



USAID | ZAMBIA

FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Amendment #1

Issuance Date:	June 9, 2014
Questions and Answers Posting Date:	June 9, 2014
Concept Paper Submission due by:	June 19, 2014 (16:00 hrs, Local Zambia time)

Subject: Request for Concept Papers: Zambia Family Activity (ZAMFAM). Reference Number: RFA-611-14-000003.

The purpose of this amendment to the Request for Concept Papers is to respond to the requests for clarification.

All questions and points of clarification received by the due date and time were considered for inclusion in this amendment. If the exact wording of your question(s) cannot be located it is because it is addressed in another similar question or request for clarification.

/S/
Edward Acevedo
Agreement Officer

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
1. The official announcement gives an application deadline for concepts notes as June 18th, 2014. However, numerous announcements by USAID in the local papers give the deadline as June 11th, 2014. Please confirm that date given in the grants.gov announcement is the correct one.	By this amendment USAID has extended the due date to June 19, 2014, 16:00 hours Zambia time.
2. On page 3, under C.1. Geographic Scope, it is stated that a Recipient will work with approximately 10 districts within a province. What is the minimum number of districts that is acceptable for a Recipient to work in?	10 districts.
3. On page 9, under D.8. Capacity Building Approach, the RFA states that applicants should reserve 10% of the overall budget for capacity building development including an international or national partner. On page 11, under 3.1 Limitation of sub-awards, the RFA states that a non-indigenous organization shall have no more than 30% of the overall budget. It is our understanding that if an international organization (or “non-indigenous” organization) is awarded all or part of the 10% for capacity building, that would be part of the 30% allowed as sub-award to non-indigenous organizations; is that correct? Please clarify.	Under tier two, applicants may propose partners who are not indigenous organizations. The sub awards made by the prime applicant to non-indigenous organizations may not exceed 30% of the total estimated cost of the full award. The 10% for Capacity Building and the 1% for “co-ordination” (see question #4 below) are “plug values”, that is the amounts for capacity building and coordination should be set aside as part of the total budget, but USAID will provide guidance and approval for when and how those funds will be spent. There is no need for the concept papers or the full proposals to discuss these “plug values.”
4. In section D.7, it specifies that 1% of the budget can be dedicated to coordination. Is it allowable for the Recipient to delegate and sub-award this coordination to an international partner?	See answer above.
5. With regards to sub-grantees per district (p.3 c.1), a recipient is expected to work with approximately 5 sub-grantees per district across approximately 10 districts (thus, potentially, a total of 50 local sub-grantees), is it allowable to have the same 5 sub-grantees working in all ten districts?	Yes.
6. With regards to either the summary budget or the detailed/itemized budget, should a line item be included for the \$8,000 received to develop a full proposal based on the initial concept note?	No. The \$8,000 that might be awarded to a winning concept paper is a separate grant from the cooperative agreement that may be awarded under the second tier.

7. The RFA uses terms such as “Sub-partners” (D.8) and “sub-grantees” (C.1). Could USAID please define the difference between them?	They are often the same, but the term “sub-partner” could include a “sub-contractor”.
8. On page 7, under D.3. The RFA states that approaches should seek to address the needs of specific sub-sets of vulnerable children and households, including those outside the care of families. Does this include children living in residential institutions?	Institutionalizing children is not encouraged per PEPFAR guidance in the links in attachment 4 of the RFA. Exceptions can be made but two points must be emphasized: first sustainability and second if there is no family, including distant family members, which can meet the OVC needs, then there must be a plan in place to integrate the institutionalized OVC into society.
9. For OVC education support, will payment of examination fees or school fees be allowed or procurement of school uniform, shoes, etc.?	The PEPFAR guidance recommends block grants are used to cover these types of support. This will allow support to continue after the end of the project. In only rare situations involving small numbers of OVC would direct support to the OVC be considered. Refer to links in attachment 4 of the RFA.
10. Which OVC definition will USAID use? Is it the PEPFAR definition or the one the Data Rising Project in concert with what stakeholders will come up with?	The PEPFAR definition.
11. For the budget template, is there flexibility to put in our own line items for items mentioned in the description, but there is no corresponding line item? For example, while it is noted 10% for M&E, there is no line item for such in the budget template.	Applicants are discouraged from creating additional budget lines. For purposes of the Concept Paper, detailed budget notes are not required. However, applicants should follow the instructions which will be included in the second tier Request for Applications. The budget notes submitted as part of the cost portion of the application should adequately explain what elements are included in each budget line.

