# Questions and Answers

1. Will the Government (USAID) consider extending the Closing Date of the RFA?
   **Answer:** ***In order to allow potential applicants enough time to process the Government's response to the questions posed herein, USAID is extending the Closing Date of the RFA from January 6, 2012 to Monday, January 23, 2012. The Closing Time remains unchanged at 14:00 (Nigeria Time, GMT +1).***

2. On page 2 of the RFA, it is stated that "Applications must be received by the closing date and time indicated at the top of this cover letter…" Please indicate if the hard copies of the application can be postmarked on the submission deadline day, i.e., January 6th.
   **Answer:** ***See response to Question 1. All hard copies should be post marked on the Closing Date of the solicitation, which has been changed to January 23, 2012.***

3. On page 36 of the RFA, it states "hard copies must be received no later than twenty-four (24) hours after submission deadline." Given that the day after the closing date is a Saturday, would USAID consider extending the time in which applicants may submit a hardcopy?
   **Answer:** ***See responses to Question 1 and Question 2.***

4. When does USAID expect that the MARKETS program will be awarded and what is the expectation that this award coordinate with that program?
   **Answer:** ***USAID does not release information on upcoming procurements/assistance awards. It should be noted that this is a standalone solicitation.***

   ***In general, USAID expects all of its programs to collaborate (as appropriate) in order to maximize efficiency and have maximum developmental impact.***

5. Does USAID anticipate ADS 303.3.6.5 "Exceptions to Competition Requirements" to impact the requirements set forth in the RFA?
   **Answer:** ***This RFA is under full and open competition.***

6. On page 6 of the RFA, Section I – Funding Opportunities Description, A. Program Description Summary it is indicated that the "Resource requirements for each Assistance Objective are as follows: - Strengthening Civic Engagement for Good Governance; - Increasing Rural Incomes and Jobs in Assisted Areas, etc…" Should the applicant allocate a specific percentage in the Summary Table of the cost proposal for each objective?
   **Answer:** ***This is not a requirement of the RFA. As stated in the last sentence of Section I. A. of the RFA, "Resources under this RFA will contribute to the objective of Increasing Nigerian Capacity for a Sustainable HIV/AIDS and TB Response."***

7. What is the expectation for working with children in institutions? Will service delivery to children in institutions be included? Or simply capacity building for government agencies that have responsibility for the institutions?
   **Answer:** ***Please refer to PEPFAR Orphans and other Vulnerable Children programming Guidance found at http://www.pepfar.gov/guidance/78161.htm.***

8. Are applicants expected to become fully operable in all states in Year 1?
   **Answer:** ***USAID expects that the program will be operational in all the target states by the end of the first year.***

9. On page 7 of the RFA, it states that "70% of the budget is for sub-grants and sub-contracts to Nigerian entities only. The remaining 30% or less will be the cost for administrative and personnel support to the awardees."
   a. On pages 14-16, of the RFA, can USAID confirm whether the funds for activities 1 and 3, related to capacity building, are expected to come out of the 30% of the budget allocated for sub-grants management or can these activities be funded out of the 70% portion of the budget?

   b. If a partner organization that is contributing to providing capacity building and managing sub-grants is Nigerian, can the funds for their activities be allocated out of the 70%?

   **Answer:** ***USAID envisions awarding to a Prime Recipient who in turn will make sub-awards to Nigerian entities as described in detail in the RFA. It is also envisioned that the selected Nigerian entities will either work directly with OVCs or with other local organizations that work with OVCs. (Note that while such a framework is envisioned, USAID is looking for innovative approaches from applicants.)***

   ***In the above-described scenario, USAID confirms that activities that enhance the capacity of the sub-awardees should be funded out of the 30%. The 70% should go directly to sub-awardees. The sub-awardee cannot exclusively be a capacity building organization.***

   ***In general, it is expected that capacity building shall be a substantial component of the support provided by the Prime Recipient for the overall success of the program.***

10. The RFA requires that 70% of funds be allocated to Nigerian organizations. Is this only for OVC service delivery organizations? Or does it also include local government, private sector entities other technical assistance organizations not providing direct services to OVC?
    **Answer:** ***While USAID expects that the majority of these funds to be allocated to the organizations providing direct services to OVCs, sub-awards can also be made to public or private organizations providing support to OVCs. See Section I.E. Activity 2 for further details.***

11. Page 12, D.3 Estimated Targets – The two proposed awards will support approximately 250,000 caregivers of OVC. Please confirm that this is the total number to be reached over 5 years and not the annual number.
    **Answer:** ***USAID confirms that the 250,000 caregivers specified on the referenced page are to be reached over a five year period.***

