

“Advancing Global Health” APS, Round 2a Q&A

Formatting Clarifications

The Department of State has received numerous questions regarding formatting requirements for Statements of Interest (SOIs). The following clarifications are provided to ensure consistent interpretation of the instructions outlined in *Section D: Application Contents and Format* of the APS.

- **Page Limit and Narrative Content**

As stated in the APS, SOI submissions should be no more than five (5) pages in length for the narrative portion. This page limit applies to the core narrative content only. Submissions will only be reviewed up to the specified page limit and no further.

- **Table of Critical Details (Cover Page)**

The required “Table Listing of Critical Details” (Section D.1.a) does not count toward the five-page narrative limit. Applicants must include this table as a cover page to their submission.

- **Tables, Charts, and Visual Elements**

As specified in the APS, tables and charts are not included in the five-page narrative limit. Applicants may include relevant tables and charts either within the narrative or as annexes. For the purposes of this guidance, diagrams, conceptual frameworks, and other visual representations may be treated as charts and are therefore also excluded from the page limit. Given the nature of tables and charts, font sizes as small as 10-point are acceptable for these elements.

- **Annexes**

Applicants may include annexes containing supporting tables, charts, or other visual materials. **To ensure a fair and efficient review process, the Department will review up to four (4) annexes per submission, and each annex should be no more than one (1) page.** Annexes should be used to supplement, not replace, the narrative. Reviewers will primarily evaluate the five-page narrative submission in accordance with the APS review criteria.

- **General Guidance**

Applicants are encouraged to present information clearly and concisely within the five-page narrative, using annexes only where they add value or clarity.

Process and Timeline Clarifications

The Department of State has received a number of questions regarding the anticipated timeline for review, selection, and award under the Advancing Global Health APS. The following clarifications are provided to outline the general process while preserving necessary flexibility.

- **Review Timing and Process**

All SOIs submitted within a given quarterly window are reviewed after the submission deadline for that window has passed. Following the close of the submission window, the Department conducts a multi-step review process, including:

- o Technical Eligibility Review
- o Merit Review Panel evaluation
- o Internal clearance and selection decision-making

The Department aims to complete and communicate results of the Technical Eligibility Review in a timely manner following the close of the window. However, timelines may vary based on the volume of submissions and operational considerations.

- **Notification of Results**

Organizations who have submitted an SOI will be notified of one of the following outcomes, consistent with the APS:

- o Not selected for continued review
- o Recommended for consultative program design
- o Recommended to proceed to Phase 2 (full application)

Due to the anticipated volume of submissions, the Department does not anticipate being able to provide individualized feedback to unsuccessful applicants.

- **Consultative Program Design (if applicable)**

For organizations selected for consultative program design, this stage is intended to be a structured, time-bound process to refine proposed concepts in collaboration with the Department of State. In general, this process is expected to occur over a defined and relatively short period and may include virtual, in-person, or hybrid engagement. As this is a new approach being implemented on a pilot basis, the Department retains flexibility in how consultative program design is conducted.

- **Phase 2 (Full Application) and Awards**

Organizations invited to submit a full application will receive additional guidance, including submission requirements and timelines, at that stage. The timing of full application review and award issuance will depend on a range of factors, including:

- o Complexity of proposed programs
- o Availability of funding
- o Completion of required reviews and approvals

- **General Guidance**

The Department of State is committed to conducting a fair, transparent, and efficient review process. At the same time, applicants should anticipate that the full process (from SOI submission to potential award) may take several months. Organizations are encouraged to plan accordingly and monitor official communications for updates.

Submission Platform Clarifications (Grants.gov and MyGrants)

The Department of State has received a number of questions regarding submission requirements across Grants.gov and MyGrants, particularly related to required forms at the SOI stage.

- **SOI Submission Requirements**

As stated in the APS, the only required submission at Phase 1 is the SOI. Standard federal assistance forms (e.g., SF-424, SF-424A, SF-424B) are not required at the SOI stage and are not part of the merit review. SOIs will be accepted on grants.gov (now requires an active sam.gov registration to apply) or MyGrants (does not require an active sam.gov registration to apply).

- **Grants.gov System Requirements**

The Department is aware that, due to Grants.gov system functionality, certain forms (including the SF-424) may appear as required fields in order to complete a submission through that platform. At this time, these system requirements cannot be modified or bypassed. Applicants who choose to submit via Grants.gov may therefore complete and upload the required forms for the purpose of satisfying system submission requirements.

only.

- **Review Process**

Any SF-424 or related forms submitted as part of a Grants.gov package at the SOI stage will not be reviewed or evaluated. The Department will assess only the SOI document in accordance with the evaluation criteria outlined in the APS.

- **Alternative Submission Platform**

Applicants may also submit SOIs via MyGrants, which does not require completion of these forms at the SOI stage.

- **Troubleshooting Help Desk**

- For assistance with **Grants.gov** accounts and technical issues related to using the system, please call the Contact Center at +1 (800) 518-4726 or email support@grants.gov. The Contact Center is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, except federal holidays.
- For assistance with **MyGrants** accounts and technical issues related to the system, please contact the ILMS help desk by phone at +1 (888) 313-4567 (toll charges apply for international callers) or through the Self Service online portal that can be accessed from <https://afsism.servicenow.com/ilms>. Customer support is available 24/7.

MOU Alignment and Country Priorities Clarifications

The Department of State received several questions regarding how applicants should align proposed activities with bilateral Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and whether these documents are publicly available. As stated in the APS, bilateral MOUs are a central element of the America First Global Health Strategy (AFGHS) and serve as a framework for partnership, reinforcing shared commitments between the U.S. government and recipient governments to sustain health gains and advance health systems performance and integration. The overarching goals are to save lives, strengthen health systems, and advance U.S. interests by fostering country self-reliance, reducing dependency on U.S. funding, and improving global health security to protect U.S. and global populations.

MOUs will be implemented through multiple mechanisms, including government-to-government (G2G) agreements and APS-funded activities. The APS is designed to support projects that support the implementation of the MOUs as well projects that complement the MOUs. For example, some APS addenda will be for specific countries and will be used to implement MOU priorities with MOU funding. Other APS addendum will be for specific services that could compliment MOUs and would be funded with non-MOU funding.

SOIs should be responsive to the priorities outlined in the specific Addendum to which they are applying. For general context on U.S. global health priorities and the strategic framework underpinning this APS, applicants may refer to the publicly available U.S. Department of State America First Global Health Strategy: <https://www.state.gov/america-first-global-health-strategy/>. This resource provides high-level information on the goals of the strategy. Organizations should focus on developing clear, feasible, and impactful concepts that respond directly to Addendum priorities. Detailed knowledge of specific MOUs is not required to submit a competitive SOI.

Addendum D: Nigeria Q&A

1. Under Objective 4, may applicants propose electronic medical record migration and interoperability support scoped to priority states or a defined subset of facilities, with national coverage of the approximately 4,000 facilities achieved across multiple awards, or does the Department expect individual awards to propose national coverage?

Organizations may propose approaches that are national or sub-national in scope, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified. The Department does not expect every individual SOI to achieve national coverage on its own. Organizations should clearly describe the proposed geographic and facility scope, the rationale for that scope, and how the proposed approach would contribute to broader Government of Nigeria ownership, interoperability, sustainability, and achievement of the Addendum objectives.

2. Is there any preference regarding geographic focus (national versus sub-national implementation), or are applicants encouraged to propose target states based on epidemiological and programmatic considerations?

Organizations may propose national or sub-national approaches, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified. Organizations should clearly describe the proposed geographic scope and explain how the proposed approach will contribute to achievement of the Addendum objectives.

3. Are applicants encouraged to propose integrated approaches spanning multiple disease areas and health system functions, or should interventions be aligned to specific priority areas?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Consistent with the Addendum's emphasis on integrated health systems and service delivery, organizations may propose activities that address multiple disease areas and health system functions where appropriate.

Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

4. Are consortium applications encouraged, and if so, are there any limitations regarding the number or types of consortium partners?

Applicants may propose consortium, partnership, or other collaborative implementation arrangements where appropriate to achieve the objectives described in the Addendum.

The APS does not establish a specific limit on the number or types of consortium partners. Organizations should clearly describe the roles and responsibilities of proposed partners and demonstrate how the consortium structure supports successful implementation of the proposed approach.

5. Scope fit under Objective 4: Under Addendum D for Nigeria, would a digital health safety, pharmacovigilance, risk communication, adverse-event reporting awareness, and stakeholder engagement platform be considered responsive under Objective 4 if it supports interoperability, analytics, cybersecurity, data-driven decision-making, and transition to Government of Nigeria ownership?

Organizations should review the objectives and scope described in Addendum D and determine whether their proposed concept is responsive to one or more of those objectives. The Department will evaluate SOIs based on the extent to which they address the priorities and objectives identified in the Addendum. Organizations are

encouraged to clearly explain how proposed activities support interoperability, evidence-based decision-making, government ownership, sustainability, and achievement of the selected objective(s).

6. Relationship to Objectives 3 and 6: If a digital health safety platform also supports outbreak-related risk communication, medicine safety alerts, post-market surveillance awareness, or diagnostic product safety communication, should the SOI identify alignment only with Objective 4 or also with Objective 3 and/or Objective 6?

Organizations may propose concepts that support one or multiple objectives where appropriate. Applicants should clearly identify the objective(s) addressed by the proposed concept and explain how proposed activities contribute to achievement of those objectives. The Department recognizes that some activities may support multiple objectives within the Addendum.

7. Pharmacovigilance and medicine-safety scope: Does GHSD consider pharmacovigilance, adverse-event reporting awareness, post-market medicine safety communication, counterfeit/substandard medicine alerts, and regulator-led stakeholder engagement to be within scope when linked to integrated digital health systems, health security, or data-driven decision-making?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Consistent with the Addendum's emphasis on integrated health systems and service delivery, organizations may propose activities that address multiple disease areas and health system functions where appropriate.

Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

8. Government of Nigeria counterpart: For Objective 4 digital health and safety-surveillance concepts, which Government of Nigeria institutions should applicants prioritize for alignment and ownership, such as the Federal Ministry of Health, NCDC, NAFDAC, NHMIS leadership, or other national digital health governance bodies?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. The Addendum does not prioritize specific Government of Nigeria institutions. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

9. Interoperability expectations: For Objective 4, does GHSD expect proposed digital platforms to integrate directly with named systems such as SORMAS, LIMS, NHMIS, mSupply, and EMR platforms, or may applicants propose complementary systems that exchange data, provide analytics, support stakeholder engagement, and strengthen government-owned digital health workflows?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

10. Data governance and cybersecurity expectations: What level of detail should an SOI provide regarding hosting environment, data sovereignty, Nigerian data protection compliance, role-based access controls, audit logging, security audits, network monitoring, privacy safeguards, mobile device management, and incident response?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

11. Allowable digital health costs: Are software configuration or development, cloud infrastructure, hardware and digital devices, networking equipment, cybersecurity tools, interoperability/API development, analytics dashboards, helpdesk support, user training, and platform maintenance allowable activities under Objective 4 when tied to government ownership and sustainability?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Applicants should refer to 2 CFR 200. Subpart E – Cost Principles to determine allowable costs. Under 2 CFR 200.403, costs must be necessary and reasonable for the performance of the award, allocable to the award, and conform to any limitations and exclusions in 2 CFR 200 and the terms and conditions of the award.

12. Prime applicant and consortium structure: May a U.S.-based for-profit small business serve as the prime applicant under Nigeria Addendum D if it proposes a strong consortium with Nigerian public-sector, academic, professional association, faith/community-based, or technology partners? Are there circumstances where GHSD would prefer such a firm to participate as a subrecipient or technical partner instead of prime?

Eligibility requirements are described in the APS. Eligible organizations may apply as prime recipients or participate as consortium members, subrecipients, or partners. The Department has not established a preferred organizational type or consortium structure. Applications will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed concept, organizational capacity, and ability to achieve the stated objectives.

13. Local partner expectations at SOI stage: At the SOI stage, how important is it to name Nigerian partners or include letters of support from Nigerian government institutions, universities, professional associations, faith/community-based providers, or local organizations? What level of partner commitment is expected at Phase 1?

Organizations are not required to submit letters of support at the SOI stage. Applicants should describe relevant partnerships and implementation arrangements to the extent known at the time of submission. Organizations should clearly explain how proposed partnerships contribute to successful implementation, sustainability, local ownership, and achievement of the Addendum objectives.

14. Phased pilot-to-scale approach: Are phased approaches acceptable under Addendum D where the project begins with selected federal institutions, pilot states, teaching hospitals, professional associations, or community networks, then scales nationally based on measurable adoption, interoperability, data quality, sustainability, and transition milestones?

Organizations may propose phased approaches where appropriate to achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Applicants should clearly describe the proposed implementation strategy, rationale, anticipated milestones, and how the approach supports sustainability, government ownership, and achievement of the intended outcomes.

15. Performance indicators: For digital health and surveillance-related SOIs, what types of outcome indicators are most important to GHSD, such as number of facilities/users connected, interoperability milestones, data quality, reporting timeliness, safety alert dissemination speed, cybersecurity maturity, adoption by government users, use of dashboards for decision-making, or government cost absorption?

The Department has not prescribed specific indicators at the SOI stage. Organizations are encouraged to describe anticipated results and how progress and success would be measured. Proposed indicators should be appropriate to the concept and demonstrate how the proposed approach contributes to the objectives of the Addendum, including sustainability, government ownership, and measurable outcomes.
16. Sustainability and transition requirements: What level of detail should an SOI provide on transition to Government of Nigeria ownership, including data ownership, platform governance, recurrent cost absorption, local staffing, service contracts, technology licensing, source-code/configuration ownership, and long-term financing?

Organizations should provide sufficient information to demonstrate how the proposed approach supports sustainability and long-term Government of Nigeria ownership. Detailed transition plans are not required at the SOI stage. However, applicants are encouraged to describe key assumptions, governance approaches, capacity-building strategies, and other factors that would support sustainable implementation beyond the period of U.S. government support.
17. One integrated SOI versus separate SOIs: If a proposed concept addresses both Objective 3 and Objective 4, would GHSD prefer one integrated SOI that clearly identifies multiple objectives, or separate SOIs for the health security/surveillance and digital health/interoperability components?

Organizations may submit multiple SOIs under a given Addendum and may participate in multiple submissions as a prime applicant, subrecipient, or consortium member. However, applicants are encouraged to submit their most competitive and responsive concept(s) rather than multiple variations of similar approaches. In many cases, a single well-developed SOI that presents an integrated and comprehensive approach to the Addendum objectives may be more effective than multiple narrowly focused or overlapping submissions. Applicants should carefully consider whether related concepts can be presented within a single SOI.
18. Can a foreign based (non-Nigerian) entity (NGO) be part of the Nigerian consortium?

Eligible organizations may participate in a consortium, partnership, or other collaborative implementation arrangement as a prime recipient, subrecipient, or consortium member, consistent with the eligibility requirements described in the APS. Applicants should clearly describe the roles and responsibilities of all proposed partners.
19. Is it allowed for a non-Nigerian NGO to lead a consortium with Nigerian based local NGOs?

Eligible organizations may serve as the prime recipient and propose implementation arrangements that include local, national, regional, or international partners. Applications will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed concept, organizational capacity, and ability to achieve the objectives described in the Addendum.
20. Objective 2 – Health Insurance Expansion: The addendum references support for premium payments through NHIA mechanisms. Could you please clarify whether grant funds may

be used directly to finance health insurance premium subscriptions/enrolment costs for beneficiaries, or whether funding is restricted to technical assistance, systems strengthening, and implementation support activities related to health insurance expansion

Applicants should reference 2 CFR 200 Subpart E – Cost Principles to determine allowable costs. Additionally, organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum.

21. Objective 8 – Health Workforce Financing and E-Learning Platforms: The addendum mentions maintaining e-learning platforms to support health workforce mentoring. Could you clarify whether applicants are expected to leverage and strengthen existing local e-learning platforms, or whether the development of new e-learning platforms is permissible and/or encouraged where existing platforms do not adequately meet project needs?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

22. Geographic Scope and State Coverage: Could you provide guidance on the expected geographic scope of proposed interventions? Specifically, are applicants expected to propose activities across all 36 states and the FCT, or may proposals focus on a subset of states based on demonstrated need and alignment with the selected objectives

Organizations may propose approaches that are national or sub-national in scope, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified. The Department does not expect every individual SOI to achieve national coverage on its own. Organizations should clearly describe the proposed geographic and facility scope, the rationale for that scope, and how the proposed approach would contribute to broader Government of Nigeria ownership, interoperability, sustainability, and achievement of the Addendum objectives.

23. Budget Ceiling and Funding Allocation: The addendum indicates an estimated total funding envelope of up to \$200 million and up to 20 anticipated awards. Is there an indicative funding ceiling per award, or should applicants determine the budget based on the scale, number of objectives to be implemented, geographic coverage, and technical requirements necessary to achieve the proposed objectives and outcomes?

At the SOI stage, organizations are not required to submit a detailed budget.

Organizations should propose concepts that are appropriately scoped to achieve the objectives described in the Addendum. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and U.S. Embassy priorities, and availability of funding.

24. How many objectives may a single organization apply for under this funding opportunity?

Organizations may propose concepts addressing one or multiple objectives. Applicants should clearly identify the objective(s) addressed and explain how the proposed activities contribute to achievement of those objectives.

25. Is an applicant permitted to serve as a prime recipient for one or more objectives while simultaneously participating as a sub-recipient under another prime applicant for different objectives?

Organizations may participate in multiple submissions as a prime applicant, subrecipient, or consortium member, consistent with the eligibility requirements described in the APS.

26. Are there any restrictions on the number of applications in which an organization may participate as either a prime applicant or a sub-recipient?
- Organizations may submit multiple SOIs under a given Addendum and may participate in multiple submissions as a prime applicant, subrecipient, or consortium member. However, applicants are encouraged to submit their most competitive and responsive concept(s) rather than multiple variations of similar approaches. In many cases, a single well-developed SOI that presents an integrated and comprehensive approach to the Addendum objectives may be more effective than multiple narrowly focused or overlapping submissions. Applicants should carefully consider whether related concepts can be presented within a single SOI.
27. Is there a limit to the number of states that a single organization can propose to cover under an objective?
- No specific limit has been established. Organizations should propose a geographic scope that is appropriate, feasible, and responsive to the selected objective(s), and clearly explain the rationale for the proposed coverage area.
28. Has the donor identified priority states, regions, or geographic areas for implementation under this APS? If so, could these be specified?
- GHSD has not identified priority states, regions, or geographic areas for this Addendum. Organizations may propose approaches that are national or sub-national in scope, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified.
29. If applicants may select specific objectives, will proposals be evaluated independently by objective, or as part of an integrated package?
- SOIs will be evaluated against the APS evaluation criteria and the extent to which the proposed concept responds to the objectives described in the Addendum. The Department recognizes that some concepts may address a single objective while others may address multiple objectives through an integrated approach.
30. What is the anticipated budget ceiling or funding range for each objective?
- The Department has not established a specific budget ceiling or funding range for individual objectives. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, GHSD and Embassy priorities, and availability of funding.
31. Is there a maximum award amount that an organization may request if applying for multiple objectives?
- At the SOI stage, organizations are not required to submit a detailed budget. The Department has not established a maximum award amount associated with a particular number of objectives. Applicants should propose concepts that are appropriately scoped to achieve the intended results.
32. Could DOS please clarify the intended geographic scope of this Addendum? Or is it up to the applicant to specify the locations?
- Organizations may propose approaches that are national or sub-national in scope, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified. The Department does not expect every individual SOI to achieve national coverage on its own. Organizations should clearly describe the proposed geographic scope, the rationale for that scope, and how the proposed approach would contribute to broader Government of Nigeria ownership, sustainability, and achievement of the Addendum objectives.

33. **Cross-addendum concept:** Would a secure, consent-based patient/family records and understanding layer that digitizes paper records, photos, and PDFs be considered responsive where it complements, rather than replaces, national EMR/HMIS systems
Applicants should explain in their SOI how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the addendum. SOIs will be evaluated against the APS evaluation criteria and the extent to which the proposed concept responds to the objectives described in the Addendum.
34. **Nigeria Addendum D:** Under Objective 4, would patient/family-facing records continuity tools be considered allowable if they improve data visibility, referral continuity, and interoperability across public, private, faith-based, and community-based settings
Applicants should explain in their SOI how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the addendum. SOIs will be evaluated against the APS evaluation criteria and the extent to which the proposed concept responds to the objectives described in the Addendum.
35. **Consortium model:** Would a model be responsive where a local health-system, faith/community, or government-aligned partner leads implementation and a technology partner provides the secure records/scannable-paper/interoperability layer?
Applicants may propose consortium or partnership arrangements that they believe are best suited to achieve the objectives of the Addendum. The Department has not prescribed a preferred consortium structure. Organizations should clearly describe partner roles and explain how the proposed arrangement supports successful implementation, sustainability, local ownership, and achievement of the intended outcomes.
36. Is there a preference for applications that speak to multiple objectives as discrete pieces of work as they are presented in the Addendum, or that combine objectives into a more holistic, integrated design?
The Department welcomes both integrated and more narrowly focused approaches, provided they are responsive to the objectives described in the Addendum. Applicants should clearly explain how the proposed activities contribute to the selected objective(s) and why the proposed design is appropriate to achieve the intended outcomes. The Department recognizes that integrated approaches may be appropriate where objectives are interrelated.
37. If all components/objectives are required to be addressed in the SOI and to ensure comprehensive partnership involvement, will GHSD fund all components at start of budget period or likely to designate one or more components as 'approved but unfunded'?
Applicants are not required to address all objectives. The number, size, scope, and funding structure of any awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, GHSD and U.S Embassy priorities, availability of funding, and completion of required reviews and approvals. Additional guidance will be provided to applicants invited to proceed to a subsequent phase.
38. Can we assume a budget summary is not required at the SOI stage, and that a total estimated budget amount will suffice in this SOI submission?
At the SOI stage, organizations are not required to submit a detailed budget. Applicants should provide sufficient information to describe the proposed concept, anticipated scale, and general resource needs. Additional budget guidance will be provided to applicants invited to proceed to a subsequent phase.

