



SUBJECT: Request for Applications (RFA) Number SOL-521-12-000043
AVOID HIV and its Transmission (EVIHT)

Questions and Answers

1. Are Global Fund monies acceptable forms of cost share under 22 CFR 226.23?

Answer: USAID follows the regulations indicated in 22CFR226.23 regarding Cost share or matching, therefore Federal Government funds under another award, except where authorized by Federal Statute may not be used for cost sharing or matching.

2. Will USAID provide additional guidance on how you will evaluate cost share in the technical application, per pg. 36 of the RFA, as it is unusual to see cost share evaluated in the technical approach.

Answer: The RFA has been amended, please refer to cover page 1 of this amendment 03.

3. The RFA document is sometimes unclear about the interventions USAID wants to cover the entire country, those that should primarily target the USG development corridors, and those that should work primarily in the West, Artibonite, North, and North East Departments. Does USAID wish to specify this in more detail, or is it intentionally flexible to allow the applicant the possibility to propose the package of interventions that it thinks makes most sense?

Answer: It is indeed USAID expectations to receive technical applications with a package of interventions that is logical and will contribute to achieve the three strategic objectives of the RFA. However, as a communication project EVIHT should have national coverage since HIV prevention is part of the basic package of primary health care. USAID commitments remain to support the basic package of primary health care nationwide.

The RFA promotes a strong advocacy strategy to support HIV activities which should have national coverage not limited to specific geographic Departments.

While USAID is intensifying support within the corridor regions, it is expected that for the purposes of this RFA, in addition to national communication support, the implementing partner would coordinate activities (where appropriate) with the PSI PrevSIDA II project, which has conducted a national mapping of HIV "hot spots" where known transactional sex/risky behaviors are known to take place.

4. Page 11 of the RFA states: Effective availability of quality discordant counseling protocols. Should it read "quality discordant couple counseling"?

Answer: *Please read “Effective availability of discordant couple counseling protocols” see amendment 03*

5. In the table on Page 12 of the RFA, under “HIV Prevention Interventions” for “Tested HIV Positive” states: Provide prevention case management. Is it supposed to read “Provide secondary prevention case management”?

Answer: *Please read “Provide secondary prevention case management” please refer to cover page 1of this amendment 03.*

6. There is mention of many USG-supported HIV/AIDS prevention programs with which EVIHT will need to collaborate, including PrevSIDA, CHAMP, PROMARK, PMTCT, ART, PEP, HTC and ART programs. Are there documents or websites that can easily be shared with applicants eager to find out more about these programs? As just one example, (p. 14) mention is made that “...rapid expansion in the delivery of PEP services will start immediately.” Information on plans for that rapid expansion will be useful to applicants.

Answer: *Yes documents are available. We encourage applicants to consult the PEPFAR, Global Fund and UNAIDS websites at www.unaids.org . It is also good for applicants to consult the National AIDS Program.*

USAID expectation is to receive from applicants plans that would facilitate the rapid expansion of PEP services since the availability of these services has been very limited. PMTCT, ART, PEP, HTC and ART services are different components of the national AIDS strategy/program supported mainly by PEPFAR and Global Fund.

7. The RFA makes the point that data on HIV/AIDS current data on prevalence and risk factors is either not available or not up to date. The RFA also mentions studies in progress, such as PLACE, IBBS, and TRaC. Would it be possible to have access to data/reports being generated/already disseminated through these studies, or other suggested current relevant programmatic research?

Answer: *Yes data is available. PLACE, IBBS and TraC surveys have been completed and results are available at the Ministry of Health and these data have been also used to prepare the UNGASS report at www.unaids.org this year.*

8. The manner in which EVIHT amounts to a “GDA” is unclear in the RFA. For example, page 21: “...the EVIHT project itself should be structured as a global development alliance (GDA)...” makes it seem as if the entire EVIHT effort should be organized as a public private partnership. Given the substantial scope of work partnering and building the capacity of public sector entities in Haiti, it some of the scope of work lends itself to GDA-like public private partnerships, while other portions of the work seem to not fit that programming model. Any clarification that can be provided will be appreciated.

Answer: *As discussed during the pre-award conference delete “GDA”. The word GDA has been deleted since it refers to the office in DC that works on promoting the public-private partnership initiative, please refer to cover page 1of this amendment 03. To ensure the sustainability of activities under EVIHT, we encourage applicants to partner with entities from the private sector in order to leverage resources and expertise for the benefit of the project. Thus our expectation is*

to receive technical applications that aim to strengthen the NACP while partnering with private entities to guarantee the continuity of the activities after the life of the project.

9. On pages 20 and 21, the RFA lists 15 pages as maximum for technical proposal and 15 pages maximum for Annexes. So the total maximum for all components of the technical submission is 30 pages, correct?

Answer: *Yes correct, total pages for all submissions shall not exceed 30 pages.*

10. On page 21, the RFA lists 3 to 4 pages that will be taken up with cover page, table of contents and executive summary. Are these counted against the 15 page maximum for technical before annexes, or are these separate from that page limit?