12. Reference page 12: Estimated Targets - Is there any expectation about division of effort across the 5 focal States? Clearly, some States have a higher prevalence of OVC than others, and we propose that our input should reflect this.
    **Answer:** ***We understand that there could be variations in the number of OVCs in the targeted States and it is recommended that this fact be considered in applications.***

***However, note that USAID expects each Region (Region 1 and Region 2) will contribute approximately half of the beneficiaries.***

13. On page 12, the text reads, "The Recipient(s) will not directly implement program activities, but rather act as a grant management partner, issuing sub-grants and building the organizational and technical capacity of grantees and sub-grantees that are the implementers of PEPFAR OVC programs and provide assistance to OVC." Kindly confirm the difference between "grantees" and "sub-grantees" for the purpose of this RFA and if different levels of grant-management are permitted?
**Answer:** ***The wording in this sentence is in error and is hereby corrected to read as follows: "The Recipient(s) will not directly implement program activities, but rather act as a grant management partner, issuing sub-grants and building the organizational and technical capacity of sub-awardees/sub-grantees who are the implementers of PEPFAR OVC programs and provide assistance to OVC."***

    ***USAID envisions awarding to a Prime Recipient who in turn will make sub-awards to Nigerian entities as described in detail in the RFA. It is also envisioned that the selected Nigerian entities (sub-awardees) will either work directly with OVCs or with other local organizations that work with OVCs. See responses to Question 9.***

    ***USAID does not envision sub-awardees making any grants.***

    ***(Note that while such a framework is envisioned, USAID is looking for innovative approaches from applicants.)***

14. Is it the expectation that the prime will provide all technical assistance to the state and local governments and the CSO that receive subgrants?
**Answer:** ***Yes, it is expected that the Prime Recipient(s) will provide technical assistance and support to sub-awardees.***

15. Is there any restriction on the types of grants that can be used (fixed obligation, cost-reimbursable, challenge grants, etc.—also subcontracts if applicable)?
**Answer:** ***Going by the kind and level of intervention that this RFA seeks to address, applicants are free to propose an optimum and result-oriented grant strategy.***

16. Grant making in Nigeria especially to government authorities carries a level of risk in relation to disallowable expenditure or misused funds. If USAID were to give out the sub-grants they would be indemnified no matter how effectively they awarded and/or managed the sub-grants. Would USAID accept an approach that approval of a sub-grant based on procedures within the agreed grant manual that outlines clear compliance requirements and demonstrates fiscal due diligence, that the prime will be held harmless should a sub-grantee incur unallowable costs?
**Answer:** ***USAID regulations require that unallowable costs are reimbursed back to the project. Accordingly, the Prime Recipient will be held responsible for every dollar of the award including amounts that the Prime Recipient gives out to the sub-awardees.***

17. Reference page 16: it states that implementing partners *'are encouraged to work with grantees and sub-grantees that have successfully implemented OVC programming under previous USG awards'*. Might we assume that it is therefore acceptable to use this as one of the key selection criteria when making awards under the competitive granting process?
    **Answer:** ***The full sentence referenced in this question reads, "…that have successfully implemented OVC programming under previous USG awards, as well as identify new sub-grantees."***

    ***While it is acceptable to consider Past Performance (to include quality of product and services, cost control, timeliness, customer satisfaction and effectiveness of Key Personnel) as a selection criterion, it is important to note that entities that do not have Past Performance should not be penalized. Rather, they should receive a "neutral" rating for Past Performance in the selection process.***

    ***It should also be noted that in order to foster a larger assistance base and expand the number and sustainability of development partners, USAID encourages applications from potential new members. It is expected the Prime Recipient will support this policy.***

    ***In general, USAID encourages a transparent grants process under full and open competition that will bring on board both new and existing qualified sub-awardees.***

18. Page 21 of the RFA highlights that "Approaches should seek to co-fund and plan with other key donors (I.e. UNICEF, DfID, World Bank) investment in strengthening social service systems." Would USAID/Nigeria kindly clarify its specific expectations of applicants in this area?
    **Answer:** ***The referenced bullet on page 21 of the RFA is hereby replaced to read as follows: "Coordinate and collaborate efforts with key players in OVC care in the country including seeking opportunities for leveraging resources to improve program impact".***