39. In the APS, GHSD has indicated award range from a minimum of USD 500,000 - \$250 M. For this addendum D, GHSD anticipates 20 awards with a total estimated funding of up to USD \$200 M (subject to availability). Can we assume the maximum ceiling per award is estimated at \$10M? otherwise, what is anticipated maximum ceiling per award?
- Applicants should not assume that the estimated total funding amount will be divided equally among anticipated awards. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and Embassy priorities, proposed scope, and availability of funding.
40. GHSD has indicated in the APS that addenda "will complement, extend or fill identified gaps in the implementation of bilateral MOUs...Detailed knowledge of specific MOUs is not required to submit a competitive SOI". Furthermore, in addendum D, GHSD indicates that applicants should ensure alignments with MOU priorities. Will GHSD at anytime in the future share MOU objectives and activities to help applicants avoid duplicative efforts and ensure they furnish gap-filling tailored activities that complement MOUs?
- SOIs should be responsive to the priorities outlined in the Addendum to which they are applying. Detailed knowledge of specific MOUs is not required to submit a competitive SOI. For general context on U.S. global health priorities and the strategic framework underpinning this APS, applicants may refer to the publicly available AFGHS. Additional information may be provided during subsequent phases, if applicable.
41. Objective 1 clearly states that service for Government supported facilities and clinics are excluded and included in other sections of the MoU implementation plan. Can more information be shared on the services that may be required for these government supported facilities?
- Applicants are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Objectives 2-8 address services in government supported facilities where relevant. SOIs will be evaluated against the APS evaluation criteria and the extent to which the proposed concept responds to the objectives described in the Addendum. Additional information may be provided during subsequent phases, if applicable.
42. Does GHSD anticipate single-organisation applications or does it expect consortium-led implementation?
- The Department has not prescribed a specific implementation model. Applicants may submit SOIs as single organizations or as part of a consortium, partnership, or other collaborative implementation arrangement. The proposed structure should be appropriate to the scope and objectives of the concept.
43. If a consortium is allowed, is there a preferred minimum proportion of organisations within a consortium?
- The APS does not establish a required minimum or preferred proportion of organizations within a consortium. Applicants should propose a partnership structure that is appropriate to the proposed concept and clearly describe the roles and responsibilities of proposed partners.
44. If a consortium is allowed, can a consortium be led by a local Nigerian organisation with or without an international partner?
- Eligible organizations, including eligible local organizations, may serve as prime applicants. Applicants may propose partnership arrangements with or without

international partners, provided the proposed structure supports successful implementation of the proposed concept.

45. Does GHSD anticipate any advantage or preference for local organizations serving as prime recipients?

The Department has not established a separate evaluation preference based solely on whether an applicant is local or international; however, as per the guiding principles stated within Addendum D, there should be a priority placed on engaging local Nigerian organizations with a strong emphasis on faith-based and community-based providers to deliver services, strengthen local systems, and ensure culturally appropriate, sustainable, and accountable implementation at national and sub-national levels. SOIs will be evaluated in accordance with the APS evaluation criteria and the priorities outlined in the Addendum.

46. If an organisation appears in multiple consortiums, will that affect competitiveness?

Organizations may participate in multiple submissions as a prime applicant, subrecipient, or consortium member. However, applicants are encouraged to submit and participate in their most competitive and responsive concept(s) rather than multiple overlapping or duplicative submissions. The Department will consider the merits of each SOI based on the APS evaluation criteria.

47. Does GHSD have an expected or preferred consortium structure?

The Department has not prescribed a preferred consortium structure. Applicants should clearly describe proposed partner roles, responsibilities, and management arrangements, and explain how the structure supports successful implementation, sustainability, and achievement of the Addendum objectives.

48. Are faith-based organizations expected to be implementation partners, subrecipients, or beneficiaries?

The Department has not prescribed a required role for faith-based organizations. Faith-based organizations may serve as prime applicants, subrecipients, consortium members, implementation partners, or beneficiaries, as appropriate to the proposed concept and consistent with applicable eligibility and program requirements.

49. Will GHSD make separate awards for each objective, or are integrated multi-objective proposals preferred?

The Department has not predetermined whether awards will be made by objective or through integrated multi-objective approaches. Applicants may propose concepts addressing one or multiple objectives. The proposed approach should be clearly justified and responsive to the Addendum.

50. Is addressing more objectives viewed more favorably?

SOIs will be evaluated based on the APS evaluation criteria, including the quality, feasibility, responsiveness, and likely impact of the proposed concept. A focused SOI that addresses fewer objectives in a strong and feasible way may be competitive.

51. How will proposals covering different numbers of objectives be compared?

SOIs will be evaluated in accordance with the APS evaluation criteria and the extent to which the proposed concept responds to the objectives identified by the applicant. The Department recognizes that some SOIs may address a single objective while others may address multiple objectives through an integrated approach.

52. Are some objectives considered higher priority than others?

All objectives identified in the Addendum are priorities. The Department has not established a public ranking of objectives. Applicants should propose concepts that are responsive to one or more objectives and clearly explain how the proposed activities will achieve meaningful results.

53. Is there a preferred combination of objectives?

The Department has not prescribed a preferred combination of objectives. Applicants may propose the combination of objectives that best reflects their technical approach, capacity, partnerships, and proposed results.

54. If a proposal addresses fewer objectives, what level of depth is expected?

Applicants should provide sufficient detail to demonstrate that the proposed concept is technically sound, feasible, responsive to the selected objective(s), and capable of achieving meaningful results. A focused SOI should clearly explain the rationale for the selected scope and how the proposed activities will contribute to the Addendum objectives.

55. Is there an expected minimum or maximum budget range per award?

The Department has not established a specific minimum or maximum budget range per award beyond the information provided in the APS and Addendum. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and Embassy priorities, proposed scope, and availability of funding.

56. Does GHSD expect national-scale implementation from Year 1 or phased geographic expansion?

Organizations may propose approaches that are national or sub-national in scope, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified. The Department does not expect every individual SOI to achieve national coverage on its own. Organizations should clearly describe the proposed geographic scope, the rationale for that scope, and how the proposed approach would contribute to broader Government of Nigeria ownership, sustainability, and achievement of the Addendum objectives.

57. What specific evidence of "country ownership" will be most heavily weighted during merit review?

SOIs will be evaluated based on APS evaluation criteria, including the quality, feasibility, responsiveness, and likely impact of the concept. Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

58. How will GHSD assess sustainability for interventions that require ongoing operational funding?

SOIs will be evaluated based on APS evaluation criteria, including the quality, feasibility, responsiveness, and likely impact of the concept. Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

59. Does GHSD have priority faith-based networks it expects applicants to engage?

Eligible organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. The Addendum does not prescribe any priority faith-based networks.

60. What is the definition of Community-based facilities and Faith-based facilities?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
61. Are Primary Healthcare facilities and Comprehensive Healthcare facilities considered as Community-based facilities?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
62. What proportion of service delivery is expected to occur through faith-based facilities versus community-based platforms?
The Addendum does not specify expectations for proportion of service delivery. Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
63. Is GHSD interested primarily in service integration at the facility level or integrated referral systems across facilities and communities?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
64. For surveillance and outbreak response, are there priority states or geopolitical zones? The Addendum did not identify priority states or geopolitical zones.
The Addendum does not identify priority states or geopolitical zones. Organizations may propose activities in any state(s) or geopolitical zone in Nigeria.
65. Does GHSD have preferred approaches for strengthening PHEOCs such as infrastructure investment, incident management strengthening or workforce development?
GHSD does not have predetermined expectations beyond the stated objectives in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in their SOIs how their proposed approach will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
66. What Government of Nigeria-owned EMR platform(s) does GHSD envision as the destination for migration?
The Department does not have any preferred EMR platforms for migration.
67. How will GHSD define success for interoperability?
Organizations should explain in their SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum. The scope and nature of any post-SOI engagement will depend on the results of the review process and the needs of the proposed concept. Additional guidance, if applicable, will be provided to selected organizations at a later stage.
68. Does GHSD anticipate that applicants directly support salaries during transition, or only provide technical assistance?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how proposed workforce-related activities support the objectives outlined.
69. Has GHSD identified workforce categories that should be prioritized for transition: Clinical staff, Laboratory scientists, or community health workers?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how proposed workforce-related activities support the objectives outlined.

70. What evidence will be required to demonstrate successful workforce transition?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how proposed workforce-related activities support the objectives outlined.
71. Objectives 2 and 7 appeared to be currently implemented by government of Nigerian agencies. Is the APS requesting a takeover of this roles from the government or approaches to provision of technical assistance to the government to continue to do what they are doing?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how their proposed approach supports the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
72. Can GHSD clarify the operational definition of "community-based health facilities", whether this includes private for-profit facilities, community pharmacies, patent medicine vendors, and community health platforms?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how their proposed approach supports the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
73. Under Objective 4, applicants are asked to support migration of U.S.-supported EMR systems to Government of Nigeria-owned platforms across 4,000 facilities, including hardware, cloud infrastructure, and networking. Could DoS clarify whether this objective is intended to finance significant capital/IT procurement at scale, or whether the emphasis is primarily on technical assistance, interoperability, and transition planning?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how their proposed approach supports the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
74. Objective 8: The Addendum states "Recipients will provide support for salaries, stipends, non-monetary compensation, and travel for persons delivering frontline health services." Can the department of State clarify that "recipients" means recipients of Objective 8 funding or is it referencing the Addendum or other DOS award recipients?
"Recipients" is defined in 2 CFR 200.1. It means an entity that receives a Federal award directly from a Federal agency to carry out an activity under a Federal program. The term recipient does not include subrecipients or individuals that are participants or beneficiaries of the award.
75. If Objective 8 is expected to directly provide salaries and other compensation for healthcare workers, can the Department of State provide a plug number for this expense for budget purposes?
The Department has not established a specific minimum or maximum budget range per award beyond the information provided in the APS and Addendum. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, GHSD and U.S. Embassy priorities, proposed scope availability of funding, and compliance with regulation and Department policy.
76. Objective 8: Can the Department of State provide more information on who these frontline health care workers are: Do they work in the public, community-based, faith-based, not-

for-profit or private sectors? Are they working at the primary, secondary or tertiary level? (as this will impact the transition strategy). Where are they located geographically?

Organizations may propose approaches that are national or sub-national in scope, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified. The Department does not expect every individual SOI to cover all frontline healthcare workers in all geographies.

77. Objective 8: The addendum mentions “deploying telehealth technologies to support remote consultations.” Can the Department of State clarify if the remote consultations are direct provider/patient clinical consultations or if they are provider to provider consultations for mentoring and professional support?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how their proposed approach supports the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

78. How and to what extent will AI tools be used in the review of SOIs?

GHSD confirms that no AI tools are used to review any SOIs. All SOIs are reviewed by relevant subject matter experts against the evaluation criteria outlined in Section B.1 of the APS.

79. Please clarify whether the objectives are weighted equally, or whether some are expected to require a higher level of effort and budget than others. In other words, can DOS share an estimated percentage breakdown of the total funding envelope by objective?

The Department has not established a specific minimum or maximum budget range per award beyond the information provided in the APS and Addendum. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, GHSD and U.S. Embassy priorities, proposed scope, and availability of funding.

80. Objective 1 excludes government-run facilities. How does GHSD intend to deconflict faith- and community-based delivery awards from the government-to-government agreements and from awards under other Objectives at the Local Government Area level, and would an applicant-proposed coordination map be useful?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how their proposed approach supports the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

81. For insurance (Objective 2), does GHSD anticipate a single national NHIA mechanism, such that delivery applicants should design enrolment as a referral handshake into NHIA and State schemes rather than direct premium support?

GHSD does not have predetermined expectations beyond the stated objectives.

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how their proposed approach supports the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

82. For digital systems (Objective 4), will GHSD designate the target Government-owned platform(s) and data-governance authority, so applicants align with — rather than duplicate — national systems?

GHSD does not have predetermined expectations beyond the stated objectives.

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how their proposed approach supports the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

83. Objective 1 excludes government facilities. Does this restriction apply to other objectives in the addenda and if so, which ones?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how their proposed approach supports the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
84. Would Nigerian military facilities be considered excluded under the government exclusion clause?
Eligibility requirements are described in the APS. Eligible organizations may apply as prime recipients or participate as consortium members, subrecipients, or partners. The Department has not established a preferred organizational type or consortium structure. Applications will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed concept, organizational capacity, and ability to achieve the stated objectives. Note, however, that there are limits on the use of global health programs funds that substantially limit work with foreign militaries.
85. The Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) specifically states that funds will flow from USG to Government of Nigeria (GON) entities (bypassing NGOs and implementing partners). Does this mean that the priming organization must be Nigerian-government-affiliated?
Eligibility requirements are described in the APS. Eligible organizations may apply as prime recipients or participate as consortium members, subrecipients, or partners. The Department has not established a preferred organizational type or consortium structure. Applications will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed concept, organizational capacity, and ability to achieve the stated objectives.
86. May established community-finance structures — such as Self-Help Groups and Village Savings and Loan Associations — be recognized as a sustainability mechanism for health-insurance premium mobilization and enrolment, and counted toward the transition strategy?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum and terms outlined in the broader APS. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum
87. To ensure the separation of explicitly religious activities from funded services is auditable from inception, what documentation or monitoring (for example, facility-level standard operating procedures, time or location records) will GHSD expect a faith-based recipient to maintain?
Applicants are not required to provide records management information at the SOI stage. Faith-based organizations receiving federal assistance are subject to 2 CFR 200.300(a), applicable Executive Orders, and will be required to maintain documentation demonstrating separation.
88. For an indigenous faith-based organization with a long record of donor-funded delivery serving as prime, what financial-management or capacity thresholds (for example, audited financials, indirect-cost arrangements, prior award history) will be assessed at the full-application stage, so applicants can prepare documentation early?
At the SOI stage, applicants are not expected to share financial management or capacity thresholds. All recipient and subrecipient financial management systems, including records documenting compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award.

89. Kindly clarify the expected process and structure for engagement between Prime Recipients and Subrecipients under this APS. Specifically, are there any prescribed requirements, limitations, or expectations regarding partnership arrangements, roles, and management responsibilities? (Reference: APS, Section D.1, Phase 1 - SOI, “List of Partner Roles and Responsibilities”, page 7 on APS/Addendum D)

It is acceptable at the SOI stage to describe a subrecipient arrangement, noting that formal subaward terms would be finalized in Phase 2. Organizational capacity will be assessed based on the information provided in the SOI, including the roles and contributions of proposed partners.

90. Kindly clarify eligibility requirements for foreign organizations/institutions under this funding opportunity. Are foreign entities eligible to apply directly or participate only under specific partnership arrangements? (APS, Section B.1, Eligible Applicants; page 5 on APS/Addendum D)

Eligibility requirements are described in the APS. Eligible organizations may apply as prime recipients or participate as consortium members, subrecipients, or partners. The Department has not established a preferred organizational type or consortium structure. Applications will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed concept, organizational capacity, and ability to achieve the stated objectives.

91. The APS references Public International Organizations (PIOs). Kindly provide clarification on the definition of PIOs for the purpose of this opportunity and indicate the categories of organizations that qualify under this designation. (APS, Section B.1, Eligible Applicants; page 5 on APS/Addendum D)

Eligibility requirements are described in the APS. Eligible organizations may apply as prime recipients or participate as consortium members, subrecipients, or partners. The Department has not established a preferred organizational type or consortium structure. Applications will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed concept, organizational capacity, and ability to achieve the stated objectives.

92. Kindly clarify the meaning of “Community-based health facilities/hospitals” as referenced in the APS and distinguish these from Government-run hospitals and clinics for purposes of eligibility and implementation considerations. (Addendum D, Section B, Program Description, Goals and Objectives; Objective 1; pages 2 and 3 on APS/Addendum D)

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum and terms outlined in the broader APS. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum

93. Should transition milestones be benchmarked against specific Government of Nigeria co-investment commitments in the MOU, and will those commitments or per-state SWAp budget lines be shared during co-design to calibrate the pace of handover?

Organizations should provide sufficient information to demonstrate how the proposed approach supports sustainability and long-term Government of Nigeria ownership. Detailed transition plans are not required at the SOI stage. However, applicants are encouraged to describe key assumptions, governance approaches, capacity-building strategies, and other factors that would support sustainable implementation beyond the period of U.S. government support.

94. For the workforce-financing taper beginning in 2027, is the baseline the FY2026 U.S. Government-funded full-time-equivalent level, and does the 25-percent-per-year reduction apply at the aggregate award level or per cadre and per facility?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum and terms outlined in the broader APS. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum
95. What criteria determine whether an award is issued as a grant or a cooperative agreement, and what cadence of substantial involvement should applicants anticipate for the latter?
The type of foreign assistance awarded will be disclosed at a later stage and will be in accordance with the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977, 31 U.S.C. 6301-6308
96. In Addendum D, for Digital Health software proposals in the SOI submissions, does the Government of Nigeria provide the data center infrastructure to host the proposed software? If not, is there a national Telecom provider that provides the data center infrastructure for hosting the proposed software? Or, are infrastructure proposals/pricing to be included by the submitters in the SOI response for Digital Health software?
The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.
97. May a single SOI propose a shared national digital infrastructure platform supporting several Addendum D objectives, including Objectives 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8, or would GHSD prefer separate SOIs for health insurance, digital health, supply chain, infrastructure, and workforce components?
The Department has no preference. The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.
98. Would GHSD consider funding a shared digital public infrastructure or national interoperability backbone that could be used by other recipients implementing different objectives under Addendum D?
The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.
99. If multiple recipients receive awards involving digital systems, insurance, surveillance, or supply-chain platforms, will GHSD or the Government of Nigeria establish a common enterprise architecture and coordination mechanism to prevent duplicative or incompatible systems?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage.

100. Will selected applicants receive a current-state inventory of the U.S. government-supported EMR systems, SORMAS, LIMS, NHMIS, mSupply, hosting environments, APIs, data dictionaries, connectivity conditions, and facility readiness levels?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

101. For the migration of EMR systems across approximately ~4,000 facilities, which party will determine the systems, historical records, and data elements that must be migrated?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

102. Should applicants include data cleansing, patient matching, deduplication, terminology mapping, record reconciliation, and data-quality remediation as part of the migration approach?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

103. Will applicants be given access to technical documentation, API specifications, test environments, or system sandboxes before the detailed architecture and implementation costs are finalized?

Applicants will not be given access to technical documentation, API specifications, test environments, or system sandboxes. The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

104. What specifically constitutes a “Government of Nigeria-owned platform”? Does ownership include the source code, software licenses, cloud tenancy, health data, intellectual property, technical documentation, operational staffing, service desk, and recurrent operating budget?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

105. Does GHSD or the Government of Nigeria require particular interoperability standards or implementation profiles, such as HL7 FHIR R4, OpenHIE architecture, IHE profiles, ICD-10, LOINC, SNOMED CT, DICOM, or GS1?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

106. Which government system or institution should serve as the authoritative source for the national client or patient registry, healthcare-provider registry, facility registry, insurance-plan registry, and terminology services?

There is no preferred government system or institution. Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

107. Is the creation or modernization of a national master patient index, provider directory, facility registry, and consent-management service an expected component of Objective 4?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

108. Is linkage of health records or insurance enrollment to Nigeria's National Identification Number, Bank Verification Number, or another national identifier expected, permitted, or restricted?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

109. Is the recipient expected to develop a national health information exchange governance framework, trust framework, common participation agreement, or data-sharing agreement? If so, which Nigerian government institution would approve and administer it?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

110. How should data-controller, data-processor, data-custodian, and system-operator responsibilities be allocated among the Federal Ministry of Health, NHIA, NCDC, NAFDAC, state agencies, private providers, and the award recipient?

The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.

111. Are there specific requirements relating to patient consent, secondary use of data, research access, de-identification, data retention, audit access, breach notification, or remote administrative access by personnel outside Nigeria?
- The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.
112. In addition to compliance with Nigerian data-protection requirements, will recipients be expected to meet particular security standards or certifications, such as ISO 27001, NIST Cybersecurity Framework, SOC reporting, independent penetration testing, zero-trust architecture, or a defined security-operations capability?
- The SOI should provide sufficient information for reviewers to understand the proposed concept and implementation approach. Detailed technical specifications are not required at the SOI stage. Organizations proposing digital health or information systems activities should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept.
113. May Objective 2 support an end-to-end health insurance marketplace that includes enrollment, eligibility verification, premium collection, provider credentialing, claims submission, claims adjudication, payment verification, fraud detection, reimbursement, and member support?
- Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
114. Where the Addendum permits support for premium payments through NHIA mechanisms, may federal award funds be transferred into NHIA or State Health Insurance Agency mechanisms for qualifying beneficiaries? Which entity would determine beneficiary eligibility, premium amounts, and covered benefit packages?
- Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
115. Are there preferred electronic claims standards, or may applicants propose FHIR-based Claim, Coverage, Eligibility, and Explanation of Benefit transactions?
- Unless otherwise stated in the APS or Addendum, GHSD does not have a preference.
116. May the platform charge provider enrollment fees, subscriber enrollment fees, transaction fees, or subscription fees during the award period? If such revenue is permitted, how would it be classified and treated as program income?
- Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
117. After the federal award ends, may a private-sector platform operator continue providing managed services and receive reasonable transaction or subscription revenue, or must the platform be fully transferred to the Government of Nigeria without an ongoing commercial operating role?
- Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the

proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s). This Addendum only accounts for U.S. government-supported awards.

