USAID | MOZAMBIQUE
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

AMENDMENT 01

RFA Issue Date: August 17, 2021,

Opportunity Number: RFA Number: 72065621RFA00009 RESINA

Deadline for Questions: September 1, 2021, at 17:00 PM

Amendment 1 Issuance: **September 23, 2021**

Closing Date & Time to submit application: **October 26, 2021, at 17:00 pm (Maputo Time)**

Submit Full Applications to: **amanhica@usaid.gov**
with a copy to **gboateng@usaid.gov**

Subject: Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Request For Application (RFA) Number: 72065621RFA00009

Program Title: USAID Feed The Future (FTF): Resiliência Integrada na Nutrição e Agricultura (RESINA)

Dear Applicant:

The Purpose of the **Amendment No. 01** is to:

1) Amend submission application due date from **October 19, 2021, at 17:00 pm** to **October 26, 2021, at 17:00 pm**
2) Provide responses to questions submitted in Attachment 1 to this Amendment;
3) Provide the "Revised Request For Application (RFA) Number: 72065621RFA00009"; and
4) Provide Attachment 3: USAID June 2019 Gender Assessment Report for USAID/Mozambique Final Report; and,
Attachment 4: final Mozambique Agriculture Initial Environmental Examination (IEE).

Sincerely,

Jean-Jacques Badiane
Digitally signed by Jean-Jacques Badiane
Date: 2021.09.23 17:33:08 +02'00'

Jean-Jacques Badiane
Agreement Officer/USAID Mozambique

ATTACHMENT 01

72065621RFA00009 RESINA

USAID Feed The Future (FTF): Resiliência Integrada na Nutrição e Agricultura

Questions & Answers

Question NO.01:
CIP, an International Agricultural Research Center (IARC) and member of the CGIAR consortium, is designated by USAID as a Category 1 Public International Organization (PIO) under ADS 308 (which sets forth USAID's mandatory policies and required procedures on assistance awards to PIOs). As a PIO, we would like to confirm that should CIP be successful, the applicable funding mechanism to receive the award could be the Project /General Contribution type subject to ADS 308 rules, in which funds are channeled through the CGIAR System (Trust Fund Contribution USAID – IBRD as Trustee of CGIAR Trust Fund). We also would like to verify that should CIP participate as a sub-awardee under a prime applicant, in accordance with ADS 303.3.21 (d) "for sub-awards to PIOs", it would be subject to the terms and conditions contained in the "Standard Provisions for Cost-Type Awards to PIOs in ADS 308"?

ANSWER NO.01:

Part I of the Question: No, USAID does not envision a Field Support Mechanism Award.
Part II of the Question: Yes. That is correct.

Question NO.02
Given the description of the program that USAID has laid out in its Intermediate Results and illustrative points of intervention for the project, and recognizing that the first 120 days will be used to assess shocks and stressors in the resilience zone to determine planning, does USAID envision other research opportunities for the project? Would USAID support a strong research component across the IRs to evaluate the interventions being implemented?

ANSWER NO.02:
While USAID does not see research as a core activity under RESINA, USAID would be supportive of an applied research component with a clear justification. The applicant should provide a clear understanding of the use and application of this research, the advantage of directly funding this research, and how it will be applied to the learning agenda as part of the CLA approach of the activity. USAID strongly encourages applicants to think creatively on how RESINA can coordinate with other activities (PREMIER, SPEED, Innovation Labs) and or partners (public

and private) to
leverage knowledge and learning through communities of practice.

Question NO.03:
Can U.S. graduate student research be funded through the RESINA project?

ANSWER NO.03:
Only on a limited basis and with a strong justification. USAID does not see research as a core activity under RESINA and highly encourages applicants to be creative and strategic in establishing partnerships and cooperation with other activities and partners to leverage resources where possible. Any proposed graduate student research should clearly explain how this research would be applied, the advantage of directly funding this research, and how it will be applied to the learning agenda as part of the CLA approach of the RESINA activity.

Question NO.04:
Recent literature suggests that much of the "yield gap" between experiment station, farmer field trials and yields obtained by typical farmers is due to a built-in "bias" in field trials. Is USAID, through RESINA, interested in this as a topic of research?

ANSWER NO.04:
USAID recognizes the importance of connecting implementation approaches with sound research-based evidence; however, USAID does not see research as a core activity under RESINA.

Question NO.05:
On pg. 33, USAID mentions that the Finance and Compliance Director will supervise the Grants Manager, Accountant, Procurement Officer, and the Regional HR & Operations Manager…however, only the Grants Manager is listed under the "Non-Key Personnel" section as 'Grants Manager and Finance Advisor for the Poor.' None of the other positions are mentioned again in the RFA. Can USAID please advise if those will be required positions?

ANSWER NO.05:
USAID provided an indicative set of positions for Non-key personnel considered to be important for the RESINA activity. However, Applicants may develop a staffing pattern to demonstrate an appropriate set of expertise in the proposed project team.

(RFA amended on p.38 Non-Key Personnel in the RFA.)

Question NO.06:
Can USAID confirm that consortium partner/sub-applicant Letters of Commitment are not to be included?

ANSWER NO.06:
Letters of commitment are encouraged, but not required, for consortium partners. The letters of commitment do not count against the page limits of the application.

Question NO.07:
Can USAID please confirm the deadlines for Final Report submission (both draft and final), since there are conflicting numbers on pgs. 52 and 55?

ANSWER NO.07:
The correct answer is Pg. 61 "A draft final report should be submitted to the AOR no later than 30 calendar days after the completion of the activity. USAID will review and comment within 30 days of receipt. The final report is due 90 calendar days after the end of the award"

(RFA amended on p.57 and 61. SECTION F: FEDERAL AWARD INFORMATION. F.3. Reporting and Plans Requirements.)

Question NO.08:
Pg. 21 says the recipient applicant will conduct and submit a final gender analysis within 120 days of award, while pg. 52 and 55 say 90 days after award. Can USAID please confirm the correct number of days?

ANSWER NO.08:
The gender analysis should be submitted within 120 days after award date as it aligns with the required submission of the resilience assessment.

(RFA amended on p.57. SECTION F: FEDERAL AWARD INFORMATION. F.3. Reporting and Plans Requirements)

Question NO.09:
Pg. 17 describes a key takeaway/lesson learned for WASH as "Multi-use systems are not common in rural areas, where WASH infrastructure is primarily for human demand and incorporating other uses has not yet been fully addressed." Does this mean that USAID would discourage interventions dealing with multi-use systems?

ANSWER NO.09:
USAID highly encourages the establishment and renovation of multi-use WASH systems. USAID is interested in links between clean water and agricultural and economic productivity as both a means for increased access and use of clean drinking water and sustainable maintenance of water systems.

Question NO.10:

Can the 10%
crisis modifier budget set aside for emergency or crisis response be allocated to project activities if it is not needed for an emergency or crisis? At what point in the project can this determination be made, and the money used for non-emergency activities (e.g. last year)?