19. On page 22 of the RFA, under F.5. Quality-focused Approach, in its last bullet is indicated: "Introduce performance-based financing which links motivational incentives (performance fee) as well as sanctions (little or no performance fee), to achieving performance agreed upon in a subgrant." Please elaborate on the 'performance fee' and the 22 CFR 226.81 on prohibition of fee under assistance instruments.
    **Answer:** ***The usage of the terms "performance-based financing" and "performance fee" was in error. The first sentence of the referenced bullet on page 22 of the RFA is hereby replaced as follows: "Propose motivational incentives for sub-awardees to improve access to and quality of OVC services."***

20. Is it anticipated that there will be one Grants Manager as key personnel? Also please clarify the title, in some places this person is referred to as a specialist, and at other times as a manager.
    **Answer:** ***The RFA requires that there be only one Grant Manager as Key Personnel. Further, USAID/Nigeria understands that different organizations have differing nomenclatures. It is acceptable to refer to the position as "Grants Manager" or "Grants Specialist".***

21. On page 25 of the RFA, in F.12 Personnel and Staffing Plan, a list of suggested sections is included (e.g., Organizational Chart, skills matrix, staffing pattern, etc). May USAID clarify (if any) the difference between 'staffing pattern' and the 'organizational chart."?
**Answer:** ***The "Organizational Chart" and the "Staffing Pattern" are used interchangeably in the RFA. They are both components of the "Staffing Plan".***

22. Mid-term and Final Evaluation - What is prime partners's responsibility for the mid-term and final evaluation. On page 27 it states: "At program mid-term, USAID will conduct performance assessment to determine need for program review, redirection, lessons learned, challenges and possible continuation of funding." On page 29, it states: "Evaluations shall be planned by the designated Agreement Officer Technical Representative and conducted during the life of the project. The recipient shall maintain a database of monitoring data that will be used in evaluating the performance of the project. The recipient shall prepare the database and other information necessary for a thorough evaluation accessible to the evaluation team." Does this mean we have no responsibility for either and we do not have to budget for them?
**Answer:** ***While applicants can budget for a baseline assessment and other project related assessments and special studies to generate strategic information, external midterm and end of project evaluations (as necessary) will be separately budgeted for by USAID and should not be included in the budget proposal for this application.***

23. Will USAID commission an external baseline and an endline evaluation for this grant or are applicants expected to include these costs in our budgets and in our technical approaches?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 22.***

24. Will USAID conduct both mid-term and final evaluations per the new USAID evaluation policy?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 22.***

25. Is it expected that MEASURE Evaluation will work with the successful applicant(s) in the program implementation?
**Answer:** ***See Section I. F.8 Coordinated Approach for details.***

***In general, USAID expects that all its implementing partners collaborate and coordinate with each other as necessary to accomplish the Agency's mission as efficiently as possible.***

26. Are evaluations of Track 1 OVC grants available? Will USAID please share them with the applicants?
**Answer:** ***Track One OVC grants evaluation report is publicly available at: http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACO348.pdf***

27. Can USAID provide the list of track 1 funded partners, their area of implementation and number of OVC expected to be absorbed?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 26.***

28. Can the targets that must be provided in the proposal be revised once the project starts if necessary?

**Answer:** ***USAID expects the applicant to meet the targets set for each year and for the entire duration of the program.***

29. Reference page 28: Information about all activities to be monitored under the PMP: The list of activities should be provided in a logical framework which links activities to Agreement results - both those dictated by USAID in the solicitation and lower level or complementary results contained in the Recipient's approach. What are these agreement results dictated by USAID in the solicitation?
    **Answer: The "Agreement Results" dictated by USAID (referenced on page 28 of the solicitation) are the "Activities" and the associated results contained in Section I.E.**

    ***(Note that activities and the associated results are illustrative and USAID is looking for innovative approaches from applicants. The award document (i.e., the Cooperative Agreement) will include the final Agreement Results that will be expected from the Recipient.)***

30. The proposal references a PMP, a monitoring and evaluation plan, and a performance implementation plan. What content should be in the M&E plan, and how is it different from a PMP, and what content should be in a performance implementation plan?
    **Answer:** ***A Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (M&E Plan) encompasses the strategies, tools and processes used to collect, transfer, analyze and communicate data to monitor and evaluate the project. See Section I.G. for details.***

    ***A Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) focuses on monitoring project performance. It is a tool that helps measure the achievement of project objectives, milestones and targets for ongoing decision making, and to meet reporting requirements. A PMP is a component of a M&E Plan. See Section I.H.2 for details.***

    ***References in the RFA to a "Performance Implementation Plan" (as a standalone deliverable) are in error and are hereby deleted. Where a "performance implementation plan" is mentioned, the applicant is expected to provide a detailed description of the technical approaches and strategies as to how its proposed technical approaches will be implemented.***

    ***As such, on Page 39, "3. Implementation and Monitoring and Evaluation Plan" is hereby changed to read "3. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan". The first sentence under the same section is hereby revised to read as follows: "The technical approach must include a proposed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan which suggests both quantitative and qualitative indicators and proxy indicators to measure effectiveness of OVC programs.***

    ***Additionally, on Page 46, C.1. Technical Evaluation Criteria, the fourth header "Implementation and Monitoring and Evaluation Plan" is hereby changed to read "Monitoring and Evaluation Plan". The first sentence under the same section is hereby revised to read as follows: "Illustrate/demonstrate proactive and responsive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan that contributes to the achievement of the stated objectives of the RFA."***

31. Please confirm that the performance implementation plan is similar to a detailed implementation plan and whether this is expected prior to award? If expected within the

application, can USAID clarify the expectations as to what level of detail should be included in this plan? Should it cover all five years or just one year?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 30. Applicants are required to provide a Technical Approach (including detailed implementation steps) as requested in the RFA; all five years of the project should be addressed.***

32. Can USAID please clarify what is expected to be submitted for the M&E plan? On page 29 it makes reference to an executive summary and summary table but this seems to refer more to annual reports that are submitted post-award.
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 30. The "Executive Summary" and "Summary Table" referenced in the question (on page 29 of RFA) are part of the Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP), which is a post-award requirement.***

33. The RFA says that proposals should state how monitoring indicators relate to activities - does this mean that a detailed list of monitoring indicators for every corresponding activity must be provided? Or can lists of indicators be illustrative?
**Answer:** ***Illustrative indicators suffice for the application.***

34. OVC Age Categories - What are the OVC age categories used by USAID for disaggregating OVC data by age?
**Answer:** ***The age categorization for children is 0-5; 6-11; and 12-17 years of age. The applicant shall use this age categorization as there is no different age categorization for OVCs.***

35. Should applicants submit with their applications an IEE referred to on page 29?
**Answer:** ***No special document is expected on IEE in the application.***

36. On page 30 of the RFA, an environmental examination is mentioned. Can USAID confirm that this is not required at the time of proposal submission but rather, at the time of award?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 35.***

37. On page 32 of the RFA in Section II – Award Information, A. Estimated Funds Available is stated: "… USAID intends to allocate a total of up $32.5 million to each of the two Cooperative Agreements for the two identified regions (Region 1 and Region 2)…" May USAID indicate if an organization can apply to both regions simultaneously?
**Answer:** ***USAID confirms that an organization can submit applications for both regions identified in the RFA. However, applicants must clearly state the Region for which it is submitting an application.***

38. On page 33, the RFA states that the recipient should mobilize within 30 days and establish an office in Abuja. Please clarify that the preference is Kaduna and Kogi and not Abuja.
**Answer:** ***The reference to Abuja is a typographical error: the preference is for Prime recipients to establish offices in Kaduna (Region 1) and Kogi (Region 2).***

***As such, the first sentence in Section II.H. is hereby changed to read as follows: "The applicant will be expected to mobilize within thirty days of signing the award, including***

***having senior staff in place and an office established in the recommended headquarters for the project--Kaduna (Region 1) and Kogi (Region 2."***

39. The RFA indicates the applicant is to establish an office in Abuja, Nigeria within 30 days, in addition to having senior staff in place (page 33). However there is a requirement for the main office to be established in Kaduna or Kogi. Does this mean there is an expectation that there will be a presence in Abuja as well as the main offices being situated in Kogi and Kaduna for the two regions?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 38.***

40. Ref pg.33: Mobilization Plan – "*the applicant is expected to mobilize within thirty days of signing the award…*" This seems like a very rapid start-up and could be problematic in terms of engagement of staff who need to give notice periods.
**Answer:** ***USAID expects that Applicants would have identified Key Personnel already and it is USAID's judgment that this milestone remains feasible. The requirement remains unchanged.***

41. On page 34 of the RFA, it states "cost share amount will not be evaluated nor considered in the award selection process," however in the evaluation criteria on page 48 it states "If two applications are determined to be technically equal, the one with greater cost share, favorable past performance and lower cost will be considered to be of greater value." Please clarify.
**Answer:** ***The last sentence in Section III (page 34 of the RFA), which reads, "Note that Cost Share amount will not be evaluated nor considered in the award selection process" is in error and is hereby deleted.***

42. Page 34 of the RFA states "USAID encourages cost sharing to be included as part of the application. Note that cost share amount will not be evaluated nor considered in the award selection process." However, page 48 has a contradictory statement: "Cost share from the applicant is viewed favorably. If two applications are determined to be technically equal, the one with greater cost share, favorable past performance and lower cost will be considered to be of greater value." Please clarify whether cost share will be evaluated and considered in the selection process.
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 41.***

43. Ref pg.34 Cost-Sharing – It states that "*…cost share amount will not be evaluated nor considered in the award selection process…*" However, this appears contradictory to the statement on pg.48 which states "*…if two applications are determined to be technically equal, the one with greater cost share, favourable past performance and lower cost will be considered to be of greater value*."
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 41.***

44. On page 39 of the RFA, it states "Applicants must submit up to five past performance references relevant to this scope of work." Is the maximum of 5 per consortium or per implementing partner?
**Answer:** ***Applicants should submit 5 past performance references for the Prime, and 5 additional for each of the consortium members.***

45. Page 39 indicates that up to five past performance references should be included as Appendix 7. Is this total inclusive of the prime and all partners? Or should each consortium member submit up to five?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 44.***

46. Whether or not all the partners in a consortium need to submit a PPR. It requests that the applicant submits a PPR, and not sure if that means it's just the prime or all subs as well.
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 41. Regarding sub-awardees, there is no requirement for Past Performance information from any sub-awardees as the expectation is that the Prime Recipient will conduct a transparent grants process under full and open competition that will bring on board both new and existing qualified sub-awardees. See response to Question 17 as well.***

47. Past Performance References - Can number of past performance references exceed five if the Agency applying has more references involving similar or related programs?
**Answer:** ***Five is the maximum for this RFA.***

48. Project Abstract - On pg. 40, #3 is stated as Project Abstract. Can you please clarify if the Project Abstract constitutes the Executive Summary or if these should be two separate sections?
**Answer:** ***For the purpose of this RFA, "Project Abstract" and "Executive Summary" are used interchangeably.***

49. Should the Project Abstract referred to on page 40 of the RFA be included within the 50 page count of the proposal?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 48. The Project Abstract/Executive Summary will not count as part of the 50-page limit for the Technical Application.***

***Additionally, Section IV.G.3 (page 40 of RFA), is hereby changed to read as follows: "3. Project Abstract/Executive Summary should not exceed one (1) page."***

50. Would USAID like the monitoring and evaluation plan, performance monitoring plan, and the implementation plan included within the 50 page count of the proposal?
**Answer:** ***The Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) is a post-award requirement. See response to Question 32.***

***References in the RFA to a "Performance Implementation Plan" (as a standalone deliverable) are in error and not applicable. See response to Question 30.***

***A summary of the overall Monitoring and Evaluation Plan should be included in the Technical Application and is subject to the 50-page limit. If the applicant wants to submit a detailed plan, it can be submitted as an attachment.***

51. M&E Plan - Is the M&E plan part of the 50 pages? Are we permitted to include the detailed plan as an appendix?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 50.***

52. Ref. pg 40: There seems to be some confusion as to the difference between requested appendices and attachments. It states on page 40 as well that appendices, as specified, should be included. However, it then says that *'attachments should be lettered*' (e.g. Attachment A), and should include a staffing plan including an organogram, the resumes/CVs of key personnel, letters of support, letters from public entities, and other supporting documents' (page 40). Yet on page 25 it refers to these specifically as appendices, and says that this section should include:
    - A detailed organizational chart (Appendix 1)
    - A brief description of relevant experience of key personnel
    - A skills matrix for proposed program staff (Appendix 2) identifying skills and expertise of proposed staff appropriate to the activities in the Scope of Work
    - Curricula Vitae's (CVs) and profiles for Key Personnel (3 pages maximum per position) and other proposed key staff (2 pages maximum per position), where appropriate (Appendix 4) and
    - Chart reflecting the staffing Pattern (Appendix 6)

    **Answer:** ***Note that "Attachments" and "Appendices" are used interchangeably for the purpose of this RFA and none of the items designated as "Attachments" or "Appendices" will count towards the 50-page limit.***

    ***Moreover, suggested numbering of appendices (Appendix 1, 2, etc.) and suggested lettering of attachments (Attachment A, B, etc.) are hereby deleted from the RFA. Applicants are free to order appendices/attachments as they deem fit.***

53. There is thus some confusion as to what the appendices are and what they should be called. The PD refers to an example PMP which is supposed to be here as an Attachment 1 but isn't attached. On page 66 and 67 it says: Annex 3. Performance Monitoring Plan (See Attachment 1). Also refers to Annex 4. Quarterly Report Format (See Attachment 2) on page 66 and 67 which also isn't attached.
    **Answer:** ***See response to Question 52.***

    ***With respect to the referenced attachments, the Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) Template and the Quarterly Report Format (QRF) Template are attached to this Q&A. Please note that the PMP and QRF are post-award requirements.***

54. Page 25 of the RFA lists a number of required personnel appendices. Please clarify the difference between Appendix 1—detailed organizational chart and Appendix 6—chart reflecting the staffing Pattern?
    **Answer:** ***See response to Questions 25 and 52.***

55. The PD states '…*applicants should provide more detailed job descriptions in Appendix 3*…' on page 26; it never refers to Appendix
    **Answer:** ***See response to Question 52. Applicants are free to submit this information in an Appendix/Attachment number/letter of their choosing.***

56. Please clarify what USAID expects to be included in the staffing pattern chart (Attachment F/Appendix 6).

**Answer:** ***See response to Question 52. Also refer to Section I.F.12. (Personnel and Staffing Plan) for details of what should be included.***

**57.** Appendix 5 - On pages 25-26 of the RFA, a number of Appendices 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 are mentioned: the RFA says that Organizational Chart will be evaluated as Appendix 1, Skills Matrix as Appendix 2, Job Descriptions as Appendix 4, and a Chart reflecting the staffing pattern as Appendix 6. Appendix 5 is not mentioned. Is there an Appendix 5?
**Answer:** ***There was no Appendix 5 listed on Pages 25-26 of the RFA. See response to Question 52 for latest guidance.***

58. Appendix 5: Seems to have been skipped in the programme description – what could it be?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 57.***

59. Reference page 48: We have 'Branding and Marking Strategy Plan' under evaluation section, but not in the guidelines or instructions or format. Where does it go in the application?
**Answer:** ***The Branding Strategy and Marking Plan (currently in Section V.C.4) is misplaced and is hereby moved to Section VI. and input as new sub section letter I.***

***Applicants are free to submit a Branding Strategy and Marking Plan at this stage as an attachment/appendix but can also wait until invited to do so by USAID at a later point in the application process. Note that applicants submit the Branding Strategy and Marking Plan for USAID's approval.***

60. Would USAID like a draft Branding and Marking Plan included as an attachment to the proposal?
**Answer:** ***See response to Question 58.***

61. Can non-US agency access advances or lines of credits on the funding from a USAID cooperative agreement, like US based agencies can? Or would our costs only be reimbursed quarterly in arrears? In other words how can the prime receive advances if it is a non-US based PVO.
**Answer:** ***Yes, Non-US NGOs are eligible for payment advances. (See 22 CFR 226.22; Mandatory standard provisions for Non-US NGOs (a mandatory reference to ADS 303); and Payment Advances and Refunds (October 1998)). However, there are some differences in treatment based on the type of award and type of organization. (See ADS 636.5.6).***

62. How can we treat a **for-profit-organisation** that is essential to the project and that we might want to include in our consortium?
**Answer:** ***No funds shall be paid as profit to any Recipient that is a for-profit organization. Profit is any amount in excess of allowable direct and indirect costs. (See 22 CFR 226.81).***

63. Do for-profit organisation need to have a **DUNS**?
**Answer:** ***All organizations doing business with the United States Government must have a DUNS number. (See 2 CFR 25).***

64. How do they **claim their overheads** since it does not have a NICRA?

**Answer:** ***Indirect charges are not applicable to organizations that do not have a NICRA. All budgeted costs will have to be directly charged to the program.***

65. Can we name the subpartner in the application **or** should its selection be done after the award in an open tendering process?
    **Answer:** ***Yes, the Prime Recipient should name its partners (i.e. members of its consortium) in the application.***

    ***However, USAID expects that sub-awardees will come on-board after the Prime Recipient conducts a transparent grants process under full and open competition that will bring on board both new and existing qualified sub-awardees.***

66. Does USAID require the submission of supporting cost documents from all proposed subgrantees or only from the prime applicant (representations and certifications, SF424 forms, NICRA, evidence of responsibility)?
    **Answer:** ***Detailed budgets are required for the Prime Applicant and any of its major partners/consortium members (major partners/consortium members whose individual budget is equal to or greater than 6% of the total cost application).***

67. Can a prime which has a provisional NICRA agreement with USAID, include the same in the budget?
    **Answer:** ***Yes. Applicants should submit copies of the provisional Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreements to substantiate the proposed cost.***

68. If we have already submitted our application, given these Questions and Answers (or otherwise), can we send in an updated application?
    **Answer:** ***Applicants who have submitted applications are free to update their applications as long as they do so prior to the Closing Date and Closing Time of the RFA. See response to Question 1.***

69. Will USAID answer further questions related to this RFA?
    **Answer:** ***No, the deadline for questions has passed and the Government will not entertain any more questions.***

## ATTACHMENT 1: PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN (PMP) TEMPLATE (1 PAGE)

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT | DATA SOURCE | METHOD/ APPROACH OF DATA COLLECTION OR CALCULATION | DATA ACQUISITION BY MISSION | | ANALYSIS, USE AND REPORTING | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | SCHEDULE/ FREQUENCY | BY WHOM (PERSON/ TEAM) | SCHEDULE/ FREQUENCY | BY WHOM (PERSON/ TEAM) |
| Intermediate Result Name: | | | | | | | |
| 1. | **Definition:**<br><br>**Unit of Measurement:** | | | | | | |
| 2. | **Definition:**<br><br>**Unit of Measurement**: | | | | | | |
| 3. | **Definition:**<br><br>**Unit of Measurement:** | | | | | | |
| **Intermediate Result Name:** | | | | | | | |
| 1. | **Definition:**<br><br>**Unit of Measurement:** | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |

REQUEST FOR APPLICATION (RFA) NUMBER RFA-620-11-012

**"Scale-Up of Care and Support Services for Orphans and Vulnerable Children (O VC) in Selected States in Nigeria"**

## ATTACHMENT 2: QUARTERLY REPORT FORMAT (QRF) TEMPLATE (6 PAGES)

| *ACTIVITY SUMMARY* |
|---|
| **Implementing Partner:** |
| **Activity Name:** |
| **Activity Objective:** |
| **USAID/Nigeria SO:** |
| **Life of Activity:** |
| **Total Estimated Contract/Agreement Amount:** |
| **Obligations to date:** |
| **Accrued Expenditures this Quarter:** |
| **Activity Cumulative Accrued Expenditures to Date:** |
| **Estimated Expenditures Next Quarter:** |

**Title of Activity**

| | This year target | This year actual | This quarter target | This quarter actual | Explanation for variance or why not reported during this quarter | Next quarter target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Project Objective:** | | | | | | |
| Indicator 1: | | | | | | |
| Indicator 2: | | | | | | |
| Result 1: | | | | | | |
| Indicator 1.1: | | | | | | |
| • Output 1.1.1:<br>• Output 1.1.2: | | | | | | |
| Result 2: | | | | | | |
| Indicator 2.1: | | | | | | |
| • Output 2.1.1: | | | | | | |
| Indicator 2.2: | | | | | | |
| • Output 2.2.1:<br>• Output 2.2.2: | | | | | | |
| Result 3: | | | | | | |
| Indicator 3.1: | | | | | | |
| • Output 3.1.1:<br>• Output 3.1.2: | | | | | | |
| Indicator 3.2: | | | | | | |
| • Output 3.2.1 | | | | | | |
| Indicator 3.3: | | | | | | |
| • Output 3.3.1: | | | | | | |

The information in this table is to be based on the IP's Mission-approved PMP and Work Plan, and should focus on whether targets were met, not met or have been exceeded during the reporting period. The IP should report on all of the results and performance measures in the PMP and Work Plan if possible. Where reporting is not applicable, the IP may enter "N/A" and explain why in the "Explanation for variance" column (e.g., this data is collected and reported on annually). Discrepancies between targets and actuals must be explained. Please report according to the USG financial year calendar: Q1 = Oct-Dec 2011, Q2 = Jan-Mar 2012, FY 2012, etc. Refer to the sample table below as a guide.

**Sample Table: Rural Nigerians Growing Groundnuts Project**

| | This year target | This year actual | This quarter target | This quarter actual | Explanation for variance or why not reported during this quarter | Next quarter target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Objective: Increased groundnut-based economic opportunities** | | | | | | |
| Indicator 1: Income from groundnut and products | | | | | | |
| Indicator 2: Job creation | | | | | | |
| Result 1: Increased productivity of groundnuts | | | | | | |
| Indicator 1.1: Productivity of groundnuts | | | | | | |
| • Output 1.1.1: Quantity of improved seeds distributed to target farmers<br>• Output 1.1.2: Number of farmers who attended farmer extension trainings | | | | | | |
| Result 2: Increased value-added of groundnuts | | | | | | |
| Indicator 2.1: Volume of value-added groundnut products | | | | | | |
| • Output 2.1.1: Number of hectares planted with improved groundnut variety | | | | | | |
| Indicator 2.2: Value of value-added groundnut products | | | | | | |
| • Output 2.2.1: Number of groundnut products tested on the market<br>• Output 2.2.2: Number of groundnut products approved by Nigerian Board of Standards | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Result 3: Increased commercialization of groundnuts | | | | | | |
| Indicator 3.1: Proportion of groundnut production sold | | | | | | |
| • Output 3.1.1: Number of farmers trained in groundnut marketing<br>• Output 3.1.2: Number of farmers receiving market information bulletins | | | | | | |
| Indicator 3.2: Sustainable groundnut producer associations | | | | | | |
| • Output 3.2.1 Number of producer associations trained in group management | | | | | | |
| Indicator 3.3: Membership in groundnut producer/ marketing associations | | | | | | |
| • Output 3.3.1: Number of associations completing membership drive campaigns | | | | | | |

## Narrative section

### I. Background

The IP is to summarize briefly what are the project's objectives, results and basic interventions, preferably in one or two paragraphs. Mention the life of the project, as well as the SO and the intermediate results to which the activity contributes.

### II. Quarter Progress

Report the progress in implementing the activity against each Intermediate Result (IR). Provide qualitative statements that describe the achievements in table above.

The IP should also report on its inputs, outputs and their respective budgets that were laid out in its annual work plan. Doing so will help USAID determine whether inputs and outputs are being delivered in sufficient quantity and quality to contribute to the desired results. However, the IP should be reporting more and more on results as the life of its activity progresses.

If no interventions or components of the activity were accomplished for a particular indicator or output for this quarter, then note this (e.g., No intervention this quarter). If the intervention or component was completed in a previous quarter, then say so (e.g., This component has been completed and was reported in the quarterly report for July-September 2005).

### III. Problems and Opportunities

This section should provide a synopsis of technical, management and/or financial problems that must be resolved as well as follow-up and next steps. If any activity has fallen behind, explain why, and what steps will be taken to bring it back on track.

### IV. Success Stories

USAID/Nigeria strongly encourages its implementing partners to include success stories in their quarterly reports. Success stories are an excellent way for USAID to show the US Government, the American people and the rest of the world how the United States helps those in need. These stories personalize how US taxpayer money directly improves people's lives. For guidance on the proper format and content of a success story, visit the "Telling Our Story" weblink http://4.21.100.189/usaid/jsp/success_story.jsp. IPs must not submit their success stories on their own, but rather to USAID/Nigeria so as to ensure quality and consistency.

### V. Next Quarter Results and related Tasks

In this section, the IP must report on the progress it expects to make in the next quarter. Provide qualitative statements that describe what will be achieved, in support of the targets laid out in the table above. This section should not discuss plans for addressing components or elements that have lagged behind in the current quarter, as these are captured in Section III above.

## Other guidance

The IP is to submit one original and two hardcopies and one electronic copy of each quarterly report in the format described above.

To avoid confusion as to what achievements the IPs are to report on, the following USAID definitions are to be used:

- *Activity* - A set of actions through which inputs, such as commodities, technical assistance, training, or resource transfers, are mobilized to produce specific outputs, such as vaccinations given, schools built, microenterprise loans issued, or policies changed.
- *Input* - A resource, such as technical assistance, commodities, training, or provision of USAID staff that is used to create an output.
- *Output* - A tangible, immediate, and intended product or consequence of an activity within USAID's control. Examples of outputs include people fed, personnel trained, better technologies developed, and new construction.
- *Result* - A significant, intended, and measurable change in the condition of a customer, or a change in the host country, institutions, or other entities that will affect the customer directly or indirectly. Results are typically broader than USAID-funded outputs and require support from other donors and partners not within USAID's control. Another word for "result" is "outcome."

For further clarification, ACTIVITY is basically the project the IP is implementing, the set of actions necessary to achieve the project's goal. Components and interventions are the more discreet actions themselves, which feed into the overall ACTIVITY.

Training is an INPUT that results in people trained, which is an OUTPUT that contributes to a desired RESULT, such as increased capacity of these people to improve their or their community's health, economic wellbeing, etc. In differentiating outputs from results, the USAID Results Framework approach explains the usefulness of thinking of "results as developmentally significant events that may influence customers, while outputs are lower-level steps that are essential in achieving results."