an RI coverage survey, but no impact evaluations
Data collection tools	**10:** Significant (5yr) experience with electronic data collection and ODK, including tracking enumerator movements.	**9:** Have used electronic data collection for all previous projects, but BOL has had far fewer projects than Hanovia.	**5.5:** Extensive experience in using custom electronic data collection tools, but not oriented to survey work.	**3:** No reference to experience with electronic data collection tools in proposal aside from GPS tracking
Staff experience	**8.5:** Highly experienced staff having conducted a number of RCTs; established organization	**7:** Proposed project leader has led 4 RCTs. In general good experience, but not particularly deep; younger organization.	**4:** Staff have experience with health systems strengthening and field epidemiology, but not impact evaluation.	**4:** Proposed staff have extensive data collection experience, but no experience with large scale impact evaluations.
Understand workplan	**7.5:** Good understanding of what needs to be done, but potentially too many preparation days relative to data collection days.	**7.5:** Good understanding of the design. Initial submission had an error in staffing calculations but corrected later.	**7:** Good understanding of the design. Timeline doesn't fully align with TOR, but may be due to lack of clarity in TOR	**4.5:** Poor understanding of workplan. Proposing a different sampling method on a different sample than specified in TOR.
Technical Rigor (Pre-RCT)	**7.5:** Strong emphasis on back-checks and management	**4:** No discussion of data quality checks, otherwise strong.	**3:** No discussion of data quality checks, otherwise reasonable	**3:** Only GPS based data quality checks, otherwise limited detail.
Technical Rigor (RCT)	**8:** Strong emphasis on back-checks and management	**7:** Adequate plan for back-checks and data quality	**5:** Brief discussion of back-checks echoing TOR	**4:** Inadequate plan for back-checks and data quality
RCT Cost	**7:** $276,851	**8:** $232,284	**2:** $542,859	**2:** $381,449

Pre-RCT Cost	3: $38,611	7: $27,776	6: $29,776	10: $12,713
Total Score	60	55.5	37	35.5