



USAID | **SENEGAL**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

RFI-685-19-MN
Meeting Notes for Markets and Nutrition
Held on June 13, 2019

LISTS PARTICIPANTS & REMARKS

Participants

In addition to the 36 people who called-in through remote access, the following people attended in person in Dakar:

Abdullahi Sadiq, USAID
Doudou Ndiaye, USAID/SRO
Cheikh A BA, USAID
Jorge Oliveira, USAID/WA
Kether Hayden, Action for Enterprise
Krystle Austin, ACDI/VOCA
Patrick Roisen, Lutheran World Relief
Eugenie Lund-Simon, Chemonics International
Garron Hansen, Chemonics International
Nana Aminata TOURE SIDIBE, Lutheran World Relief
Daniel J Lissit, Catholic Relief Services
Idrissa BA, ICCO Cooperation
Jean-Michel Voisard, RTI International
Vincent Roger, CNFA
Lenoure Recanatini, CNFA
Charles Alan May, DAI Global, LLC
Harold Emmanuel Strecker, SNV USA
Will Bullock, NCBA/CLUSA
Karl Rosenberg, NCBA/CLUSA
Emmet Murphy, Creative Associates
John Uniack Davis, Helen Keller International
Akoto Osei, Helen Keller International
Christine Mukamugema, World Vision International

Opening Remarks

Zeric Smith, Director, Sahel Regional Technical Office:

- Welcome to this pre-solicitation conference. I'm the Director of the Sahel Regional Technical Office here in Dakar. The Sahel Regional Office supports programs to enhance resilience of vulnerable populations in the Sahel and reduce vulnerability to violent extremism. While we

have activities in Mauritania and Chad, the bulk of the programs we manage are in Burkina Faso and Niger.

- Markets and Nutrition is part of broader effort to aid the Sahel, the Resilience in the Sahel Enhanced (RISE II) program. USAID is convinced that aid to the Sahel needs to take into account not only the inevitable “shocks” (drought, climate, food insecurity, etc) but how they interact with political and social disorganization and unrest.
- The Sahel is plagued by shocks and stresses that are predictable—frequent, revolve around climate issues, particularly worried about how climate shocks and stability shocks happen around the same time.
- The RISE approach incorporates the central themes of governance, social cohesion, and community.

Yves Kore, Regional Acquisition and Agreement Officer:

- SRO profits by sharing information with the industry (through this RFI) so that we can learn from the development community. USAID is mandated by the “Competition in Contracting Act” (CICA) to provide information publicly.
- We have not decided what instrument will be used in this activity, and whether it will be assistance or contract. This will be clarified through an update to the Business Forecast.
- We anticipate answers to the questions posed in response to this RFI will be posted by at least Tuesday, but possibly Monday next week.
- Anything “promised” or said during the pre-solicitation conference is legally non-binding. The official answers to questions will be provided in written form.

Patrick Smith, Deputy Director and Agriculture Officer, Sahel Regional Technical Office:

- I’d like to begin by having all attendees introduce themselves (Name and Organization), while also recognizing that there are approximately 30 people calling in remotely who will not be introduced although we do have a record of who participated in Adobe Connect.
[went around the room in Dakar for introductions, then made the comments below to describe the presentation slides.]
- **Agenda:** Our agenda today has begun with welcoming remarks and introductions, and I will soon present an overview of the Markets and Nutrition activity. This will be followed by Q&A with the audience, and then I hope you will share with all of us lessons learned about integrating nutrition into market approaches, as well as how to implement in insecure environments.
- **Sahel context:** First I’d like to briefly describe the context and technical approach. As described by Zeric, this is a challenging environment/situation with chronic unrest and climate shocks. The level of need level is high. Our approach is cross-sectoral, integrating and layering interventions in health, nutrition, markets, governance.
- **RISE Results Framework:** As you can see in the results framework for RISE II, the results in red are the ones Markets and Nutrition will particularly contribute to: objective 1, particularly in enhancing risk management, Objective 2 on incomes and economic well-being, and Objective 3 on health and nutrition particularly in terms of access to nutritious foods, Objective 4 particularly in terms of enhancing local civil society capacity, and to Objective 5 on womens’ and youth empowerment.
- **Sahel Development Partnership:** M&N also contributes to the Sahel Development Partnership, by enhancing economic opportunities and livelihoods which addresses the economic insecurity

than can be a driver for individuals and communities to support violent extremism or engage in conflict. We also recognize that insecurity is dynamic and changing. M&N will primarily program in the “buffer areas” where we will implement integrated and layered resilience activities. However, M&N may also work in warm or hotter zones where there are beneficiaries that we supported under REGIS-AG in RISE I.