12. The eligibility checklist states, “The prime applicant has demonstrated successful financial management experience for the past three (3) years”. Can this amount also include the value of in-kind contributions (e.g. gifts-in-kind such as medical supplies, volunteer time, etc.)? For organizations that operate on as a “network” (an association of like-minded groups), can the budgets of the network be combined?	Yes, in kind contributions may be included. USAID will award to only one prime, therefore, combined budgets of a “network” or “consortium” will not be considered.
13. The eligibility checklist states “Applicant currently has an operational and physical presence (i.e. a staffed office) in the immediate geographic area where the proposed program is to be implemented.” Does this requirement mean that the prime applicant must have a current staffed office in the province where the activities are to be carried out? In the case of organizations operating as a “network” (an association of like-minded groups), does association/membership affiliation in the proposed geographic area suffice?	Partners will be selected based on who can offer the best services; therefore, presence is a factor in this decision even if the presence is provided by sub-partners.
14. Is it acceptable to amend the results framework by adding additional intermediate results (IR) under the expected results and move other IRs to different expected results column? For example, move IR1s to IR3s, develop IR3s, and add additional IRs to IR1s and IR2s columns. These changes to the IRs would still be aligned with objectives that have been formulated in order to meet the goal of the project as well as the expected results.	The IRs are designed and internally approved by USAID. All ZAMFAM activities must support USAID’s goals described by the IR table.
15. Alternatively, is it that strategies and activities suggested should be derived from the expected IRs only?	USAID will consider concepts that go beyond the established IRs, but only if the goals of the IRs are met as well.
16. In addition to five local awardees that the RFA demands to include in the application, can the prime applicant include an international sub-awardee to make the awardees six in number?	Yes. It is encouraged to include an international organization as a sub. There is no limit to the number of sub awardees.
17. On p. 13 is stated “all interested organizations may submit one concept paper for one or more targeted provinces”. Please clarify whether we can submit one concept paper for more provinces or one concept paper for each of the provinces we have interest in and send in more submissions.	Each Concept Paper is to be tailored to a specific province, so it is one Concept Paper for each province.

18. In Section 1, sub-section B1 Goal, page 1, the RFA includes among the indicators: ‘Number of vulnerable youth enrolled in USG supported education/vocational programs’. What is meant exactly by ‘USG education/vocational programs’? Are these existing programs, or should the activity establish new education/vocational programs? Please give further details as this activity is not mentioned anywhere else in the RFA.	The indicator cited in the question is a standard PEPFAR indicator. Information concerning existing USG supported educational programs in Zambia can be found in Attachment #7 <i>Expanded Background</i>, which has been added to this amendment to the RFA. Concept Papers could propose new educational/vocational programs where existing programs are lacking, however, the emphasis should be on enhancing existing activities, even GRZ and/or other donor supported activities.
19. On the second page of the cover letter to the RFA, the text notes, “Awards will be made to the applicant whose application offers the greatest value to the U.S. government.” However, the criteria are not indicated for value within the Concept Paper Evaluation Criteria on p. 16. Can you please describe what greatest value means to the U.S. government in the context of this proposed program?	USAID/Zambia will select concept papers based on the criteria listed on p. 16 of the RFA. The best value determination will consider technical and cost factors as described in the RFA.
20. On p.1-2 and at several points in the RFA, the program refers to OVC, their families and “associated PLHIV.” Is this program expected to serve non-OVC-linked PLHIV? And, if so, in what context and with what proportion of targets or attention?	Yes. However, the focus should be on those most in need and there needs to be a clear correlation on how assisting the non-OVC-linked PLHIV will benefit OVC in the community. Majority of the emphasis should be on OVC and their families. Refer to PEPFAR guidance in the links in attachment 4.
21. On p.3 of the RFA, it describes working with a total of 50 sub-grantees in 10 districts per province. For what duration of the program are prime recipients expected to work with sub-grantees and is it required to work with 50 sub grantees continuously or would it be the total number of sub grantees to sub-grant during the implementation period?	It is up to the applicants to propose sub-awarding arrangements that best provide the expected services while developing local capacity to ensure those services continue after the award ends.
22. The Attachment 2 (Previous Experience Template) on grants.gov notes that “This table must be completed and included as page 10 of the concept paper submission.” However, the Concept Paper instructions on p. 13-14 of the RFA do not include this component (and further limits the pages to 6 pages). Where should this be included?	Include this completed template with the budget.