Answer: *Yes they are counted.*

11. On page 9 of the RFA, it is specified that the project has 60 days to prepare and submit to USAID “an inventory of the staffing needs” of the NACP. Is 2 months enough time for the project to startup activities and adequately engage government and NACP in a participatory and thorough review of management strengths and weaknesses to prepare such a set of recommendations?

Answer: *Based on our estimation, 60 days will be sufficient time.*

12. The directions regarding the technical application format (pages 20 through 22) are confusing, particularly when compared with “Section V – Application Review Information” on pages 36 -38. Any clarification/harmonization that can be provided between the two will be helpful. For example, on page 22, “Planning Monitoring and Reporting”, “Project Management and Staffing Plan”, “Key Personnel” and “Past Performance” are all listed as Annexes I through IV. Should we read that to mean that these 4 topics should be primarily treated in Annexes, and not the body of the 15 page technical response?

Answer: *No these items must be inserted in the technical application; however, supporting documentation may be included in the annexes.*

13. Please clarify the extent to which this program will be expected to support HIV services in terms of management/logistics and technical/quality delivery.

Answer: *This is a communication focused project. All activities under EVIHT, beside specific activities under strategic objective II, should aim to promote behavior change and advocate creating the enabling environment for the delivery of good HIV services to all beneficiaries and their relatives.*

14. There seems to be a disconnect between the technical content of the IR and the indicators. Several of the indicators to measure achievement of the strategic objective results seem overly focused on expansion of service provision, as distinct from changes in attitudes, norms, behaviors, policies or capacity. AS an example, on page 15 of the RFA, there are indicators related to the Percentage of facilities that provide PMTCT, PEP and HTC services. Is the VIHT program going to be held accountable for the expansion of those services.

Answer: *It's important that the overarching goal of the RFA matches with each strategic objective and indicators that have been proposed under each objective. USAID expectation is to receive technical applications that meet these requirements. As discussed during the pre-award conference, each applicant has the possibility to propose indicators that would facilitate to monitor the activities based on their technical approach.*

16. Page 21 of the RFA notes that the award will be structured as a global development alliance (GDA) "...and will likely include at least one (private sector) resource partner and an implementing partner." Could USAID define what they consider a "resource partner"? Does USAID anticipate that a "resource partner" would not receive budget under this program but rather contribute services pro bono? Does USAID expect these private sector "resource partners" to be identified in the proposal phase or after award?

Answer: *A "resource partner" can be a private company, a university, an association, etc. which is willing to commit resources and expertise toward the implementation of this program. It's expected that the applicant will identify its resource partner and describe how this partner will contribute toward implementation of the project. USAID does not anticipate that a Resource Partner would receive a budget, rather will contribute with their own resources, pro-bono or otherwise.*

17. Also on page 21, the RFA encourages inclusion of the Haitian government in the partnership and notes that the parties to the partnership should jointly define the problems, situation and solutions, noting it are beneficial to do so from the outset. Given the competitive nature of this solicitation, is USAID expecting that applicants will work with the Haitian government in developing their proposals?

Answer: *USAID encourages all applicants to work closely with the Ministry of Health as needed. However, USAID does not expect for the Ministry to participate in the developing proposals.*

18. Does USAID consider "men in uniform" (military personnel) and/or migrant workers as being appropriate target populations for this proposal?

Answer: *Men in uniform and/or migrant workers are categorized as Most-at-Risk Populations (MARPS) by the Ministry of Health. Thus, USAID considers them as MARPS for the purposes of this RFA.*

19. Is there a limit on the file size per email that can be submitted to USAID when emailing the application?

Answer: *USAID is able to receive files up to 20mb.*

20. Could USAID kindly provide the points/weighting associated with each category in the technical evaluation section of the RFA (pages 36-37 of the RFA)? For example, how many points / what is the weighting for Key Personnel vs. Organizational Capability.

Answer: *The Technical Evaluation Criteria shall be evaluated based on the **adjectival ratings** described in the RFA. The focus of the technical evaluation will be to identify the strengths, weaknesses and*

deficiencies of each application. The adjectival ratings will be the basis for ranking applications and will serve as the basis for the TEC's selection recommendation. No points will be attributed in scoring applications.

21. Page 25 of the RFA stipulates a separate section to detail the 20% cost share requirement. Would USAID consider the possibility of submitting a paragraph on the cost share stating where the funds will come from instead of having to give details by line item and year? The concern is that we have not yet secured funds for the next 4 years to be able to adequately provide a detailed cost share.

Answer: USAID follows the regulations indicated in 22CFR226.23 regarding Cost share. It is expected for the applicant to provide sufficient details to make the proposed cost share realistic per the requirements of 22CFR226.23.

23. On line 13 of the budget template, could USAID please clarify the difference between “home office” and “field office”? Is home office considered PSI/Washington (headquarters) and field office PSI/Haiti or is it PSI/Haiti main office (home office) and other local offices in country (field office)

Answer: Home Office is the location of the organization's headquarters if it is outside Haiti, then the office in Haiti would be considered the field office.

24. On line 26 of the budget template, can USAID clarify the term "Transportation of HHE &C"?

Answer: HHE – Household Effects and Consumables see FAM.

26. I would like to confirm that PIO's are eligible for this solicitation.

Answer: Yes, PIO's are eligible to apply for this Cooperative Agreement.