



**Issue Date:**

November 27, 2019

**Application Submission Closing Date:**

December 11, 2019 [3:00 pm Lusaka Time]

**Subject:**

Amendment 02 to Notice of Funding Opportunity Number (NOFO):  
72061120RFA00001;

**Program Title:**

Service Delivery for Vulnerable Children and Adolescents (SDVCA)  
under existing New Partnerships Initiative Global Health Annual Program  
Statement (NPI GH APS) No.: 7200AA19APS00013

The purpose of this letter is to update USAID's responses to questions that were found to be inconsistent with the solicitation documents.

The inconsistencies are explained below and have been rectified in the updated Questions and Answers (Q&A) attached hereto.

**Inconsistency #1 - Between two answers included in "Attachment I – Questions and Answers" related to restrictions applied to Modality I subgrantees.**

In response to the Eligibility question, "*Under Modality I, are direct awardees permitted to sub award to international NGOs for specific technical support needs?*", USAID responded "Yes" (Round 3 Q&A, p. 4). This means that that local entities preparing submissions under Modality I **are permitted to include an international NGO on their consortium.**

In response to the "Information on Application and Submission" question, "*This call for concepts is it allowed to submit the concept as a consortium of CBOs and if yes maximum how many?*", USAID responded that "... all applicants under a consortium *must meet eligibility requirements as specified in Round 3 (pg 6 and 7)*" (Round 3 Q&A, p. 6). These eligibility requirements restrict applications to local entities per PEPFAR's definition. USAID's response to this question seem to indicate that all consortium partners must meet this requirement, and therefore local entities preparing submissions under Modality I **are not permitted to include an international NGO on their consortium, which is not the case.**

These responses appear to be in conflict with each other regarding the teaming choices available to local entities who intend to submit as a prime and therefore USAID's updated response on page 6 of the Q&A is that; *Any consortium must have the local entity as the 'prime' or 'lead' that meets eligibility requirements specified*

*in Round 3 (pg 6 and 7). The remaining make-up of the consortium is not restricted (i.e. international NGO's may be a member of the consortium) (Page 6, Q&A)..*

**Inconsistency #2 – Between one answer included in “Attachment I – Questions and Answers” and the Amended APS related to definition of ‘underutilized.’**

The amended Round 3 (Round 3, p. 7) and the original APS (NPI APS, p. 15) both indicate that “An underutilized partner is defined by the Agency as an organization that has received less than \$25 million in direct or indirect awards from USAID over the past five years”. However, the Round 3 Q&A indicated a different criteria – broadening the definition to include “all USG agencies” (Round 3 Q&A, p. 4). USAID would therefore like to clarify that the language in amended Round 3, p.7 and the original APS (NPI GH APS, p. 15) remains unchanged and the response is updated as follows; *The \$25M threshold relates to USAID funding received by an organization in the past five years. For example, if an organization received \$25M from USG Agency XYZ and only \$1M from USAID. It would be considered an underutilized USAID partner (Page 4, Q&A).*

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mohib Ahmed  
Supervisory Agreement Officer  
Director, Office of Acquisition and Assistance

ATTACHMENT I – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS