# RFP: Answers to Questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project:** | **Lebanon Citizen Perception Survey (CPS) – Wave 2** |
| **Answers to Questions:** | July 7, 2020 17.00 EDT |

**Thank you for all who submitted questions for this opportunity. We received 20 questions from 3 potential bidders. Answers to all questions received are provided below, distributed to all potential bidders, without reference to the firm that posed the question. A revised RFP dated 07 July 2020 has also been posted.**

**Answers to Questions**

1. The page limitation for the technical approach is set at 5 pages. However, the rationale behind each of the two alternative methods needs to be detailed along with the risks associated with each suggested methodology. As such, we kindly ask to increase the page limitation for this section to 7-8 pages.
   1. We can increase pages to 7 for technical approach. See revision on p. 9 RFP.
2. Practicing administration of the tool in a sample of 2 hhs/enumerator, not included in the wave 1 CPS sample: Are those hhs to be selected randomly from the larger sample of the 6,667 households and then excluded from the actual remaining sample?
   1. Those households should be selected by another method, e.g. random digit dialing or any other proposed method, and should not come from the pilot sample. Bidder should specify how they plan to do this.
3. Pre-testing the questionnaire with a sample of 20 hhs not part of the wave 1 CPS sample: Would SI assign the hhs or the areas from which the hhs to be interviewed at this stage, or would it be a random selection from the 6,627 database of valid phone numbers (excluding the practice interviews)?  Are those hhs to be also excluded from the actual remaining sample?
   1. Same as answer to Q2, pre-test households should not be from the pilot sample.
4. Would SI assign the 10% pilot interviews (667 interviews), or would the consulting firm make a random selection proportionally from each Caza?
   1. SI will draw the random sample and deliver to the firm.
5. Once the practice interviews (estimated at 60 interviews), 20 pretest interviews and the 667 pilot interviews are conducted, and if SI decides to proceed with the phone interviews from the baseline (Wave 1) survey, then we would be left with around 5,880 interviews to be conducted in wave 2. As such, the main survey (wave 2) would include around 5,880 phone interviews. Correct?
   1. No, see answers to Q2 and Q3. Practice interviews and pre-test interviews are not to come from the Wave 1 sample so as not to decrease the sample available for the panel.
6. As per each phone survey, we would definitely face refusals, non-response, changed mobile numbers etc… Is there a minimum number of filled in (complete) questionnaires that SI would accept?
   1. This depends partly on the design that is pursued. If a purely random sample was taken, for example, a final sample of 384 per governate could be sufficient, whereas with any clustering, this number would increase based on the assumed design effect. We have added some guidance in the revised RFP (see p. 5) to enable comparability between proposals.
7. Regarding the 2 alternatives to be proposed by the consulting firm, could any of them include a field survey, i.e. face to face interviews, or is SI limiting the choice to only phone interviews?
   1. We anticipated that only phone-based surveys would be possible given the COVID-19 situation. We will allow face to face options to be proposed, but these must be accompanied by adequate explanation of how the safety of field teams and respondents will be ensured, what measures will be taken for ongoing monitoring of the health situation, and under what conditions face to face surveying may be halted and how the firm would proceed in that scenario. This has also been added to p. 5 of the RFP.
8. If face to face interviews are allowed as alternatives, would SI be considering the same sample size assigned for wave 1 (i.e. around 8,000 questionnaires)?
   1. For face to face alternatives proposed which ues the same sampling methodology used for Wave 1 (multi-stage stratified probability proportional to size cluster sampling with systematic random-walk sampling within clusters), the required final sample size after refusals/non-response would be 6,048 completed surveys. Face to face alternatives that use another sampling methodology other than that which was used for Wave 1 would require sample sizes according to the method proposed.
9. As per the RFP, two weeks only are assigned for data collection (weeks 6 to 8) for around 6,000 questionnaires! The timeline listed in the RFP shows that another 2 weeks are assigned for reconciliation of data quality checks and the final data collection report.  Would it be possible that the timeline assigned for data collection be extended by one week (3 weeks) and as such only one week would be assigned for the data reconciliation and final report if SI does not want to extend the timeline by an additional week?
   1. We can extend the timeline overall by one week to accommodate a third week of data collection. Changes made in Table 2 accordingly.
10. Would all questions in the survey instrument be close ended? If not, what is the number of open-ended questions and how would they be delivered in the data? (e.g. coded or text translated into English)
    1. All questions are close-ended, though many would have “other, specify” fields where text would need to be filled in. There may also be a few other short text fields in the survey, but these would not be considered open-ended survey questions. The data would be delivered to SI through the data collection server in the original Arabic, but any text would also have to be translated by the firm. This is now specified on p. 6 of the RFP.
11. The RFP mentioned that from Wave 1 6,627 respondents have valid phones. By valid phones, do you mean that those records contain phone numbers or did someone called them during Wave 1 to make sure that the phone numbers are valid and belong to the respondent that replied to the questionnaire?
    1. “Valid” in this RFP just means a phone number that has the appropriate number of digits, is not something obviously invalid such as “00000000” and is not a duplicate phone number with others in the survey. Some of them were called during Wave 1 for back-checks and quality control purposes, but not all were attempted.
12. The RFP mentioned that wave 2 will make use of a heavily abbreviated version of the wave 1 questionnaire, with a new brief module to gather perceptions regarding COVID-19. Will the consultant receive the translated wave 1 questionnaire with its relevant manuals to use them as a base for Wave 2?
    1. Yes.
13. In the RFP, it was mentioned that a Wave 2 Pilot will be used and SI will assess the pilot results to take the decision to continue with the Pilot approach or select the alternative approach. In case, the Pilot approach was dropped, will the data collected (667 respondents) be discarded (and not considered as part of the sample of the alternative approach)?
    1. Correct, we are looking for alternative approaches and associated sample sizes that do not assume that the 667 would be part of the alternative approach.
14. What is the level of segmentation required for the analysis? Is it only across the nine governorates?
    1. Governorate representativeness, assuming nine governorates (see table later in this Q&A and footnote #2 in this document). Optionally, firms are welcome to propose additional levels of representativeness with explanations of how that would be achieved.
15. Since SI will set-up and manage the server, will the consultant have access to the submitted data in order to perform the quality checks? And in what form will the consultant have access to the data?
    1. Yes, consultant would have access to download (but not edit) the raw data.
16. In the RFP, a “Final Data collection completion” report is mentioned as one of the deliverables. Is the final report a complete analytical report or is it a fieldwork data collection report highlighting the methodology, the quality checks, lessons learnt during fieldwork etc.?
    1. It is a fieldwork data collection report – we have made that clarification on pp.7-8 of the RFP.
17. What is the budget ceiling for this project?
    1. We do not have a budget ceiling to specify. We do ask that firms provide the cost per survey for each of the alternatives proposed to aid in fair comparison between bids. In addition, note that SI will judge proposals based on what is deemed to be most advantageous, weighing technical and cost proposals.
18. In response to the RFP forwarded for the CPS Wave 2, is it possible to know the exact n (Sample size) of wave one or does it correspond to the example included in the RFP (n=8091 total target sample and n=6,627 achieved).
    1. The total sample size of Wave 1 was 8,091 completed surveys (see Table 1 second column). The number 6,627 corresponds to the number of valid phone numbers (see answer to Q 11 re: “valid”).
19. Furthermore, was it a PPS sample distributed across the regions of Lebanon and if so which (4 historical areas or 8 muhafazas)? What are the other relevant target profile demographic data that should be replicated in the following wave 2 for purposes of comparison? For example was it conducted with Lebanese aged above 18 years? Were there specific age related brackets? and is social class relevant to generated cross tab etc.
    1. The following describes the sampling approach for Wave 1:   
         