ANSWER NO.10

P.23 has been modified to read as follows:
"In an effort to streamline our development and humanitarian programming, the activity may plan for the reprogramming of up to 10% of the TEC over the life of the activity for the purposes of responding to shocks and crises. Given the potential for known and unknown risks to project implementation, the Crises Modifier allows flexibility for contingency planning that will be linked to the CLA approach. The award recipient will develop a simple and practical contingency plan as part of their annual work planning process. The plan will identify key criteria and conditions for the execution of contingency mechanisms. Contingency planning needs to be developed in a coordinated and integrated manner to promote synergies and value added with other USAID investments in the RFZ. The Applicant should propose how the activity will utilize the crisis modifier as part of the annual planning process."

(RFA amended on pg. 23 - B.8. Crisis Modifier)

Question NO.11
The RFA pg. 24 states that "at least 30% of the FTF RESINA budget should be spent on partnering through sub-awards (sub-grants)…with multiple committed local partners…" and on pg. 25 states "the total value of an individual grant to a U.S. organization must not exceed $100,000." Can USAID confirm that this refers to a competitive grant facility set up during implementation for the purpose of awarding sub-grants, and not to consortium partners/sub-applicants listed in the proposal application that have sub-award budgets?

ANSWER NO.11
At least 25% of the RESINA budget should be spent on partnering through sub-recipients (sub-awards) and grants. This includes sub-awards to consortium partners, which are outside the competitive grant facility, as well as grants within the competitive grant facility. The restriction to not exceed $100,000 to U.S. organizations has been removed from the RFA.

(RFA amended on pg. 28-29 - C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants)

Question NO.12:
Is it correct that locally-established organizations do not count toward the requirement on pg. 24 of "a minimum of 20% of activity costs allocated to local organizations?

ANSWER NO.12:
Page 28 of the RFA is amended to state that at least 25% of the FTF RESINA budget should be spent on partnering through sub-recipients (sub-awards) and (sub-grants) or other formats (i.e. mechanisms could include in-kind or technical support, performance-based contracts, and fixed-amount subawards) with multiple committed local entities and locally established partners, including NGOs, government institutions, parastatals, and the private sector, to help build their capacity and implement their ecosystem development initiatives. Of the 25% of the FTF RESINA budget allocated for sub-recipients (sub-awards) and grants, 10% must go to local entities (sub-awards and sub-grants).

To be considered a local entity an applicant must meet the following criteria:

1) **Is legally organized under the laws of a country that is receiving assistance from USAID;**
2) **Has its principal place of business or operations in a country receiving assistance from USAID;**
3) **Is majority-owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of a country receiving assistance from USAID; and 4) is managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the country receiving assistance from USAID.**

To be considered locally established partner (LEP) a recipient must meet the following criteria:

1) **"A U.S. or international organization that works through locally-led operations and programming models;**
2) **Have maintained continuous operations in-country for at least five years and materially demonstrate a long-term presence in a country through adherence or alignment to the following: Local staff should comprise at least 50% of office personnel, Maintenance of a dedicated local office, Registration with the appropriate local authorities, A local bank account, and - A portfolio of locally-implemented programs;**
3) **Have demonstrated links to the local community, including: If the organization has a governing body or board of directors, then it must include a majority of local citizens; A letter of support from a local organization to attest to its work; and Other criteria that an organization proposes to demonstrate its local roots.**

As the percentages may be confusing, an illustrative Table is as follows. This addresses the following Questions: #11, #12, #20, #37 part 2, #55, #56...)

Percentage of the TEC for Sub- awards and Grants	**At least 25% of the TEC**	**$7.375.000**

Percentage that must go to Local Organizations	**A minimum of 10% of the TEC**	**$2,950,000**
Important to NOTE that FUNDS for Sub-Awards and Grants are NOT cumulative / Additive (should not be 25% + 10%)	**$7.375.000**	

(RFA amended on pg. 28 - C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants)

Question NO.13:
Section C.14 states that "the Recipient must not award grants to host country government entities" while section C.14.1 goes on to talk about sub-awards to partner government entities and what illustrative activities those might include. Can USAID please clarify the expectation for working with (and sub-granting to) Mozambican government entities? Do these sub-grants have to be detailed during the proposal stage or can this be determined at a later date during implementation?

ANSWER NO.13:
a) The Recipient will consider the provision of a sub-award to a Mozambican entity for the production and supply of early generation seeds (EGS) to implement activities at Provincial and District levels in collaboration with local government agriculture entities, as well as local NGOs, CBOs, educational institutions, small and medium agribusiness enterprises, etc. The Prime Recipient can propose a subaward that provides funds to partner government entities excluding "in-kind" grants.
b) Please refer to Page 30 of the RFA for illustrative sub-award activities to be implemented by partner government entities.
c) The activities under the sub-recipients need to be detailed at the proposal stage.

(RFA amended on pg. 30 - C.14.1. Sub-Awards to partner government entities)

Question NO.14:
Could USAID please provide a copy of the Mozambique local compensation plan?

ANSWER NO.14:
Salaries must be based on current market rates for the respective proposed positions. Therefore, the Local Compensation Plan will not be provided.

Question NO.15:

Page 7, Section B.1, Background and Problem Analysis, Footnote 28 states: "USAID June 2019. Gender Assessment Report for USAID/Mozambique - Final Report. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00WGW3.pdf

The Applicant respectfully requests a copy of the USAID June 2019 Gender Assessment Report for USAID/Mozambique as an attachment.

ANSWER NO.15
The USAID Gender Assessment Report for USAID/Mozambique - Final Report (June 2019) will be provided as an attachment 3 to this Amendment 01 and the Revised RFA. The access Link was removed from the RFA.

(RFA amended on pg. 7 - The Link was removed from the References)

Question NO.16:
Page 15, Section B.5.2, Targeted Agriculture Value Chains, states: "The applicant shall provide the overall method and rationale for selecting a portfolio of value chains that aligns with the objectives and principles of RESINA and as entry points into agri-food systems."
The Applicant respectfully requests confirmation that the target value chains should be provided in the response.

ANSWER NO.16
The targeted value chains should be provided in the response, with a clear rationale for Applicant's selection, but the final value chain selections will be finalized post-award and in consultation with USAID.

Question NO.17:
Page 19 Section B.8., Crisis Modifier, states: "In an effort to streamline our development and humanitarian programming, the activity will set aside the equivalent of 10% of the budget to be programmed in the event of an emergency, or crisis response. The Applicant should propose how the activity will apply these development funds in an emergency or crisis situation."

The Applicant respectfully requests USAID confirm the 10% allocation for the Crisis Modifier is based on total activity cost.

ANSWER NO.17:
Please refer to Answer # 10.

Question NO.18:

Page 20,
Section C.3, Climate Change Integration and Adaptation, states: "As part of the resilience assessment mentioned in Section B.9., Applicants should clearly identify and rate the climate change related risks and stressors that are likely to impact the activity, and how the activity will work to address or mitigate potential impacts."

The Applicant respectfully requests confirmation from USAID that the applicant to identify and rate the climate change risks and stressors during the proposal stage.

ANSWER NO.18:
The climate change assessment should be specific to the districts and communities in which RESINA will operate. While general climate risks and stressors can be described in the Application, applicants should specifically explain how they will carry out a context-specific assessment and how the results will be applied.

