



USAID | DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO ADDENDUM NPICPRP-DRC UNDER APS NO. No. 7200AA19APS00012 QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The purpose of this amendment is to answer the questions received under this Addendum:

1. Question: Can a local company apply for this addendum? if yes, is there a condition on his past experience and on the amount of his share capital

1. USAID Response: Yes, a local company can apply for this addendum. If an organization does not have past experience in the programmatic area requested under the Addendum, USAID/DRC will evaluate if the concept paper has technical merits that would allow the opportunity to invest in the proposed intervention. The technical review will be in conformance with the process described in Section D, paragraph III of the Addendum.

2. Question: Can a local company being legalized also apply for this addendum?

2. USAID Response: Yes, a local company being legalized can apply. Nevertheless, USAID will only enter into a formal agreement with a legally established organization.

3. Question: Can a consortium of local partners (representing IPLCs) with a formal decision-making committee submit an application?

3. USAID Response: Yes, however, the consortium needs to be legally established or the consortium must designate the organization that will represent the consortium legally.

4. Question: If so, should one partner be designated as the lead partner, establish a SAM, DUNS and NCAGE registration, and apply on behalf of the consortium? Or is there some other mechanism you would accept for a joint application?

4. USAID Response: The mechanism described above would be acceptable, as long as the “lead partner” is a legally established organization or company and has been granted legal authority to represent the other partners.

5. Question: Is cost-sharing (10% - 25%) required or expected for new partners (no or minimal funding from USAID) who are themselves IPLC organizations with strong experience and connections but few financial resources?

5. USAID Response: The cost share of 10%-25% is a suggested range and it is highly encouraged. If organizations are unable to provide cost share as part of their proposed intervention, they will not be unfavorably evaluated.

6. Question: Will English be used throughout the entire application process, project and reporting, or will most communications (including the co-design process) take place with French-speaking USAID representatives?

6. USAID Response: French and English will be used interchangeably during the co-design and co-creation process. Concepts can be submitted in English or French although English is preferred.

7. Question: Will you accept applications from partners who do not speak English, if they have an English-speaking representative designated to write the proposal, participate in the co-design process, and communicate throughout the project (under their direction) as needed?

7. USAID Response: Yes, we will. French and English will be used interchangeably during the co-design and co-creation process. Concepts can be submitted in English or French although English is preferred.

8. Question: Page 3 of the Addendum states: “Successful applicants under this Addendum must be able to demonstrate the commitment of the central government of the DRC to implementation of the NPI program in a transparent and accountable manner.” Can you clarify what type of commitment is required from the DRC’s national government? If the conflict we intend to address is at least partially between the IPLC’s and the national government, how can we obtain the government’s commitment in advance?

8. USAID Response: There is flexibility for the method of commitment. This could take the form of a letter, Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), etc. USAID could assist and work together with the successful applicant to acquire government commitment before funds are obligated.

9. Question: Under the eligibility criteria for partners who are not new or underutilized, would USAID consider a consortium in which two or more established partners provide mentorship and subawards to local, underutilized partners?

9. USAID Response: Section III of the Annual Program Statement Number 7200AA19APS00012, New Partnerships Initiative (NPI), provides a list of the organizations eligible under the APS and this Addendum, which require compliance with specific modalities. Further, applicants must check one of the boxes in Attachment 2 certifying the type of organization and arrangement proposed.

10. Question: Is a co-mentoring consortium partnership allowable?

10. USAID Response: Yes. However, the proposed partnership must comply with the eligibility requirements in the APS mentioned above and certify the eligibility by checking one of the boxes in Attachment 2.

11. Question: Can a local partner include an internationally registered NGO with local DRC legal registrations in place?

11. USAID Response: The local partner may include international NGOs, however, the applicant must certify the type of organization under which it is applying, per Attachment 2 of the

Addendum.

12. Question: On p.3 of the DRC addendum, the engagement of Indigenous Peoples as authentic partners in the development process is described. What is the definition of an authentic partner and how does this differ from ""local partner"" or ""locally established partner""?

