

Announcement Type: Open Competition Cooperative Agreement

Funding Opportunity Title: Counterproliferation Finance

Funding Opportunity Number: DFOP0014001

NOFO Qs & As

Q1. p.5 of NOFO: Are applicants expected to cover all 10 countries listed (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Kosovo, Moldova, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia)? If not, is there a minimum number of countries that applicants need to cover?

A1. As stated in the Project Goal section (p.7) there are two separate tasks 1) PF Risk assessments for Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, and Moldova and 2) PF Risk Assessment Implementation Support in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Serbia, and potentially Moldova. EXBS is willing to consider proposals more limited proposals, in that case the priority would be for Montenegro and Moldova for risk assessments and Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, and Moldova for implementation support.

Q2. If applicants are required to cover all 10 countries listed in the NOFO, can there be primary and secondary recipients of technical assistance within these countries?

A2. It is the decision of the applicant whether they wish to include a sub-awardee.

Q3. Can applicants reach out to potential counterpart government institutions in the target countries to discuss their current technical assistance needs in the NOFO areas?

A3. Applicants are permitted to reach out to potential counterpart government institutions, however, the applicant must be cautious of making unauthorized commitments. An unauthorized commitment occurs when promises to bind the Federal Government without appropriate authority to do so. Unauthorized commitments frequently occur due to simple error or a lack of understanding of the Department's established roles and responsibilities in managing a Federal award. Bureaus/offices/posts must strive to prevent unauthorized commitments, in order to prevent unauthorized obligations and possible deficiencies in appropriations.

Q4. Does EXBS have a preferred area of focus for Cyprus and Croatia? (either 1) undertaking proliferation finance national risk assessments; developing action

plans for addressing the needs identified in those assessments; or 2)
Implementing specific components of those action plans)

A4. Proposals for Croatia and Cyprus are not required.

Q5. Could you please clarify if all documents to be submitted must be in Calibri 15-point?

A5. All documents should be 15-point Calibri except the Detailed Budget

Q6. Could you please confirm that the standalone DEIA plan has a two-page limit?

A6. The maximum is two pages.

Q7. Can applicants include in one combined Word document: Table of Contents, Proposal Narrative (15-page limit), Risk Assessment, Detailed Agenda and List of Experts?

A7. Yes

Q8. p17 of NOFO: "f. Risk Assessment described in Section A above" - Could you please clarify what is expected for this "Risk Assessment" and whether it is part of the 15-page Proposal Narrative or a separate section?

A8. Proposals must include a risk assessment and a plan for monitoring and mitigating the risks identified. Risks to project implementation may include a variety of political, environmental, and other factors. A few examples include outbreak of violent conflict, elections that change government partners, cybersecurity / hacking, misuse of personally identifiable information (PII), and diversion of financial or non-financial support to prohibited parties (terrorist financing). The assessment should also identify risks to staff, implementers, participants, beneficiaries, or their communities. Besides political and environmental factors, risks may include online or in-person potential physical, social, psychological, economic, and/or reputational backlash to beneficiaries as a result of their participation. The proposal should include a participatory needs assessment and explain how its implementers will engage with local actors throughout its lifecycle. Strong proposals will also describe strategies to sustain the activities beyond ISN/ECC funding, or alternatively, how applicants will co-design a responsible exit strategy with local partners and in consultation with beneficiaries.

Q9. We understand that through this funding opportunity EXBS is seeking to support Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, and Moldova in developing

national PF risk assessments and/or action plans; and to support implementation of the action plans resulting from PF risk assessments conducted in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Serbia (and potentially Moldova if the process moves that far).

- Therefore, this project seeks to assist nine (9) countries through “a combination of virtual and in-person consultations and other engagements”. Is this correct?
- If so, Cyprus and Croatia were initially named in the document, but do not appear in either line of effort – support for PF risk assessments and action plan, or implementation of action plans. Which line of effort would Cyprus and Croatia fall under?
- Would this increase the number of countries to be supported through this opportunity to 11 countries?

A9. As stated in the Project Goal section (p.7) there are two separate tasks 1) PF Risk assessments for Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, and Moldova and 2) PF Risk Assessment Implementation Support in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Serbia, and potentially Moldova. EXBS is willing to consider proposals more limited proposals, in that case the priority would be for Montenegro and Moldova for risk assessments and Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, and Moldova for implementation support. Proposals for Croatia and Cyprus are not required.

Q10. As mentioned earlier, EXBS seeks to support the partner countries through “a combination of virtual and in-person consultations and other engagements,” in countries where English is not the native language. Who bears the cost of translation (into or from English) for written reports and other written (e.g., email, and/or other electronic documents) and oral communication (calls/virtual meetings)?

A10. The awardee is expected to plan for logistical costs of the engagement, to include required translation and/or interpretation.

Q11. If the delegates live in the city where the training/workshop is being held, would the delegates still require lodging and the implementor be responsible for the lodging cost?

A11. If the delegate lives in the city where the training/workshop is being held the delegate is NOT entitled to lodging cost.