Question NO.19:

Page 23, Section C.9., Environmental Compliance Considerations, states: "An Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) has been conducted for this activity under the 2021 Agriculture IEE for USAID/Mozambique and it includes an assessment of climate risks and mitigation measures."

The Applicant seeks to request a copy of the Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) to inform the response to Strategic Consideration #9.

ANSWER NO.19:
The Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) will be provided as an Attachment 4 this Amendment 01 and Revised RFA.

Question NO.20:
Page 24, Section C.12¸ Host Government, Donor, and other Counterpart Collaboration, states: "Applicants are encouraged to propose a team of partners composed of various organizations with a minimum of 20% of activity costs allocated to local organizations." Further, page 24, Section C.14, Sub-awards and Grants, states:" At least 30% of the FTF RESINA budget should be spent on partnering through sub-awards (sub-grants) or other formats (i.e. mechanisms could include in-kind or technical support, performance-based contracts, and fixed-amount subawards) with multiple committed local partners, including NGOs, government institutions, parastatals, and the private sector, to help build their capacity and implement their ecosystem development initiatives."

The Applicant respectfully requests confirmation that a minimum of 20% of the activity budget should be used for partnering with local organizations.

ANSWER NO.20:
Please Refer to ANSWER #12.

(RFA amended on pg. 28-29 - C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants)

Question NO.21
Page 23, Section 8, *Self-Reliance and Sustainability*, states: "… To help achieve Mozambique's self-sustaining development, the Activity will support the GRM's efforts to develop sustainable systems for improved agriculture sector management. Sub-grants (e.g., direct funds, in-kind assistance) to sub-national government entities, institutions, and/or parastatals at the provincial and district levels will be used to enable the GRM to take on increased responsibility and leadership in implementing the GRM-led components supported by the activity. The GRM is envisioned as an active partner in implementation, with aspects of the workplan to be carried out by the GRM." **Further, Page 25, Section C.14.1, *Subawards to partner government entities, states:*** "… Note that USAID must comply with the requirements of ADS 303.3.21 prior to the Recipient executing any sub-award that provides funds (excluding "in-kind" grants, technical assistance or other activities provided to or on behalf of the partner government entities) to a partner government entity. Such requirements may include the preparation by USAID of a Determination & Finding. The Recipient will be expected to furnish information to USAID on proposed partner government entities and perform other activities to facilitate USAID's compliance with such requirements.``

For planning purposes, the Applicant respectfully requests confirmation from USAID that support through provision of DSSA or per diem to GRM employees is not subject to a D&F?

ANSWER NO.21
For government entities' employees, the applicant shall use the latest approved Government of Mozambique per diem rates.

Question NO.22:
Page 27, Section E.1., *Monitoring and Evaluation*, states: "…whether implementation is on track and whether expected results are being achieved. Requirements for implementation of the MEL plan, including the development of needed baselines, should be included in the proposed budget. As outlined in USAID's ADS 201.3.4.10, the Activity MEL Plan will follow the standard USAID format, including data sources, disaggregation, collection methodologies, and data quality assessments for each indicator."

The Applicant respectfully requests USAID confirm the costs for the baseline assessment need to be included in the Applicant's cost submission?

ANSWER NO.022:
Yes, the Applicant should include the activity level baseline assessment for the selected indicators in the budget.

Question NO.23:
Page 27, Section E.1., *Monitoring and Evaluation*, states: "…whether implementation is on track and whether expected results are being achieved. Requirements for implementation of the MEL plan, including the development of needed baselines, should be included in the proposed budget. As outlined in USAID's ADS 201.3.4.10, the Activity MEL Plan will follow the standard USAID format, including data sources, disaggregation, collection methodologies, and data quality assessments for each indicator."

The Applicant respectfully requests USAID confirm the costs for the mid-term and final evaluation do not need to be included in the Applicant's cost submission?

ANSWER NO.23:
Correct, the costs for the mid-term and final evaluations do not need to be included in the Applicant's cost submission. Evaluations will be procured by USAID through a third partner Contractor.

Question NO.24:
Page 31, Section F, *Key Personnel, KP Requirements*, states: "USAID stipulates the following qualifications for the four key personnel positions:" The subsequent description of the positions on pages 31-33 list only three key personnel positions: COP, DCOP, and Finance and Compliance Director.

The Applicant respectfully requests confirmation that there are three Key Personnel positions: COP, DCOP, and Finance and Compliance Director?

ANSWER NO.24:
Yes, RESINA's Key personnel includes three positions: COP, DCOP, and Finance and Compliance Director.

Question NO.25:
Page 32, Section F, *Key Personnel, COP and DCOP Requirements*, states: "Excellent past performance/job references;"

The Applicant respectfully requests confirmation concerning the number of references required per Key Personnel position.

ANSWER NO.25:
At least three references will be required for each Key Personnel position.

Question NO.26:
Page 33, Section F, *Key Personnel*, states: "The Applicant will be required to plan for the following positions in the personnel to ensure an adequate management of the activity (non-key personnel):

- Grants Manager and Finance Advisor for the Poor
- Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Manager
- Gender Specialist
- Climate Change Adaptation Manager"

The Applicant respectfully requests confirmation that the "Grants Manager and Finance Advisor for the Poor" is one position.

ANSWER NO.026
USAID provided an indicative set of positions for Non-key personnel considered to be relevant for the RESINA activity. However, Applicants may develop a staffing pattern to demonstrate an appropriate set of expertise in the proposed project team.

(RFA amended on p.38 Non-Key Personnel in the Revised RFA.)

Question NO.27:
Page 38, Section B.2, *Start Date and Period of Performance for Federal Awards*, states: "the anticipated period of performance is 5 (five) years. The estimated start date will be upon the signature of the award, on or about, or other effective date determined by the Agreement Officer."

The Applicant respectfully requests confirmation that the anticipated start date is 1/27/2022.

ANSWER NO.27:
USAID expects to make an award by the end of the first quarter of calendar year 2022. As stated in the RFA p. 39, the estimated start date will be upon the signature of the award, on or about, or other effective date determined by the Agreement Officer.

Question NO.28:
Page 48, Section E.2.b, *Selection Criteria*, states: "Criterion 1: An illustrative First-Year Work Plan will be evaluated based on its clarity and appropriateness (given the theory of change) for achieving expected outcomes, layering and collaborating with other USAID- and GoM-funded activities, and building-in sufficient flexibility to learn and adapt."

Given the importance of the illustrative First-Year Work Plan, the Applicant respectfully requests USAID consider allowing the illustrative First-Year Work Plan as an annex?

ANSWER NO.28:
USAID will allow the illustrative First-Year Work Plan as an annex of 5 pages limit. It will not count against the application page limit.

(RFA amended on sub-Section (h) p.46. under SECTION D: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION and on p.53. under SECTION E: APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION; E.2. Review and Selection Process)

Question NO.29:
Page 48, Section E.2.b, *Merit Review Criteria*, states: "The technical applications will be reviewed in accordance with the four (4) review criteria set forth below. The table below outlines the evaluation criteria which include: (1) Technical Approach (2) Management Approach (3) Institutional Capacity and Past Performance, which are listed in descending order of Importance..."