12. USAID Response: As written on pg. 3 “USAID/DRC is therefore seeking applications...to engage Indigenous Peoples as authentic partners in the development process in order to prevent and resolve conflict, promote respect for human rights, and sustainably manage the environment”. Authentic partnership in general means creating and sustaining a partnership with Indigenous Peoples in a mutually beneficial, respectful, and meaningful way. A local partner is one based in DRC as opposed to internationally. Engagement with and among local partners should also be authentic.

With respect to organizations interested in applying for USAID NPI funding, the definitions contained in the NPI Fact Sheet are official definitions of categories of organizations. This includes “locally established partner” and “local entity”. The NPI Fact Sheet can be found at this address: <https://www.usaid.gov/npi/npi-key-definitions>.

13. Question: In Eligibility Certification Form (Attachment 2), Partners Applying as New/Underutilized Locally Established Partners must certify that their organization has not received more than \$25 million in direct or indirect funding from USG over the last five (5) years and can demonstrate non-federal funding equal to or greater than the award value of this proposal, and New Partners must attest that their organization has not received more than \$25 million in direct or indirect funding from USG over the last five (5) years. In the NPI factsheet, a New Partner is an individual or organization that has not received any funding from USAID as a prime partner over the last five years, and an Underutilized Partner is an organization that has received less than \$25 million in direct or indirect awards from USAID over the past five years. For the purposes of the DRC concept, what definitions apply, and are the limitations determined by USG or USAID - funding ceilings?

13. USAID Response: The definitions contained in the NPI Fact Sheet are official definitions of these categories of organizations. This section is revised to conform to the definitions contained in the NPI Fact Sheet found at this address: <https://www.usaid.gov/npi/npi-key-definitions>

14. Question: The Addendum mentions that USAID/DRC undertook a "consultative assessment to strengthen engagement of Indigenous Peoples in the Central Africa Regional Program for the environment in January 2020 in addition to a literacy landscape analysis". Is USAID able to provide a copy of those reports/documents? (NOTE: XXXX could not find them on CARPE website indicated in the footnote).

14. USAID Response: The report is still being finalized, however a Guide to Engagement of Indigenous Peoples based on the assessment made for Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE) will be made publicly available in the coming weeks through the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC).

15. Question: The Addendum mentions that "USAID/DRC has invested in intercommunal conflict mitigation that addresses the rights-based grievances of IPs in Tanganyika and South Kivu". Is

USAID able to provide a copy of any documents relating to these programs? (NOTE: XXXX could not find those on DEC website)

15. USAID Response: A Guide to Engagement of Indigenous Peoples will be made publicly available in the coming weeks through the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC).

16. Question: The addendum references "renewed optimism for the passage of national-level legislation recognizing Indigenous Peoples", and expects the applicant "to demonstrate commitment by the central government of DRC toward implementation of the NPI program". Is USAID able to give examples of the types of "commitment" foreseen/envisaged, and allowed/feasible in light of DRC being classed as Tier 3 under the Trafficking In Persons Report?

16. USAID Response: There is flexibility in the types of commitment which could take the form of a letter, Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), etc. USAID could assist and work together with the successful applicant to acquire government commitment before funds are obligated. Soliciting commitment from the government for the program is distinct from providing financial or other assistance directly to the government, and can be done whether or not DRC is listed as Tier 3.

17. Question: In light of COVID-19 pandemic (and travel restrictions limiting ability to engage with potential local partners) is USAID considering an extension of the timeframe for submission of concept notes?

17. USAID Response: USAID is not currently considering an extension of the timeframe for submission of concept notes.

18. Question: "For the purposes of this Call for Concept Notes, is USAID's definition of Indigenous Peoples limited to groups Indigenous to the three provinces identified as eligible under the NPI addendum? According to various international organizations, Mbororos are classed as an 'indigenous peoples' and sightings of Mbororos have been reported in Ituri Province, including in vicinity of Okapi Wildlife Reserve.

18. USAID Response: Under many definitions, Peulh pastoralists (called Mbororo in DRC) are considered Indigenous Peoples or, more specifically, Mobile Indigenous Peoples. Their particular situation and legal status differ significantly, however, from the Indigenous inhabitants of DRC such as the BaMbuti, Efe, and Batwa. This call is for concepts limited to the latter group.