118. Because Objective 5 excludes direct procurement, warehousing, and last-mile distribution, may award funds nevertheless support GS1 master-data management, serialization, barcode scanners, verification applications, ERP integrations, track-and-trace systems, dashboards, data-quality assessments, and supply-chain audits?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
119. Which Nigerian institution is expected to own and administer GS1 product, location, and organizational identifiers for the health commodity supply chain?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
120. May the project fund integration with private pharmaceutical manufacturers, distributors, wholesalers, and pharmacies where those integrations provide the Government of Nigeria with improved public-health commodity visibility?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
121. May post-market product verification, medication-safety information, adverse-event signals, and product-recall workflows be integrated with NAFDAC and other national platforms as part of the broader interoperability ecosystem?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
122. Are artificial-intelligence or agentic services permitted for claims verification, fraud detection, inventory anomaly detection, disease-signal triage, automated reporting, and operational decision support?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
123. If AI capabilities are permitted, are there specific requirements for human review, clinical validation, explainability, bias testing, audit trails, model monitoring, and government approval?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
124. May verified community-generated reports be used as preliminary early-warning signals that are subsequently reviewed and submitted to official NCDC or SORMAS surveillance processes?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
125. May telemedicine activities include provider credentialing, e-prescribing, insurance reimbursement integration, remote diagnostic devices, patient scheduling, connectivity, and remote consultation equipment, in addition to software deployment and training?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

126. May Objective 7 support off-grid power, solar systems, backup power, internet connectivity, and networking equipment specifically required to operate EMRs, telemedicine, laboratory, surveillance, and health insurance systems?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

127. Are recurring internet-service charges, mobile data plans, cloud subscriptions, cybersecurity monitoring, equipment maintenance, service contracts, and replacement-spares costs allowable during the project period?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

128. Who will retain title to computers, mobile devices, servers, networking equipment, solar equipment, and other physical assets during the award and after project closeout?

Asset disposition plans are not required at the SOI phase. Organizations should reference 2 CFR 200.313 Equipment for more information.

129. May the project establish a Nigerian national service desk, security-operations capability, interoperability support center, or shared technical support organization to maintain the systems after deployment?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

130. May training and professional certification of Nigerian software developers, data engineers, cybersecurity professionals, system administrators, project managers, and support personnel be included under the workforce transition activities described in Objective 8?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

131. Will GHSD and the Government of Nigeria establish measurable transition-acceptance criteria covering system availability, staffing, government budget commitments, data quality, cybersecurity, technical support, and operational responsibility before systems are formally handed over?

The AFGHS emphasizes the importance of transitioning assistance to partner governments and strengthening country self-reliance. Organizations are encouraged to consider sustainability in their proposed approaches. Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

132. Must software developed with award funds be released as open-source software or assigned entirely to the Government of Nigeria?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s). Importantly,

- intellectual property arrangements will be subject to applicable federal regulations, including 2 CFR 200.315.
133. May an applicant retain ownership of pre-existing intellectual property while providing the Government of Nigeria with a perpetual or otherwise sustainable license?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s). Importantly, intellectual property arrangements will be subject to applicable federal regulations, including 2 CFR 200.315
134. The APS references a preference for U.S.-produced goods, products, and materials. Will the use of U.S.-developed technologies or standards be considered during the SOI merit review, or will that preference apply only during post-award procurement?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s). SOIs will be evaluated based on the published criteria described within Section F of the APS.
135. May a for-profit prime recipient design, build, operate, and maintain the platform during the transition period and subsequently continue as a locally financed managed-service provider after the federal award concludes?
Organizations that meet the eligibility criteria outlined in Section B of the APS are eligible to apply.
136. For objectives that look at faith based and community-based organizations, can partners seek to apply with only community-based organizations?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
137. Are applicants able to choose more than one track and one objective per SOI? If so, should partners submit different SOIs for each track or objective?
Organizations may submit multiple SOIs under a given Addendum. However, applicants are encouraged to submit their most competitive and responsive concept(s) rather than multiple variations of similar approaches. In many cases, a single well-developed SOI that presents an integrated and comprehensive approach to the Addendum objectives may be more effective than multiple narrowly focused or overlapping submissions. Applicants should carefully consider whether related concepts can be presented within a single SOI.
138. If partners apply for one objective, do partners need to have the capacity to complete all the activities proposed under that objective?
Applicants are encouraged to submit their most competitive and responsive concept(s) rather. In many cases, a single well-developed SOI that presents an integrated and comprehensive approach to the Addendum objectives may be more effective than multiple narrowly focused or overlapping submissions. Applicants should carefully consider whether related concepts can be presented within a single SOI.
139. For the SOI, does an expression of interest or a supporting letter from a supporting/facilitating organization (for e.g. the national ministry of health, community-based organization) help positioning or can this be reserved for a later stage?

At the SOI stage, organizations are not required to submit letters of support or formal endorsements from government entities. Organizations should describe relevant partnerships, coordination mechanisms, and stakeholder engagement strategies, as appropriate to the proposed concept. Additional information regarding partnerships and implementation arrangements may be requested during subsequent phases.

140. We are kindly seeking clarification on how the integration agenda will be pursued if the APS Addendum D is for up to 20 awards.

GHSD welcomes SOIs that are aligned with the AFGHS's emphasis on integrating work across disease programs within a country's health system. Organizations should explain in their SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

141. For Objective 1 in Nigeria, kindly clarify how applicants should interpret the reference to "faith and community-based hospitals and clinics"? Does the Department of State consider all primary-healthcare-tiered private facilities as "community-based"? Can secondary-healthcare-tiered private facilities also be considered "community-based"? Are secondary-healthcare-tiered facilities that are not faith-based also eligible for programmatic support under the APS?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

142. For Objective 1 in Nigeria, could the Department of State please clarify the boundary around the exclusion of health service delivery at government-run hospitals and clinics? For example, may an SOI include coordination, referral linkages, reporting, supportive supervision, quality assurance, or data exchange with government facilities and/or LGA health teams, where direct U.S. Government-funded service delivery would only occur through faith and community-based facilities?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

143. For Objective 3 in Nigeria, the Addendum references support for "national and subnational and multisectoral" PHEOCs. Must SOIs include both national-level PHEOC strengthening and subnational PHEOC operationalization, or may applicants propose subnational (e.g. State-level) PHEOC support only, linked to NCDC and relevant federal coordination structures, without a direct national PHEOC strengthening component?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

144. Objective 3 calls for strengthening NCDC and federal/state capacity for integrated disease surveillance and outbreak detection and response, including PHEOC operationalization, 7-1-7 assessments, and specimen referral. Would an SOI whose primary innovation is an AI-enabled early-detection and surveillance system, deployed nationwide to compress detection timelines and feed existing platforms such as SORMAS and NHMIS, be fully responsive to Objective 3, or does GHSD expect Objective 3 SOIs to focus on capacity-building and coordination of existing government systems rather than introducing new detection technology?

Unless otherwise stated in the APS or Addendum, GHSD does not have a preference. Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

145. Objective 4 addresses interoperable digital health systems, EMR migration, and health information exchanges, but does not explicitly reference AI-assisted clinical decision support or AI-based diagnostic image analysis at the point of care. Does GHSD consider AI-enabled clinical decision support and AI-based image analysis for frontline health workers to be within scope under Objective 1 (integrated service delivery) and/or Objective 4 (digital health), and may such tools be proposed as a primary programmatic innovation rather than solely as backend interoperability infrastructure?

Unless otherwise stated in the APS or Addendum, GHSD does not have a preference. Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

146. Objective 3 references detection and response “across all disease areas,” while other parts of the addendum emphasize HIV, TB, malaria, MNCH, immunization, and nutrition. Should an Objective 3 SOI prioritize the integrated MOU disease set, or is a broader all-hazards / epidemic-prone-pathogen surveillance scope (e.g., Lassa, Mpox, measles, cholera, viral hemorrhagic fevers) equally responsive under this addendum?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

147. Objective 3 emphasizes community-based early-warning surveillance through community health worker networks. Would deployment of AI-assisted screening through faith- and community-based frontline workers, as the community-level sensing layer feeding national surveillance, including in insecure or hard-to-reach areas, be recognized as responsive under Objective 3?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

148. Our organization has submitted an SOI under the Rapid Outbreak Response Addendum that includes Nigeria among several countries. May the same organization submit an SOI under Addendum D that applies a related technical approach at nationwide scale within Nigeria? If so, how does GHSD wish applicants to distinguish or relate the two submissions to avoid the appearance of duplication, and are the two Addenda funded from separate envelopes such that an award under one does not preclude an award under the other?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

149. Given Addendum D’s reference to all 36 states and the FCT, would an SOI proposing nationwide coverage across Nigeria for an Objective 3 surveillance-and-detection program be viewed as appropriately scoped, or does GHSD prefer Objective 3 proposals concentrated in defined high-burden or high-risk subnational areas?

Organizations may propose approaches that are national or sub-national in scope, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified. The Department does not expect every individual SOI to achieve national coverage on its own. Organizations should clearly describe the proposed geographic scope, the rationale for that scope, and how the proposed approach would contribute to broader Government of Nigeria ownership, sustainability, and achievement of the Addendum objectives.

150. The addendum emphasizes integrated services and warns against parallel, disease-specific approaches. If an SOI is anchored in a single objective (e.g., Objective 3), to what extent must it also demonstrate integration with the service-delivery, insurance, supply-chain, or workforce objectives to be competitive; or, are tightly focused single-objective SOIs evaluated on their own merits without penalty for not spanning the full integrated agenda?

The Department welcomes both integrated and more narrowly focused approaches, provided they are responsive to the objectives described in the Addendum. Applicants should clearly explain how the proposed activities contribute to the selected objective(s) and why the proposed design is appropriate to achieve the intended outcomes. The Department recognizes that integrated approaches may be appropriate where objectives are interrelated.

151. For an applicant whose demonstrated strength is HIV/TB systems strengthening, policy development, and integration rather than direct ART provision, would a proposal that strengthens HIV/TB integration, referral linkage, and data systems at faith- and community-based facilities be fully responsive to Objective 1, or does Objective 1 expect direct HIV clinical service delivery at the applicant's supported facilities?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

152. Objective 6 references deploying integrated molecular diagnostics and genomic sequencing capacity at national reference laboratories and regional hubs. Is the optimization, integration, and transition-to-GON-ownership of *existing* USG-funded diagnostic networks (for example, the national GeneXpert platform), including AI-assisted diagnostic and specimen-referral optimization, within scope under Objectives 4 and 6, or does Objective 6 primarily anticipate net-new genomic and sequencing infrastructure at the scale specified (e.g., the 500-personnel and ISO 15189 targets)?

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).

153. Several objectives anticipate transition of donor-supported systems to GON-owned platforms by project end. Where an applicant proposes a proprietary, commercially licensed AI technology, what does GHSD expect regarding the transition or licensing pathway to Government of Nigeria ownership, and would a non-commercial / LMIC access-pricing commitment, combined with sovereign host-country control of aggregated de-identified data, satisfy the country-ownership principle?

Unless specifically stated, GHSD does not have predetermined expectations. Organizations should explain in their SOIs how proposed approaches support the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Importantly, intellectual property arrangements will be subject to applicable federal regulations, including 2 CFR 200.315

154. Objective 1 excludes government-run hospitals and clinics. Where a faith- or community-based facility is co-located with, or formally affiliated to, a Local Government Area health structure, how should applicants determine eligibility, by facility ownership, by management/operational control, or by the specific service-delivery site?
- Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
155. Objective 2 references enrolling people living with HIV and/or TB and their families into health insurance schemes. For patients affected by neglected tropical diseases, who carry comparable catastrophic-cost and stigma burdens but fall outside the named disease list, are enrollment and premium-support activities for NTD-affected households within scope under Objective 2?
- Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
156. May an SOI under this addendum embed a rigorous evaluation component (for example, a stepped-wedge, cluster-randomized, or quasi-experimental design) to generate transition-relevant evidence on an AI detection system or integrated service model, including effects on detection-to-alert timelines, or does the addendum's emphasis on service delivery and transition discourage research-oriented designs?
- Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
157. For this Nigeria Addendum specifically (up to \$200M, up to 20 awards), does GHSD anticipate a meaningfully different typical award size for narrowly scoped single-objective SOIs versus broad multi-objective SOIs?
- Final number of awards, amounts, and scope are subject to the SOI review and phase 2 (request for full applications). The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and U.S. Embassy priorities, and availability of funding.
158. May applicants submit SOIs addressing a subset of the objectives described in the addendum, or does GHSD expect applicants to propose activities across all eight objectives?
- SOIs do not need to address all eight Addendum objectives; it is acceptable to focus on only one. The Department will evaluate SOIs based on the extent to which they address the priorities and objectives identified in the Addendum.
159. May applicants form consortia with other organisations against each objective?
- A consortium may submit a single application for each objective.
160. Page 2, Objective 2, second bullet point, Does GHSD consider direct payments to be an option under this bullet to meet Objective 2?
- Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve Objective 2 as outlined in the Addendum.
161. Does GHSD expect that all SOI responses will address each objective?
- SOIs do not need to address all eight Addendum objectives; it is acceptable to focus on only one. The Department will evaluate SOIs based on the extent to which they address the priorities and objectives identified in the Addendum.

162. For Objective 4: The Addendum focuses heavily on EMR and LIMS integration. Is there flexibility to propose specialized data-driven decision-support platforms that sit on top of or integrate with these primary systems to further advance "interoperability, data quality, and evidence-based decision-making" (and other terms quoted in the Objective)?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
163. For Objective 4: For cloud infrastructure and interoperability solutions supporting these platforms, are there strict in-country data residency requirements under the NDPR that a cloud-based solution must adhere to?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
164. For Objective 6: How does the first bullet about deploying "integrated molecular diagnostics" relate to the recently released RFI for molecular diagnostics, which covers Nigeria and these routine and outbreak infectious diseases? There appears to be a lot of overlap between the various Addendums released, so how will coordination between the awards happen?
Organizations should explain in their SOIs how proposed activities align with the objectives of the specific Addendum to which they are applying.
165. For Objective 6:(If) we propose equipment purchase plus technical services. When transfer to NG govt happens will it also include technical services? (There could be a cost impact)
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
166. For Objective 6: Will the specimen referral network capabilities requested build on the progress already made by Nigeria Health Logistics Management Information System (NHLMIS) to strengthen in-country infrastructure and ownership of this critical capability in preparation for eventual USG handover?
Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the selected objective(s).
167. Can GHSD advise on the anticipated timing for the second phase of the solicitation process and grant/cooperative agreement awards?
Timing for the second phase of the solicitation process is contingent on completion of the SOI reviews. Awards are anticipated to be issued by September 30, 2026, subject to completion of required reviews and availability of funds.
168. Recognizing that multiple digital health platforms are currently in use across Nigeria, could the Department clarify the intended target architecture and roadmap for EMR harmonization, including expectations for interoperability, data governance, system ownership, and the respective roles of implementing partners and government institutions in leading the transition? For example, are applicants expected to lead the technical migration of systems or primarily provide technical assistance to support a Government-led transition strategy?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their

proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum, including long-term Government of Nigeria ownership. The Department does not have a preferred role for organizations.

169. Are organizations/applicants expected to respond to all objectives or selected objectives under the addendum? If the latter is the case, would an organization submit separate SOI for each objective or one SOI for selected objectives?

Applicants may propose concepts that address one or more objectives. Organizations are not required to address all objectives within the Addendum.

170. When is the expected start date for successful applicants?

The expected start date cannot be provided at this time as it is contingent on the SOI reviews and completion of the 2nd phase.

171. Are US-based organization allowed to prime for the project and partner with a local sub-awardee(s) in Nigeria to submit an SOI?

Eligibility requirements are described in the APS. Eligible organizations may apply as prime recipients or participate as consortium members, subrecipients, or partners. The Department has not established a preferred organizational type or consortium structure. Applications will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed concept, organizational capacity, and ability to achieve the stated objectives.

172. What does the U.S. Government–Federal Republic of Nigeria Health Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) entail? Is the organization expected to facilitate and MOU that will warrant co-financing of this project?

GHSD will not be disclosing details of the U.S. – Federal Republic of Nigeria bilateral health MOU. Co-financing is not a requirement of this Addendum.

173. Will this project be co-funded by the government of the US and Nigeria? If yes, what is the expected co-financing ratio between US government and Nigerian government?

Co-financing is not a requirement of this Addendum. Potential U.S. government foreign assistance is detailed in the Addendum.

174. What does “Total Federal Share Requested” mean?

Total Federal Share Requested is the amount in dollars that the organization is requesting to complete the proposed work under this Addendum.

175. Is there a standard range for an “Indirect Cost” rate? Applicants should comply with 2 CFR 200, Subpart E - Cost Principles with respect to indirect costs.

Organizations with a federally negotiated indirect cost rate agreement (NICRA) may use that rate. Organizations that have never received a federally negotiated indirect cost rate may elect to use the de minimis rate of 15% of modified total direct costs (MTDC) as outlined in 2 CFR 200.414(f). Detailed budgets are not required at the SOI stage.

176. Can a single SOI address multiple objectives, or does GHSD prefer applications focused on a single objective area?

Applicants may propose concepts that address one or more objectives. Organizations are not required to address all objectives within the Addendum.

177. Are there specific states or regions considered highest priority? How should we determine "high-burden" and "underserved" areas?

There are no priority states specified in this APS Addendum. Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum.

178. With up to \$200M across up to 20 awards, should we expect roughly \$10M per award, or is there significant variation expected?
Final size, scope and number of awards are subject to the results of the SOI review process and Phase 2 (request for full applications). The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and U.S. Embassy priorities, and availability of funding.
179. How are the 20 awards determined across the addendum objectives?
Final size, scope and number of awards are subject to the results of the SOI review process and Phase 2 (request for full applications). The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and U.S. Embassy priorities, and availability of funding.
180. Are there budget limitations by cost category?
Applicants are not required to submit a detailed budget at the SOI stage.
181. Is there a preference for prime applicants to be Nigerian local organizations vs. international organizations with local partners?
The Department has not established a separate evaluation preference based solely on whether an applicant is local or international; however, as per the guiding principles stated within Addendum D, there should be a priority placed on engaging local Nigerian organizations with a strong emphasis on faith-based and community-based providers to deliver services, strengthen local systems, and ensure culturally appropriate, sustainable, and accountable implementation at national and sub-national levels. SOIs will be evaluated in accordance with the APS evaluation criteria and the priorities outlined in the Addendum. Unless otherwise noted in specific Addendum, Department of State has no preference.
182. Are sub-awards to faith-based organizations encouraged or required for Objective 1?
The Department has not prescribed a required role for faith-based organizations. Faith-based organizations may serve as prime applicants, subrecipients, consortium members, implementation partners, or beneficiaries, as appropriate to the proposed concept and consistent with applicable eligibility and program requirements.
183. What GON financing commitments have already been secured to support the transition timeline?
GHSD will not be disclosing GON financing commitments.
184. Are there established transition frameworks or readiness assessments we should reference or align with?
The Addendum does not specify established transition frameworks or readiness assessments. Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
185. What happens if GON financing commitments are not met during the project period
Co-financing commitments between the United States and Federal Republic of Nigeria are subject to the terms of the signed MOU. The maximum amounts of the awards in the APS are noted in the application.
186. The addendum states: "Broad and innovative ideas that support integrated health services and systems that can be transitioned to the national government are encouraged." Does this indicate a deliberate focus on transition to national-level government entities, or will state-level transitions also be encouraged?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

187. In addition to strong partnership with the national government, will this addendum prioritize certain states in Nigeria?"

The Addendum does not specify priority states. Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum.

188. Does Objective 6 permit pathogen-agnostic or environmental surveillance approaches alongside the required HIV/TB/malaria sequencing targets, or must those annual sample quotas be met strictly through clinical specimens? (Genomic Surveillance and Sample Types, Page 5, Section B.1/Objective 6).

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

189. The Addendum requires sequencing at least 1,000 HIV samples, 500 tuberculosis isolates, and 500 malaria samples annually. Given that monitoring these specific diseases traditionally relies on clinical samples (e.g., blood or tissue) rather than environmental samples (e.g., wastewater and air), is the surveillance for epidemic-prone and emerging diseases evaluated separately from these specific index numbers? Furthermore, is the Government open to the development of custom multiplex panels capable of covering both high and low biomass samples, or is the expectation to rely strictly on existing testing panels? (Genomic Surveillance and Sample Types, Page 5, Section B.1/Objective 6)

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

190. Objective 6 outlines the expectation to establish or optimize specimen referral networks across all 36 states and the FCT, transporting at least 500,000 specimens annually through hub-and-spoke models. Given the significant logistical scope of this requirement, would the State Department consider a phased rollout approach over the five-year project period (e.g., initiating the network in a smaller subset of states in Year 1 and progressively scaling), rather than requiring a fully operational 36-state network immediately upon award? (Specimen Referral and Network Logistics, Page 5, Section B.1/Objective 6)

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

191. The Addendum indicates up to 20 awards anticipated with total estimated funding of up to \$200 million. Will the Government clarify how this funding is expected to be distributed? Specifically, is there a designated budget ceiling per individual award or per objective, or is the \$200 million divided equally among the 20 anticipated awards? (Funding Allocation, Page 1, Section A/Basic Information/Overview)

Final size, scope and number of awards are subject to the results of the SOI review process and Phase 2 (request for full applications). The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and U.S. Embassy priorities, and availability of funding.