       SI calculated sample size requirements based on standard parameters for population-based surveys, as well as inputs such as design effects gleaned from similar surveys in this context.[[1]](#footnote-1) To allow for sub-national representation (i.e. stratification) by each of the nine governorates,[[2]](#footnote-2) the required sample size from this calculation was multiplied by nine and then proportionally allocated across each of the governorates based on population estimates obtained from the Lebanon Ministry of Health Statistical Bulletin for 2016.[[3]](#footnote-3)

All nine governorates and all 26 districts in Lebanon are represented in our sample. Within each district, the number of clusters (primary sampling units, or PSUs, comprised of villages, towns, or sub-sections of large villages and towns), were first selected by probability proportional to size (PPS), i.e. larger towns and villages had a higher probability of being chosen within each district.[[4]](#footnote-4) Households were then selected systematically from within each PSU using a random-walk approach, originating from a central landmark in each PSU and using a random number table to select buildings/dwellings to be interviewed. Within each sampled household, respondents were selected from among eligible individuals (Lebanese citizens, aged 18 to 65), based on whose birthday would occur next, taking into consideration the assigned sex for each interview in order to enforce gender balance across the respondent pool.  
  
A total of 8,091 households were interviewed from across Lebanon:

**Wave 1 Allocation of Sample across Governorates**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Governorate & District | N (%) | Estimated Governorate Population[[5]](#footnote-5) |
| Akkar | 573 (7.1%) | 306,733 (7%) |
| Baalbek-Hermel | 605 (7.5%) | 323,883 (7%) |
| Beirut | 754 (9.3%) | 407,453 (9%) |
| Beqaa | 552 (6.8%) | 297,080 (7%) |
| Keserwan-Jbeil | 485 (6.0%) | 260,192 (6%) |
| Mount Lebanon | 2,397 (29.6%) | 1,290,553 (30%) |
| Nabatieh | 611 (7.6%) | 329,803 (8%) |
| North | 1,171 (14.5%) | 632,222 (15%) |
| South | 943 (11.7%) | 507,995 (12%) |
| *Total* | *8,091 (100%)* | *4,355,914 (100%)* |

1. With reference to the sample size, it is it not the sample already provided as the illustrative sample size table in RFP on page 3, can we have as per table initial and achieved sample.
   1. Wave 1 achieved sample size was 8,091.

1. Population proportion 50%, margin of error ±5 percentage points, confidence level 95%, design effect 1.75 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Includes Keserwan-Jbeil, the newest governorate not yet fully implemented, formerly part of North governorate. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Ministry of Health Statistical Bulletin provides governorate-specific population estimates; the 2016 Statistical Bulletin was the most recent Statistical Bulletin available at the time that the CPS survey was designed. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. District- and PSU-level population information was held by Information International, the Wave 1 survey firm. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Source: Ministry of Health 2016 Statistical Bulletin. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)