19. Question: In the call's guidelines, it is mentioned :

"Reflect one (1) of the following four (4) forms:

- a. Direct awards to new and underutilized organizations that are local entities in the host country or countries for which the Applicant is applying;*
- b. Direct awards to new and underutilized organizations that are LEPs in the host country or countries for which the Applicant is applying;*
- c. Sub-awards to new or underutilized partners via prime awardees that serve in a limited mentorship role; OR*
- d. Direct awards to partners underutilized with respect to opportunities to leverage <private /*

non-U.S. Government funding.”

In this regard, since XXX is an INGO registered in DRC, it is our understanding that we are only eligible under options C or D as prime awardee under this opportunity. Can you please confirm it is correct?

19. USAID Response: Applicants must carefully read Section III: Eligibility information in the NPI: CPRP APS Amendment 01 pg. 12-14. Available here: <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/view-opportunity.html?oppId=315424> in addition to any requirements in the Addendum. Applicants are required to meet only one of the four forms to be eligible. It is possible that XXX could be eligible under b as well if the criteria are met.

20. Question: Would it be possible to also receive further information about how does USAID define “limited mentorship role” ?

20. USAID Response: Prime recipients of USAID funding will increasingly be required to train, coach and mentor local organizations or companies that have not done business with USAID. Under such arrangements, training, coaching and mentoring may take different forms depending on the capacity of the organizations in question and the structure of the agreement signed with USAID. Under a transition award for example, the prime may start by performing 80% of the work, while the local organization covers the other 20%, with the hope of transferring all implementation responsibility to the local organization by year x for example. In this case, we start with 80% mentorship - and hope to end - in year x - with a limited mentorship role only i.e. 20%.

21. Question: Would the program be open to extending the geographic zone to the province of Equateur, where there are large numbers of Indigenous Populations, although it is not in a conflict zone?

21. USAID Response: The Addendum states that Applicants “may also propose activities in and/or around additional protected areas in conflict affected areas of eastern DRC”. Unfortunately Equateur province is out of scope.

22. Question: What is the rationale for including Kabobo as priority in the APS?

22. USAID Response: Kabobo is located in Tanganyika province - a conflict-affected region in eastern DRC. The conflict concerns Batwa and Bantu and is based on various grievances including discrimination against the Batwa and lack of access to services. This has led to armed conflict, several human rights violations, displacement, and loss of life. Villages have been destroyed in their entirety and there are over 98,000 internally displaced persons (IDP) and around fifty [50] IDP camps around Kalemie, Tanganyika. The long-term vision is to reduce the need for humanitarian interventions by building resilience for IDPs and receptor communities so that IDPs may return to their homes in a durable and sustainable manner and to reduce the incidence of conflict by addressing the root causes. However, this cannot be achieved without adequate livelihood options as well as mechanisms for peacebuilding, reintegration, and investment in services. The Kabobo Natural Reserve, located adjacent to Lake Tanganyika provides an avenue for environmental peacebuilding and livelihoods for people living around the area. This includes Indigenous Peoples and the Reserve was formed via a consultative process with Indigenous Communities. Thus, investment in and around Kabobo can provide livelihoods, peacebuilding, environmental, and

stabilization benefits which can contribute to enhancing the rights of Indigenous Peoples.

23. Question: Why is it phrased as indigenous peoples and local communities? It seems like this opens the APS up to concepts focused on local communities.

23. USAID Response: **The Addendum states that approach “shall engage with traditional decision making processes, leaders, men, women, and youth from *both* Indigenous Peoples’ and Local Communities, the latter who may be members of other groups, living in and around protected areas. The two communities are referred to collectively in this Addendum as *Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs)*”. Please read the Intermediate Results 1-4 and the required Intermediate Results to be included for the Concept Note. Indigenous Peoples are often linked with other local communities by complex social ties and a sound development approach must consider these two communities together.**

All other terms and conditions of the Addendum remain unchanged.

Sincerely,

Andre-Guy Soh
Agreement Officer