192. For HIV, TB, and malaria under Objective 6, is GHSD expecting surveillance of known drug-resistance markers only, or broader phenotype prediction/validation? (Drug resistance scope, Page 5, Section B.1/Objective 6)
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
193. Which government-led surveillance systems should applicants align with under Objectives 3 and 6? (Government-led systems, Pages 3, 5, Section B.1/Objective 3; Objective 6)
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
194. What existing instruments, assay kits, sequencing platforms, and LIMS should applicants plan to integrate with? (Existing technologies, Pages 3,5, Section B.1/Objective 6; Objective 4)
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
195. What data outputs will recipients receive for analysis — raw reads, assembled genomes, variant calls, and linked specimen metadata? (Data access for analysis, Pages 3,5, Section B.1/Objective 6; Objective 4)
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
196. Beyond specimen transport metrics, are there expected turnaround-time requirements for genomic analysis and reporting? (Analysis turnaround time, Page 5, Section B.1/Objective 6)
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
197. May recipients use archived or biobanked specimens for baseline mapping, retrospective analysis, or early-year ramp-up under Objective 6? (archived/biobanked samples, Page 5, Section B.1/Objective 6)
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain in the SOIs how their proposed work will achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
198. The APS states that cost sharing or matching is not required and will not be evaluated as part of the merit review process, but it also asks for a description of 'Resource Contributions and/or Cost Share' in the Phase 1 SOI format. Can the Government confirm that providing voluntary cost-share or non-federal resource contributions will not provide any competitive advantage during the Phase 1 Merit Review Panel evaluation? (Proposal Evaluation, Section B.2/Cost Sharing or Matching)
Cost sharing or matching is not required. While applicants may propose cost share or matching, cost-sharing/matching will not be evaluated as part of the merit review process. Opportunities for cost sharing and matching may be discussed during negotiation, if applicable. Per 2 CFR §200.306, items proposed for cost share must be

- allowable. Importantly, though, cost share that is voluntarily proposed by an applicant, and then accepted by the Department of State becomes legally binding.
199. Will voluntary cost share or non-federal resource contributions provide any competitive advantage at SOI stage? (Proposal Evaluation, Section B.2/Cost Sharing or Matching)
No cost sharing or non-federal resource contributions are not required. SOIs will be evaluated based on the objectives outlined in the Addendum.
200. Can SOIs propose geo-political regions/states of the country based on needs assessment or focus on all current Department of state (DOS) focus states?
Organizations may propose approaches that are national or sub-national in scope, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified. The Department does not expect every individual SOI to achieve national coverage on its own. Organizations should clearly describe the proposed geographic and facility scope, the rationale for that scope, and how the proposed approach would contribute to broader Government of Nigeria ownership, interoperability, sustainability, and achievement of the Addendum objectives.

Addendum E: Uganda Q&A

1. Allowable costs — facility construction and infrastructure: Our proposed model involves replicating our proven, self-sustaining community health facility model into seven additional underserved districts in Uganda. Each new facility requires a one-time capital investment of approximately \$750,000 for construction, infrastructure, and furnishing. Following this investment, facilities operate sustainably through locally generated income with no ongoing external funding required. Can you confirm whether facility construction and capital infrastructure costs are allowable under Addendum E, or whether funding is limited to programmatic and operational activities?
Organizations should propose activities that are responsive to the objectives and scope described in Addendum E. At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit, responsiveness, and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making determinations regarding the allowability of specific budget line items. Detailed budget and cost allowability considerations will be addressed during subsequent phases, if applicable.
2. SOI format specific to Addendum E: The Round 1 Q&A confirms the standard 5-page narrative limit. Are there any additional formatting requirements, evaluation criteria weighting, or submission guidance specific to Addendum E beyond what is outlined in the main APS?
Organizations should follow the submission requirements, formatting instructions, and evaluation criteria outlined in the APS. There are no additional formatting requirements or alternative evaluation criteria specific to Addendum E.
3. Does the Department intend for verification activities under Objective 7 to be conducted by a recipient that is independent of recipients implementing the systems or services being verified? If a single recipient proposes activities under both Objective 4 and Objective 7, what independence safeguards would the Department expect?
The Department has not prescribed a specific implementation model for Objective 7. Organizations may propose approaches that are responsive to the objective and clearly describe any governance, oversight, quality assurance, conflict-of-interest mitigation, or other safeguards that support the credibility and integrity of verification activities. Final

implementation arrangements, if applicable, will be determined through the award process.

4. I am a paediatric oncologist at the Uganda Cancer Institute and we are interested in this call. The call however seems to emphasise HIV, malaria, and TB. We would like to explore the scale up of EAFYA to regional cancer centers. Do we qualify?

Organizations should review the objectives and scope described in Addendum E and determine whether their proposed concept is responsive to one or more of those objectives. The Department will evaluate SOIs based on the extent to which they address the priorities and objectives identified in the Addendum. Organizations are encouraged to clearly explain how their proposed approach contributes to the stated objectives and expected outcomes.

5. For Objective 1 (Community-Based Health Financing), does GHSD envision formal community health insurance schemes as the preferred model, or would alternative community financing approaches (such as savings groups, cooperative health funds, revolving health funds, or hybrid financing models) be considered responsive?

The Department has not prescribed a single implementation model for Objective 1. Organizations may propose community-based health financing approaches that are responsive to the objective and are appropriate to the Ugandan context. Organizations should clearly describe the proposed model, its rationale, and how it will contribute to sustainability, increased access to services, financial protection, and long-term country ownership.

6. For Objective 2 (Sustain Integrated Service Delivery), are applicants expected to demonstrate existing implementation capacity across all priority health areas (HIV, TB, malaria, MNCH, immunization, and outbreak preparedness), or may organizations focus on a subset of services that reflect their current operational scope and comparative advantage?

Organizations may propose approaches that reflect their operational scope and comparative advantage, provided the proposed concept is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. The Addendum emphasizes integrated service delivery across priority health areas; however, the Department does not require that a single organization demonstrate existing capacity across all named service areas at the SOI stage. Organizations should clearly describe the scope of services proposed, the rationale for that scope, and how the proposed approach contributes to the Addendum's integrated service delivery objectives. Where applicable, organizations may propose partnership or consortium arrangements that complement their capacity.

7. For smaller indigenous organizations operating health facilities and community outreach programs, is there an expected minimum geographic scale, catchment population, or funding level that would be considered competitive under Track 1 objectives?

The Department has not established a minimum geographic scale, catchment population, or funding level for Track 1. SOIs will be evaluated based on the APS evaluation criteria, including the quality, feasibility, responsiveness, and likely impact of the proposed concept. Smaller indigenous organizations are encouraged to propose concepts that are appropriately scoped to their operational capacity and clearly demonstrate how the proposed approach contributes to achievement of the Addendum objectives, sustainability, and country ownership.

8. To what extent are applicants encouraged to submit integrated proposals addressing multiple Track 1 objectives (Objectives 1–3), versus focusing on a single objective with

greater depth?

The Department welcomes both integrated and focused approaches, provided they are responsive to the objectives described in the Addendum. A focused SOI that addresses a single objective in a strong and feasible way may be competitive. Equally, organizations may propose integrated approaches spanning multiple Track 1 objectives where those objectives are interrelated and the integrated design is clearly justified. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed activities contribute to the selected objective(s) and why the proposed design is appropriate to achieve the intended outcomes.

9. For applicants proposing consortium-based approaches, what factors will GHSD consider when assessing whether the consortium composition is appropriate, complementary, and capable of delivering the proposed outcomes?

Applicants proposing consortium or partnership arrangements should clearly describe the roles and responsibilities of each proposed partner and explain how the proposed structure supports successful implementation of the selected objective(s). The Department will consider the extent to which the consortium demonstrates relevant technical expertise, operational capacity, local and government engagement, clear management arrangements, sustainability, and the ability to achieve the proposed outcomes.

10. What exactly are contained in the 15 awards?

The Addendum indicates that the Department anticipates making up to 15 award. The final number, size, scope, and technical focus of any awards will depend on the SOIs received, GHSD and Embassy priorities, availability of funding, and completion of required reviews and approvals.

11. What constitutes an award?

An award refers to a federal assistance award issued by the Department of State to an eligible recipient following completion of the applicable review, selection, negotiation, and approval processes. The number, size, scope, and structure of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, GHSD and Embassy priorities, and availability of funding.

12. Is there a budget ceiling to operate within?

The Addendum provides the total estimated funding amount and anticipated number of awards, subject to availability of funding. The Department has not established a fixed budget ceiling for each individual award at the SOI stage. Applicants should propose concepts that are appropriately scoped to achieve the objectives described in the Addendum.

13. What is the geographical scope? Can an organization propose to support health services in more than one region of Uganda?

Organizations may propose national or sub-national approaches, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

14. Refer to APS section E sub section 1e: Resource Contributions and/or Cost Share from non-federal sources (if applicable): The call notes: *This should be a preliminary description; actual resource contributions*. Question: What does actual resources mean? Is this limited to funds or using existing resources line infrastructure, equipment would be considered as “actual resources”

Resource contributions may include cash or in-kind contributions, where applicable.

Examples may include funds, staff time, equipment, infrastructure, services, or other resources that support the proposed concept. Cost share is not required unless specifically stated, and applicants should describe any proposed resource contributions clearly and realistically.

15. Refer to APS section D: Required format of the SOI submission: *To facilitate processing and review, applicants should clearly identify the applicable Addendum in the file name (e.g., Organization Name – SOI – Addendum F.pdf). Question: If an organisation is going to submit more than one SOI, with this guidance, all files will have the same file name. How with these be differentiated?*

Organizations may use the following “Organization Name – SOI 1 – Addendum F” and “Organization Name – SOI 2 – Addendum F.”

16. Under Track 1 and specifically Objective 2: Sustain Integrated Service Delivery in Faith- and Community-Based Facilities. What are Community Based Facilities? Are you meaning community based structures like Community Pharmacies, Community Extension health workers (CHEWs), Expert Clients, Village Health Teams (VHTs) and Community drug distribution points, clients ‘groups, community insurance schemes under Differentiated Services delivery (DSD) or these also include the Centers of Excellence such as TASO, Baylor, JCRC, MU-JHU, Mildmay, AIDS information Center (AIC), IDI and Others that are private not for Profits but with HIV Clients under their care?

For purposes of the SOI stage, applicants should clearly describe the types of facilities, platforms, or community-based structures they propose to support and explain how those entities are responsive to the objectives described in the Addendum. The Department has not prescribed an exhaustive list of eligible faith- or community-based facilities or platforms at the SOI stage. Applicants should explain the ownership, management, service-delivery role, and relationship to government and community systems for any proposed facilities or platforms.

17. The Notice of Funding Opportunity indicates that up to USD 60 million is available for 15 recipients. Will funding be allocated equally among the recipients, or will award amounts be determined based on the scope of work, proposed activities, geographic coverage, technical approach, and expected outcomes?

Applicants should not assume that total estimated funding will be divided equally among anticipated recipients. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, GHSD and Embassy priorities, proposed scope, technical approach, expected outcomes, and availability of funding.

18. Could you please provide the list of the 35 target districts identified for implementation of Indoor Residual Spraying (IRS) under Objective 8?

The Ministry of Health plans a phased IRS scale-up from seven districts in 2026 to 35 districts by 2027, sustained through 2030, targeting regions including Acholi, Busoga, Lango, Teso, Bukedi, and West Nile regions. Quality Assurance (QA) activities should be designed to support this phased rollout. Specific district lists and operational details will be provided during subsequent phases.

19. Will recipient organizations be expected to pre-finance project activities and subsequently seek reimbursement, or will funds be disbursed in advance based on an approved work plan and implementation schedule? Clarification on the anticipated funding and disbursement mechanism would be appreciated, as advance funding can facilitate timely and effective implementation.

Payment and disbursement arrangements will be determined during the award process and will depend on the type of award, applicable federal assistance requirements, recipient capacity, and approved implementation plans. Additional guidance will be provided to applicants invited to proceed to a subsequent phase.

20. Are applicants permitted to budget for short-term technical consultants, as needed, to support specialized activities such as training and mentoring personnel for laboratory capacity strengthening, epidemiological and entomological data analysis, disease risk mapping, mathematical modeling, monitoring and evaluation, and other technical assistance requirements necessary for successful project implementation.

At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit, responsiveness, and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making determinations regarding the allowability of specific budget line items. Applicants may describe the types of technical expertise required to implement the proposed concept. Detailed budget and cost allowability considerations will be addressed during subsequent phases, if applicable.

21. We would appreciate clarification on the tracks, are applicants required to apply to all objectives under each track?

Applicants are not required to apply to all objectives under a track. Organizations may propose concepts addressing one or more objectives within a track or across tracks, as appropriate to the proposed concept and organizational capacity.

22. For Objective 4, does "deployment, integration, and progressive GOU responsibility" include net-new system development, or is scope limited to integrating, transitioning, and operationalizing the named existing systems (eAfya, ClinicMaster, ALIS, LabExpert, eIDSR, IOMS, NMS/JMS ERPs, National Data Warehouse, eCHIS, iHRIS)? Are recipients expected to own the underlying software, or to strengthen GOU operations of GOU- or vendor-owned systems?

The Addendum identifies a specific set of priority digital health systems for deployment, integration, and progressive transition to Government of Uganda responsibility and operation. Organizations should propose approaches that are responsive to these named systems and the stated objectives. The Department has not prescribed whether scope must be limited exclusively to existing systems or may include complementary development where clearly justified in support of the Addendum objectives.

Organizations should clearly describe the proposed technical approach, its rationale, and how it supports interoperability, fit-for-purpose functionality, and full transition of system management, staffing, and recurrent operating costs to the Ministry of Health by project close, as stated in the Addendum.

23. May a single award span multiple objectives, or will awards be made on a per-objective basis? Is an SOI addressing one objective (for example, Objective 4, 5, or 6 individually) competitive, or does the Department favor SOIs that combine multiple objectives within or across the two tracks?

The Department has not pre-determined whether awards will be made by objective or through integrated multi-objective approaches. Applicants may submit SOIs addressing one or multiple objectives. A focused SOI addressing one objective may be competitive if it is technically sound, feasible, responsive to the Addendum, and capable of achieving meaningful results.

24. Within the anticipated 15 awards and \$60,000,000 total, is there an indicative funding range or ceiling per award or per objective? Are some objectives expected to be funded at materially larger levels than others (for example, Objective 5 power solutions at up to 700 facilities)?

The Department has not established a fixed funding range or ceiling per award or per objective at the SOI stage. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, GHSD and Embassy priorities, proposed scope, technical approach, expected outcomes, and availability of funding.

25. Several Track 1 objectives center on faith- and community-based facilities. For the Track 2 enabling-systems objectives (4–8), is experience in or partnership with the faith-/community-based sector expected, or are these objectives open to any qualified systems implementer?

Track 2 enabling-systems objectives are open to eligible applicants that can demonstrate the technical, operational, and institutional capacity necessary to achieve the selected objective(s). Applicants should describe any relevant experience, partnerships, and coordination approaches that support successful implementation, including engagement with faith- and community-based actors where relevant to the proposed concept.

26. How will activities under the enabling-systems objectives coordinate with or transition from existing USG implementing partners that currently operate these systems (for example, the National Data Warehouse, eCHIS, eIDSR, and the NMS/JMS ERPs)? Will incumbent partners' assets, source code, and historical data be made available to new recipients?

There are existing U.S. government-funded programs supporting health systems in Uganda. Activities under this Addendum are designed to support the MOU Implementation Plan and the phased transition described therein. The Department will manage any programmatic overlap or transition through standard award administration processes. Specific arrangements regarding access to assets, source code, historical data, and coordination with incumbent partners will be addressed during subsequent phases, if applicable.

27. For Objective 4, are there required interoperability standards or a reference/enterprise architecture (for example, HL7 FHIR, OpenHIE) that systems must conform to, and a designated GOU/MOH digital health authority that recipients must align with?

Uganda has an approved national digital health architecture roadmap guided by the Uganda National Digital Health Strategic Plan and the National Digital Health Architecture (NDHA), which provides the overarching enterprise architecture framework for all digital health investments across the country. Organizations should frame their SOI responses around demonstrated alignment with NDHA standards and explain how their proposed architecture supports fit-for-purpose, Open HIE-consistent interoperability. The Ministry of Health serves as the designated authority for digital health systems governance.

28. For Objective 5, will the Department or MOH provide the list of target facilities and any existing power-assessment data, or are facility selection and assessment within the recipient's scope? Is a particular technology mix (grid-tied, solar, hybrid) anticipated, and does scope include financing post-project operations and maintenance?

Detailed facility information, including facility lists and power-assessment data, if applicable, may be made available during subsequent phases. The Addendum states that

technology selection should be justified through lifecycle cost analysis; the Department has not prescribed a specific technology mix. The Addendum includes post-commissioning maintenance and monitoring within scope. Organizations should explain how proposed approaches address the Addendum objective, support sustainability, and describe how recurrent operations and maintenance costs will be managed beyond the award period.

29. For Objective 6, are recipients expected to procure and deploy traceability hardware and software (GS-1 scanning and serialization at NMS/JMS and facilities), or to provide technical assistance for GOU/National Drug Authority–led deployment? How does this objective differ from existing LMIS investments?

Uganda has formally adopted GS-1 standards, though rollout is in early stages; currently, no commodity flows utilize GS-1-compatible systems. Organizations should propose approaches responsive to the Addendum objectives, including deployment of GS-1 traceability from central warehouses to facility dispensing points, and should clearly explain how the proposed approach complements and builds upon existing supply chain information systems and investments. At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making determinations regarding specific budget line items.

30. Objectives 4, 6, and 7 each generate data that feed into GOU national systems and the performance-based payment verification process. Are these expected to be integrated under a single award, or coordinated across separate recipients? How will data interoperability and access across multiple recipients be governed?

The Department has not predetermined whether these objectives will be integrated under a single award or coordinated across separate recipients. Applicants may propose concepts addressing one or multiple objectives. Organizations should clearly describe how proposed approaches support data interoperability, alignment with GOU national systems, and coordination with other implementing partners. Specific coordination and data governance arrangements across multiple recipients will be addressed during subsequent phases and award implementation.

31. Do any objectives permit procurement of equipment under the award (for example, power systems, IT hardware, scanning equipment), or must such items be financed through G2G/GOU channels? Are there source/origin requirements given the guiding principle on expanding the use of U.S. technologies and standards?

At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making determinations regarding the allowability of specific budget line items. Applicants should reference 2 CFR 200 Subpart E – Cost Principles. The Addendum's guiding principles reference leveraging U.S. and Ugandan private sector expertise, technology, and investment, and expanding the use of U.S. technologies, standards, and solutions. All SOIs will be evaluated based on the published evaluation criteria outlined in Section F of the APS.

32. Programmatic Scope: For applicants proposing work under multiple objectives, will DOS favor integrated cross-objective proposals or highly specialized single-objective submissions?

The Department welcomes both integrated and focused approaches, provided they are responsive to the objectives described in the Addendum. A focused SOI that addresses a single objective in a strong and feasible way may be competitive. Equally, integrated

approaches may be appropriate where objectives are interrelated and the integrated design is clearly justified. Organizations should clearly explain how the proposed activities contribute to the selected objective(s) and why the proposed design is appropriate to achieve the intended outcomes.

33. Programmatic Scope: Are consortium applications encouraged for this Addendum, particularly where different partners bring comparative advantages across digital systems, service delivery, and financing?

Applicants may propose consortium, partnership, or other collaborative implementation arrangements where appropriate to achieve the objectives described in the Addendum. The Department has not prescribed a preferred implementation model. Organizations should clearly describe the roles and responsibilities of proposed partners and demonstrate how the consortium structure supports successful implementation, relevant technical expertise, operational capacity, sustainability, and achievement of the proposed outcomes.

34. Programmatic Scope: Does DOS anticipate geographic prioritization within Uganda (e.g., specific districts, regions, or burden areas)?

Unless otherwise specified, the Department has not identified priority districts or regions. Organizations should propose a geographic scope that is responsive to the selected objective(s) and appropriately justified.

35. Programmatic Scope: How will coordination with existing PEPFAR, PMI, Gavi, Global Fund, and World Bank investments be handled to avoid duplication?

The Addendum's guiding principles require active participation in designated coordination, performance monitoring, and implementation review platforms. Organizations should describe in their SOIs how proposed approaches will coordinate with and complement existing investments to avoid duplication. Specific coordination mechanisms will be identified during award implementation.

36. Programmatic Scope: Are there existing implementing partners currently supporting these systems whose activities are expected to transition under this Addendum?

There are existing U.S. government-funded programs supporting health systems in Uganda. Activities under this Addendum are designed to support the MOU Implementation Plan and the phased transition described therein. The Department will manage any programmatic overlap or transition through standard award administration processes.

37. Programmatic Scope: How should applicants balance innovation versus scale-up of already approved MOH approaches?

The Addendum's guiding principles require evidence-based and context-appropriate approaches adapted to Uganda's environment. Organizations should propose approaches that are responsive to the Addendum objectives and should clearly explain the rationale for their proposed approach, whether it involves scaling proven models, introducing innovations, or a combination. Proposed innovations should be justified and demonstrate feasibility within the Ugandan context.

38. Objective 1: Does the Government of Uganda (GOU) currently endorse specific community health insurance (CHI) models or regulatory frameworks that applicants must align with?

CHI is part of the Government of Uganda (GOU) Ministry of Health's (MoH) strategy. Organizations should explain in their SOIs how proposed CHI approaches align with

Ugandan policy, operational, and regulatory context. The Addendum's guiding principles require evidence-based and context-appropriate approaches adapted to Uganda's environment.

