



USAID | SENEGAL

FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Amendment Issuance Date: January 18, 2024
Date and time for Full
Application Closing: March 1, 2024 by 17:00 GMT

Subject: **Amendment N°1 to the Request for Full
Application # 72068524RFA00008**

Program Title: Governance for Local Development Plus (GoLD +)

Dear applicants,

The purpose of Amendment No. 01 is to provide answers to the questions received regarding the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Number: 72068524RFA00008.

Questions are addressed in the subsequent pages, as referenced by the sections of the Notice of Funding Opportunity, as follows:

- General questions
- Section A – Question(s)
- Section B – Question(s)
- Section D – Question(s)
- Annex and template(s)
- Other resources

Thank you for your interest in USAID projects.

Sincerely,

Jaime Dominguez
Regional Agreement Officer

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

General Questions

- Q.1 There appears to be contractual language in the RFA – e.g., “the contractor is expected to coordinate with USAID on Monitoring and Evaluation” (pg. 32). Is USAID considering retaining the option of awarding GoLD+ as a contract?

Replace both "offeror" and "contractor" as appropriate by "applicant" and "recipient," respectively.

- Q.2 Are local entities required exclusivity as part of a consortium?

No exclusivity on local entities as part of consortium or consortia is required by USAID. This is the prime's **area of responsibility**, including its business relationship with its subs.

Section A – Question(s)

- Q.3 Q1 - Since “Commonwealth countries” usually refers to countries aligned with the United Kingdom, could USAID please clarify the meaning of this sentence in Section A2.1 on page 9: “Governance of tax and revenue systems has greatly improved in Commonwealth countries under the aegis of the Transitional Federal Government through improved processes, tax base inventories and citizen education campaigns.”

"Commonwealth countries" to be deleted in the next modification of the RFA.

- Q.4 Q2 - The RFA mentions different target or priority sectors to enable service delivery improvement under GoLD+. Page 5 of the RFA mentions the health, education and WASH sectors, while page 9 mentions the health, education, nutrition, WASH, agriculture and natural resource management (NRM) sectors. The theory of change on page 13 mentions the health, education, nutrition, WASH, and NRM sectors, but does not mention agriculture. Can USAID please confirm that offerors under GoLD+ are expected to improve service delivery in the health, education, WASH, and NRM sectors only?

RFA Page 15: A2.7 Expected Results: "Local governments are empowered with more resources to provide essential services (education, health, WASH, agriculture and NRM) to their citizens".

Q.5 Sections A2.6.iii, A2.11, D5.5, and E.2.1 (Factor 1) on pages 15, 20, 41, and 53 require a local organization to transition to direct award with USAID.

a. Would USAID kindly clarify whether Applicants are expected to focus only on preparing one local organization to transition to direct award after 12 months, or may the offerors build the capacity of numerous local organizations in order to ensure one local awardee is ready to take a direct award after 12 months?

b. In order to develop relevant criteria for identifying a local organization that will be in a position to transition to a direct award within 12 months after approval of the year-one work plan, could USAID kindly clarify the anticipated technical focus, scope, and size of the anticipated local award?

a) As stated in section D5.9, the applicant must recommend within one year one local subrecipient for a potential transition award. GoLD+ Activity will focus on strengthening the capacity of local organizations identified in the application (in conformance with the ADS, Chapter 303).

b) USAID is not able to share any information related to the anticipated local award, yet.

Q.6 Section A3.6 on pages 25 and 26 includes: “Small grants: The project will work to strengthen strategic partnerships with local government, local actors, community-based organizations, women, and youth groups, to achieve its objectives. A sub-grant mechanism will provide local civil society organizations, non-government organizations, and community radio stations with an opportunity to engage in the successful implementation of the GoLD+ activity.” The description of allowable recipients for sub-grants includes local civil society organizations, non-government organizations, and community radio stations, but does not include local government. Would USAID consider allowing offerors to provide grants to local governments?

The description of allowable recipients for sub-grants is not an exhaustive one.

Q.7 In Sections A.1 and A2.8, the RFA emphasizes the need for GoLD+ to collaborate with the USAID/Public Financial Management project and the Transparency and Accountability in Extractives Sector (TRACES) program. Could USAID please share the latest quarterly and annual reports available for PFM and TRACES, so applicants may better ensure the complementarity of their proposed approaches with these ongoing programs? Per a recent search, these do not appear to be available on the DEC at this time.