- **Map of RISE and SDP:** This map shows the RISE zone in blue, and the SDP zone outlined in red. Note that parts of RISE zone are within the SDP zone.
- **Markets and Nutrition Considerations:** First, collaboration with RISE II activities is essential to success, such as with FFP on support to agricultural producer groups, or with Breakthrough-Action on social behavior change, or with finance activities to help beneficiaries access funds. Second, M&N needs to be flexible in design and implementation- able to respond to shocks and stresses and implement in conflict zone. M&N will have a 6 month “refinement” period during which the awardee is can make major changes in the activity, which can include adjustments to reduce overlap or build synergies with other partners.
- **Markets and Nutrition Overview:** M&N Goal is to *Strengthen market systems to sustainably improve household incomes and nutrition nutritional status.*
 - Result 1: Enhanced performance of commodity and market systems.
 - Primarily chickpeas, ruminants, etc.
 - Result 2: Increased utilization of quality inputs and services.
 - Result 3: Increased local consumption of nutritious, safe foods.

USAID is looking for applicants to be creative, particularly on the nutrition part of the activity. We anticipate two awards (one for Niger and one for Burkina Faso).

- **Cross-cutting concerns:** Self reliance is the number one agency goal; and this aligns well with objectives under RISE, especially the cross-cutting results that every activity is intended to contribute toward: community leadership, social capital, and the ability to learn and adapt

Q&A Session

Patrick Smith

We received close to 40 written questions in response to this RFI and we commit to respond to all of them in writing, however for the discussion now, I have chosen some overarching questions either mentioned by multiple organizations, or of potential interest to all of you that I will address at the beginning.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1: What will the DFSAs be doing?

Each DFSA has its own strategic approach, but as multi-sectoral activities they will likely be contributing to all IRs under the RISE II framework with the exception of national health system strengthening (IR3.1), and national and regional resilience institutions (IRs 4.3 and 4.4). In general, DFSAs will focus on household, village and commune level interventions.

Q2: How do applicants design collaboration into their award now without full information on what other partners are, or will, do?

We expect that this collaboration will be developed and occur **post-award**. Applicants are not expected to have detailed information of implementation plans for other partners beyond what is publicly available. Applications should demonstrate an awareness of other partners and describe the Applicant's general approach to collaboration. The final solicitation will include additional guidance on expectations for collaboration.

Q3: How do Applicants deal with areas/issues where M&N results could depend on the actions of other partners?

In general, where there is a core expected result for M&N, the Applicant's approach and level of effort should include all necessary components to achieve the results. The award includes a six-month refinement period during which the Awardee will consult widely to determine areas of overlap and gaps, forge collaborations, collect information and review their theory of change. They will then submit to USAID a revised project document and a workplan for the rest of the year. The refinement period exists because USAID recognizes that plans often need to change once the team is on the ground, particularly when there are interdependencies with other actors.

Q4: What is the role of Sahel Collaboration and Communication (SCC) vis-à-vis M&N?

SCC is currently in procurement and will likely be awarded prior to issuance of the M&N awards. We will add SCC to the list of partners in the solicitation and describe the relationship and roles. SCC is meant to provide an overall collaboration structure and process within which specialized activities, such as M&N, will lead on technical matters. The SCC implementer will lead a process among all partners to identify shared objectives, agree on how to monitor progress toward those goals, and identify what kind of support is needed to enhance collaboration. We expect M&N to be the lead technical partner on market systems development.

Q5: Clarify the crisis modifier and the mechanism.

Up to 5 million per country. We will provide detailed guidance in the final solicitation on the modifier – how it works and what partners are expected to do. Feel free to share with us any lessons learned on crisis modifiers.

Q6: What could trigger a change in geography?

The award will be written flexibly to adjust to change. Programmatic adjustments of USAID activities will be determined jointly between USAID and its partners in response to the dynamics on the ground. We do not have pre-determined security triggers, but we expect all our partners to have situational awareness and their own security plans and procedures, and to proactively raise concerns to USAID. Relocation of activities within the ZOI will be a relatively straightforward process to approve. Relocation outside the ZOI is within the realm of possibility, but would be a major decision. The final solicitation will include further details on expectations regarding contingency planning.

Q7: What is M&N expected to do in finance?

We expect M&N to be the principal partner responsible to facilitate access to finance for its direct beneficiaries. Other USAID finance activities should make this easier to achieve, such as through a partial loan guarantee, but M&N implementers should be prepared to provide the full package of interventions to assist their direct beneficiaries obtain finance. Once the additional finance activities are awarded, M&N implementers will need to seek synergies with those new partners and negotiate, with USAID's assistance, respective roles and contributions. Applicants can expect the Development Credit Authority loan guarantee program in Burkina Faso to continue and to be one of the complementary financing modes. We may add some further clarification in the solicitation.

Q8: What is M&N expected to do in policy/lobbying?