39. Objective 1: Are applicants expected to directly capitalize CHI schemes or only provide technical assistance and systems strengthening?
Applicants may propose activities that support the capitalization and long-term sustainability of CHI schemes, where such activities are consistent with the scope of works and terms and conditions of the award. Organizations are encouraged to submit an SOI for any work that falls within the scope of the Addendum and should clearly explain how the proposed activities will achieve the stated objectives, including through technical assistance, systems strengthening, and other sustainable interventions.
40. Objective 1: What are DOS' expectations regarding affordability thresholds and equity protections for vulnerable populations?
Organizations should explain in their SOIs how proposed approaches maintain client-centered access to care, consistent with the Addendum's reference to transparent waiver systems and willingness-to-pay studies.
41. Objective 1: Are there preferred digital health financing/payment platforms already approved by MOH or MOFPED?
Organizations should explain in their SOIs how proposed digital platforms support the objectives outlined in the Addendum. The Department has not prescribed specific platforms.
42. Objective 1: How does DOS envision CHI schemes interfacing with Uganda's planned national health insurance framework?
Organizations should explain in their SOIs how proposed approaches are responsive to the Ugandan policy context and support long-term sustainability and country ownership.
43. Objective 1: Will willingness-to-pay studies already conducted by MOH or development partners be shared with successful applicants?
The Department does not anticipate sharing specific studies at the SOI stage.
Organizations should propose approaches informed by available evidence appropriate to the Ugandan context.
44. Objective 1: Is there an expected target number of enrollees, facilities, or districts for CHI implementation?
At this point, the Department estimates approximately 491 facilities across the FBO network will be eligible for CHI. Organizations should propose appropriately scoped concepts and clearly describe anticipated scale, rationale, and expected outcomes.
45. Objective 2: What is the baseline expectation for continuity of HIV/TB/malaria/MNCH services during transition periods?
As stated in the Addendum, continuity of life-saving services, including antiretroviral therapy, tuberculosis treatment, and prevention of mother-to-child transmission, must not be disrupted during transition. The Ministry of Health establishes national-level targets including HIV 95-95-95, a 50% reduction in TB mortality, a 62% reduction in malaria deaths, and reduction of maternal mortality to 70 per 100,000 live births by 2030. While specific indicator thresholds are not prescribed at the SOI stage, organizations should demonstrate awareness of these national targets and describe how

- proposed approaches contribute to their achievement. Under a results-based framework, final performance milestones will be negotiated during subsequent phases.
46. Objective 2: Are applicants expected to directly fund commodities, HRH salaries, or service delivery gaps during transition?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should explain how proposed activities sustain integrated service delivery while financing mechanisms mature.
47. Objective 2: How will "verified service continuity benchmarks" be measured and by whom?
Organizations should describe in their SOIs how proposed approaches support performance-based programming and verification of service continuity. Information about the award type and other requirements will be outlined in the award provisions of any resulting awards, as applicable.
48. Objective 2: Are there minimum required indicators for ART retention, viral suppression, TB success rates, or immunization coverage?
The Department has not prescribed specific indicator thresholds at the SOI stage. However, the Ministry of Health has established national-level targets, including HIV 95-95-95, a 50% reduction in TB mortality, and reduction of maternal mortality to 70 per 100,000 live births by 2030 that provide a guiding framework. Organizations may propose metrics appropriate to their concept. Under anticipated performance-based award mechanisms, final indicators and milestones against which results-based payments may be structured will be addressed during subsequent phases.
49. Objective 2: Is there a preferred model for integrating outbreak preparedness into routine primary care services?
The Department has not prescribed a specific model. Organizations should propose approaches aligned with the Addendum objectives and the Ministry of Health Integration Strategy.
50. Objective 2: How should applicants address human resource transition risks where salary absorption by domestic systems may be delayed?
Organizations should describe in their SOIs how phased transition plans address risks related to workforce financing, consistent with the Addendum's emphasis on progressively shifting facility operational costs to domestic revenue streams.
51. Objective 3: Which faith- and community-based networks are already recognized or prioritized by MOH/GOU?
The Addendum identifies medical bureaus, community-based organizations, and network coordinating bodies. Organizations should explain how proposed activities strengthen the institutional capacity of relevant governance and oversight structures.
52. Objective 3: Can applicants work with only one network (e.g., UCMB/UPMB/UMMB) or is broader sector engagement expected?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Organizations should clearly describe proposed partnerships and explain how the approach supports the Addendum objectives.
53. Objective 3: Will indirect support to affiliated financial institutions or training institutions be allowable under the award?
At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making specific cost-allowability determinations. The

Addendum references leveraging network assets including affiliated financial institutions and training institutions to diversify revenue. Applicants should reference 2 CFR 200 Subpart E – Cost Principles for more information on allowable costs.

54. Objective 3: What level of fiduciary strengthening is expected before institutions can receive direct performance-based financing?

Organizations should propose approaches that address fiduciary systems, governance, and financial management capacity consistent with the Addendum's stated objectives. Additional requirements and terms of receiving payment will be outlined in the award provisions of any resulting awards, as applicable.

55. Objective 3: Are there expectations regarding legal incorporation, governance standards, or audit history of participating local entities?

Organizations should demonstrate the technical, operational, and institutional capacity required for implementation, consistent with the APS eligibility requirements and applicable federal regulations.

56. Objective 4: Which ministry/entity is officially designated as long-term owner for each named digital platform?

The Addendum states that all systems must be fully under GOU responsibility and operation by project close, with documented transition of staffing and recurrent operating costs to the Ministry of Health.

57. Objective 4: Are there required interoperability standards (FHIR, HL7, OpenHIE, etc.) applicants must follow?

The Department has not prescribed specific interoperability standards at the SOI stage. Implemented systems will be assessed against Uganda's National Digital Health Architecture (NDHA), which explicitly requires HL7 FHIR or equivalent messaging standards, unique patient identifier (UPI) integration, terminology standards (ICD-10, SNOMED), and API availability for third-party integration. Applicants should therefore frame their SOI responses around demonstrated alignment with NDHA standards and explain how their proposed architecture supports fit-for-purpose, Open HIE-consistent interoperability.

58. Objective 4: Does DOS require hosting within Uganda or specific cloud/data residency arrangements?

The Department has not prescribed specific hosting or data residency requirements at the SOI stage. Organizations should demonstrate awareness of relevant Uganda's data governance, security, and privacy considerations.

59. Objective 4: Are there cybersecurity requirements or mandatory compliance frameworks?

Applicants must demonstrate how their proposed technical assistance will support Uganda's compliance with national cybersecurity and data governance frameworks including the Uganda National Information Security Framework, the National Digital Health Architecture (NDHA), and the Uganda Data Protection and Privacy Act (2019) ensuring that national systems maintain and strengthen standards governing audit logging, encryption, role-based access control, and patient data security and privacy throughout the program lifecycle.

60. Objective 4: Will source code and intellectual property developed under the award need to transfer to GOU?

The Addendum states systems must be fully under GOU responsibility and operation by project close. Specific IP and licensing arrangements will be addressed during subsequent phases, if applicable.

61. Objective 4: What level of system uptime, support SLAs, or operational continuity is expected?

Organizations should propose approaches that support fit-for-purpose systems capable of sustaining operations under GOU ownership. Uganda's national digital health systems operate in a complex, resource-constrained environment where network instability, power interruptions, and limited sub-national ICT capacity routinely threaten system availability. Applicants must therefore demonstrate how their proposed technical assistance will sustain robust operational continuity across national and sub-national health facilities, with a minimum expected system uptime of $\geq 95\%$ during official operational hours, excluding MoH-approved maintenance windows.

62. Objective 4: Are applicants expected to cover recurrent hosting/licensing costs during transition?

Organizations should explain how proposed approaches support sustainability, including how recurrent operating costs will be transitioned to the Ministry of Health.

63. Objective 4: Which systems are considered highest priority for transition by 2030?

The Addendum identifies the full set of priority systems. Organizations may propose approaches addressing one or more of the named systems and should explain how the proposed scope contributes to the Addendum objectives.

64. Objective 4: Is there an approved enterprise architecture roadmap for Uganda digital health systems?

Uganda has an approved national digital health architecture roadmap guided by the Uganda National Digital Health Strategic Plan and the National Digital Health Architecture (NDHA), which provides the overarching enterprise architecture framework for all digital health investments across the country. Detailed system documentation, if applicable, may be addressed during subsequent phases.

65. Objective 5: What proportion of the 700 facilities already have partial electrification versus none?

The Ministry of Health identifies HC IIIs, HC IVs, General Hospitals, and Regional Referral Hospitals as priority facility types. Over 40% of lower-level health facilities are not connected to the national grid and more than 60% of upgraded facilities lack infrastructure commensurate with their service level. Detailed facility-level data, if applicable, may be made available during subsequent phases. Organizations should explain how proposed approaches address the Addendum objective and what can be reasonably achieved over a proposed period of performance.

66. Objective 5: Are solar solutions preferred, or are hybrid/grid-connected systems acceptable?

The Addendum states technology selection should be justified through lifecycle cost analysis. The Department has not prescribed a specific technology.

67. Objective 5: Will facility lists and power-demand assessments be provided?

Detailed facility information, if applicable, may be made available during subsequent phases.

68. Objective 5: Are applicants responsible for long-term maintenance contracts beyond installation?

The Addendum includes post-commissioning maintenance and monitoring within scope. Organizations should explain how proposed approaches support sustainability.

69. Objective 5: What environmental and social safeguards apply to equipment disposal and battery management?

Organizations should propose approaches consistent with applicable regulations and the Addendum's environmental and safety compliance requirements.

70. Objective 5: Are there local procurement or local content expectations for infrastructure projects?

Organizations should reference the APS and applicable federal regulations, including the guiding principle on expanding use of U.S. technologies, standards, and solutions.

71. Objective 6: Has Uganda already formally adopted GS-1 standards nationally?

Uganda has already formally adopted GS-1 standards. The roll out is in early stages.

Organizations should explain how proposed approaches support deployment of GS-1 standards as described in the Addendum. Understanding of current context is important.

Detailed country context information may be addressed during subsequent phases.

72. Objective 6: What percentage of current commodity flows already utilize GS-1-compatible systems?

Uganda is in early stages of roll out of the GS-1. Currently, no commodity flows utilize GS-1-compatible systems. The Department does not anticipate sharing more detailed systems data at the SOI stage.

73. Objective 6: Will NMS and Joint Medical Stores provide API/integration access to awardees?

Technical access and coordination arrangements will be addressed during subsequent phases, if applicable.

74. Objective 6: Are applicants expected to procure scanning hardware and field equipment?

The Department is assessing the overall merit and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making determinations regarding specific budget line items.

75. Objective 6: What audit standards/frameworks should annual supply chain audits follow?

Organizations should propose audit approaches appropriate to the Addendum objectives.

The Addendum identifies four audit domains: (a) Procurement and Contract Management; (b) Warehousing and Inventory Management; (c) Distribution and Transport; and (d) Supply Chain Information Systems and Data Quality.

76. Objective 6: Will audit findings be public, shared only with GOU, or shared with all implementing partners?

Reporting and dissemination arrangements will be determined during subsequent phases.

77. Objective 6: Are there specific categories of commodities prioritized for traceability implementation?

The Addendum references medicines from central warehouses to facility dispensing points.

Organizations should propose approaches responsive to the stated objectives.

Specific categories of commodities prioritized for traceability will be determined during subsequent phases.

78. Objective 7: Is there an existing approved risk assessment methodology applicants must use?

The Addendum describes required assessment components. Organizations should propose methodologies responsive to the stated requirements.

79. Objective 7: Will DOS provide standardized verification tools/templates?

- Standardized tools, if applicable, may be provided during subsequent phases.
80. Objective 7: How many districts/entities are anticipated for assessment over the project period?
The Addendum states assessments will cover all entities proposed to receive direct U.S. government funding, including local government authorities. Specific numbers will depend on the G2G transition plan.
81. Objective 7: What degree of independence is required between implementers and verification entities?
Organizations may propose approaches that are responsive to the objective and should clearly describe any governance, oversight, or conflict-of-interest mitigation safeguards that support credibility and integrity of verification activities.
82. Objective 7: Can organizations both implement programs and serve as independent verification agents?
The Department has not prescribed a specific implementation model for Objective 7. However, consistent with federal requirements regarding organizational conflict of interest, organizations proposing to serve in both implementation and verification roles must clearly describe governance, structural, and procedural safeguards that ensure the credibility, independence, and integrity of verification activities. The Department reserves the right to determine that certain combinations of roles present unacceptable conflicts.
83. Objective 7: Are there anticipated thresholds that determine whether districts may receive direct USG funding?
Specific thresholds and readiness criteria will be informed by the assessment process described in Objective 7, including funds flow analysis, systems verification, and risk identification.
84. Objective 7: How will disputed verification findings be resolved?
Dispute resolution mechanisms will be addressed during subsequent phases and award implementation.
85. Objective 7: Will milestone verification rely solely on GOU systems or also parallel source verification?
The Addendum references drawing on GOU national information systems and physical verification of source documents as needed.
86. Objective 8: Which 35 districts are currently prioritized for IRS QA support?
The Ministry of Health plans a phased IRS scale-up from 7 districts in 2026 to 35 districts by 2027, sustained through 2030, targeting regions including Acholi, Busoga, Lango, Teso, Bukedi, and West Nile regions. Quality Assurance (QA) activities should be designed to support this phased rollout. Specific district lists and operational details will be provided during subsequent phases.
87. Objective 8: Which insecticides/products are expected to be used during the implementation period?
Organizations should propose approaches responsive to the Addendum objective. Specific product information may be provided during subsequent phases.
88. Objective 8: Are applicants expected to conduct entomological surveillance in addition to QA?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum.
89. Objective 8: How will "85% household spray coverage" be independently validated?

Organizations should explain in their SOIs how proposed verification approaches achieve the stated coverage targets. Information about the award type and other requirements will be outlined in the award provisions of any resulting awards, as applicable.

90. Objective 8: What role will district health teams versus national malaria programs play in verification?

Organizations should propose approaches that align with existing GOU coordination structures. Specific institutional roles may be further clarified during subsequent phases.

91. Is there an anticipated ceiling range by objective or track?

The Department has not established a fixed funding range or ceiling per award or per objective at the SOI stage. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, GHSD and Embassy priorities, proposed scope, and availability of funding.

92. Are fixed amount awards or performance-based disbursement mechanisms being considered?

The Department anticipates that award structures will increasingly link disbursements to the achievement of independently verified milestones and outcomes and this includes consideration for fixed amount awards. Award type and specific disbursement mechanisms will be determined during the award process.

93. What proportion of funding is expected to flow directly to Ugandan local organizations?

There are no prescribed proportions at this stage. Organizations should propose partnership structures that support effective implementation, sustainability, and country ownership.

94. Are there expectations for cost share or private sector leverage?

Cost sharing or matching is not required. While applicants may propose cost share or matching, cost-sharing/matching will not be evaluated as part of the merit review process.

95. Will capital expenditures (solar infrastructure, IT hardware, etc.) be allowable?

At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making determinations regarding specific budget line items. Applicants should reference 2 CFR 200 Subpart E – Cost Principles.

96. Does DOS anticipate annual funding increments or full obligation at award?

Funding structure will be determined during the award process and will depend on the type of award and availability of funding.

97. Are there mandatory indicators beyond standard PEPFAR/MOH reporting requirements?

The Department has not prescribed specific mandatory indicators beyond those referenced in the Addendum at the SOI stage. Organizations should propose indicators appropriate to their concept that demonstrate how the proposed approach contributes to the Addendum objectives. Specific reporting requirements and indicators will be addressed during subsequent phases.

98. What sustainability benchmarks must be achieved by project close?

The Addendum emphasizes progressive transition to sustainable Ugandan ownership, financing, and management of systems and services. Organizations should describe in their SOIs how proposed approaches achieve sustainability by project close, including transition of operational costs, staffing, and management to domestic systems. Specific benchmarks may be further defined during subsequent phases.

99. How will "successful transition" be defined operationally?

Consistent with the Addendum and the AFGHS, transition refers to the progressive, phased transfer of functions, financing, management, and operational responsibility from implementing partners to Government of Uganda systems and institutions, with the goal of sustainable country ownership. Specific operational definitions and additional requirements will be addressed during subsequent phases.

100. Are independent evaluations anticipated during the award period?
Organizations may propose an evaluation approach as appropriate. The Department has not specified whether independent evaluations will be externally commissioned. Specific evaluation arrangements will be addressed during subsequent phases.
101. What documentation will be required to demonstrate transfer of recurrent costs to GOU?
Specific documentation and reporting requirements will be addressed during subsequent phases and reflected in any resulting award. Organizations should describe in their SOIs how proposed approaches support verifiable transition of recurrent costs to domestic financing.
102. Are there restrictions on use of foreign subcontractors or offshore technical support?
Applicants should reference the APS and applicable federal regulations. Organizations should explain how proposed arrangements support effective implementation and country ownership.
103. What approvals are required from MOH/MOFPED before implementation begins?
Specific pre-implementation requirements will be addressed during the award process. Recipients must align all programming with GOU priorities as stated in the Addendum's guiding principles.
104. Are there anticipated procurement preferences for U.S. technologies or firms?
The Addendum's guiding principles reference leveraging U.S. and Ugandan private sector expertise, technology, and investment, and expanding the use of U.S. technologies, standards, and solutions. All SOIs will be evaluated based on the published evaluation criteria outlined in Section F of the APS.
105. How will foreign exchange risk and inflation adjustments be handled over a five-year award period?
Financial management and risk mitigation arrangements will be addressed during the award process.
106. What safeguarding, data privacy, and patient confidentiality standards apply across digital systems?
Organizations should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, and privacy considerations appropriate to the proposed concept. Detailed requirements will be addressed during subsequent phases.
107. Under Objective 4, would a consent-based patient/family-facing records and understanding layer be considered responsive if it complements, rather than replaces, facility EMR/HMIS systems such as eAfya or ClinicMaster?
Organizations should review the objectives and scope described in Addendum E and determine whether their proposed concept is responsive to one or more of those objectives. The Department will evaluate SOIs based on the extent to which they address the priorities and objectives identified in the Addendum. Organizations are encouraged to clearly explain how proposed activities support interoperability, government ownership, sustainability, and achievement of the selected objective(s).

108. Under Objectives 2, 3, and/or 4, would tools that help patients and families securely organize health records across multiple facilities, understand lab/prescription/discharge information in plain language, and prepare better questions for clinicians be considered part of people-centered integrated service delivery or faith/community health-system strengthening?

Organizations should review the objectives and scope described in Addendum E and determine whether their proposed concept is responsive to one or more of those objectives. Organizations should clearly identify the objective(s) addressed and explain how the proposed activities contribute to achievement of those objectives.

109. For patient-facing adjunct tools that generate consented family records from uploaded photos/PDFs, are there specific expectations for data ownership, hosting, interoperability, or transition to Government of Uganda responsibility beyond compliance with Uganda data-protection requirements and alignment with MOH systems?

Organizations should demonstrate awareness of relevant governance, security, privacy, and sustainability considerations appropriate to the proposed concept. The Addendum states that all systems must be fully under GOU responsibility and operation by project close. Specific data ownership, hosting, and interoperability arrangements will be addressed during subsequent phases, if applicable.

110. Would an SOI be considered responsive if a Ugandan faith/community-based health network or medical bureau is the primary implementation partner, with a technology partner providing the secure records/comprehension layer and interoperability support?

Organizations may propose consortium or partnership arrangements that they believe are best suited to achieve the objectives of the Addendum. The Department has not prescribed a preferred consortium structure. Organizations should clearly describe partner roles and explain how the proposed arrangement supports successful implementation, sustainability, local ownership, and achievement of the intended outcomes.

111. Consortium Prime/Sub-Recipient Relationships: Does GHSD prefer a single Statement of Interest (SOI) submitted by a prime recipient (for example, the Diocese of Kasana-Luweero as a local faith-based network) with Amref Uganda / Makerere Walter Reed programme (MUWRP) serving as a core sub-recipient responsible for the technical part under Track 1, or would separate SOIs for individual objectives be more appropriate?

Organizations may structure submissions as they determine most appropriate. The Department has no stated preference. In many cases, a single well-developed SOI that presents an integrated approach may be more effective than multiple narrowly focused submissions.

112. Cost-Sharing and Matching Requirements: Given the emphasis on transitioning to domestic revenue sources, is there a formal cost-sharing or matching fund requirement expected from applicants at either the Statement of Interest or full proposal stage?

Cost sharing or matching is not required. While applicants may propose cost share or matching, cost-sharing/matching will not be evaluated as part of the merit review process. Opportunities for cost sharing and matching may be discussed during negotiation, if applicable. Per 2 CFR §200.306, items proposed for cost share must be allowable. Importantly, though, cost share that is voluntarily proposed by an applicant, and then accepted by the Department of State becomes legally binding.

113. Separation of Religious Activities: For faith-based health facilities where spaces are integrated, would the presence of standard religious symbols or routine morning prayers

conducted before clinic hours be considered compliant with the separation-of-religious-activities provision, provided that health services remain entirely non-discriminatory and accessible to all beneficiaries?

The Addendum states that explicitly religious activities must be kept separate in time or location from U.S. government-funded health service delivery activities. Health services must be provided without regard to the religious beliefs of beneficiaries or their participation in religious activities. Organizations should describe how they will ensure compliance with this requirement.

114. Premium Subsidies for Vulnerable Groups: Since Objective 1 promotes Community Health Insurance (CHI) schemes linked to income-generating initiatives, can award funds be used to temporarily subsidize or seed insurance premiums for highly vulnerable populations such as youth, orphans, and other vulnerable children while those income-generating mechanisms are being established and become self-sustaining?

Organizations may structure submissions as they determine most appropriate. The Department has no stated preference. Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making specific cost-allowability determinations.