The Applicant respectfully requests confirmation the evaluation criteria will be based upon three (3) factors: (1) Technical Approach (2) Management Approach (3) Institutional Capacity and Past Performance.

ANSWER NO.29:
The evaluation criteria will be based upon three (3) factors: (1) Technical Approach; (2) Management Approach; and (3) Institutional Capacity. On p. 42 of the RFA, USAID requests past performance information that will be used in cross referencing the institutional capacity of the organization. However, Past Performance will not be scored in the evaluation process.

(RFA amended on sub-section b.p.53. SECTION E: APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION; E.2. Review and Selection Process)

Question NO.30:
RFA Section C.14 on page 25, bullet #6, indicates *"The recipient must not award grants to host country (Mozambican) government entities…"* in bullet #6. However, section C.14.1 then provides terms for issuing sub-awards to host country government entities.

Can USAID clarify if host country government entities are eligible sub-awardees?

ANSWER NO.30:
Please see ANSWER NO.13 above.

Question NO.31:
Section F, page 31 mentions four key personnel but only lists three position descriptions. Kindly confirm that the project will have only three named Key Personnel positions: Chief of Party, Deputy Chief of Party, and Finance and Compliance Director.

ANSWER NO.31:

RESINA will
have only three Key Personnel positions: 1) Chief of Party; 2) Deputy Chief of Party; and 3) Finance and Compliance Director

(RFA amended on p.36. SECTION F: KEY PERSONNEL)

Question NO.32:
Page 40-41, Personnel and Management Structure: May the applicants include a staffing table as part of the Organizational Chart Annex?

ANSWER NO.32:
Yes, The Applicant is encouraged to include a staffing table as part of the Organizational Chart Annex. The Table should present how the combined staff meets project implementation requirements.

(RFA amended sub-section (h) of p.46. SECTION D: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION)

Question NO.33:
Page 41 of the RFA states applicants must address the question *"Where will project offices outside of Maputo be located…?"* Does USAID thus expect the project to also maintain an office in Maputo?

ANSWER NO.33:
USAID does not require or expect that the Project establishes an Office in Maputo.

Question NO.34:
Page 49, Institutional Capacity evaluation criterion includes: *"Demonstrates an effective plan for using grants to stimulate and support learning as well as planned outcomes. The plan will be evaluated based on its effectiveness for using grants in flexible, strategic and cost-effective ways to buy down risk, stimulate private sector engagement, promote innovative practices and technologies, and stimulate learning and adaptation for ensuring results."* This evaluation criteria seems at odds with the description of Institutional Capacity section content (page41, g).

Can USAID confirm that grants language in the Institutional Capacity should focus on past project grants experience, and the applicant's plan for RESINA grants would be evaluated as part of the technical approach (criterion 1)?

ANSWER NO.34:
The RFA language has been harmonized between the Institutional Capacity Evaluation Criteria and the Institutional capacity sections.

Yes, the grants
language in the Institutional Capacity focuses on past experience. The Past Performance will not be scored in the evaluation process, but will be used to assess the institutional capacity of the applicant.

(RFA amended on p.46 SECTION 5: Technical Application Format, g) Institutional Capacity)

Question NO.35:
Page 10, Section A, B.2 Summary of Relevant USG, Government of Mozambique and Donor Activities: Figure 1 outlines illustrative interventions and their corresponding key stakeholders for engagement under the various existing and planned USAID Activities in Mozambique. Innovative financial solutions are identified as illustrative activities for both RESINA and PREMIER. However, formal financial service providers were not included as stakeholders for engagement in either. RESINA does include savings and loan groups, which is generally considered to be an informal finance service.

Does USAID envisage access to finance solutions that include formal financial service providers as stakeholders in either RESINA or PREMIER?

ANSWER NO.35:
USAID does not foresee formal financial service providers as stakeholders under RESINA.

Question NO.36:
Page 14, Section B.5: In the list of suggested districts, both Nampula city and Nampula district are mentioned. Does Nampula district refer to Rapale?

ANSWER NO.36:

That refers to Nampula District.

Question NO.37:
Page 19, Section B.8: Would USAID consider including part of the crisis modifier as a contribution to the 20% allocation of the budget to local entities and/or 30% allocation for sub-awards or grants? That is, can we consider that funds reserved and eventually used by the crisis modifier will contribute to the overall budget allocations to be made to local entities and sub-awards?

ANSWER NO.37:

Part I: Please Refer to ANSWER #12.

Part II: Please Refer to ANSWER #10.

Question NO.38:
Page 19: Can USAID elaborate on any criteria or requirements for the crisis modifier? Can we use the crisis modifier set aside for activities such as contingency planning?

ANSWER NO.38:
Refer to Answer # 10

Question NO.39:
Page 21 and Page 19: The solicitation states on page 21, "As part of the resilience assessment mentioned in Section B.9., Applicants should clearly identify and rate the climate change related risks and stressors that are likely to impact the activity, and how the activity will work to address or mitigate potential impacts." The referenced section on page 19 states, "The Recipient will have 120 days to assess the specific shocks and stressors in the resilience zone and submit a gender analysis and action plan and a youth action plan. The Recipient applicant shall conduct relevant and/or required assessments using the REAL Measurement Guidance Series Risks and Resilience Assessment."

Could USAID confirm that the applicant should identify and rate climate change risks and mitigation strategies as part of the post-award resilience assessment rather than in the proposal

ANSWERNO.39:
Refer to Answer #18

Question NO.40:
Page 21, Section C.5: The guidance requires a final gender analysis within 120 days, while page 55 indicates a draft due in 90 days. Can USAID confirm that the draft gender analysis is due in 90 days, with the final submitted in 120 days?

ANSWER NO.40:
Refer to Answer #08.

(RFA amended on p.57 and 61. SECTION F: FEDERAL AWARD INFORMATION. F.3. Reporting and Plans Requirements)

Question NO.41:
Page 21, Section C.5 and Section C.6: The solicitation states that the gender and youth analyses will be submitted with budgeted action plans. Will USAID accept applicants to earmark a lumpsum in the cost plan without too much detail to allow flexibility for filling out details when the gender and youth action plans are prepared?

ANSWER NO.41:

Yes, an earmark or lumpsum in the cost plan with some indicative details is acceptable as the Recipient will have 120 days after award to submit a final gender analysis, which will include a budgeted gender action plan for USAID review and approval.

Question NO.42:
Page 24 Section C.12 and Section C.14: Are the allocations of 20% for local organizations and 30% for sub-awards and grants cumulative or overlapping? That is, would a sub-award to a local organization count for both the 20% target for local organizations and 30% target for sub-awards and grants? Can USAID provide guidance on how you would like to see these distributions presented and explained – in budget notes, an appendix to the technical proposal, or in some other format?

ANSWER NO.42:
Refer to Answer #12

Question NO.43:
Page 25, Section C. Strategic Considerations C.14. Sub-awards and Grants: The solicitation states, "The total value of an individual grant to a U.S. organization must not exceed $100,000." Would USAID please clarify whether this restriction applies to subawards and confirm whether U.S. sub-recipients are limited to receiving $100,000 within this cooperative agreement?

ANSWER NO.43:
The restriction to not exceed $100,000 to U.S. organizations has been removed from the RFA.