As stated in the RFI, the Applicant should propose a set of activities designed to achieve the three higher level M&N results and the M&N Goal. The Applicant's technical approach should include those policy and lobbying priorities, interventions, and results that are necessary to achieve those results and goals in a sustainable manner. Applicants should note that this is a market systems activity, and thus should seek to achieve system-level change that drives individual and household-level outcomes.

Q9: What nutritious food should M&N support?

USAID does not have preconceived notions of what constitutes local nutritious foods. Cowpeas, small ruminants, and poultry are mentioned specifically in the RFI because they have good market potential and are nutritious. The M&N implementers will need to conduct their own desk studies, consultations, and field studies to identify nutritional deficiencies by locality and assess the best options for using market solutions to meet those needs. This will be a close collaboration post-award with the DFSAs as they are also collecting this type of information.

Questions and comments from the Floor

Q10: Some REGIS-AG interventions in Niger and in the Sahel and Eastern Regions in Burkina Faso are outside the M&N ZOI but inside the Sahel Development Partnership (SDP). Would USAID support M&N ZOI including Est and Sahel region?

The M&N zone includes both the RISE II ZOI, as well as the SDP zone, so M&N will continue to be able to support REGIS-AG beneficiaries in the Est and Sahel. We would like to make sure that M&N continues to support beneficiaries assisted by REGIS-AG to the extent the security situation allows. We will make sure the M&N solicitation is clear on geographic scope.

Q11: Can nutrition products be distributed as a possible contingency plan?

Nutrition products are generally distributed by other agencies, like UNICEF, so we are hesitant to ask M&N to do this unless it is a real emergency that no one else can address. Overall, we don't want to turn M&N into a humanitarian assistance activity other than for a short term period. Rather than support distribution of free nutrition products, it would make more sense for M&N to focus on how to use the market to bring nutritious foods into a region during a crisis.

Q12: Are additional value-chain analyses needed?

This is up to the implementer to determine. The implementer should look at the analyses already produced and determine if additional work is needed. Given it is a new area, the market for nutritious foods may need further information and analysis. This information gathering can be done during application or after award.

Q13: Can you elaborate further on how the private sector partnerships anticipated with which M&N could collaborate?

USAID is developing and will continue to develop private sector partnerships, but these are not yet finished so we cannot provide details. We are prioritizing partnerships that benefit the RISE and SDP ZOIs, so there may very well be synergistic opportunities with M&N. This cannot be specified at this time but the implementer needs to be ready to collaborate if appropriate.

Q14: We note in the RISE Technical Approach Working Paper that USAID expressed a switch from cowpeas to rural foods. However, M&N still includes cowpea. Also we note the switch from the broad term of rural foods (sorghum, millet, etc.) in the technical approach working paper to a focus on nutritious foods in M&N? Can you clarify your intent?

USAID saw the value in continuing to support the production of cowpeas since we realized that our producer groups were not yet ready to fully, and independently, participate in markets. In addition, we felt we had the budget to do both cowpea and other nutritious foods.

USAID followup Q: Asked participant to further clarify their opinion on the difference between rural foods and nutritious foods.

Participant's response: Rural food, as defined by participant, is "profitable food products that are not necessarily high in vitamins" such as basic staples like millet and sorghum.

USAID response: This is a very interesting question which requires further thought. Part of good nutrition is consideration of adequate consumption of calories. We'll need to internally discuss this more and then clearly specify it in the solicitation. As a general matter, USAID intends that partners specify themselves what falls into the nutritious foods category, but the interpretation can be broad, for example going beyond consumption of vegetables to include

food safety. However, we don't want M&N to become an activity focused on increasing basic production of staples, such as done by some DFSAs.

Q15: Participant opened comment with their experience in participating in a UN conference which generated the following conclusions: 1. In Africa, the youth no longer feel a part of their own society 2. Therefore, they turn to violent extremism (VE). Further, VE is a complex issue and market interventions may not be the answer to VE; applicants will need to go beyond what is proposed and “add more.” Participant mentions the possibility of implementing, for example, community training programs. Also emphasized the research component to better understand how to address VE

VE is a very complex problem, there is no singular cause or singular solution. However one of the factors is the lack of alternative opportunities available to youth, who then turn to VE for alternatives. Where extremism thrives, grievances are high. Moreover, when the State doesn't address grievances, this can further drive VE. Economic livelihoods can aid in the fight against VE. Indeed, youth can be a critical part of the solution, and the RFI emphasizes the importance of youth engagement.

Q16: How will the Health Services Delivery (HSD) activity work with the DFSAs and the M&N nutrition component?