115. Digital Financial Technology Solutions: May project funds be used to procure, customize, or co-develop digital financial technology solutions, such as mobile money-integrated health savings wallets, in partnership with Ugandan telecommunications or private financial service providers to facilitate CHI enrolment, premium collection, and financial management?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Any proposed use of funds must be consistent with applicable federal regulations and guidance, including 2 CFR 200 Subpart E – Cost Principles.

116. The Ministry has indicated a need to select and limit the number of partners in the country. Is there a possibility that a partner is awarded this grant and disqualified by the MOH?

The Department coordinates with U.S. Embassies and relevant government counterparts. Award decisions are made in accordance with the APS and applicable federal requirements.

117. Are the current running grants by DoS affected by this addendum if their work covers any of these areas?

Activities under this Addendum are designed to support the MOU Implementation Plan and the phased transition described therein. The Department will manage any programmatic overlap or transition through standard award administration processes.

118. Are there specific geographic areas, districts, facility types, or regions that are priority sites for this addendum?

Unless otherwise specified, the Department has not identified priority districts or regions. Organizations should propose a geographic scope that is responsive to the selected objective(s) and appropriately justified.

119. Is the prime recipient of the current grant expected to transition program responsibilities to a local organization during the 5 years of the current call?

The Addendum emphasizes progressive transition to sustainable Ugandan ownership, financing, and management of systems and services. Organizations should clearly describe how proposed approaches support this principle.

120. Are there any USG funded implementing partners currently providing support to the objectives mentioned?
There are existing U.S. government-funded programs supporting health systems in Uganda. Activities under this Addendum are designed to support the MOU Implementation Plan and the phased transition described therein.
121. Are there any caps or restrictions on indirect costs/administrative overhead for the prime organization? For the sub-awards?
Applicants should comply with 2 CFR 200, Subpart E – Cost Principles. Organizations with a federally negotiated indirect cost rate agreement (NICRA) may use that rate. Organizations without one may elect to use the de minimis rate of 15% of MTDC per 2 CFR 200.414(f). Per Section F of the APS, lower indirect cost rates serve as a tie-breaking mechanism only.
122. On digital health systems: What does "fully under GOU responsibility and operation by project close" mean in practical terms?
Organizations should explain in their SOIs how proposed approaches support full transition of staffing, recurrent operating costs, system management, and operational responsibility to the Ministry of Health by project close, as stated in the Addendum.
123. On digital health systems: Will applicants be expected to migrate existing platforms, or merely support interoperability and handover of functions?
Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. The Addendum references deployment, integration, and progressive GOU responsibility for the named systems.
124. What coordination forums or technical working groups will recipients be able to participate in?
The Addendum's guiding principles require active participation in designated coordination, performance monitoring, and implementation review platforms. Specific forums will be identified during award implementation.
125. Is formal approval from MOH, MOFPED, districts etc. required prior to submission or only before award implementation?
There are no requirements for formal government approvals at the SOI stage.
126. Should evaluation activities be included within each SOI? Or is DOS planning to engage independent evaluators, separate from the current call.
Organizations may propose an evaluation approach as appropriate. A detailed evaluation plan is not required at the SOI stage.
127. Objective 4 describes Uganda's national health data architecture in terms of software platforms (EMRs, laboratory information systems, surveillance and outbreak-management systems, warehouse systems, the National Data Warehouse, eCHIS, and iHRIS). Are last-mile connectivity investments — field hardware such as low-power radio relays, gateways, and solar power that carry off-grid facility data into these national systems — considered in-scope and allowable under Objective 4? If such hardware is better situated under Objective 5 (Expand Sustainable Power Solutions) or another objective, we would welcome that guidance.
Organizations should propose approaches that are responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. The Department recognizes that some activities may support multiple objectives. Applicants should clearly explain how proposed activities, including any connectivity or infrastructure components, contribute to achievement of the

selected objective(s) and provide a rationale for the proposed scope. At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making determinations regarding the allowability of specific budget line items.

128. For Objective 4, may an SOI focus on a specific subsystem within the national architecture — for example, the surveillance and outbreak-management systems (eIDSR and the Integrated Outbreak Management System) — or is an Objective 4 SOI expected to address the full set of systems named in the Addendum?

Organizations may propose approaches addressing one or more of the named systems. The Addendum identifies the full set of priority systems; however, a focused SOI addressing a subset of systems may be competitive if it is technically sound, feasible, responsive to the Addendum, and capable of achieving meaningful results. Organizations should clearly explain the rationale for the proposed scope and how it contributes to the Addendum objectives.

129. Is the transition of Objective 4 digital health systems to Government of Uganda ownership already underway through a government-to-government channel or a designated implementing partner? If so, how should an APS-funded Objective 4 project complement that work and avoid creating parallel structures?

There are existing U.S. government-funded programs supporting health systems in Uganda, including digital health systems. Activities under this Addendum are designed to support the MOU Implementation Plan and the phased transition described therein. Organizations should describe in their SOIs how proposed approaches complement existing investments and avoid creating parallel structures. The Department will manage any programmatic overlap or transition through standard award administration processes.

130. For Objective 4, will the Ministry of Health designate the target districts and facilities, or should applicants propose the geographic scope? Are there priority off-grid or underserved districts for last-mile digital-systems and connectivity investments to which applicants should align?

Unless otherwise specified, the Department has not identified priority districts or regions at the SOI stage. Organizations should propose a geographic scope that is responsive to the selected objective(s) and appropriately justified. Detailed facility and district information, if applicable, may be made available during subsequent phases.

131. Under Addendum E, will awards to non-governmental prime applicants — for example, a Ugandan faith-based medical bureau — be made directly as grants or cooperative agreements, distinct from the government-to-government financing through MOFPED, the Ministry of Health, and districts described in the Program Description?

Awards under this APS may be structured as grants, cooperative agreements, or fixed amount awards, consistent with the APS. G2G financing channeled through GOU entities is a separate mechanism described in the MOU Implementation Plan.

132. Given the Addendum's emphasis on Government of Uganda ownership from inception, is a Ministry of Health letter of support or documented engagement expected, or advantageous, at the SOI stage for an Objective 4 project, or is such documentation relevant only at the full-application stage?

At the SOI stage, organizations are not required to submit letters of support or formal endorsements from government entities. Organizations should describe relevant partnerships, coordination mechanisms, and stakeholder engagement strategies,

as appropriate to the proposed concept. Additional information regarding partnerships and implementation arrangements may be requested during subsequent phases.

133. The U.S. Government–Government of Uganda MOU Implementation Plan runs April 2026–December 2030. Should Objective 4 SOIs propose a performance period ending December 2030 to align with the Plan, or a full five-year period measured from the actual award date?

Organizations should propose a timeline that is reasonable for their project, consistent with the Addendum requirement that proposed projects be completed in five years or less.

134. Will an SOI that connects a Track 2 enabling-systems investment (Objective 4) to the faith- and community-based sector's recognized frontline-surveillance and outbreak-detection role be considered responsive, or should activities under Track 1 and Track 2 be presented in separate SOIs?

Organizations may propose concepts addressing one or more objectives within a track or across tracks, as appropriate to the proposed concept and organizational capacity.

Applicants should clearly identify the objective(s) addressed and explain how proposed activities contribute to achievement of those objectives.

135. Does the Department of State have any policy, restriction, or disclosure requirement regarding the use of artificial-intelligence tools to assist in drafting Statements of Interest or full applications under this APS?

The Department does not have a specific policy restricting the use of AI tools in the preparation of SOIs. Organizations are responsible for the accuracy, originality, and responsiveness of their submissions.

136. For the APS Addendum E on Uganda, which has both tracks and objectives, can GHSD clarify if a single SOI can be submitted that covers objectives from both tracks 1 and 2?

Organizations may propose concepts addressing one or more objectives within a track or across tracks, as appropriate to the proposed concept and organizational capacity.

137. Objective 1 references linking CHI groups to income-generating initiatives. Could DoS clarify whether awards are expected to directly finance such initiatives, or whether support is limited to technical assistance and linkage facilitation?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. Applicants should explain how proposed activities achieve the stated objectives, including how community-based health financing approaches are linked to sustainable income-generating mechanisms. At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making specific cost-allowability determinations.

138. The Uganda MOU contemplates paying the medical bureaus directly by the government of Uganda using GTG funding. Should bidders assume that funding for the actual delivery of health services by the faith-based and community-based networks, referenced in Objective 2, is strictly outside of the addendum?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. G2G financing channeled through GOU entities is a separate mechanism described in the MOU Implementation Plan. Activities funded under this Addendum are designed to support and complement MOU implementation of G2G activities. Applicants should explain how proposed activities sustain integrated service delivery and contribute to achievement of the Addendum objectives.

139. We note that the Uganda MOU metrics cover health outcomes and health delivery processes, but only one indicator directly related to readiness (focused on accuracy of reported data into the national health information system) is included. In the addendum, the focus for the service delivery objective with faith- and community-based networks seems to be on sustainability and readiness to provide services with operational costs taken on by those networks. Does the State Department want to use Objective 2 as the mechanism for service delivery, or as the mechanism for strategic technical assistance to prepare the service providers for financial sustainability?

Objective 2 is the mechanism for both life-saving service delivery and technical assistance. The Addendum emphasizes both sustaining integrated service delivery and progressively transitioning operational costs to domestic revenue streams. Organizations should explain in their SOIs how proposed approaches achieve both continuity of life-saving services and progressive financial sustainability, consistent with the Addendum objectives.

140. The APS Addendum states that approximately \$60 million is available for awards under this opportunity. Could the Department of State please provide additional guidance regarding how this funding is anticipated to be allocated across the various objectives and resulting awards, including any estimated funding ranges or ceilings for individual awards anticipated under the addendum?

The Department has not established a fixed funding range or ceiling per award or per objective at the SOI stage. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and Embassy priorities, proposed scope, and availability of funding.

141. Objective 5 states that recipients will support sustainable power solutions at up to 700 health facilities by 2029. To support development of a realistic technical approach, implementation strategy, and budget estimate for the Statement of Interest, could GHSD clarify its expectations regarding the scale of implementation under this objective?

Organizations should propose concepts that are appropriately scoped to achieve the objectives described in the Addendum. Organizations may propose approaches that address a subset of facilities, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified. Organizations should clearly describe the proposed scope and rationale.

142. Are applicants expected to propose support for all 700 facilities anticipated under Objective 5, or may applicants propose support for a subset of facilities based on their technical approach and available resources?

Organizations may propose approaches that address a subset of facilities, provided the proposed scope is responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum and is appropriately justified. Organizations should clearly describe the proposed scope and rationale.

143. How should applicants determine the appropriate scale of investment and corresponding budget under Objective 5, particularly given the potentially wide variation in costs associated with different implementation approaches and levels of facility coverage?

At the SOI stage, organizations are not required to submit a detailed budget. Organizations should propose concepts that are appropriately scoped to achieve the objectives described in the Addendum. Applicants should present a budget figure they estimate to be realistic for meeting the proposed scope and objectives according to

their proposed project design. Additional budget guidance will be provided to applicants invited to proceed to a subsequent phase.

144. Does GHSD anticipate that awards under Objective 5 will include procurement and installation of sustainable energy technologies (e.g., solar photovoltaic systems, battery storage systems, and related infrastructure), or is the expectation that recipients primarily provide technical assistance, planning, oversight, monitoring, and/or capacity strengthening support?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making determinations regarding the allowability of specific budget line items. Applicants should clearly describe the proposed implementation approach and explain how it achieves the Addendum objectives, including sustainability beyond the award period.

145. Objective 8 describes delivering IRS quality assurance in 35 districts. We request clarification on the acceptable scope of an SOI responding to this objective: Would a phased approach that demonstrates an integrated QA model in a defined subset of districts, with a costed plan to transfer and scale to the full 35 districts, be considered responsive to Objective 8?

Organizations may propose phased approaches where appropriate to achieve the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Applicants should clearly describe the proposed implementation strategy, rationale, anticipated milestones, and how the approach supports achievement of the intended outcomes.

146. Are applicants able to choose more than one track and one objective per SOI? If so, should partners submit different SOIs for each track or objective?

Organizations may propose concepts addressing one or more objectives within a track or across tracks, as appropriate to the proposed concept and organizational capacity. Applicants should clearly identify the objective(s) and track(s) addressed and explain how the proposed activities contribute to achievement of those objectives. In many cases, a single well-developed SOI that presents an integrated approach may be more effective than multiple narrowly focused submissions.

147. If partners apply for one objective, do partners need to have the capacity to complete all the activities proposed under that objective?

Organizations should demonstrate the technical, operational, and institutional capacity required for implementation of the proposed activities.

148. For the SOI, does an expression of interest or a supporting letter from a supporting/facilitating organization (for e.g. the national ministry of health, community-based organization) help positioning or can this be reserved for a later stage?

At the SOI stage, organizations are not required to submit letters of support or formal endorsements. Organizations may incorporate relevant context as appropriate.

149. Do partners need to have a letter of support/ no objection from the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Health, and Faith or Community based organizations you plan to work with by the 31 July 2026 SOI submission deadline?

There are no requirements for letters of support at the SOI stage.

150. Could the community-based facilities or organization specifically target the non-Ugandan populations?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum.

151. Does the donor require that partners adopt an integrated one-stop service model, and are there preferred models or examples we should follow?

The Addendum references integrated, one-stop service delivery models aligned with the Ministry of Health Integration Strategy. Organizations should explain how proposed approaches reduce programmatic fragmentation.

152. What financial sustainability and transition milestones does the donor expect under Objective 1 for shifting operational costs to domestic financing?

Organizations should describe in their SOIs how proposed approaches progressively build sustainable, community-owned financing that reduces reliance on external support. Information about the award type and other requirements will be outlined in the award provisions of any resulting awards, as applicable.

153. Could the Department of State please clarify whether the budget referenced in the APS - particularly for Uganda - should be developed on an annual basis or as a life-of-project (LoP) total?

The "Total Federal Share Requested" in the SOI should reflect the total amount for the proposed period of performance. A detailed annual budget is not required at the SOI stage.

154. Is the Government-to-Government Health MOU or Implementation Plan (2026-2030) for Uganda available to the public, or could GHSD make it available for applicants?

Detailed knowledge of specific MOUs is not required to submit a competitive SOI. SOIs should be responsive to the priorities outlined in the Addendum.

155. The APS identifies "outcomes and results" as a key element of the SOI. Because results can be articulated at different levels of the results chain (e.g., activity outputs, intermediate outcomes, or higher-level outcomes/impact), could the Department clarify the level at which applicants are expected to express anticipated results in the SOI? Specifically, should results be described at the activity output level, or at the outcome level?

Organizations should describe anticipated results at a level sufficient to demonstrate the feasibility and impact of the proposed concept. Both outputs and outcomes may be referenced as appropriate.

156. Eligibility of Non-Salary Local Representative Incentives: Our low-overhead cost model utilizes a network of 1,200 localized church community tech volunteers instead of a centralized, salaried field staff. Can the Bureau confirm if non-salary participant incentives—specifically localized transport tokens, mobile internet data bundles, and professional digital skills certifications—are fully allowable and classified as direct program execution costs under Track 1?

At the SOI stage, the Department is assessing the overall merit, responsiveness, and feasibility of proposed concepts rather than making determinations regarding the allowability of specific budget line items. Applicants should reference 2 CFR 200 Subpart E – Cost Principles. Detailed budget and cost allowability considerations will be addressed during subsequent phases, if applicable.

157. Pre-Existing Spatial and Real Estate Assets: To maximize cost efficiency, our consortium is anchoring mobile outreach clinics, school nutrition programs, and eco-processing workshops entirely within pre-existing, titled, church-owned land and facilities across 600 locations, resulting in a zero-cost (\$0) rent overhead to the grant. How does the review

board weigh the leverage of such pre-existing local capital assets during the cost-realism and sustainability evaluation rounds?

SOIs will be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria outlined in Section B.1 of the APS, including the quality, feasibility, responsiveness, and likely impact of the proposed concept. While cost sharing or matching is not required and will not be evaluated as part of the merit review process, organizations may describe how existing assets and resources support the feasibility and sustainability of the proposed approach. Per 2 CFR §200.306, items proposed for cost share must be allowable.

158. Phased Absorption of Human Resource Costs: Our transition plan features a structured 3-year seed facilitation window where grant funds secure mobile health worker stipends, allowing our church-linked savings clubs and SACCO micro-premiums to build capital depth. From Year 4 onward, these domestically mobilized capital pools will progressively absorb 100% of personnel payroll. Does this 3-year stabilization runway and subsequent hybrid hand-off model fulfill the transition metrics mandated under Addendum E?

The Department has not prescribed specific transition timelines or models at the SOI stage. Organizations should describe in their SOIs how proposed approaches progressively build sustainable, community-owned financing that reduces reliance on external support, consistent with the Addendum's emphasis on transitioning operational costs to domestic revenue streams. Information about the award type and other requirements will be outlined in the award provisions of any resulting awards, as applicable.

159. Track 2, Objective 4: Addendum E, Objective 4 lists several digital health systems in Uganda. Are these the priority systems that will be worked on by recipients or could additional systems such as DATIM (PEPFAR system) be included in the scope of work?

The Addendum identifies a specific set of priority digital health systems. Organizations should propose approaches that are responsive to the named systems and objectives outlined in the Addendum. Organizations may describe how proposed approaches interface with or complement other systems where relevant to achieving the Addendum objectives.

160. Track 2, Objective 4: Is there a budget ceiling for Objective 4?

The Department has not established a fixed funding range or ceiling per award or per objective at the SOI stage. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and Embassy priorities, proposed scope, and availability of funding.

161. Track 2, Objective 4: Since Objective 4 also includes Fit-for-Purpose Digital Health Systems, should recipients also focus on the quality and use of data in the health systems?

Organizations are encouraged to submit SOIs for any work that falls within the scope outlined in the Addendum. The Addendum references fit-for-purpose digital health systems, which includes ensuring systems support data quality and evidence-based decision-making. Organizations should explain in their SOIs how proposed approaches contribute to achievement of the Addendum objectives.

162. Will the award build in any FX adjustment or contingency mechanism for USD-funded activities delivered in UGX over a 5-year period?

Financial management and risk mitigation arrangements will be addressed during the award process.

163. Will the applicable DOS Standard Terms & Conditions and any country-specific award terms be made available before the SOI or Phase 2 deadline so applicants can assess compliance before committing?

Standard terms and conditions are publicly available and will be incorporated into any resulting awards. See APS Section H.

164. Are the Standard T&Cs negotiable at the award stage? Should any exceptions be included in proposals?

Standard terms and conditions will be applied consistent with applicable federal regulations and Department policy.

165. Can GHSD advise on the anticipated timing for the second phase of the solicitation process and grant/cooperative agreement awards?

Additional guidance, including timelines, will be provided to applicants invited to proceed to a subsequent phase. The full process from SOI submission to potential award may take several months.

166. Can GHSD advise on if there is any conflict of interest presented across objectives; for example, can the implementer of Objective 7 also contribute to other objectives?

Organizations should ensure that any proposed approach complies with applicable federal regulations and guidance, including conflict of interest requirements. See also the response regarding Objective 7 independence safeguards.

167. To help applicants provide more targeted and tailored concepts, could GHSD provide additional detail on the G2G model - including what entities are anticipated to receive direct funding and what benchmarks or mechanisms are envisioned to determine transition readiness, assess performance and incrementally increase funding per the "performance-verified system"?

Detailed knowledge of specific MOUs is not required to submit a competitive SOI. SOIs should be responsive to the priorities outlined in the Addendum. Specific information regarding G2G transition benchmarks, performance verification mechanisms, and entities anticipated to receive direct funding may be provided during subsequent phases, if applicable.

168. Could you kindly clarify whether a student-led project team can submit a Statement of Interest directly under Addendum E, or whether we must apply through a formally registered entity such as a company, NGO, university, faith-based organization, or established health-sector partner?

SOIs must be submitted by an eligible organization as defined in the APS. Individuals or informal teams may not submit SOIs in an individual capacity.

169. We would also appreciate confirmation on whether a digital health interoperability and outbreak-readiness concept of this nature (digital health project developing a Health Information Exchange concept for Uganda, focused on disease surveillance, outbreak signal visibility, lab-result access, referrals, medicine/commodity visibility, facility capacity, data quality, audit logs, and Ministry of Health-level dashboards) may be considered responsive under Addendum E.

Organizations should review the objectives and scope described in Addendum E and determine whether their proposed concept is responsive to one or more of those objectives. The Department will evaluate SOIs based on the extent to which they address

the priorities and objectives identified in the Addendum. Organizations are encouraged to clearly explain how proposed activities support interoperability, government ownership, sustainability, and achievement of the selected objective(s).