(RFA amended on pg. 28 - C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants)

Question NO.44:
Page 25, Section C. Strategic Considerations C.14. Sub-awards and Grants: The solicitation states, "The Recipient must not award grants to host country (Mozambican) government entities including, but not limited to, public universities". Would USAID please clarify whether this restriction applies to subawards and confirm whether public Mozambican universities are restricted from receiving funding within this cooperative agreement?

ANSWER NO.44:
a) Refer to question #13.

b) Public Mozambican Universities are not restricted from receiving funding within this cooperative agreement.

(RFA amended on pg 39 under session C.14.1 Sub-Awards to partner government entities)

Question NO.45:
Page 25-26, Section C.14.1: While it is stated in the preceding section that "the recipient must not award grants to host country (Mozambican) government…" the section on sub-awards to partner government states "the grants program should be strategically structured to evolve as the capacity of the GRM grows…" The section further notes the requirements for sub-awards of funds to government, but allows for in-kind, technical assistance and activities provided to and on behalf of the partner government entity. Can USAID confirm that sub-awards to GRM entities can be fully in the form of in-kind, technical assistance, and support for activities would be considered as compliant for the sub-award target?

ANSWER NO.45:
Please Refer to Answer # 13

Question NO.46:
Page 27, Section E.1, baseline conditions: Will USAID undertake a baseline survey (e.g., population-based survey), or will it be the responsibility of the implementing partner to budget for and commission the baseline survey? If incumbent on the recipient, is there a preference for population-based surveys or more targeted beneficiary surveys?

ANSWER NO.46:
The Applicant should include the activity level baseline assessment in the budget. The baseline for the Resilience Focus Zone (RFZ) will be contracted directly by USAID through a third-party mechanism. (Same as for Question #22).

Question NO.47:
Page 31, Section F Key Personnel: USAID mentioned COP, DCOP. and Finance and Compliance Director as key personnel but mentioned "four key personnel positions." Can USAID please confirm the position for the fourth key personnel?

ANSWER NO.47:
RESINA will have only three Key Personnel positions:1) Chief of Party; 2) Deputy Chief of Party; and 3)Finance and Compliance Director (Same as Question #31)

Question NO.48:
Page 31, Section F Key Personnel: The solicitation states that "staff should have extensive experience in the areas of public health, policy development, training,

partnership
development, capacity building, implementation, and other related areas." Does USAID envisage that this Activity will include work in public health broadly, or specifically nutrition? Does USAID envisage this Activity will include work on policy analysis and/or policy implementation support? This does not appear to align with the Program Description, or the delineation of USAID Activities outlined in Figure 1.

ANSWER NO.48:

a) **USAID envisages the Activity to work on improved health and nutrition practices.**
b) **RESINA will not include work on policy analysis. RESINA can coordinate with other activities (PREMIER, SPEED, Innovation Labs) and/or partners' (public and private) to leverage knowledge and learning through communities of practice for policy implementation support.**
c) **RFA amended on pg. 36**

(RFA amended on p.36. SECTION F: KEY PERSONNEL)

Question NO.49:
Page 33, Section F Non-Key Personnel (Page 33): The non-key position of Grants Manager and Finance Advisor for the Poor includes two distinctly different areas of work that require considerably different experience, expertise and qualifications. Would USAID consider separating this into two separate positions? If so, would both positions remain non-key personnel?

ANSWER NO.49:
Please Refer to Answer #5.

(RFA amended on p.38. SECTION F. Non-Key Personnel.)

Question NO.50:
Page 48, Section E.2.b: The RFA mentions four review criteria, but the table only lists three (technical approach, personnel and management structure, and institutional capacity), and detailed descriptions seem to be misnumbered with no criterion 2. Can USAID confirm that there are three (3) criteria, or provide details on the fourth one?

ANSWER NO.50:
Please Refer to Answer #29.

(RFA amended on p.53. E.2. Review and Selection Process)

Question NO.51:
Page 41, Authorized Annexes: The solicitation states, "List of Past Performance Information (not to exceed 1 page per award) - The Applicant must provide a list of all its

contracts,
grants, or cooperative agreements involving similar or related programs during the past three years." Could USAID clarify if there is a limit on the total number of Past Performance References?

ANSWER NO.51:
USAID recommends the Applicant to provide not more than five most relevant past performance references from the past 5 years.

(RFA amended on p.46. SECTION D: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION. 5. Technical Application Format)

Question NO.52:
Representations & Certifications: There is no reference to applicants including Representations & Certifications as part of their applications. Please confirm that they are not required to be included by the prime and its partner subs given that they are included in each organization's SAM registration.

ANSWER NO.52:
Representations & Certifications are Not Required to be included by the prime and its partner subs given that they are included in each organization's SAM registration database.

Question NO.53:
Cost share: We respectfully request USAID's consideration to accept a 5% leverage commitment instead of cost share.

ANSWER NO.53:
USAID would like to maintain the 5% Cost Share.

Question NO.54:
On p.24, C.14 is entitled "Sub-awards and Grants." The two terms appear to be used interchangeably throughout the RFA. Please clearly differentiate instructions for "partner subawards" from "beneficiary grants" to better understand USAID's expectations on grants to smallholder farmers and other beneficiaries vs. subawards to organizations helping build capacity.

ANSWER NO.54:
Section C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants of the RFA were amended to add clarity on how to differentiate between funding mechanisms.

(RFA amended on pg. 28 of RFA - C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants)

Question NO.55:
What percentage of the total budget funds does USAID expect should be awarded in small grants to beneficiary grantees?

ANSWER NO.55:
Please Refer to Answer #12.

(RFA amended on pg. 58 of RFA - C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants)

Question NO.56:
On p.24, the RFA states that applicants are encouraged to propose a team of partners composed of various organizations with a minimum of 20% of activity costs allocated to local organizations.

a. Please clarify and confirm that the 20% does not include beneficiary grantee funding who may be receiving FAAs or In-Kind grants.
b. Please confirm that the 20% is to be calculated on activity costs and not the entire RESINA budget value.

ANSWER NO.56:
Please Refer to Answer #12.

(RFA amended on pg. 58 of RFA - C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants)

Question NO.57:
On p.24, the RFA states that "Applicants are encouraged to propose a team of partners composed of various organizations with a minimum of 20% of activity costs allocated to local organizations." Given that USAID would like to see a team composed of various organizations and predominantly local organizations, can USAID clarify if it prohibits local organizations from entering into exclusive partnerships at time of proposal submission?

ANSWER NO.57:
USAID strongly discourages local organizations from entering into exclusive partnerships. Local organizations may partner with multiple applicants.

Question NO.58:
On p.25, the RFA states that at "least 30% of the FTF RESINA budget should be spent on partnering through sub-awards (sub-grants) or other formats (i.e. mechanisms could include in-kind or technical support, performance-based contracts, and fixed-amount subawards) with multiple committed local partners, including NGOs, government institutions, parastatals, and the private sector, to help build their capacity and implement their ecosystem development initiatives."

a. Please
confirm that the 30% should be based on the entire RESINA budget value and not on 30% of estimated activity/program costs.
b. Please clarify whether the 20% referred to on p.24 is part of and included in the 30% referred to on p.25; so of 30% to be issued as subawards to organizations, 20% must be to local organizations.
c. Please confirm that the 30% referred to includes life-of-project subrecipient partners who will be implementing with the prime recipient.
d. Please clarify whether 30% referred to on p.25 includes grant support to beneficiaries including smallholder farmers; or is 30% of the entire budget expected to be spent only on subawards to local and non-local partner organizations that will be helping build capacity and implement initiatives.