HSD focuses on the health system at a governmental system level which is different from FFP activities which focus on the community level, they intersect at the “clinical level.” M&N's work on nutrition focuses on nutritional behaviors of the female direct beneficiaries which we anticipate will flow down to benefit other members of household. M&N will also seek to bring market solutions to address nutrition challenges at the population level. M&N can collaborate by sharing approaches, being consistent in messaging, etc. We expect these areas to be further clarified among all partners post-award.

Q17: Will the security context in Niger and Burkina Faso affect how organizations will be considered for these awards?

Anyone can apply - with or without USAID experience. As USAID reviews applications/proposals we'll be assessing: Do they have the capacity to deliver results, do we believe their technical approach, experience, and management approach are appropriate? Overall, applicants have to meet the evaluation criteria, there will not be exceptions made because of higher security risk. Note that we remain committed to Agency procurement reforms that encourage awards to non-traditional partners and religious organizations. Note that we have not yet determined, nor posted, the evaluation criteria.

The following questions were submitted through Adobe chat:

Q18: To achieve Objective 3 of the RISE II Results Framework, how will M&N collaborate with the Integrated Health Service Delivery Activity which also has a nutrition component?

See answer to Q16 above.

Q19: Regarding the targeted population, it is mentioned that the focus is on women and that child nutrition will not be the focus. It makes sense regarding management of Acute Malnutrition, as there are other actors working on this aspect, but will there not be opportunities to develop nutritious food targeted for children?

M&N should definitely be looking into producing more nutritious food for children as a market opportunity and this should contribute to improved overall nutrition in this zone, including for children. This project is meant to create market change so the fear is that targeting children would take the focus away from markets. We do not want M&N to conduct activity similar to FFP DFSAs that are community level, working with children as a direct beneficiary.

Q20: It seems like the SCC component of RISE II will be largely focused on collaboration and coordination among RISE II programs rather than evaluation. Is there to be a separate mechanism for evaluations, or are there evaluation components of the technical programs like M&N?

USAID prefers third-party evaluations and will have a different way to conduct evaluations, but this has not yet been procured. We recognize that SCC is meant to promote collaboration and learning, and we learned from RISE I that including evaluation in the collaboration mechanism created awkward dynamics.

Q21: Animal-source foods not listed as a nutritious food.

Animal-source foods are mentioned in the RFI as an important nutritious food.

Q22: How should the Crisis Modifier be budgeted for? Kept by the prime or integrated into all partner budgets? Programmed or be kept as a general contingency line?

USAID will provide additional clarity in the RFI. Given that it is meant to be a contingency for unexpected situations, it is best to keep it flexible. Applicants/bidders will need to make their own judgement on the best way to represent it in the budget.

Q23: Can USAID expand on the reasons and objectives for changing the originally forecasted regional opportunity into two separate country opportunities?

It was generally USAID management and budget considerations.

Q24: Given the \$34 - 37M ceiling (including \$5 million modifier component) for Niger, how many awards are anticipated to be given?

We have not completed procurement plan yet so the type and number of awards is not yet determined. This will be clarified in the solicitation.

Q25: Does USAID still estimate 7/9 release date for Burkina and 8/9 for Niger?

Will update the Business Forecast with further information about release dates. We try to keep timeline but sometimes it is out of our control.

Took additional questions from room in Dakar

Q26: What is the Award date and when is the refinement period?

The Award date is based on the longest possible time to make an award. Co-creation approach is not yet decided. The refinement period is *after* award.

Q27: How should we apply knowing there is a strong possibility of a crisis? Is there space for a crisis modifier?

The crisis modifier will be further clarified in the solicitation. The crisis modifier generally allows reprogramming activities as needed as well as adding additional funds to take advantage of the fact that the partner and project are in place and can react quickly.

Q28: How much time from release of application date to submission deadline?

Not yet decided. This will be clear in the final solicitation.

Q29: Given the focus on market resilience, how do we take into account external factors that affect the market (for example, price fluctuations)?

External factors are exactly why it's important to focus on market resiliency and flexibility. For example, when the naira devalued, we looked for other potential markets, such as Senegal, that were not affected. Applicants need to be able to change their projects to respond to external factors. We recognize that developing market resilience is a 10 to 20-year process, and this activity will be expected to make a start in that direction over its 5 year period.

More questions submitted through online Adobe chat.

Q30: In Niger, while there are documents referenced where more directions can be found in terms of actual locations, at this stage do we know where exactly in the regions (Tillaberi, Maradi and Zinder) will the project be anticipated to be implemented? (Question was based on this statement: "In Niger, the zone of intervention encompasses parts of Tillaberi, Maradi, and Zinder regions.")

You can see the map in the RFI which indicates which general parts of the regions are in the project area. At a more fine-grained level, M&N will need to be collocated with current DFSA partners and we'll make sure that information is public. However, the geography is deliberately written broadly because geography is dynamic and changing.

