APPLICANTS' QUESTIONS ON SMALL TOWN WASH NOFO FOR USAID RESPONSES

Question #1

Would USAID accept a consortium application comprised of two implementers (with one as lead agency)?

USAID RESPONSE: ***Yes. Their respective roles and contributions must be clearly outlined in the application.***

Question #2

Will USAID have specific requirements and provisions for project beneficiary (individuals) vetting to determine their potential links to designated terrorist organizations?

USAID RESPONSE: ***Yes. As stated on page 8 of the RFA, the target beneficiaries will be identified during field visits in coordination with the host governments, community leaders, USAID, and other humanitarian and development partners working in the area.***

Question #3

Can you kindly confirm the total available budget (US$ 8M is indicated in the NOFO while US$ 10M on the website)

USAID RESPONSE: ***As stated in Section B.1 of the RFA, subject to funding availability and at the discretion of the Agency, USAID intends to provide $8,000,000 in total USAID funding over a five (5) year period.***

Question #4

Could USAID provide the proposal templates for this application (the NOFO has some as Annexes within the pdf)

USAID RESPONSE: ***Search for "Small Town WASH" and when it pops up , click on the opportunity number then click on "Related Documents" and finally click on the last row under "File Name" to access the RFA.***

Question #5

The RFA states "The applicant must provide information regarding its recent history of performance for all its cost-reimbursement contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements involving similar or related programs, recent and relevant" using the format provided in Annex

4. Is there a limit or suggested number of Past Performance Information which should be provided?

USAID RESPONSE: ***No limit. The applicant can provide as many relevant past performance as possible.***

Question #6

Cost Share vs. Leverage: USAID seems to intend to restrict eligibility for this NOFO to organizations that have the means to provide 20% cost share by including, in Section C. Eligibility Information, 2. Cost Sharing, a requirement that in order to be eligible to submit an application, an organization meet the mandatory minimum recipient cost share of a minimum of 20% of the award cost. But ADS 303.3.6.5 Restrictions to Eligibility only allows limited reasons to restrict eligibility. Further, NOFO Section E-Application Review Information, 2.(b) Business Review states "Proposed cost share, if provided...", which seems to indicate that the inclusion of cost share in the budget is optional. Additionally, the examples of cost share provided in the RFA and the overall program approach seems more in-line with USAID's definition of leverage (as opposed to cost share), per ADS 303.3.27, which states, "Leveraging includes resources that third-parties bring to the program without necessarily providing them to the recipient of the USAID assistance award. These parties may include the host government, private foundations, businesses, or individuals." As such, can USAID confirm that its intent is that a 20% cost share is required in order to be eligible to apply under this NOFO? If so, would USAID consider changing the cost share requirement to leverage, or at a minimum, reducing the cost share requirement and incorporating a mixture of cost share and leverage?

USAID RESPONSE: ***As stated in the cover letter, "Eligibility for this award is not restricted." This NOFO requires a mandatory recipient cost share of 20% within the purview of 2 CFR 200.306 and ADS 3.10. Applicants that do not meet the minimum cost share requirement are not eligible for award consideration.***

TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

Question #7

The RFA provides a couple different definitions of small towns. It states, "In the water sector, the definition of 'small town' is based on the type of water service delivery model applied. Small towns are generally 'settlements that are sufficiently large and dense to benefit from the economies of scale offered by piped systems, but too small and dispersed to be efficiently managed by a conventional urban water utility.' The RFA also references Nigeria's National Water Supply and Sanitation Policy (2000) as defining small towns as "having a population between 5,000 and 20,000." Finally, the RFA provides examples of "select small towns such as Ganye, Song, Viniklang in Adamawa State; Biu, Kwaya Tera and Paklama in Borno State; and Damaturu, Geidam, and Potiskum in Yobe State." The populations in several of these towns (like

Biu, Potiskum and Damaturu) far exceed 20,000. Is there a specific population limit to the small towns that can be proposed in this application, or should small towns instead be selected based on the water sector definition and the "illustrative selection criteria" listed on page 9-10 of the RFA?

USAID RESPONSE: ***As stated in the RFA, the reference is the "Nigeria's National Water Supply and Sanitation Policy (2000) as defining small towns as "having a population between 5,000 and 20,000." USAID acknowledges that different statistics exist due to lack of current census. The list of small towns is illustrative only.***

Question #8

Construction Timeline: The RFA states, "Construction must be completed by the end of the second year of implementation. Applicants are required to present a list of activities that will be included." Since the RFA requires close coordination with local government entities and a collaborative approach with local stakeholders in determining the small towns to be targeted and the specific activities to take place in each small town, should this list of construction activities included in the proposal simply be an illustrative list that is subject to change based on the input of the multi-stakeholder coordination groups?

USAID RESPONSE: ***Applicants are required to present a list of "illustrative activities" that will be included.***

Question #9

Targeting Internally Displaces Persons (IDPs): The RFA places an emphasis on targeting IDPs, and states that "interventions must target the most vulnerable IDPs and host communities in affected LGAs." In the context of the proposed geographic areas, IDPs are not necessarily acknowledged by the Government and IDP camps are referred to as informal settlements. Is USAID proposing we specifically target IDPs in former camps and/or informal settlements, or simply that small towns with a prevalence of IDPs should be prioritized?

USAID RESPONSE: ***Small towns with a prevalence of IDPs should be prioritized.***

Question #10

Chief of Party Location: The RFA states that the Chief of Party must be based in Adamawa. Given the extensive geography to be covered, would USAID be willing to have key personnel stationed in other, more central locations outside of Adamawa, like in Biu or Damaturu for example?

USAID RESPONSE: ***As stated in Section e.1 of the RFA, the Chief of Party must be based in Adamawa. Other key or non-key personnel may be based in other locations.***