23. On p. 16 of the RFA, under Concept Paper Evaluation Criteria, the RFA notes that one of the key criteria to be evaluated is the management structure. However, this information is not requested in the 5 page concept paper guidance on p.14. Where should this information be included (is an attachment for this allowed)?	Management structure, including sub-awardees and other partners, should be included in the "strategies" asked for in section iii on p. 14 of the RFA.
24. Can one organization be awarded more than one grant in Tier One? Can one organization be awarded more than one grant in Tier Two?	Yes.
25. You have asked for detailed budget for the concept note. How much leeway is there to vary this budget at full proposal stage?	We expect applicants to submit concept papers and proposals in good faith, although USAID understands budget estimates may have to be revised.
26. Some provinces have less than 10 districts, does this mean implementing in all the districts of that province?	Yes.
27. Does goal number 4 " percent of vulnerable households receiving social protection support" mean recipients of the social cash transfer scheme?	Social protection support includes but is not limited to the social cash transfer scheme. Other key aspects of social protection support may include system strengthening of community and/or GRZ advocacy and legal support systems.
28. Doesn't targeting youth enrolled in USG supported programs limit sustainability efforts the program is intending to uphold?	No, the opportunities for additional resources (i.e., linkages, human resources, information sharing...) when working with and leveraging other USG supported partners are encouraged..
29. Is there a fixed percent for cost-share?	No.
30. A lot of work we do is using local resources in terms of labor/volunteers and local materials such as food for children etc. The amount used is substantial Can we count the value of this work in the required K20 billion?	See #12 above.
31. Can we bid as a consortium in addition to working with CBOs in the various districts?	USAID will award to only one prime, therefore, awards to a "network" or "consortium" will not be considered, although sub-partnering arrangements are expected.
32. Are we going to be allowed feeding programs to breast feeding mothers who are also HIV positive to boost their nutrition?	Include this in your concept paper if this is (part of) the approach you propose.
33. Are we allowed to provide school materials to vulnerable children in the program?	See #9 above.

34. Since the concept paper instructions require applicants to include a section on “goal, objectives, strategies, activities”--- can USAID please confirm that applicants are free to modify the results framework shown on page 2, to best match their strategy for achieving the program description?	See #14.
35. Must all sub-grantees in a province be identified by name at the concept paper phase, or can they be selected at a later time? Can fewer than the suggested five sub-grantees be designated in a province?	Full details regarding all sub-grantees are not expected at the concept paper stage.
36. Can USAID please clarify if they have an existing organizational capacity assessment (OCA) tool that they will expect grantees to use?	There are several organizational capacity tools available, but the focus of the concept papers and second tier awards is OVC services, not local capacity development.
37. Can USAID please confirm if signed Certifications and Assurances are required as part of the concept paper submission?	They are not required as part of the submission, but will be required if an award is made.
38. Can USAID please confirm if the requested detailed budget to accompany the concept paper submission should be for the \$8,000 or for the anticipated \$10-\$16million per province?	The Concept Paper budget should be for the anticipated \$10-\$16 million per province.
39. Can USAID please confirm that a budget narrative document, beyond the notes in the budget template, is not required for submission with the concept paper?	Detailed budget notes are not required with the Concept Paper.
40. Can USAID please clarify whether only the lead local organization should complete the Previous Experience Template, or if all sub grantees (local and/or international) should also complete the template?	For the purposes of the concept paper we are only requiring this of the prime applicant, not the subs.
41. Can USAID please clarify if additional columns can be added to the budget template— to show the breakdown of cost share, for example?	This would be acceptable.
42. The RFA states, “USAID anticipates awarding one or more Cooperative Agreements in each of the five target provinces in the range of US\$10 million to \$16 million for ZAMFAM activities for a five-year period.” What is the approximate budget for each cooperative agreement?	US\$10 million to \$16 million

In addition to the above questions and answers, included in this amendment to the RFA is a slightly revised Eligibility Checklist.

Also attached are two additional resources which may help inform applicants. They are:

- The Expanded Background document, and
- <http://www.bu.edu/cghd/files/2011/12/Block-Grant-Final-Report-9.30.11-Full-Report.pdf> (A link to) the Block Grant STUDY REPORT.