ANSWER NO.58:

a. **At least 25% of the RESINA (entire) budget should be spent on partnering through sub-recipients (sub-awards) and grants or other formats (i.e. mechanisms could include in-kind or technical support, performance-based contracts, and fixed-amount subawards) with multiple committed local partners, including NGOs, government institutions, parastatals, and the private sector, to help build their capacity and implement their ecosystem development initiatives.**
b. **Of the 25% of the RESINA budget allocated for sub-recipients (sub-awards) and grants 10% must go to local organizations.**
c. **That is correct.**
d. **Please Refer to Answer #12 above**

(RFA amended on pg. 58 of RFA - C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants)

Question NO.59:
Crisis Modifier: Please confirm that the 10% Crisis Modifier should be calculated on the total overall budget value.

ANSWER NO.59:
Yes the 10% allocation for the crisis modifier is based on the estimated TEC of the RESINA activity.

Please Refer to Answer #10

Question NO.60:
Crisis Modifier: Please confirm that applicants may include a separate budget category for the Crisis Modifier since it is not part of indirect costs and is an amount contingent on USAID approval to spend during the life of the project

ANSWER NO.60:

Please Refer to Answer #10

(RFA amended on pg. 23 - B.8. Crisis Modifier)

Question NO.61:
Host Country Government: On p.25, it states "the Recipient must not award grants to host country (Mozambican) government entities including, but not limited to, public universities, district and regional offices and/or national Ministries." P.26 states, "Note that USAID must comply with the requirements of ADS 303.3.21 prior to the Recipient executing any sub-award that provides funds (excluding "in-kind" grants, technical assistance or other activities provided to or on behalf of the partner government entities) to a partner government entity."

a. Please clarify whether subawards to the host country government and its government entities will be allowed.
b. Does USAID want to see a specific amount of funding budgeted for subawards to the host country government under the Subaward and Grants line of the budget?

ANSWER NO.61:

a. **Please Refer to Answer #13.**
b. **At least 25% of the RESINA (entire) budget should be spent on partnering through sub-recipients (sub-awards) and grants. Including the host country government entities. Please refer to Pg# 30 of the RFA for illustrative sub-award activities by partner government entities.**

(RFA amended on pg. 28 - C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants)

Question NO.62:
On p.26, please clarify what exactly is being referred to in the statement "or other activities provided to or on behalf of the partner government entities."

ANSWER NO.62:
Please refer to the requirements of ADS 303.3.21 prior to the Recipient executing any sub-award that provides funds (excluding "in-kind" grants, technical assistance or other activities provided to or on behalf of the partner government entities) to a partner government entity.

Question NO.63:
On p.56, under Financial Reporting: Quarterly Financial Report, it states that the Quarterly Financial Report requires "disaggregation by program area." In order to be able to report by program area, applicants would have to budget by program area. Please confirm that

applicants
should follow the Budget instructions on pages 42-43 and develop a detailed budget broken out by major budget category and by year.

ANSWER NO.63:
Yes, the applicant should follow the budget instructions on page 47-49.

(RFA amended on pg. 48 under Section SECTION D: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION, 6. c) Budget and Budget Narrative.)

Question NO.64:
Can USAID please confirm that applicants should follow the Budget instructions on pages 42-43 and develop a detailed budget broken out by major budget category and by year.

ANSWER NO.64:
Please Refer to Answer # 63

Question NO.65:
On p.48, there is reference to an illustrative first-year Work Plan that will be evaluated, implying that applicants are required to develop an illustrative first-year work plan and include it in their applications. Can USAID please confirm that applicants are required to complete the Gantt Chart included in Annex 3?

ANSWER NO.65
USAID will allow the illustrative First-Year Work Plan as an annex to the application and will not count against the page limit. Annex 3 provides the USAID Template to develop a Work Plan. The illustrative First-Year Work Plan should not exceed 5 pages limit.

(RFA amended subsection (h) on p.46. under SECTION D: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION and on p.52. under SECTION E: APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION; E.2. Review and Selection Process)

Question NO.66:
On p.31 the RFA states that "The Mission will also support a third-party partner to conduct a mid-term performance evaluation approximately 30 months after the award and a final performance evaluation near the end of the award." Can USAID confirm that offerors should not budget for these third party evaluations under RESINA and that USAID will contract these third party evaluations under a separate procurement mechanism?

ANSWER NO.66:
That is correct, the mid term evaluation and final evaluation should not be budgeted for. However, the IP is expected to budget for an activity level baseline assessment.

Question NO.67:
P.41, Section D, sub-section (h) Authorized Annexes, can USAID confirm which sections from the Activity MEL Plan Word template are to be included in the five page limit for the Draft Activity Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Annex?

ANSWER NO.67:
USAID recommends that the Applicant should select the sections of the MEL Plan that better represents its M&E strategies and priorities, including an Indicator Summary Table.

Question NO.68:
P.41, Section D, sub-section (h) Authorized Annexes, does USAID have any specific requirements for the Draft Activity Monitoring and Evaluation Plan? We note that on p.29, USAID indicates, "for this RFA, a draft MELP, in the form of a Table is expected to be presented in the application that captures the MAIN performance indicators and targets through the end of the program." Can USAID confirm that a Table that captures MAIN performance indicators is the only requirement as part of submission for the Draft Activity Monitoring and Evaluation Plan? Can USAID also clarify any other information that must be included in the Draft Activity Monitoring and Evaluation Plan besides the table specified on p.29? Does USAID have specific data requirements that must be captured in the Draft Activity Monitoring and Evaluation Plan table?"

ANSWER NO.68:
a) **Please refer to the USAID MEL Plan Template.**
b) **Please refer to Answer #67**
c) **Please refer to Answer #67**
d) **An Indicator Summary Table as indicated. in Answer #67**

Question NO.69:
P.27, Section E, MEL and p.19, Section B.9 Technical Approach, would USAID be amenable to the Final Activity MEL Plan being submitted by Offerors in 120 days rather than 90 days post-award given that resilience indicators and context-specific and context-responsive resilience approach will be informed by the risk resilience assessment completed 120 days post-award?

ANSWER NO.69:
Final Activity MEL Plan should be submitted within the 90 days. MELP can be revised along with implementation of the award pending approval by the AOR.

Question NO.70:
P.28, Section E, MEL, indicator "Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger" was archived and dropped by USAID's Feed the Future Indicator Handbook.

Can USAID
confirm that Offerors can instead use the replacement indicator, EG-e, in the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook?

ANSWER NO.70:
YES. The replacement indicator is EG-e Prevalence of moderate and severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) [ZOI-level].

Question NO.71:
P.29, Section E, MEL, indicator "Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet" was changed. The title and PIRS definitions were edited in the latest version of the USAID's Feed the Future Indicator Handbook, can USAID clarify and confirm if Offerors use the latest version of the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook?