Shifted back to take questions from the room in Dakar

Q31: Strongly suggest that as much information as possible be made available on the locations and activities of the DFSAs to level the playing field for those preparing proposals.

You are welcome to submit your suggestions to USAID on the types of information that needs to be shared and will consider that request.

USAID: Now we'd like to take a few moments to hear from you about what you have learned on the questions we posed in the RFI on nutrition and markets, as well as a new question on markets and insecurity.

USAID: What have you learned about the ability of the poor to purchase nutritious food?

Attendee: Ability to produce is limited when they are poor so we need to help build “food self-sufficiency.” The reality is that the poor buy food, but nutritious food is expensive or not always available, so they may not choose to buy it and so remain food insecure.

USAID: Correct - the demand element will be challenging, and perhaps the behavior component is not sufficiently discussed in RFI.

Attendee: Availability is important—accessing foods in rural areas will be difficult, supply and demand will be challenging. Production at scale will be a challenge

USAID: Where have we seen successes? How to increase opportunities for better income so the poor can purchase food?

Attendee: Farmers and women face more difficulties. Require information sharing and collaboration. Need to collaborate with FFP because they know about demand, ability, landscape, population etc.

USAID: What have we learned about Market approaches in an insecure environment?

Adobe chat: Participant's experience in doing market systems work has shown that it is feasible with strong local relations, and enough resources to provide appropriate security measures in insecure contexts.

Attendee: Have seen a successful activity in Mali in which the NGO could no longer access the community and began instead to provide assistance through local market actors who were still able to reach the communities. This suggests we need to provide assistance to market actors.

USAID Closing Remarks: Yves Kore

All answers to questions asked, comments will be taken into consideration, questions that were left unanswered will be considered, clarification will be provided. We will decide what instrument will be used, what co-creation aspect will be used, and the timeline for solicitation and award. We thank everyone for coming and participating.

Answers to written questions submitted prior to the Pre-solicitation conference.

1. Some REGIS-AG interventions in Tillaberi in Niger and in the Sahel and Eastern Regions in Burkina Faso that are outside the M&N ZOI but inside the M&N Sahel Development Partnership (SDP) areas contribute to important improvements in social cohesion, rural employment, and reduced conflict in these regions. To ensure lasting impact, CNFA recommends that USAID allow the M&N implementer to consider continuing activities in the Nord Region of Burkina Faso as a means to consolidate the more incipient gains of REGIS-AG. Retaining these regions in M&N will also provide flexibility of programming across regions given the changing security situation. Would USAID consider including these parts of the SDP ZOI in the ZOI of M&N?

The current SDP ZOI does not include Nord region which is why it is not in the ZOI of M&N. The award will include a general clause allowing geographic flexibility with USAID concurrence. As the Activity is implemented, USAID will work with its partners to make geographic adjustments as needed, which could include working outside the currently specified ZOI. In general, the purpose of having a ZOI is to focus and concentrate resources for greater impact.

2. For the crisis modifier, do you expect that the M&N activity will include a detailed plan based on our preliminary needs assessment of what the crisis modifier should look like or should it present a process and “triggers” that will indicate when these funds will be re-allocated, to whom they will be submitted, in what form?

We will provide detailed guidance in the final solicitation.

3. Will the crisis modifier be up to \$5 million for each country or total across the two countries?

Up to 5 million per country.

4. Does USAID have a preferred source of nutrition and economic data on the Central North Region of Burkina Faso and the three targeted Regions in Niger considering the challenges of finding this information?

The RFI included references to documents that contain nutrition and economic data. However, we expect that one of the tasks of M&N is to fill knowledge gaps with additional information needed to make programming decisions.

5. Could USAID provide further indication on what is understood by "local nutritious food"?

See answer above to Q9.

6. Given the current security situation in Burkina Faso, notably based on USAID's latest assessment, what could trigger a need to relocate potential future actions?

Programmatic adjustments of USAID activities will be determined jointly between USAID and its partners in response to the dynamic on the ground. We do not have pre-determined triggers, but we expect all our partners to have situational awareness and their own security plans and procedures, and to proactively raise concerns to USAID. Relocation of activities within the ZOI

will be a relatively straightforward process to approve. Relocation outside the ZOI is within the realm of possibility, but would be a major decision. The final solicitation will include further details on expectations regarding contingency planning.

7. Could USAID please clarify whether the Markets and Nutrition activities will be awarded as contracts or cooperative agreements?

This has not yet been formally determined. The Business Forecast will be updated when a decision is made.

8. Page 2 of the RFI states that the awards “will include up to \$5 million set aside for a crisis modifier that allows the Implementer to undertake additional early actions or shock response in the event of a projected or current shock.” Would USAID kindly clarify if the \$5 million crisis modifier is meant to be part of the overall \$18-\$19 million and \$34-\$37 million ceilings for the two awards, or is it in addition to those amounts?

The five million is within those total levels.

9. Page 9 of the RFI states that “Each DFSA is taking its own approach to these challenges, so the M&N Implementer will need to develop collaborative relationships with each separately.” Additionally, on Page 19 the RFI states that “M&N will need to engage with each DFSA individually to understand its theory of change and major investments, and propose how M&N can add value to that work through specialized market systems expertise and systems-level interventions.”

a. Given that some of the DFSA implementers are submitting bids for the Markets and Nutrition activities, and may therefore be disincentivized to share information on approaches to maintain a competitive advantage, how will USAID ensure that information regarding the approaches and activities being undertaken on the DFSAs is shared publicly?

See answer to Q2 above.

b. Which IRs does USAID envision the DFSAs contributing to?

See answer to Q1 above.

c. Will the M&N implementers be able to leverage the networks of DFSA implementers to carry out pilot projects in nutrition programming, even if the DFSA implementers are not directly part of the winning consortium?

The M&N implementers can develop collaborations with any partner to pilot nutrition programming, but this will be mutually determined by the interested parties.

10. Page 9 states that “USAID is designing new programming for both Burkina Faso and Niger to enhance the availability of finance to beneficiaries through incentive grants and technical assistance to financial institutions.” Could USAID please provide additional background on these finance activities and how they will relate to the M&N activities?

See answer above to Q7.

11. Page 9 states a number of relevant USAID partner activities that M&N will engage with, but does not mention the Sahel Collaboration and Communication Activity (SCCA). What is the

envisioned role of SCCA vis-à-vis M&N with regards to convening RISE implementers around the achievement of shared objectives?

This is an oversight in the RFI. We will add SCC to the list of partners and describe the relationship and roles. SCC is meant to provide an overall collaboration structure and process within which specialized activities, such as M&N, will lead on technical matters. After award, the SCC implementer will lead a process among all partners to identify shared objectives, and how to monitor progress toward those goals. We expect M&N to be the lead technical partner on market systems development.

12. Page 10 of the RFI notes that USAID plans to use Breakthrough-ACTION for its cutting-edge social and behavior change expertise and that “these activities will develop, pilot, test and scale up SBC approaches and tools in collaboration with other USAID partners and partner governments.” Could USAID please provide more detail on B-A’s Scope of Work, and how it will relate to the M&N activities?

Breakthrough-Action’s scope of work was attached to the Health Services Delivery RFI ([RFI-625-18-RISEII-HSD](#)), issued on May 18, 2018 in grants.gov. We will consider how to further elaborate this in the M&N solicitation. In general, we expect collaborative activities to be defined after award.

13. The RFI refers to nutritious foods in result 3 and throughout the RFI, but does not identify priority nutritious foods. Could USAID provide more detail on which nutritious foods they are prioritizing, if any, particularly as they vary from the identified value chains (small ruminants, poultry, cowpeas)?

See answer to Q9 above.

14. Question: USAID originally forecasted the Markets and Nutrition (M&N) opportunity as one regional opportunity covering both Burkina Faso and Niger. The updated forecast has divided the regional opportunity into two separate country opportunities. Can USAID expand on its reasons and objectives for said change?

No.

15. Question: Can USAID provide information on how the increasingly complex security situation in Burkina Faso will impact the forecasted release date of the solicitation or the scope (geographic areas, feasibility of illustrative outcomes) of the Activity?

Timing of the release of solicitations can be affected by a variety of factors.

16. Page 9, Section 3, Collaborative implementation approach to improve economic well-being and nutrition indicates: that “M&N will be responsible for major contributions” to a list of RISE II Intermediate Results, including IR 2.4 Increased utilization of financial services. Question: Does USAID consider M&N to be the principal contributing program responsible for achieving results under this IR? If so, how does M&N’s contribution relate to and complement the roles of other current and future finance programming, considering that USAID currently has an active DCA loan guarantee for Burkina Faso and is designing new programming for both Burkina Faso and Niger to enhance the availability of finance to beneficiaries?

We expect M&N to be principally responsible to facilitate access to finance for its direct beneficiaries. Other USAID finance activities should make this easier to achieve, such as through a partial loan guarantee, but M&N implementers should be prepared to provide the full package of interventions to assist their direct beneficiaries obtain finance. Once the additional finance activities are awarded, M&N implementers will need to seek synergies with those new partners and negotiate, with USAID's assistance, respective roles and contributions.

17. Page 9, Section 3, Collaborative implementation approach to improve economic well-being and nutrition indicates: that "M&N will be responsible for major contributions" to four out the five IRs under RISE II's O2: Increase and sustain economic well-being. According to this list, USAID does not consider that M&N will be responsible for major contributions to IR 2.2 Diversified economic opportunities. Question: Can USAID provide information on which RISE II program(s) will be responsible for major contributions to IR 2.2, and any guidance on respective roles and potential areas of collaboration between M&N and said program(s) under IR 2.2?

This was an oversight, M&N should also contribute to diversified livelihoods within the scope of its mandate – i.e. off-farm livelihood opportunities within market systems in the targeted value chains (including nutritious foods) and supportive services and inputs.

18. Page 9, Section 3, Collaborative implementation approach to improve economic well-being and nutrition indicates: that "M&N will be responsible for major contributions" to a list of RISE II Intermediate Results, including IR 3.3 Improved Health, family planning, hygiene, and nutritional practices and IR3.4 Increased access to affordable, nutritious, and safe foods. Question: Can USAID provide guidance on respective roles and potential areas of collaboration between M&N and the forecasted Integrated Health Service Delivery Activity under IRs 3.3 and 3.4?

We do not anticipate HSD will contribute to IR3.4. Collaboration between HSD and M&N on improved health behaviors will need to be negotiated post-award. We will review the M&N solicitation to see if we can provide any further clarity.

19. Page 2, Section 1, Executive summary indicates: that the “activities will also contribute to the micro-enterprise earmark”. Question: Can USAID provide additional information and/or guidance about the micro-enterprise earmark, and if said earmark should be taken into consideration for activity design and implementation?

We believe that M&N as designed will contribute to this earmark. The main implication for partners is that they need to report on required indicators for that earmark. Guidance on the earmark can be found on USAID's website.

20. Page 4, Section 2, USAID's approach to building resilience and countering violent extremism in the Sahel indicates: that “In Burkina Faso, the zone of intervention is the Centre Nord region.” Page 8, Section 2, USAID's approach to building resilience and countering violent extremism in the Sahel indicates that in “Centre Nord, Sahel and Est in Burkina Faso, M&N contributes to the multi-sector resilience and development programming ‘implementation arm’ of

the SDP.” Page 19, Section 7, Geographic coverage and target populations indicates that “M&N will support investments in the RISE II zone of intervention which includes Centre Nord in Burkina Faso” and “M&N will also pursue opportunities in the SDP zone, which includes areas outside the RISE II zone that are conflict-affected.” Question: Can USAID please provide additional information regarding the geographic scope of M&N? In particular, clarification regarding whether USAID considers that a) M&N will implement in Centre Nord and may or may not expand into areas of Sahel and Est, depending on the state of security conditions, or b) M&N’s design and budget should include activity implementation in all three geographic areas (Centre Nord, Sahel and Est) from Activity start-up?

M&N’s design and budget should include all three regions (Centre Nord, Sahel, and Est), taking into account the dynamic security situation. We will revisit the solicitation to ensure this is clear.

21. Page 12, Section 5, M&N technical approach to achieving expected results states: that “Linkages between functional literacy and market success are an area about which USAID seeks further understanding. The Implementer is encouraged to conduct a comparative study whereby producer groups are randomly selected to participate in functional literacy activities, and the impacts on the producer groups’ performance and on the individual outcomes of the participants are assessed relative to groups who did not receive the training.” Question: Can USAID elaborate on the comparative study? Does USAID intend that the Implementer conduct a randomized control trial (RCT) whereby some producer groups participate in functional literacy activities as well as other M&N activities while other producer groups only participate in other M&N activities (no functional literacy activities) to study the differences in the groups’ performance? Does USAID wish that the Offeror include the required budget for an RCT within M&N’s budget?

We will clarify this in the final solicitation.

22. Page 15, Section 6, M&N expected results and illustrative outcomes lists: illustrative outcomes on sector governance, including “Market actors successfully lobby local and national government for supportive investments and policies” and “National and local governments adopt policies and procedures that support private sector growth in the targeted commodity market systems”. Question: Can USAID expand on their envisioned role of M&N in lobbying and support to national/local governments in the design and implementation of policies and procedures?

See answer to Q8 above.

23. Page 17, Section 6, M&N expected results and illustrative outcomes lists: illustrative outcomes on agricultural inputs, including “International donors increasingly use a voucher system for farmers to directly purchase seeds and fertilizers.” Question: Can USAID expand on its vision of M&N’s role in encouraging other international donors to use voucher systems?

We look to Applicants to propose creative ways to influence others, understanding that USAID as a donor intends to also be active on this effort.

24. Page 20, Section 7, Geographic coverage and target populations states: that “M&N is expected to seek to improve the nutritional status of women market participants with a special focus on adolescence, pregnancy, post-partum, and lactation.” Question: Can USAID expand on its guidance for M&N’s role working with adolescent, pregnant, post-partum, or lactating women

to improve nutritional status, considering that the activity is built on a market systems approach (and not individual outcomes approach)? Does USAID expect that this outcome will be measured through system-level indicators, or at the individual/household level?