The latest quarterly and annual reports for PFM and TRACES are not available; however, applicants are invited to review the NOFO number 72068521RFA00016 and its amendment for TRACES, and the solicitation number 72068521R00005 for PFM.

Q.8 In Section A.1, the RFA states that the GoLD+ intervention "is expected to benefit from the gains achieved under its predecessor "while Section E.2 Merit Review Criteria #2 assesses the extent to which an offerors management approach for GoLD+ "will capitalize on lessons learned and partnerships formed during the previous iteration of the activity". Given these expectations, could USAID please share the final evaluation report for the GOLD program (in addition to the final report), so that applicants have the most up-to-date information about the achievements, partnerships and lessons learned from GOLD? Based on a recent search, the evaluation report has not yet been added to the DEC.

Available reports have been provided in section H and as attachments to the RFA. The final evaluation report is not available yet.

Q.9 In Section A.3, page 22, the RFA refers to an initial environmental examination conducted for this activity, as well as a Climate Risk Management assessment. Could USAID please provide those documents to applicants for better understanding of the mitigation conditions and climate considerations applicants should integrate into their proposed approaches?

Summary findings of the requested documents (IEE and CRM) are provided in RFA; moreover, the applicant is tasked to provide an assessment using guidance and requirements set forth by USAID's new Climate Change Strategy, released in October 2021, as well as USAID's Climate and Water Toolkit. The Climate Risk Management Assessment must be submitted by the applicant.

Q.10 (Pg. 10) "Spaces for citizen dialogue and interpellation (EDIC) and the Integrated good governance barometers (BBGI) are less widely adopted." Is USAID/Senegal implying that these citizen participation tools should be more widely adopted in GoLD+?

Please consider the entire reference in the Problem Statement.

Q.11 (Pg. 10) What exactly are the "weak credit resilience mechanisms for the sustainable capacity-building approaches" mentioned in the problem statement, and is USAID/Senegal implying that it would like for applicants to improve/strengthen them?

USAID/Senegal will appreciate your own understanding of this statement via the technical approach you describe in the application.

Q.12 Given the guidance under IR "Reinforced local organization capacity and skills to transition to direct award with USAID," may a local Senegalese organization prime this award from the beginning of the project, instead of transitioning from a sub-recipient to prime recipient within the 12-month period after the year-one work plan is approved?

This is an open competition. Please share your approach in the application.

Q.13 On page 31, the RFA states “In addition to proposed evaluation activities carried out by the applicant, USAID may conduct mid-term and/or final performance evaluations on all the DRGP activities, including this activity.” Should the applicant include budget lines for mid-term and final evaluations, or will USAID conduct these evaluations with its own funds?

USAID will conduct mid-term and/or final performance evaluations.

Q.14 For the small grants described on page 25-26 of the RFA: a. What is the total amount USAID envisions for this granting mechanism? What is the amount range USAID envisions for the individual grants?

b. Do the grants have to be based on activities already proposed in the IR activities, or does the applicant have the flexibility to award the funds based on the technical and capacity building needs of the local civil society organizations, non-government organizations, and community radio stations?

c. Can the small grants go to preselected local civil society organizations, non-government organizations, and community radio stations who meet the detailed requirements/criteria or must open calls for proposals be conducted?

a. USAID envisages a total amount for the grant mechanism of \$2,000,000. The applicant will propose an amount for individual grants NTE \$70,000. Grant amounts above \$70,000 will require the Agreement Officer’s approval.

b. Grants should be tied to IR activities; however, if additional needs/challenges arise during the implementation, these can be presented to the AOR where AO approval would be required.

c. Though the US government prefers Full and Open competition in all processes, the applicant / awardee will provide strong reasoning (market research, summary findings; convincing elements, etc...) to support a proposal to go with pre-selected organization(s) instead of Full and Open competition.

Section B – Question(s)

Q.15 Section B4.2 on page 35 states: “Key Personnel should include, at minimum, A Chief of Party (COP) and a Monitoring, Evaluation, and learning Specialist, as further explained in Section E.” Would USAID consider changing the title of the required key personnel position “Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Specialist” to “Senior Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Manager” or “Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Director”? Given that this is a senior Key Personnel role, the broadest and most qualified set of candidates are likely to be interested in a title that reflects the role management of the indicators and data they will be overseeing.

USAID concurs with the title, "Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Manager."