ANSWER NO.71:
YES. Offerors should use the wording in the latest Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-the-future-handbook-of-indicator-definitions/).

Question NO.72:
Pages 48-49, Section E.2.b. Criterion. Could USAID kindly clarify the criterion for assessment per below:

a. USAID instructs applicants to discuss the grants management plan in the Personnel and Management Section (see p.41, paragraph f) but we note the plan for grants management is assessed under the Criterion 4: Institutional Capacity. USAID does not instruct the applicant to address grant management under the Institutional Capacity and past performance section (see p.41, paragraph g).
b. P.49, Section E.2.b. Criterion 4. Institutional Capacity. USAID does not list the applicant's ability to address gender gaps and empower women and girls or engage youth in the evaluation criteria but instead focuses on elements of project management.
c. P.41, Section D.5.g Institutional Capacity and Past Performance. USAID requires applicants to describe experience implementing activities of similar size and scope, including past performance demonstrating their ability to address gender gaps and empower women and girls, and to promote engagement and economic benefits for youth. Can USAID clarify if the institutional capacity will be assessed exclusively on management capacity and the plan for use of grants, or if other factors such as demonstrated promotion of inclusion will be measured?

ANSWER NO.72:
a., b., c. - Please Refer to Answer #34
(RFA amended on p.46 SECTION 5: Technical Application Format, g) Institutional Capacity)

Question NO.73:

P.41, Section D.5.h.5. Are applications permitted to submit PPIs reflecting the experience of subrecipients, or are PPIs permitted only for prime applicant experience?

ANSWER NO.73:
The PPIs shall include a description of both prime and sub-recipient experience relevant to the activities outlined in the RFA. Must include the prime applicant's past performance experience.

Question NO.74
P.41, Section D.5.h.5., Can USAID clarify if there is a limit to the number of PPIs for related experience in the preceding three years that may be submitted?

ANSWER NO.74:
USAID recommends the Applicant provide not more than five most relevant past performance references in the past 5 years.

(RFA amended on p.46. under SECTION D: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION)

Question NO.75:
P.42, Section D.5.h.5., USAID advises that past performance will not be scored in the evaluation process. Can USAID kindly clarify how the PPIs will be considered if they are not part of the evaluation process?

ANSWER NO.75: Please Refer to Answer #34

(RFA amended on p.46. SECTION D: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION and Pg 52. E.2. Review and Selection Process)

Question NO.76:
On p.33, Section F, the RFA reads, “USAID stipulates the following qualifications for the four key personnel positions”, however only three key personnel positions are listed (Chief of Party, Deputy Chief of Party, and Finance and Compliance Director). Will USAID confirm only the three listed positions are key?

ANSWER NO.76:
Please refer to Answer #31

Question NO.77:

On p.33,
Section F, the RFA indicates that the Finance and Compliance Director "will supervise the Grants Manager, Accountant, Procurement Officer, and the Regional Human Resources and Operations Manager". Will USAID clarify if these positions are illustrative, with illustrative titles only? Or are these specific positions/titles required to be in the offeror's Organizational Chart?

ANSWER NO.77:
Please Refer to Answer #26

Question NO.78:
On p.33, Section F, the following position is listed under Non-Key Personnel: "Grants Manager and Finance Advisor for the Poor". Could USAID kindly clarify if this is one position or two separate positions? On p.33 the RFA indicates that a standalone Grants Manager is envisioned.

ANSWER NO.78:
Please Refer to Answer #26.

Question NO.79:
On p.41, Section D, a bullet reads, "Where will project offices outside of Maputo be located and will that selection enhance results, while ensuring collaboration?" Does USAID envision an office based in Maputo as well as potentially other sites?

ANSWER NO.79
Please Refer to Answer # 33.

Question NO.80:
On p.48, Section E, the RFA states: "The technical applications will be reviewed in accordance with the four (4) review criteria set forth below. The table below outlines the evaluation criteria which include: (1) Technical Approach (2) Management Approach (3) Institutional Capacity and Past Performance, which are listed in descending order of Importance", and lists the following Criterion Descriptions "Criterion 1: Technical Approach", "Criterion 3: Personnel and Management Structure", and "Criterion 4. Institutional Capacity". Could USAID clarify whether there is a fourth review criteria?

ANSWER NO.80:
Please Refer to Answer # 29

Question NO.81:
On p.48, Section E, the RFA states: "All of the Strategic Considerations in Section C should be explicitly addressed in the proposed technical approach. (For example, C.5. Integration of nutrition-sensitive agriculture shall clearly describe the agriculture to

nutrition
pathways, and take into account the Food Systems Conceptual Framework).” Could USAID confirm that the example provided pertains to C.4. Integration of nutrition-sensitive agriculture, as opposed to C.5. Integrating gender and women’s empowerment on p.21?

ANSWER NO.81:
Yes, the example pertains to C.4. Integration of nutrition-sensitive agriculture.

(RFA amended on pg 53, Section E. Criterion 1: Technical Approach.)

Question NO.82:
On p.19 and p.21 of Sections B and C, the RFA indicates a gender analysis is due within 120 days of award, but on p.52 and p.55 of Section F, the RFA indicates that the gender analysis is due 90 days after the award. Could USAID clarify the due date for both the gender analysis and gender action plan?

ANSWER NO.82:
Please Refer to Answer #08.

(RFA amended on p.57 and 61. SECTION F: FEDERAL AWARD INFORMATION. F.3. Reporting and Plans Requirements.)

Question NO.83:
References to a youth analysis and action plan are listed below. Could USAID confirm that both a youth analysis and action plan are a required deliverable under RESINA – and if so – add it to the table in Section F.3.? If one or both are required, could USAID kindly clarify the due date for both the youth analysis and youth action plan?

a. P.19, Section B: The Recipient will have 120 days to assess the specific shocks and stressors in the resilience zone and submit a gender analysis and action plan and a youth action plan.
b. P.22, Section C: At inception of this agreement. The Recipient should develop a Youth Action Plan, with metrics to measure progress, reflective of USAID’s Youth in Development Policy and the USAID Mozambique CDCS (2020 - 2021), to ensure appropriate strategies and approaches are used that meaningfully and promptly engage adolescents and youth in agriculture sector careers, business and income opportunities, and in the activity itself.
c. P. 22, Section C: The Recipient will conduct and submit a final youth analysis within 120 days of award, which will include a budgeted youth action plan for USAID review and approval.
d. Not listed as a deliverable in Section F

ANSWER NO.83:

The Youth analysis and the youth action plan should be submitted within 120 days as it aligns with the required submission of the resilience assessment and the gender analysis. It is now listed as a deliverable in Section F.

(RFA amended on p.57 and 61. SECTION F: FEDERAL AWARD INFORMATION. F.3. Reporting and Plans Requirements.)

Question NO.84:
In Section D, Part 6 Business (Cost) Application Format, no designated exchange rate is provided. Given the ongoing currency devaluation in Mozambique, will USAID kindly indicate the designated exchange rate to be used for purposes of developing the cost application?