Addendum F: Malawi Q&A

1. Objective 1 describes the recipient's role as providing strategic assistance and advisory services. Can the Department of State confirm that the following activities are explicitly excluded from this objective's scope: direct management of GOM financial flows, employment of frontline health workers, and direct delivery of clinical services?
Objective 1 is intended to support strategic assistance, advisory services, capacity strengthening, and transition support activities as described in the Addendum. Organizations should propose approaches that are responsive to the scope and objectives outlined in the Addendum. The Department will evaluate proposed concepts based on their responsiveness to the stated objective. Detailed implementation arrangements and allowable activities will be further assessed during subsequent phases.
2. At the SOI and full proposal stage, does the Department of State expect applicants to demonstrate existing relationships with and endorsement from MOHS, MoFEPD, or relevant District Health Management Teams — or is government engagement expected to be established by the recipient after award?
Organizations are not required to submit letters of support, endorsements, or formal agreements from Government of Malawi institutions at the SOI stage. Organizations should describe relevant experience, partnerships, coordination approaches, and stakeholder engagement strategies as appropriate to the proposed concept. The Department may request additional information regarding partnerships and implementation arrangements as part of a full application submission, if applicable.
3. Will evidence of government support, co-design, or formal endorsement by the Government of Malawi be a factor in the evaluation and selection of SOIs and full proposals? And are grant recipients expected to report results to both the Department of State and relevant GOM institutions, or exclusively to the Department of State?
SOIs will be evaluated in accordance with the review criteria outlined in the APS and the applicable Addendum. Organizations are not required to provide formal government endorsements at the SOI stage. Reporting requirements, coordination mechanisms, and stakeholder engagement expectations will be established as appropriate during full application submission, review, and negotiation where applicable and reflected in any resulting award.
4. The Malawi Addendum states up to 4 awards totaling up to \$35M annually. Does the Department of State anticipate one award per objective, or could multiple awards fund the same objective? Is there a notional per-award budget range applicants should use to calibrate SOI scope?
The Department has not established a predetermined number of awards per objective. The number, size, scope, and distribution of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, GHSD and Embassy priorities, and availability of funding. At the SOI stage, organizations are not required to submit a detailed budget and should propose concepts that are appropriately scoped to achieve one or more of the objectives described in the Addendum.

5. Objective 1 requires sustained engagement with MOHS, MoFEPD, and DHMTs at both national and district level. Does the Department of State require applicants to demonstrate existing in-country presence in Malawi at the time of SOI submission? Does this requirement extend to proposed sub-contractors or consortium partners?

The Addendum does not require applicants, subrecipients, or consortium partners to have an existing in-country presence in Malawi at the time of SOI submission. Organizations should demonstrate the technical, operational, and institutional capacity necessary to successfully implement the proposed approach and achieve one or more of the stated objectives in the Addendum.
6. The Addendum's guiding principles emphasize collaboration with Malawian local organizations, faith-based organizations, and community stakeholders. Under Objective 1, does the Department of State expect or require applicants to include Malawian local organizations as formal consortium members or sub-awardees? If so, is there a minimum proportion of award value expected to flow to local organizations?

Applicants may propose consortium, partnership, or sub-award arrangements where appropriate to achieve the objectives described in the Addendum. The Department has not established a required minimum proportion of award value that must flow to Malawian local organizations. Applicants should clearly describe the roles of proposed partners and how the proposed approach supports Government of Malawi ownership, sustainability, and successful implementation.
7. The Malawi Addendum requires recipients to actively participate in designated coordination, performance monitoring, and implementation review platforms. Can the Department of State confirm whether a formal oversight structure — such as a steering committee or joint technical review body — is planned for this award? Who will convene it, and what role is the recipient expected to play?

Recipients will be expected to coordinate with relevant Government of Malawi, Department of State (including U.S. Embassy), and other stakeholder coordination mechanisms, as applicable. Specific coordination, oversight, performance monitoring, and implementation review arrangements will be determined during full application review and negotiation and/or award implementation, if applicable. Applicants should describe how they would support effective coordination, transparency, performance monitoring, and alignment with Government of Malawi priorities.
8. The Malawi Addendum states projects should be completed in five years or less, and the MOU Implementation Plan runs to December 2030. Does the Department of State intend to award the full five-year period at the outset, or structure the award in phases subject to performance review? Is a phased approach — for example, an initial 2–3 year period with an option to extend — permitted or preferred?

Projects should be completed within the period specified in the Addendum. The final period of performance, funding structure, and any phasing will be determined during the award process and will be subject to availability of funding, performance, and completion of required reviews and approvals. Organizations may propose phased approaches where appropriate and should clearly describe the approach and anticipated outcomes and results.
9. The Malawi Addendum is issued under the broader Advancing Global Health APS. Should applicants anticipate that additional objectives may be added under this APS in future years

Applicants should prepare SOIs based on the objectives and scope described in the applicable Addendum. The Department may issue additional Addenda or amendments under the APS in the future, as appropriate.

10. Could the scope of the Malawi Addendum be expanded or amended during the award period?

Interested organizations should continue to monitor grants.gov for amendments to open addenda. Addenda will not be amended after they have closed.

11. Objective 1 requires recipients to strengthen GOM capacity for data-driven decision-making and to support budget tracking, expenditure reporting, and operational planning at district level. Can the Department of State confirm whether functional performance management systems — including planning, financial reporting, and data review processes — are already in place within MOHS and DHMTs, or whether the recipient should expect to design and establish these systems from the ground up?

Organizations should: prepare SOIs based on the information provided in the Addendum; incorporate understanding of any current systems; and clearly describe their proposed approach to strengthening Government of Malawi capacity for data-driven decision-making, planning, budget tracking, expenditure reporting, and performance review. At the SOI stage, the Department has not prescribed whether applicants should assume systems will be newly established or strengthened from an existing baseline. Applicants should describe relevant assumptions and how their approach would support sustainability and Government of Malawi ownership.

12. Objective 1 references support to DHMTs but does not specify which districts are in scope. Does the Department of State expect the recipient to operate across all districts in Malawi, or will the award target a defined subset? If district selection will be determined post-award, should applicants propose a prioritisation methodology in the SOI?

Organizations may propose national or sub-national approaches, provided the proposed scope is responsive to one or more objectives outlined in the Addendum and appropriately justified. Applicants should clearly describe the proposed geographic scope or propose a prioritization methodology if specific districts are to be determined later.

13. The Addendum states that district-level G2G mechanisms will increase as parallel USG-funded clinical implementers are phased out. What coordination is expected between the Objective 1 recipient and existing clinical implementers during the transition period? Will the Department of State define a coordination architecture, or should applicants propose one as part of objective 1 of this Addendum.

Applicants are expected to describe how they will work closely with existing clinical implementers to support an orderly handover of functions to district-level G2G structures. Recipients will be expected to coordinate with relevant Government of Malawi, Department of State (including U.S. Embassy), and other stakeholder coordination mechanisms, as applicable. Specific coordination, oversight, performance monitoring, and implementation review arrangements will be determined during the full application phase and/or award implementation, if applicable. Applicants should describe how they would support effective coordination, transparency, performance monitoring, and alignment with Government of Malawi priorities.

14. Objective 1 calls for a phased transfer of functions to GOM but does not specify transition milestones or readiness benchmarks. Will the Department of State provide a transition

readiness framework, or are applicants expected to propose one? Will performance against transition milestones be a condition for continued funding?

Organizations may propose phased approaches, milestones, or benchmarks where appropriate. Applicants should clearly describe the approach and expected outcomes and results.

15. The MOU Implementation Plan involves multiple USG agencies. Under Objective 1, which USG entity will serve as the recipient's primary point of contact — GHSD, the U.S. Embassy, or another body? How is the recipient expected to interface with the broader MOU governance structure, and will that interface be defined prior to award?

The Department of State will issue awards that result from this Addendum and will designate recipient points of contact, including a Department of State Grants Officer and Grants Officer Representative for each award.

16. Addendum F indicates up to 4 awards and total estimated funding of up to \$35 million annually. Should applicants interpret the \$35 million as the total annual ceiling across all awards under this Addendum? May proposed budgets assume up to five 12-month budget periods, subject to the availability of funds?

The Addendum provides an estimated annual funding amount and anticipated number of awards, subject to availability of funding. Applicants should not assume that funding will be divided equally among awards. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and U.S. Embassy priorities, and availability of funding. Applicants may propose concepts that are appropriately scoped for the proposed period of performance, recognizing that funding levels, budget periods, and award structure will be finalized during the award negotiation process and subject to availability of funds.

17. For Objective 3, are there Government of Malawi data residency or hosting requirements or preferences (for example, hosting in a government data center versus in-country commercial hosting) that applicants should reflect in proposed digital health system architectures?

The Addendum does not prescribe specific data residency or hosting requirements for Objective 3 at this time. Applicants are encouraged to propose the digital health system architecture they believe best meets Objective 3 as described in the Addendum.

18. The addendum authorizes "equipment procurement" to support digital health systems. Please clarify whether procurement is limited to national and subnational level information technology infrastructure (servers, networking equipment, etc.), or whether it may also include facility-level end-user devices (tablets, smartphones, barcode scanners, and peripherals) necessary to implement and scale the hybrid digital health solutions described in the addendum.

The Addendum does not prescribe what specific types of equipment can be procured. Organizations may propose equipment (or supplies) necessary to implement proposed technical approaches.

19. Please clarify the intended legal and financial relationship between the Department and the selected recipient. Will the Department issue a direct assistance award (grant, cooperative agreement, or fixed-amount award) to our organization or another recipient organization, or will funding be channelled exclusively through government-to-government (G2G) arrangements directly to the Government of Malawi, with the recipient then providing services under a separate arrangement with the Government?

The Addendum is issued under the Advancing Global Health APS, which may result in

direct U.S. federal assistance awards to eligible recipients following the applicable review, selection, negotiation, and approval processes. The selected recipient will receive the award directly from the Department and will be accountable to the Department for performance and financial management. Collaboration with the Government of Malawi is expected; however, the Department does not anticipate channeling funding exclusively through G2G arrangements. Organizations should follow the eligibility and submission requirements described in the APS and Addendum. Any specific award mechanism, recipient relationship, or coordination with Government-to-Government (G2G) arrangements will be determined during the full application and award stages, if applicable. Also see, “MOU Alignment and Country Priorities Clarifications,” above.

20. Should an application cover all areas mentioned (HIV, MNCH, Tuberculosis, Malaria and Global Health Security) or not?

Organizations should propose concepts that are responsive to one or more of the objectives described in the Addendum. Applicants are not required to address every disease area unless doing so is necessary for the proposed concept. SOIs should clearly identify the health areas addressed and explain how the proposed activities contribute to the selected objective(s).

21. Is consortium created to cover more than one objective allowed to apply?

Applicants may propose consortium-based approaches that address one or more objectives. The proposed structure should be clearly described and should demonstrate that consortium members have complementary roles and capacities to achieve the objectives and proposed results and outcomes.

22. Can an organization be funded for more than one proposal?

Organizations may submit multiple SOIs under a given Addendum and may participate in multiple submissions as a prime applicant, subrecipient, or consortium member.

However, applicants are encouraged to submit their most competitive and responsive concept(s) rather than multiple variations of similar approaches.

23. How will “successful transition to government ownership” be measured?

SOIs should be responsive to the goals, objective(s), and guiding principles outlined in the Addendum. Specific information regarding G2G transition benchmarks and performance assessment mechanisms may be provided by the Department and/or proposed by the applicant during the full application stage, if applicable.

24. Will the anticipated ~\$35M annually be split evenly across all four awards, or should applicants propose varying scales?

Applicants should not assume that funding amount will be divided equally among anticipated awards. The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and U.S. Embassy priorities, and availability of funding. The Department reserves the right to make a final determination regarding all funding matters, pending funding availability.

25. Eligible Entities—Is it for local entities or open to international entities?

Eligibility requirements are described in Section B.1 of the APS. Eligible local, national, regional, international, and other qualifying organizations may apply, consistent with the APS eligibility requirements.

26. Malawi Govt MOU Implementation Plan—Are the recipients expected to work in accordance with Govt MOU implementation plan or will they be expected to support such development?

Recipients are expected to work in accordance with the MOU Implementation Plan. Further details of the plan will be provided to Phase 2 applicants and awardees where needed. Organizations should focus on developing clear, feasible, and impactful concepts that respond directly to Addendum priorities. Detailed knowledge of the MOU or its Implementation Plan is not required to submit a competitive SOI.

27. Human Resource: Are recipients expected to work with own staff or existing government staff?

SOIs should address one or more of the objectives described in the Addendum, including the use of national systems and staff, where appropriate.

28. Will the up to 4 anticipated awards correspond one-to-one to the three objectives, or may a single award cover multiple objectives? Can one organization hold awards under more than one objective?

The Department has not established a predetermined number of awards per objective. Organizations may submit multiple SOIs under a given Addendum and may participate in multiple submissions as a prime applicant, subrecipient, or consortium member.

However, applicants are encouraged to submit their most competitive and responsive concept(s) rather than multiple variations of similar approaches. In many cases, a single well-developed SOI that presents an integrated and comprehensive approach to the Addendum objectives may be more effective than multiple narrowly focused or overlapping submissions. Applicants should carefully consider whether related concepts can be presented within a single SOI.

29. Is the "up to \$35 million annually" figure an annual envelope across all awards, or a per-award range? What is the anticipated funding range per award, and **over what** period of performance?

The final size, scope, and number of awards are subject to the results of the SOI review process and Phase 2 (request for full applications). The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and U.S.

Embassy priorities, and availability of funding.

30. For SOIs recommended into the consultative program design process: what does that process involve (timeline, what is co-designed), and how does it affect competition? Are co-designed applicants effectively advanced to a full proposal, and may an organization be invited to co-design on one objective while not on another?

Applicants invited to the consultative program design phase will receive further guidance on the process, including expected timeline.

31. Objectives 1–3 involve transitioning functions from current non-GOM implementers to the GOM. How will recipients coordinate with or inherit from incumbents, and will incumbents' tools, systems, source code, and historical data be transferred to new recipients?

The availability and transferability of assets will depend on the terms of existing agreements with incumbent implementers. Applicants with questions about specific incumbent assets are encouraged to raise them during later stages of the process. The Department will facilitate introductions and coordination between incoming recipients and incumbents to the extent possible.

32. Objective 2 states it excludes direct procurement, warehousing, and last-mile distribution. Does this exclusion also preclude procuring and deploying supply chain digital tools (for example, Remote Temperature Monitoring for cold chain equipment/temperature-sensitive commodities during storage and transport), or only physical logistics services? Is

deployment and configuration of these systems in scope as technical assistance?

The exclusion under Objective 2 applies to direct physical logistics services — procurement of health commodities, warehousing, and last-mile distribution — and does not preclude technical assistance activities, including deployment and configuration of supply chain digital tools. Detailed allowable activities will be further assessed during the full application stage.

33. Objective 3 references "low-cost EMR approaches, such as AI-enabled scannable paper solutions" at low-volume facilities. Are recipients expected to provide or build these solutions, and are there preferred, pre-approved, or excluded tools? How is the boundary drawn between GOM-led EMR at high-volume facilities and recipient-supported low-cost approaches?

Low-cost EMR approaches, such as AI-enabled scannable paper solutions, are illustrative of the types of pragmatic, cost-effective tools that may be appropriate for low-volume facilities where full electronic medical record systems may not be feasible or sustainable. Recipients are expected to assess, adapt, deploy, and support existing low-cost solutions appropriate to the facility context, in coordination with the GOM.

34. For the systems named under Objective 3 (One LIMS, OpenLMIS Levels 1–4, One Health Surveillance Platform, integrated supply-chain MIS, expanded Central Data Repository, iHRIS, CPIMS, CRVS), is scope limited to operational support and transition of existing systems, or does it include new deployment or expansion? Who owns the software and intellectual property at project close

Applicants should incorporate an understanding of current operational status of relevant systems and, where/if relevant, the introduction of new deployment or expansion.

Ownership of software and intellectual property will be addressed with successful applicants at later stages of the process.

35. For Objective 3, are there required interoperability standards or a national enterprise architecture (per Malawi's national Digital Health Strategy) that solutions must conform to, and a designated GOM digital health authority that recipients must work through?

SOIs should reflect an understanding of relevant enterprise architecture, existing systems, and national strategies and policies.

36. Objective 3 references "equipment procurement." Does the award permit procurement of IT and data equipment, and are there source/origin requirements given the guiding principle on expanding the use of U.S. technologies and standards?

The Addendum does not prescribe what specific types of equipment can be procured.

Applicants may propose equipment (or supplies) necessary to implement proposed technical approaches. See APS H. Post-Award Requirements and Administration for requirements that will apply to awards resulting from the APS. Any additional sourcing and origin requirements, including guidance related to the use of U.S. technologies and standards, will be addressed in award terms and conditions with successful applicants.

37. The addenda specify a five-year duration. In our experience with other US entities, budgets are renewed yearly. Can this be expected under this award, with a overarching 5-year ceiling and yearly budget allocations that may shift depending on congressional approvals?

Funding and budget allocations under any award, including the timing and amount of funding, are subject to the terms of the award, applicable regulations, and the availability of funds. No assumptions should be made regarding future funding levels or budget structure, as these may be influenced by a range of factors.

38. Is it expected the funding mechanism (and full proposal development) is centralized with implementing partners similar to the pandemic fund given the G2G agreements “which will serve as an important mechanism for delivering and sustaining many MOU-aligned activities”?

Under this Addendum the Department anticipates issuing up to four direct U.S. federal assistance awards to applicants eligible under the APS.

39. How does GHSD define successful transition readiness at national and district levels, and are there specific benchmarks or indicators that applicants should incorporate into their Statements of Interest?

Defined criteria or metrics for transition readiness are not provided as part of the SOI application process. Applicants may propose benchmarks for G2G transition as part of their SOI submission.

40. Are partnerships with local organizations, universities, faith-based organizations, and private-sector entities expected or viewed favorably during the review process or consortium?

The Department has not established a separate evaluation preference based solely on whether an applicant is local or international; however, as per the guiding principles stated within Addendum F, there should be a priority placed on engaging local organizations with a strong emphasis on faith-based and community-based providers to deliver services, strengthen local systems, and ensure culturally appropriate, sustainable, and accountable implementation at national and sub-national levels. SOIs will be evaluated in accordance with the APS evaluation criteria and the objectives and guiding principles outlined in the Addendum.

41. In Objective 3, can the GOM provide the list of facilities/sites that would be part of the transformation/implementation?

Organizations should propose scalable approaches consistent with the digital health systems objectives described in the Addendum. Additional information such as facility and site-level details may be provided during the consultative program design process, at the full proposal stage, and/or during award implementation if applicable.

42. Should the implementation of *Advancing Global Health, Health Foreign Assistance Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Implementation in Malawi* funding opportunity be expected to end on 31 Dec 2030?

Proposed projects should be completed in five years or less.

43. Will the start date of its implementation be 1 October 2026?

Awards resulting from this Addendum are anticipated to start by 1 October 2026, subject to completion of required reviews and availability of funds

44. The APS addendum mentions that there will be a phased transfer from implementing partners to GOM systems. Does this mean that at the start of the transition process, some IP employed staff will be retained at the HFs?

SOIs should address one or more of the objectives described in the Addendum, including the use of national systems and staff, where appropriate.

45. The Malawi health system includes significant service delivery capacity provided through faith-based and other non-government health facility networks operating in partnership with the Government of Malawi. Does GHSD consider strengthening such networks and their affiliated facilities to be a responsive approach to achieving the objectives of this addendum? ***This seems most important for LifeNet and there are NO references to this

in the addendum for Malawi as it stands.

Organizations are encouraged to propose approaches they believe are most responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. The Addendum itself is the authoritative guidance for this funding opportunity, and applicants should ground their proposed approaches, including any role for faith-based or non-governmental health facility networks, in a clear and direct demonstration of how those approaches advance the specific objectives and guiding principles described therein.

46. Does GHSD anticipate support for national-scale implementation across Malawi, or will geographically targeted approaches focused on selected districts be considered responsive?
Both national-scale and geographically targeted approaches may be considered responsive, provided they are appropriately scoped to achieve one or more of the stated objectives. Applicants can describe their proposed geographic scope and rationale as part of their SOI concept.
47. How does GHSD view the role of faith-based and other non-government service delivery partners in advancing country ownership and sustainability objectives under this addendum?
There should be a priority placed on working collaboratively with Malawian government institutions, local organizations, faith-based organizations, and community stakeholders to deliver services, strengthen local systems, and ensure culturally appropriate, sustainable, and accountable implementation at national and sub-national levels. Consistent with the AFGHS, all activities should support transition to sustainable Malawian ownership, financing, and management of systems and services. Applicants should clearly identify how interventions will strengthen long-term institutional sustainability and reduce reliance on external support over time. Interventions that create parallel structures or indefinite dependence on external technical assistance will not be considered.
48. Would investments focused on strengthening management systems, quality improvement, financial sustainability, workforce performance, and operational efficiency within frontline health facilities be considered responsive where they contribute to improved HIV service outcomes? OR To what extent may applicants propose broader health system strengthening interventions that support HIV outcomes indirectly through improvements in facility performance, quality of care, workforce effectiveness, and patient retention?
Organizations may propose health system strengthening interventions that contribute to the stated objectives, provided they are clearly linked to the program goals and demonstrate how they advance the transition to sustainable, government-led service delivery. The Department will evaluate proposed concepts based on their responsiveness to the objectives and guiding principles described in the Addendum.
49. Are activities implemented through nationally recognized faith-based health provider networks and associations considered responsive where they support achievement of the addendum objectives?
Activities implemented through nationally recognized faith-based health provider networks may be considered responsive where they support achievement of the stated objectives and are consistent with the guiding principles outlined in the Addendum, including the separation of religious activities requirement. Applicants should clearly describe how such activities advance the Addendum's goals.
50. Is there a separate Terms of Reference document for this Addendum, or is the Addendum itself the full TOR? If there's more detailed guidance available, how do we get a copy?

The Addendum itself constitutes the information available to applicants at this stage; there is no separate Terms of Reference document. Applicants should base their submissions on the guidance provided in the Addendum.

51. For Objective 3 (data systems), the Addendum mentions "AI-enabled scannable paper solutions" for lower-volume facilities. Is this a preferred approach, or are other low-cost digital options acceptable?

Applicants are not prohibited from including other low-cost approaches but should address the details as described in Objective 3.

52. Under Objective 2, the prohibition on "direct procurement, warehousing, or last-mile distribution" — does this also apply to procuring digital equipment like tablets, servers, or barcode scanners? Or is it limited to health commodities only?