Section D – Question(s)

Q.16 Section D5.8 on page 42 includes: “In addition to the organizational chart, the Annex should include a matrix mapping proposed key personnel against the core technical areas of the mechanism.” Could USAID clarify what are the “core technical areas of the mechanism” that should be included in Annex A to respond to a “matrix mapping proposed key personnel against the core technical areas of the mechanism” for each of the proposed Key Personnel?

The core technical areas refer to the program description; and the applicant is invited to address the problem statement in the technical areas the applicant identifies as key to solving the problem.

Q.17 Section D5.8 on page 42 does not currently include Key Personnel CVs as a required Annex. Would USAID consider allowing Applicants to include Key Personnel CVs (not to exceed 3 pages per proposed Key Personnel) as an additional Annex/Attachment to the technical application, so as to better showcase the backgrounds of any proposed Key Personnel?

For the purpose of the application the Key Personnel (KP) matrix and the position description of those KP are sufficient, ref D5.8 Annex A.
A staffing matrix illustrative template is provided in this modification.

Q.18 Section D5.8 on page 42 Could USAID please confirm that the limit of five pages referenced in Section D5.8 is specifically referring to the “matrix of staff skills by technical area,” and that the “summary organizational chart” and “matrix mapping proposed key personnel against the core technical areas of the mechanism” are additional sections that are not subject to the five-page limit?

The staffing matrix is not to exceed 5 pages; the summary Organizational Chart and KP matrix are not included in the five-page limitation as an additional section.

Q.19 In Section D5.8, for Annex A, applicants are instructed to include a matrix mapping proposed key personnel against the mechanism “core technical areas, as well as position descriptions and letters of commitment for Key Personnel roles. Could USAID please clarify whether applicants should submit CVs for key personnel candidates as well?

The Key Personnel matrix serves as a CV. Moreover, the position description for each KP is required and not to exceed 3 pages per KP.

Q.20 Section D5.8 (page 42) requires submission of past performance references using the template included in Annex 4, while Section D6.8 (page 47) requires applicants to provide history of performance information for all similar cooperative agreements including the name of the awarding organization, award number, description of the activity, etc. Considering there is overlap between the information requested in the Annex 4 template, and the required information listed in Section D6.8 page 47, could USAID please clarify whether offerors are intended to submit organizational past performance reference information in both the technical and the cost applications per Sections 5.8 and 6.8?

All applicants are required to submit past performance information (PPI) contained in section D 5.8. Past performance in D6.8 will be requested only to the apparently successful applicant if requested by the Agreement Officer.

Q.21 On page 47 of the RFA, under section “D6.8 History of Performance, it states “The applicant must provide information regarding its recent history of performance for all its cooperative agreements involving similar or related programs, not to exceed five (5) years.”

a. Is this different from the requirement to submit similar information under “Annex C: Organizational Past Performance Reference Information”?

b. Is there a template or format that USAID prefers applicants use to present this information? If yes, can USAID please provide the template?

c. Do all members of the consortium need to provide the information detailed under “D6.8 History of Performance,” or just the prime applicant?

a - Yes; this requirement is different.

b - Annex 4 is the template provided by USAID in response to Past Performance Information required from all applicants in section D5.8.

c - Only the apparently successful applicant (ASA) may be requested to submit the PPI upon AO's request for section D6.8.

Q.22 Sections D5.7 and D5.8 on pages 41 and 42 include information on Past Performance requirements:

a. Would USAID please confirm that offerors should include 5 organizational past performance references as Annex C to technical applications?

b. Would USAID please confirm that organizational past performance references are only required for the applicant and not for all teaming partners?

c. Would USAID clarify that references for non-USAID funded programs are acceptable?

a. USAID confirms that all applicants should submit two (2) organizational past performance references as Annex C within the past five years;

b. USAID confirms that past performance is required from the applicant; Section E Merit Review Criteria #3 is hereby revised as follows: The extent to which the applicant and

its teaming partners, if any, demonstrate successful past performance in achieving results on similar programs. The Applicant's performance information will be evaluated in accordance with the elements cited in D5.7 and Annex C. For Annex C of the application, the template provided in Annex 4 of the NOFO will be updated in the next modification to address PPI of teaming partners.

c. USAID confirms that references from non-USAID funded programs are acceptable.