This is an excellent question. It is worth noting that overall, the M&N goal includes both a systems-level impact (“Strengthen market systems”) and an individual level impact (“such that household incomes and nutritional status are sustainably improved.”) M&N will need to achieve results at both levels. We will consider the issue of nutritional status measurement as we prepare the final solicitation document.

Pre-Solicitation Conference



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Health Services Delivery RFI Resilience in the Sahel Enhanced (RISE II)

June 4, 2018
Dakar,
Washington D.C.,
online



Agenda

Welcome – Alisa Cameron, Deputy Mission Director

Agenda & Purpose – Yves Kore, Supervisory Contracting Officer

Attendee Introductions – Patrick Smith, SRO

Context and Technical Approach – Patrick Smith, SRO

Q&A and general comments – Patrick Smith, SRO

Sharing of lessons learned – Patrick Smith, SRO

- Linking health programming to resilience programming

- Ensuring collaboration for collective outcomes

- Promoting use of latrines and other sanitation behaviors

- Domestic mobilization of resources for health services

Closing remarks – Yves Kore

SAHEL CONTEXT

Chronic vulnerability caused by:

- Regular poor harvests and food insecurity
- deeply rooted chronic poverty
- corrupt governance,
- high population growth rates
- recurrent climate shocks
- lack of access to adequate government services

Significant security and humanitarian crises due to:

- proliferation of violent extremist groups
- chronic political instability
- porous borders
- weak state capacity

RESILIENCE IN THE SAHEL ENHANCED (RISE)

Phase I: 2012-1019

- Burkina Faso, Niger
- Layer, sequence, integrate
- Five Food for Peace Development Food Assistance Projects (DFAP) – community development activities
- REGIS-AG – value chains
- REGIS-ER – integrated resilience
- SAREL – Collaboration, learning, monitoring, evaluation
- Credit guarantees, family planning, other

Gap – no targeted support to health system

RISE II

Phase II: 2018-2022

- In design/procurement
- RISE II Technical Approach Working Paper – USAID/SRO website
- FFP DFSA RFA – www.grants.gov
- Health Services Delivery RFI – www.grants.gov
- Others in design

Goal: Chronically vulnerable populations in Burkina Faso and Niger, supported by resilient systems, effectively manage shocks and stresses and pursue sustainable pathways out of poverty.

O1 Enhance social & ecological risk management systems

- 1.1 Water security
- 1.2 Sustainable productive land use
- 1.3 Management of shocks, risks, and stresses*

* IR1.3, O4, and O5 are crosscutting as well as stand-alone

O2 Increase and sustain economic well-being

- 2.1 Agricultural and pastoral livelihoods
- 2.2 Diversified economic opportunities
- 2.3 Inclusive and resilient market systems
- 2.4 Utilization of financial services
- 2.5 Human capacity, especially for women and youth

O3 Improve health, family planning, & nutrition outcomes

- 3.1 Health systems
- 3.2 Supply of quality health, family planning, and nutrition services
- 3.3 Health, family planning, hygiene, and nutritional practices
- 3.4 Access to affordable, nutritious, safe foods

O4 Enhance governance of institutions & organizations*

- 4.1 Performance of sub-national state institutions
- 4.2 Local civil society and community-based organizations
- 4.3 Functioning of national resilience institutions
- 4.4 Capability of regional institutions (USAID/West Africa)

O5 Enhance social, economic, and political agency of women and youth

Other RISE II cross-cutting concerns

Transformative outcomes

- Enhanced community leadership of local development
- Enhanced social capital through strengthened ties of mutual assistance among people
- Enhanced capacity to learn and adapt among beneficiaries, local partners, and partner governments

Operational Principles

- Community-led development
- Systems strengthening
- Inclusive targeting
- Collaboration for collective impact

Health Services Delivery (HSD) activity considerations

Collaboration with other RISE II activities essential to success

- The HSD refinement period will overlap with Food for Peace DFSA refinement period
- Co-location and co-work planning with SBC activity

Flexibility in design and implementation

- Be able to take early actions when local or regional shocks are projected
- Be able to implement in conflict-affected areas

HSD Activity Goal: Increased supply of quality health, family planning and nutrition services

Result 1: Greater access to quality health services, including for youth

Sub-Result 1.1: Expanded coverage and increased utilization of high impact interventions for target populations

Sub-Result 1.2: Improved quality of care in the delivery of MCH/FP and nutrition services

Result 2: Strengthened linkages between community and facility health platforms

Sub-Result 2.1: Enhanced integration of delivery of MCH, FP and nutrition services

Sub-Result 2.2: Strengthened linkages between MCH/FP/nutrition sector and other development sectors

Sub-Result 2.3: Increased engagement by communities in delivery of health services

Questions?

Comments?