ANSWER NO.84:
The cost applications must be in US dollars. If conversion is needed please refer to the Mozambique Central Bank exchange rate as reference.

Question NO.85:
Will USAID kindly confirm the need to create the RESINA budget by province? Would this include submission of separate detailed budgets for each province?

ANSWER NO.85:
A comprehensive budget submission (including the two provinces) is expected based on the RFA requirements.
USAID does not expect submission of separate budgets for each province.

Question NO.86:
For Technical design and Budget purposes, can USAID kindly clarify the estimated start date of RESINA?

ANSWER NO.86:
Please Refer to Answer #27.

Question NO.87:
Per the RFA (pg. 41), the Draft Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is not to exceed 5 pages in length. However, the provided MELP template is 14 pages in length. Can you please clarify which elements of the MELP count toward the page limit?

ANSWER NO.87:
Please Refer to Answer #67.

Question NO.88
Per the RFA (pg. 34), the Start Date has not been decided. Could USAID please provide an estimated start date to comply with the cost application requirements stated on pg. 38?

ANSWER NO.88:
Please Refer to Answer #27.

Question NO.89:
Per the RFA (pg. 19), we are introduced to a 10% Crisis Modifier for emergencies. Could USAID clarify the following:

a. Is this 10% amount from the total award amount going to the recipient, or to the full funding amount (meaning it would be $2,950,000)?
b. On pg. 59, Section H, Annex 1, in the Budget Summary Template we see the Crisis Modifier grouped with Indirect Costs. Does this indicate that the crisis modifier be treated as part of Indirect Costs, or should it be treated as direct costs (and have applicable NICRA/overhead costs coming out of it)?

ANSWER NO.89:

a) Please Refer to Answer # 10.
b) The crisis modifier is for contingency planning as part of direct cost. NICRA/overhead costs apply.

Question NO.90:
In the previously released RFI, suggested funding allocations per sector were provided ($20M – Ag, $5M - WASH and Nutrition respectively). Would USAID clarify if this rough distribution is still expected in application? As the RFA does not mention this issue.

ANSWER NO.90:
USAID confirms these are estimates for Agriculture, WASH and Nutrition budget levels. RFA was amended to include this information.

(RFA amended in pg. 1. Cover letter).

Question NO.91:
Per the RFA (pg. 48), could USAID clarify whether the number of review criteria are 3 or 4?

a. Could USAID also clarify the point-weight of each category?

ANSWER NO.91:

a) Please refer to Answer # 29.

b) **There is no numerical point-weight assigned to the review criteria. The technical applications will be reviewed in accordance with the three (3) review criteria which are listed in Descending order of Importance: (1) Technical Approach, (2) Personnel and Management Structure, and (3) Institutional Capacity. The Technical Application will be scored by a Selection Committee (SC) using the ratings described in section E.2. Review and Selection Process on p. 48 of the RFA**

Question NO.92:
Does past performance information need to be provided by each partner in an application, or only by the prime applicant?

ANSWER NO.92:
Please Refer to Question #73

Question NO.93:
Per the RFA (pg. 24), Section C.14, "At least 30% of the FTF RESINA budget should be spent on partnering through sub-awards (sub-grants) or other formats (i.e., mechanisms could include in-kind or technical support, performance-based contracts, and fixed-amount subawards) with multiple committed local partners, . . .".

a. Could USAID confirm that that statement applies to only local partners? (As the wording of the full sentence is ambiguous due to its length)

ANSWER NO.93:
Please refer to Answer #13.

(RFA amended on pg. 25 of RFA - C.14. Sub-Recipients (Sub-Awards) and Grants)

Question NO.94:
The Theory of Change states '*If we assist communities to diversify incomes through increased agricultural productivity, market engagement, and non-farm livelihoods...*' Non-farm livelihood is often used to refer to off-farm activities that are not in the agricultural sector. Off-farm is often used to refer to agricultural activities not directly related to farm production of crops and livestock. Since Sub IR 1.2 and Sub IR 2.1 refer to profitability of agricultural enterprises and climate change adaptation in agriculture, can USAID confirm that "non-farm" livelihoods in the TOC refers to livelihood strategies in the agricultural sector or change the TOC language from "non-farm" to "off-farm" livelihoods?

ANSWER NO.94:
Language has been changed from non-farm to off-farm.

**(RFA amended
on p.21. B.7. Results Framework and Expected Outcomes)**

Question NO.95:
Can USAID clarify what is considered as acceptable as cost share on this bid?

a. Must assets be cash; or are in-kind and other sources considered acceptable

ANSWER NO.95:
Cost Share is required for this NOFO at a minimum of 5% of the Total Estimated Amount by the recipient of the award. Please see additional guidance on ADS .303.3.10.2 Cost Share in NOFOs.

Question NO.96:
Per the RFA (pg. 25), "Construction activities are not allowed under grants." However, on pg. 18 USAID highlights the importance of "Increased access to clean water" under Sub-IR 2.2.

a. Could USAID please clarify if any WASH infrastructure development is allowable under this grant? Or is all WASH infrastructure – for example, the drilling of a borehole and installation of a water pump for usage – non-allowable?

ANSWER NO.96:

**Construction is allowed for WASH activities within the following rules (ADS 303):
The construction activities are only a portion of all award activities and
1. The estimated cost of WASH construction activities at a single project site is less than $500,000 (see definition of single project site below); and
2. The total aggregate estimated cost of construction activities under the award is less than $10,000,000. Please see: USAID Implementation of Construction Activities: A Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapters 303. No construction activities other than those explicitly approved under the agreement may be performed under Cooperative Agreement. Thus, Applicants should budget and provide a list of the activities/illustrative item table for interventions for WASH construction envisioned per site with their Application submission.**

(RFA amended on p.51. Section D. I. Funding Restrictions)

Question NO.97:
Em que língua (Portuguesa ou Inglesa) devem ser apresentadas as propostas?

ANSWER NO.97:
All Applications must be submitted in English following the RFA format instructions.

Question NO.98:
Existe limite do montante do orçamento que deve ser apresentado numa proposta?

ANSWER NO.98:
The RFA indicates an indicative RESINA Total Cost Estimate (TEC) of $29.5 Million.

Question NO.99:
Duas ou mais organizações interessadas podem constituir um consórcio e desenvolver uma única proposta de financiamento?

ANSWER NO.99:
Yes. Sub-recipient (sub-award) partnerships are highly encouraged. However, USAID would have a direct relationship with the Prime partner and the sub-subrecipients would have a direct relationship with the Prime.

Question NO.100:
As propostas devem necessariamente cobrir os Resultados Intermédios, ou o(s) interessado(s) podem concentrar o seu foco para um ou dois dos três resultados apresentados no Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)?

ANSWER NO.100:
Please refer to pg. 21 of the RFA: The Recipient is not expected to achieve all outcomes listed under the IRs in section B.7. Applicants shall propose a comprehensive package of interventions with a clear approach and methodology that is specific to the context, shocks and stressors in the target zones and contributes to the achievement of the overarching goals of the activity. Applicants are encouraged to propose modifications to the Results Framework (RF) and Theory of Change (TOC) as appropriate but should provide evidence and clear logical justification for the proposed modifications.

[END OF ATTACHMENT 1 Q&A'S]