Q.23 Section D.5.5 on pages 40 and 41 states: "The proposed technical approach (including its monitoring, evaluation, and learning components) will demonstrate ... ability to effectively and efficiently adapt to fluctuations in available funding." Could USAID please clarify what is meant by "adapt to fluctuations in available funding" in the description of the Technical Approach?

Any award and subsequent incremental funding will be subject to the availability of funds and continued relevance to Agency programming.

Q.24 The RFA references "guiding principles" in multiple places (Section D5.5; Section D5.6.ii, and Section E.2.1) and requests that offerors demonstrate a clear understanding of the principles. However, no guiding principles for the program are articulated in the RFA. Could USAID please confirm that offerors may propose their own guiding principles for the technical approach?

The applicants may develop their own statement and approach in the application per section A.

Q.25 Section D6.2 (page 44) requires detailed budgets for each sub-recipient. However, fixed-amount awards (FAA), which are often used to reduce the risk of working with local and new and underutilized partners, are typically deliverables-based and would not have detailed budgets as described in the RFA (with costs broken out by deliverable rather than by budget category). Would USAID allow Offerors to present FAAs as single line items with additional justification and supporting detail included in the budget narrative?

The type of award is between the prime and its subs. The applicant must have a line for each subaward in the main budget, with separate budgets and narrative for each sub.

Q.26 On page 39, Section D.3, the RFA states: "Use... 12-point Times New Roman font" and "10-point font can be used for graphs and charts." Would USAID allow Applicants to use 10-point fonts other than Times New Roman for graphs and charts?

For graphs and charts, applicants may use other fonts than Times New Roman but at 10-point font size.

Q.27 On page 39, Section D.4, the RFA states: “Applications must be submitted by email to drgpsolicitations@usaid.gov.” Is there a MB limit on emails and/or limits on the number of attachments for application submission emails?

The email size is limited to 25MB per email. There is no limit on the number of necessary attachments for application.

Q.28 Section D.5.5 on page 41 states: “The proposed technical approach (including its monitoring, evaluation, and learning components) will demonstrate a clear understanding of the expected results and guiding principles of the program and a convincing approach to achieve them, including the ability to effectively and efficiently adapt to fluctuations in available funding. Feasibility, effectiveness, sustainability, and gender and social integration of the technical approach will all be taken into consideration” and is currently limited to 15 pages. Since Applicants must include a description of the offeror’s approach to monitoring, evaluation, and learning as part of the technical approach, and to allow ample space to comprehensively cover all required technical areas, would USAID consider raising the page limits for the technical approach section from 15 pages to 20 pages total?

Technical approach is revised from 15 pages to 18 pages.

Q.29 Section D.6 on page 42 includes: “The business (cost) application must illustrate the entire period of performance, using the budget format shown in the SF-424A.” Can USAID kindly confirm the budget should be formatted according to the SF 424A categories as the provided illustrative summary budget template has different categories.

USAID confirms that for the Business (cost) application, the Applicant should use the SF 424A form. The illustrative budget served as illustration.

Annex(es) – Template(s)

For Annex C of the application, the template provided in Annex 4 of the NOFO is revised as follows:

Past Performance Information

This appendix is included in order to evaluate PPI **for the last five years** as part of the Pre-Award Risk Assessment and is to be completed by the Applicant.

	Award Number:
	Contractor/Recipient (Name and Address):
	Type of Award:
	Complexity of Work: Difficult Routine
	Description, location, and relevancy of work:
	Dollar Value of Work: Status: Active or Completed

	Date of Award:
	Award Completion Date (including extensions):
	Type and Extent of Subawards/subcontractors: List each sub, amount awarded, type of award, work performed in the award, and a brief evaluation within the last five years.
	Name, Address, Telephone Number, and E-mail Address of the Awarding Contracting/Agreement Officer and/or the Contracting/Agreement Officer 's Representative (and other references as applicable):

Staffing Matrix Template

Please note that this is just illustrative, applicants may submit (a) more comprehensive matrix(matrixes).

Position	KP 1 or Staff position title	KP 2 or Staff position title
Name/contact	If any	If any
Education		
Work Experience		
Other		
...		

Other resources

These are provided as attachments.

- ADS303mbb – Process for Transition Awards
- Notice of Funding Opportunity – Transparency & Accountability in the Extractive Sector (TRACES)
- Public Finance Management Support Activity – Request for Task Order
- Proposals

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

[End of Amendment N°01 to NoFO 72068524RFA00008]