The exclusion under Objective 2 applies to direct physical logistics services — procurement of health commodities, warehousing, and last-mile distribution — and does not preclude technical assistance activities, including deployment and configuration of supply chain digital tools. Detailed allowable activities will be further assessed during the full application phase.

53. Can Malawian organizations apply as prime applicants, or does a US organization need to lead?

Eligible organizations, including eligible local organizations, may apply as prime applicants. Applicants may propose partnership arrangements with or without international partners, provided the proposed structure supports successful implementation of the proposed concept.

54. For faith-based partners, the separation requirement — does that apply only to service delivery, or also to systems-strengthening work done at faith-based facilities?

The separation of religious activities requirement applies to all activities directly funded by Department of State under this Addendum, including systems-strengthening work conducted at faith-based facilities. Recipients must ensure that explicitly religious activities or materials are separate in time or location from activities directly funded by an award resulting from this Addendum.

55. Any restrictions on bringing in private tech firms as subcontractors for EMR or supply chain software work?

Applicants should propose the number and type of subawardees necessary to achieve the associated objective(s) as part of the proposed approach. Applicants should clearly describe the roles of proposed partners and how the proposed structure supports the objectives outlined in the Addendum. See APS H. Post-Award Requirements and Administration for requirements that will apply to awards resulting from this APS and Addendum, including subawardees where applicable. Applicants should also refer to 2 CFR 200 Subpart D.

56. Is the \$35 million the total pool for this Addendum, or the max per award? Any sense of typical award sizes for single-objective vs. multi-objective proposals?

The final number and size of awards are subject to the results of the SOI review process and Phase 2 (request for full applications). The number, size, and scope of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department and U.S. Embassy priorities, and availability of funding.

57. Will awards under this Addendum be made to single organizations as primes, to lead applicants with subrecipients, or to consortia? Are there limits on an organization serving as

a subrecipient across multiple SOIs or objectives?

Organizations may propose partnerships, consortium arrangements, subawards, or other collaborative approaches as appropriate to achieve the objectives described in the applicable Addendum. There are no limits to an organization serving as a subrecipient across multiple SOIs or objectives.

58. Can DOS share any relevant sections of the implementation plan for the US-Malawi bilateral health MOU, including timing of the phased transfer of functions from implementing partners to GOM systems?

Relevant information of the MOU Implementation Plan may be made available at later stage of the application process.

59. Does DOS and/or GOM have a plan for which districts will be prioritized (and when) for the district-level G2G mechanisms? If so, can DOS please share those districts and timeline?

District prioritization and timelines for G2G mechanisms will be addressed during a later stage of the application process and/or post-award as needed; applicants should propose prioritization methodologies consistent with the objectives outlined in the Addendum.

60. Are all districts expected to receive G2G support during the implementation period of the award(s) resulting from this Addendum?

The Addendum does not specify that all districts must receive G2G support during the implementation period; geographic scope and district coverage will be further defined during a later stage of the application process and/or post-award as needed.

Organizations should propose approaches that are appropriately scoped and clearly describe their proposed geographic rationale.

61. Is the APS mechanism (and Malawi Addendum) expected support achievement of metrics and milestones? Should proposed projects support the GOM and districts to achieve the metrics and milestones set out in the MOU and implementation plan?

Awards under this Addendum will support achievement of MOU metrics; however, applicants are not required to address specific targets at the SOI stage of the process.

62. Can one SOI cover all three objectives as an integrated proposal, or do you prefer separate SOIs? If we go integrated, should we flag one as the lead objective?

The Department has not established a preference for the number of objectives a single SOI should include. The number, size, scope, and distribution of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, Department priorities, and availability of funding.

63. The APS says SOIs are reviewed individually, not against each other. Does that mean awards aren't capped per objective? Or are the 4 awards split across the three objectives in some way?

The number, size, scope, and distribution of awards will depend on: the quality of submissions; Department priorities; and availability of funding.

64. **Cross-addendum concept:** Would a secure, consent-based patient/family records and understanding layer that digitizes paper records, photos, and PDFs be considered responsive where it complements, rather than replaces, national EMR/HMIS systems?

Applicants are encouraged to propose approaches they believe are most responsive to the objectives outlined in the Addendum. Proposed digital health solutions should complement and strengthen existing national systems, including EMR and HMIS platforms, and should reflect an understanding of relevant enterprise architecture and national digital health strategies.

65. **Malawi Addendum F:** Under Objective 3, would “AI-enabled scannable paper solutions” include secure photo/PDF capture of patient-held paper records, with phased interoperability into GOM digital systems?
Applicants are not prohibited from including other low-cost approaches but should address the details as described in Objective 3.
66. **Consortium model:** Would a model be responsive where a local health-system, faith/community, or government-aligned partner leads implementation and a technology partner provides the secure records/scannable-paper/interoperability layer?
If proposing a consortium, applicants should demonstrate that consortium members have complementary roles and the capacity to achieve the proposed outcomes. These could include a local health-system, faith-based, community, or government-aligned partner that leads implementation, and a technology partner provides complementary technical support—as just one example.
67. Could the DoS/GHSD provide access to/ or share the USG–GOM MOU Implementation Plan (April 2026–December 2030), which is referenced severally in the addendum?
Relevant information from the MOU Implementation Plan may be made available at a later stage of the application process. Organizations should base their SOI submissions on the guidance provided in the Addendum.
68. Approximately how many districts will each award cover?
The Department has not established a predetermined number of awards nor districts per award.
69. Given that GHSD anticipates making up to four awards across the three objectives, how do you envision the formal coordination mechanism between these different IPs to prevent duplication of efforts, particularly where the objectives may intersect at facility level?
Coordination structures will be shared with successful applicants at a later stage of the application process.
70. Is \$35 million annually budget estimate intended to be divided relatively equally among the four anticipated awards, or has DoS/GHSD established preliminary funding ceilings for each of the three technical objectives (Strategic Assistance, Supply Chain, and Digital Health)?
The Addendum has been revised to remove the word “annually.” Final funding levels and budget periods will be determined during the award process and are subject to availability of funds. The funding amount reflects the total funding available for the initial award(s). The period of performance for the proposed project should be 5 years or less, including any non-competitive continuations. Additional funding may be added, subject to the availability of funds, contingent on strong performance
71. Other AGH Addenda include total funding levels, but this one it is stated as an annual funding level. Is the total funding for awards under this Addendum up to \$175 million?
The funding amount reflects the total funding available for the initial award(s). The period of performance for the proposed project should be 5 years or less, including any non-competitive continuations. Additional funding may be added, subject to the availability of funds, contingent on strong performance.
72. Should the “Total Federal Share Requested” in Section A and the federal share to be award to partners in Section D be presented for the total period of performance, or annually?

At the SOI stage, applicants are not required to submit a detailed budget. Specific budget format requirements will be communicated to applicants invited to submit full applications in Phase 2.

73. The Malawi Addendum states that district-level G2G mechanisms will be implemented and increase over several years “as parallel U.S. government-funded clinical service delivery implementers are phased out,” with government health workers gradually assuming functions currently delivered through separate systems. Could the Department of State please clarify the expected sequencing and timing of this phase-out? Specifically, should applicants assume that current U.S. government-funded clinical service delivery implementers will continue operating during an initial transition period, with their direct service delivery functions reduced progressively as district G2G capacity increases, or should applicants plan for a more immediate transfer of those functions to GOM systems at or near award start?

Organizations should describe how they will work closely with existing clinical implementers to support an orderly handover of functions to district-level G2G structures. Organizations should describe how they would support effective coordination, transparency, performance monitoring, and alignment with Government of Malawi priorities. Transition timelines details will be shared with successful applicants at later stages of the process.

74. Will the U.S. Government make available the full USG–Government of Malawi MOU and the April 2026–December 2030 MOU Implementation Plan referenced in the Addendum, including targets, milestones, transition timelines, and implementation responsibilities?

Relevant information of the MOU Implementation Plan may be made available at later stage of the application process.

75. Has GHSD or the Government of Malawi conducted transition readiness, capacity, or fiduciary assessments of MOHS, CMST, MoFEPD, and DHMTs that will be made available to applicants?

Organizations should provide sufficient information to demonstrate how the proposed approach supports readiness for transition. Assessments of transition readiness and capacity assessments will not be made available to applicants.

76. Does GHSD have defined criteria or metrics that will determine when a district or system is "ready" for G2G transition, or is applicants expected to propose those benchmarks in their technical approaches?

Defined criteria or metrics for transition readiness are not provided as part of the SOI application process. Organizations may propose benchmarks for G2G transition as part of their SOI submission.

77. Does the Government of Malawi have a defined phasing strategy for district-level G2G implementation, and if so, can anticipated transition districts and timelines be shared?

The phasing of district level G2Gs will be shared at a later stage of the application process with successful applicants.

78. May applicants submit a single integrated SOI covering multiple objectives, or does GHSD anticipate separate awards aligned to individual objectives?

Organizations may submit an SOI covering one or multiple objectives of the Addendum. The final number of awards is subject to the results of the SOI and full application review processes.

79. Does GHSD anticipate funding activities under all three objectives, or may awards be concentrated in selected objectives depending on funding availability and application quality?
- The final size, scope and number of awards are subject to the results of the SOI and full application review processes. The number, size, scope, and distribution of awards will depend on the quality of submissions received, GHSD and Embassy priorities, and availability of funding.
80. If GHSD makes multiple awards under Addendum F, what mechanism does GHSD envision for coordination among awardees to ensure full alignment across the 28 districts? Will a lead integrator role be designated?
- Coordination structures will be shared with successful applicants at a later stage of the application process.
81. The Addendum notes that consultative program design "may" be applied. Can GHSD confirm whether it anticipates using consultative program design for Addendum F, and if so, whether GOM counterparts will participate in that process?
- Consultative program design is one of the possible outcomes of an SOI. The Department retains flexibility in how consultative program design is conducted, including the composition of participants.
82. The total estimated funding for Malawi is listed as "Up to \$35M annually, subject to availability" unlike other addenda where the total is listed for the entire duration of five years. Could GHSD kindly confirm the Malawi figures are correct?
- The Addendum has been revised to remove the word "annually." Final funding levels and budget periods will be determined during the award process and are subject to availability of funds. The funding amount reflects the total funding available for the initial award(s). The period of performance for the proposed project should be 5 years or less, including any non-competitive continuations. Additional funding may be added, subject to the availability of funds, contingent on strong performance.
83. To help applicants provide more targeted and tailored concepts, could GHSD provide additional detail on the G2G model - including what entities are anticipated to receive direct funding and what benchmarks or mechanisms are envisioned to determine transition readiness, assess performance and incrementally increase funding per the "performance-based model that incorporates verification"?
- SOIs should be responsive to the priorities outlined in the Addendum. Specific information regarding G2G transition benchmarks, performance assessment mechanisms, and entities anticipated to receive direct funding may be provided during a later stage of the application process, if applicable.

Administrative

1. Refer to APS Round 1 Q&A Question 9 (Addendum A: Child protection) and 110 (Administrative) with responses that indicate no detailed budget is required, however section F - Application Review Information No. 2 – Indirect costs refers to a lower indirect cost rate as a tie breaking mechanism for 2 or more applications with equivalent scores. Question: How detailed should the budget be?
- At the SOI stage, organizations are not required to submit a detailed budget. As outlined in the APS, the SOI should provide sufficient information to convey the scale and feasibility of the proposed concept. Detailed budget information, including any

applicable indirect cost information, will be requested from organizations invited to proceed to a subsequent phase. Consistent with the APS, organizations may include a high-level description of anticipated resource requirements if helpful to understanding the proposed concept.

2. What are the eligibility criteria for applicants?

Eligibility criteria can be found in Section B.1 (page 5) of the APS. Organizations should review the APS for a complete description of eligible applicants. Subject to the eligibility requirements contained in the APS and applicable U.S. government regulations, both U.S. and non-U.S. entities may apply. Organizations may propose partnerships, consortium arrangements, subawards, or other collaborative approaches as appropriate to achieve the objectives described in the applicable Addendum.

3. Can I apply as a principal Investigator with my team in the other institutions or I have to apply through the University?

SOIs must be submitted by an eligible organization. Individuals may participate as employees, consultants, investigators, or team members as part of an organizational application but may not submit an SOI in an individual capacity.

4. We wish to confirm whether GHSD is accepting new SOI submissions during the current APS Window 2 (June 1–August 14, 2026), or whether a separate Round 2 notice will be issued before submissions reopen. We would also be grateful for confirmation of the applicable submission deadline for Addendum 2 in the current or next available window.

Organizations should refer to the specific Addendum under which they are applying for applicable deadlines. SOIs are currently being accepted for the Addenda that are open during the current APS submission window (i.e. Round 2a is open until July 31st for Addenda D, E, and F). Organizations should monitor Grants.gov and MyGrants for future Addenda and submission windows.

5. Can media apply for grants through the APS?

Eligibility is governed by the APS. Organizations should review Section B.1 of the APS for a complete description of eligible applicants. Subject to the eligibility requirements contained in the APS and applicable U.S. government regulations, both U.S. and non-U.S. entities may apply. Organizations may propose partnerships, consortium arrangements, subawards, or other collaborative approaches as appropriate to achieve the objectives described in the applicable Addendum.

6. Are CBO's eligible to apply?

Eligibility is governed by the APS. Organizations should review Section B.1 of the APS for a complete description of eligible applicants. Subject to the eligibility requirements contained in the APS and applicable U.S. government regulations, both U.S. and non-U.S. entities may apply. Organizations may propose partnerships, consortium arrangements, subawards, or other collaborative approaches as appropriate to achieve the objectives described in the applicable Addendum.

7. For the 5-page limit, does the partner roles section count toward the page limit if we keep it in the narrative, or can we move it to an annex?

Organizations should refer to the APS and Round 1 Formatting Clarifications. The five-page limit applies to the narrative portion of the SOI. Information regarding partners may be included within the narrative or in an annex, as appropriate. Organizations should ensure that the narrative contains sufficient information for reviewers to assess the proposed approach and organizational capacity.

8. If an SOI gets moved to consultative program design, what's the rough timeline for that? Does it happen after the July 31 window closes?
As described in the APS and Round 1 clarifications, consultative program design is intended to be a structured, time-bound process that occurs following SOI review. The specific timing, format, and duration may vary by Addendum and operational considerations.
9. For SOIs that aren't selected, is any feedback provided, or is that not part of the process?
The Department does not anticipate being able to provide individualized feedback to unsuccessful applicants due to the anticipated volume of submissions.
10. Are there cost categories we should avoid entirely in our SOI construction, vehicles, international travel, anything like that?
At the SOI stage, organizations are not required to submit detailed budgets. Proposed concepts should be responsive to the objectives of the applicable Addendum and consistent with applicable U.S. government regulations and cost principles. Detailed cost allowability determinations will occur during subsequent application phases, if applicable.
11. What do we do for the "apply button" on grant.gov to be enabled?
For technical questions related to Grants.gov registration, account access, or system functionality, organizations should contact the Grants.gov Help Desk. Technical assistance information is available on Grants.gov. Organizations are required to have an active SAM.gov registration to apply through grants.gov.
12. Since Window 2 is now open, could you please clarify whether organizations that submitted an SOI in Window 1 may submit a new SOI under Window 2 for the Child Development, Care and Protection Addendum and/or the Rapid Outbreak Response Addendum? Specifically, we would like to know whether the amendment allows applicants to reapply under these addendums in Window 2 or whether Window 1 submissions remain under consideration and applicants should not submit again.
Organizations may submit SOIs in response to any Addendum that is open during the current submission window, provided the SOI is responsive to the requirements of that Addendum. Organizations should review the specific Addendum and submission deadlines applicable to the current window.
13. How will we find out about any conferences or informational updates for applicants and potential grantees?
Applicants should monitor Grants.gov and MyGrants for updates, amendments, webinars, informational sessions, and other announcements related to the APS.
14. Is it allowable for a foreign organization to sub to another foreign organization under this mechanism?
Eligibility is governed by the APS. Organizations should review Section B.1 of the APS for a complete description of eligible applicants. Subject to the eligibility requirements contained in the APS and applicable U.S. government regulations, both U.S. and non-U.S. entities may apply. Organizations may propose partnerships, consortium arrangements, subawards, or other collaborative approaches as appropriate to achieve the objectives described in the applicable Addendum.
15. Is it allowable for a foreign organization to sub to a US organization under this mechanism?
Eligibility is governed by the APS. Organizations should review Section B.1 the APS for a complete description of eligible applicants. Subject to the eligibility requirements

contained in the APS and applicable U.S. government regulations, both U.S. and non-U.S. entities may apply. Organizations may propose partnerships, consortium arrangements, subawards, or other collaborative approaches as appropriate to achieve the objectives described in the applicable Addendum.

16. Are private owned hospitals eligible to apply to the grant?

Eligibility is governed by the APS. Organizations should review Section B.1 the APS for a complete description of eligible applicants. Subject to the eligibility requirements contained in the APS and applicable U.S. government regulations, both U.S. and non-U.S. entities may apply. Organizations may propose partnerships, consortium arrangements, subawards, or other collaborative approaches as appropriate to achieve the objectives described in the applicable Addendum.

17. For purposes of Small Businesses, can GHSD clarify whether there are provisions that are specific for small businesses or planned small businesses set-aside?

The APS does not require small business set-asides. See APS Section H. Post-Award Requirements and Administration for information on the terms and conditions that will apply to awards that result from the APS.

18. Can GHSD clarify the characteristics of an SOI that would make it more likely to be recommended directly to Phase 2 rather than first entering consultative program design, particularly when applicants propose innovative approaches?

A SOI will be recommended for continued review through consultative program design if it is thought that it would benefit from Department of State input. For example, the Department may have input on how to further align a concept with key priorities or foreign policy goals. As this is a new approach being implemented on a pilot basis, the Department retains flexibility in how consultative program design is conducted.

19. For country-specific Addenda (refers to Uganda, Malawi, and Nigeria), does GHSD expect applicants to propose activities that align narrowly with the specific priorities and illustrative activities described, or are broader integrated approaches welcome if they clearly advance the Addendum's objectives?

SOIs must be responsive to the priorities outlined in the specific Addendum to which they are applying. Applicants to an addendum must carefully follow the instructions in that addendum, noting whether each element is described required, optional, or illustrative.

20. We would be grateful if you could kindly clarify the process for submitting the SOI, including the appropriate submission platform, email address (if applicable), and any specific formatting or registration requirements that applicants should follow.

See the APS for these instructions and requirements.

21. Would GHSD please confirm a preference for submission of one application that covers all objectives or submit multiple applications for the same addenda?

Organizations may submit multiple SOIs under a given Addendum and may participate in multiple submissions as a prime applicant, subrecipient, or consortium member.

However, applicants are encouraged to submit their most competitive and responsive concept(s) rather than multiple variations of similar approaches. In many cases, a single well-developed SOI that presents an integrated and comprehensive approach to the Addendum objectives may be more effective than multiple narrowly focused or overlapping submissions. Applicants should carefully consider whether related concepts can be presented within a single SOI.

22. Please confirm whether it is possible to submit multiple SOI applications under a single addendum in MyGrants.

While organizations are permitted to submit multiple SOIs in response to a single Addendum, each SOI must be its own unique submission within MyGrants.

23. If submitting more than one application for a specific addendum, can you please confirm the file naming convention?

Unless a specific file naming convention is required in an addendum, use the basic file naming convention noted in the APS (e.g., Organization Name – SOI – Addendum F.pdf) and add another word or two that distinguishes one concept from another. Please keep file names as concise as possible to avoid potential technical issues.

24. Please confirm the file type that should be selected for submitting the SOI project narrative file on MyGrants? The available drop-down options are: “SF Form;” “Additional Document to be Submitted;” or “Other.”

For questions about **MyGrants**, please contact the ILMS help desk by phone at +1 (888) 313-4567 (toll charges apply for international callers) or through the Self Service online portal that can be accessed from <https://afsitsm.servicenowservices.com/ilms>. Customer support is available 24/7.

25. Please confirm guidance on file-naming conventions of file submissions across the different addenda.

Unless a specific file naming convention is required in an addendum, use the basic file naming convention noted in the APS (e.g., Organization Name – SOI – Addendum F.pdf)

26. Please advise on the need to ensure that an individual registered in Mygrants requires a formal linkage to the organization (beyond a UEI number).

For questions about **MyGrants**, please contact the ILMS help desk by phone at +1 (888) 313-4567 (toll charges apply for international callers) or through the Self Service online portal that can be accessed from <https://afsitsm.servicenowservices.com/ilms>. Customer support is available 24/7.

27. Is there a preference for applicants to use mygrants or grants.gov for submissions?

There is no preference.

28. Would it be advisable to submit applications on both MyGrants and Grants.gov?

Do not submit the same SOI on both platforms; this creates unnecessary confusion and slows down the review and evaluation process. Organizations may select whether they apply on MyGrants or Grants.gov, **but they should only submit on one single platform.**

29. When applying through Grants.gov, would you kindly provide guidance on how to populate the SF form, acknowledging that it won't be reviewed?

GHSD is not specifying requirements for how to fill out these forms that will not be reviewed. Organizations may also submit SOIs via MyGrants, which does not require completion of these forms at the SOI stage.

30. Can GHSD provide guidance on how organizations should best present a budget figure given the undefined nature of the scope of work?

Applicants should present a budget figure they estimate to be realistic for meeting APS and addenda requirements and objectives according to the applicant's proposed project design.

31. The APS states that font sizes in charts and tables, including the budget, can be reformatted to fit within one page width. Could the Department clarify what "reformat" permits in this context — specifically, whether applicants may use a font size smaller than 10 point in

charts, tables, and the budget in order to fit the content within the one-page width?

Applicants must not use a font size smaller than 10-point.