

Opportunity Statement #14: Tanzania Trade Facilitation Partnership Questions & Answers

1) Is this project going to focus on agricultural products only, or will it include other sectors such as manufacturing?

Improved trade facilitation can support trade in all goods, *including* agriculture and processed agricultural goods. The Government of Tanzania (GoT) wishes to smooth the exporter journey for “non-traditional agriculture” such as horticulture and agro-processed goods. This was mentioned during the pre-application conference call. However, the GoT and the Ministry of Industry and Trade, our principal counterpart agency for the trade facilitation project, also has broader policy-related objectives in mind. These policy objectives are aligned with the new national trade policy – e.g. improving policy coherence and the legal and regulatory framework and institutional coordination for trade competitiveness – and are not confined to trade in agriculture. Activity 1 of the trade facilitation project – strengthening inter-governmental coordination through the *National Committee for Trade Facilitation* and the *National Monitoring Committee for Non-Tariff Barriers* – does *not* take a sector- or industry-specific approach to reducing trade barriers. Nor does Activity 2: digitizing the regulatory approvals process for businesses. However, Activity 3 – improving conformity assessment procedures – does focus on agriculture. In short, the project will support the government’s objective to increase agricultural exports, but it does not *exclusively* focus on agriculture.

2) In assessing the capability of applicants at the concept stage, specifically on financial management, is there a specific indicative ceiling that will be used to assess the applications as part of their past experience in financial management?

At the concept note stage, the primary focus is on the technical aspects. Applicants are required to provide a high-level budget for their proposed concept, with the understanding that MCC’s total budget for this partnership is \$16 million (please note this does not mean applicants need to propose a total budget of this amount; budgets will depend on the scope of each proposal, with \$16 million serving as the maximum for MCC’s overall contribution). Within their concept paper, applicants should provide a high-level, lump-sum estimate that reflects the anticipated implementation costs of their proposed concept.

Later, in Stage 3 (Complete Application), MCC will conduct a detailed review of the applicant’s comprehensive budget, which will include line-item breakdowns. At that stage, we will also assess applicants’ experience managing programs of similar size and scope, including whether they have worked with the U.S. government before (though prior U.S. government experience is *not* a requirement). MCC needs to ensure that applicants have the organizational capacity to manage the program and the funding effectively; and based on the results of this due diligence process, special conditions may be built into the agreement to ensure its proper management.

That said, we do ask for past performance information in the concept paper to assess the relevance of the applicant’s experience, and as part of the past performance template we ask for the value of past projects to assess how similar it was to the project at hand. See Section D.3 of the NOFO for concept paper formatting and content guidance.

3) Does MCC encourage consortiums or partnerships among implementers, or is a single entity applicant preferable?

MCC plans to make a single award to a single prime or lead implementer. However, the lead implementer may apply as part of a consortium that includes sub-awardees to implement specific components of the project. MCC is open to supporting either a single entity with the capacity to implement a strong concept independently or a consortium that brings complementary capabilities to achieve collective goals effectively.

4) Can you provide further details on leverage and unpack what you mean by “in kind leverage”?

Cost share and leverage are distinct concepts. Cost share refers to a formal requirement for the partner to contribute to the program’s implementation costs, either through in-kind services or other means. It is a formal, auditable commitment included in the program’s budget, with the partner held accountable for providing this contribution by the program’s conclusion.

Leverage, on the other hand, is more flexible and does not become part of the official program budget. It represents a commitment by the partner to allocate resources that enhance the project’s impact or sustainability. For example, a partner might identify an existing project they’re working on with respect to trade within Tanzania that overlaps with the objectives of the MCC Tanzania Trade Facilitation project. By aligning their *other* project with the MCC initiative, both efforts may achieve greater results and sustainability. While leverage is not auditable, MCC expects such commitments to be made in good faith. For more details on leverage, refer to Section C.3. of the NOFO.

5) The NOFO references analysis related to trade barriers that have been conducted by the government and MCC. Can you share any updated documents?

The Tanzania Constraints Analysis is enclosed with this amendment package on grants.gov. The Constraints Analysis includes an extensive bibliography and references to other studies used by MCC, which may be valuable for applicants. The Constraints Analysis can also be found online here: <https://www.mcc.gov/resources/doc/constraints-analysis-tanzania-2024/>.

The root cause analysis report is an internal MCC planning document, but this is the problem tree which encapsulates the root cause analysis:

