REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Date: December 16, 2023
Subject: Request for Proposal (RFP) for a Baseline Evaluation of McGovern-Dole (McGovern-Dole) International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Project in Mauritania
Q&A: January 6th, 2023 5 P.M. EST

RFP Number: FS – MR – 1113 - 00001
Offer Deadline: January 30, 2023 5 p.m. EST
Submission: procurement.mauritania@counterpart.org

Counterpart International (hereinafter Counterpart) is soliciting proposals for the Baseline Evaluation for the McGovern-Dole Food for Education project FFE-682-2022-014-00, entitled Bridging the Future as described in this Request for Proposals (RFP). The project is funded by the United States Department of Agriculture (hereinafter USDA).

Firms invited by Counterpart (hereinafter “bidders or Offerors”) to submit offers (hereinafter “bids” or “offers”) for the services described in the attached supply schedules are under no obligation to do so. The Bidder shall bear all costs associated with the preparation and submission of the Proposal.

This Request for Proposal includes the following sections:

I. Instructions to Bidders
II. Technical Specifications

All correspondence and/or inquiries regarding this RFP should be requested in accordance with the enclosed Instructions to Bidders (Section I, Clause 10, Clarifications).

The Instructions to Bidders (henceforth ITB) shall not form part of the bid. They are intended to aid bidders in the preparation of bids. For the purposes of interpretation of these ITB, unless otherwise stated, the number of days stated herein shall be consecutive calendar days.

Submission of bids should be completed in accordance with the enclosed instructions to Bidders (Section I, clause 11, Submission of Bids).
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SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

1. Introduction

RFP No. FS – MR – 1113 - 00001, dated, December 16, 2022: Counterpart is hereby soliciting bids from Mauritania based evaluators for the baseline evaluation of the Bridging the Future project in Mauritania described in Section II of the ITB.

2. Eligible Source Countries for Goods and Services

A bidder will be considered ineligible if it has been suspended, debarred, or ineligible, as indicated on (1) the “List of Parties Excluded from Federal Non-procurement Programs” and/or (2) the “Consolidated Lists of Designated Nationals”.

3. Preparation of Bids

3.1 Bidders are expected to examine the specifications and all instructions contained in this RFP. Failure to do so shall be at the Bidder's risk.

3.2 The Bid prepared by the Bidder and all correspondence related to the Bid and exchanged by the Bidder and Counterpart shall be in English.

4. Bid Content

Submitted bids are required to consist of the following documents:

Technical Proposal
The applicant shall submit a full technical proposal to Counterpart via an electronic submission with the following documents:

The applicant shall submit a full technical proposal to Counterpart via an electronic submission with the following documents:

1) CVs of Proposed Professional Staff
1.1 Lead evaluator qualifications
   a. Resume/CV of the lead evaluator of the firm that demonstrates at least 5-7 years of solid experience in evaluating USG-funded program/project (preferably USDA-funded projects), especially in Sub-Saharan Africa. Prior experience working in Mauritania is a plus.
   b. The lead evaluator should have a master’s degree (PhD preferred) in social science (Education, Anthropology, Economics, Sociology), and excellent knowledge and experience in education program evaluation including school feeding programs.
   c. The lead evaluator of the firm should demonstrate expertise and experience in the techniques, approaches and methodology related to the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data: sampling techniques, focus groups, surveys, semi-structured interviews, crossing data, and content analysis. S/he shall also have professional experience in conducting sociological surveys in the field of international development, preferably in education, health, poverty, literacy and/or school feeding projects.
d. The lead evaluator should have excellent knowledge and experience in education program evaluation including administrating Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) methodologies.

1.2 CV of Associate Consultant:
   a. Resume/CV of the associate evaluator that demonstrates at least 5 years of solid experience MS in statistics, international development or any related background.
   b. Experience and knowledge in the use of electronic data collection tools in evaluations.
   c. Background in statistics and evaluation methods that use counterfactual and experimental/quasi-experimental approach with cohort analysis experience.
   d. Experience in data processing, analysis and reporting.
   e. Ability to hire experienced enumerators that are proficient in French and Arabic. Fluency in French is required. If the proposal is submitted by a consortium of partners, qualifications of each proposed partner should be presented.

2. Proposed methodology and structure of the evaluation, which will include:
   - Proposed sampling methodology
   - Proposed evaluation design with a detailed description of tools to be used
   - Team composition and structure
   - Quality control method and tools

3. Workplan, which will include: Detailed timeline of activities – in days is required for each stage of the baseline evaluation. It is important to note that the baseline survey will not exceed three months from contract signature to submission of final report to USDA.

4. References: The applicant is required to submit three references with email and telephone contact information related to past experiences of evaluation research.

5. Format and Signing of Bid
   The Bidder shall prepare one bid in two parts (technical and price quote) with all the required sections of the proposal and shall be signed by a person duly authorized to bind the Bidder.

6. Price Quote
   6.1 Bidders shall prepare a price quote in a workable Microsoft Excel document specifying the detailed cost breakdown and the total price of the services being offered in response to this RFP. The Bid shall clearly indicate that the prices shall be for the services whose technical specifications are described in Section II – Technical Specifications.

   6.2 The Bidder shall indicate the unit price in USD for each service, the description, the quantity, and the total cost in USD of the Bid. It shall be assumed that the Bidder is not bidding on any item for which a unit price or total amount is not indicated.

   6.3 The contract will be at a firm fixed price and all costs associated with logistics such as transportation should be included in the evaluator’s budget.

7. Statement of Qualifications
The Bidder shall include three references for successful prior projects of a similar nature. These references should include contact names, e-mail addresses, and telephone numbers of people who can be contacted regarding the Bidder's prior performance.

8. **Bid Validity Period**

Bids shall remain valid 90 days after the offer deadline.

9. **Deadline and Late Bids**

9.1 It is the Bidder’s sole responsibility to ensure that bids are received by Counterpart electronically on or before the Offer Deadline of **January 30, 2023 5 p.m. EST**.

9.2 A Bid received after the deadline for submission of bids shall be rejected. Bidders will be held responsible for ensuring that their bids are received in accordance with the instructions stated herein and a late bid will not be considered even though it became late as a result of circumstances beyond the Bidder's control. A late bid will be considered only at the sole discretion of Counterpart.

10. **Clarification of Bidding Documents**

Clarifications may be requested in writing no later than five (5) business days prior to the Offer Deadline. The contact for requesting clarifications is: **procurement.mauritania@counterpart.org**

11. **Submission of Bids**

11.1 Only electronic submissions will be accepted, please email **procurement.mauritania@counterpart.org** and include in the subject line "Baseline Evaluation of Bridging the Future".

All questions relating to this call for tenders must be submitted by **5:00 pm EST on January 6, 2023**. Questions will be answered within five (5) business days by email. Questions and answers will be published publicly. Questions may be submitted, in writing, to **procurement.mauritania@counterpart.org**

11.2 Ensuring successful transmission and receipt of the bids is the responsibility of the Bidder. It is recommended that no e-mail exceeds the size of 10 MB, inclusive of attachments.

12. **Amendment of Bidding Documents**

Counterpart may at its discretion, for any reason, whether at its own initiative or in response to a clarification by a Bidder, modify bidding documents by amendment. All prospective Bidders that have received bidding documents will be notified of the amendment by e-mail and such amendments will be binding on them.

13. **Modification of Bids**

Any Bidder has the right to withdraw, modify, or correct its bid after it has been delivered to Counterpart, provided the request for such a withdrawal, modification, or correction is received by Counterpart at the email address given above before the deadline. Counterpart may ask any Bidder for a clarification of its bid; nevertheless, no Bidder will be permitted to alter its Bid Price or make any
other material modification after the deadline unless the RFP has been amended or the deadline extended.

14. **Criteria for Award and Evaluation**
Subject to Clause 15, Counterpart will award the **evaluation** to that Bidder whose proposal is deemed acceptable, and which offers the best value based upon the evaluation criteria in Section II – Technical Specifications – Evaluation Criteria. For a bid to be deemed acceptable, it must comply with all the terms and conditions of the RFP without material modification. In addition, the successful bidder must be determined to be responsible. A responsible bidder is one who has the technical expertise, management capability, workload capacity, and financial resources to perform the work. Counterpart may, at its option, reject all bids.

15. **Counterpart’s Right to Accept Any Bid and to Reject Any or All Bids**
Counterpart will reject any bid that is nonresponsive. Further, Counterpart reserves the right to reject the bid of any bidder if, in Counterpart’s judgment, the bidder is not fully qualified to provide the services, or to reject all bids.

16. **Notification of Award**

16.1 Before the expiration of the period of bid validity, Counterpart will notify the successful Bidder in writing that its bid has been accepted.

16.2 Upon the successful Bidder acknowledging receipt of the Notification of Award, Counterpart will promptly notify the unsuccessful Bidders that their bids were rejected. If after notification of award, a Bidder wishes to ascertain the grounds on which its bid was not selected, it should address its request to Counterpart in writing.

17. **Acceptance of Privacy Policy and Terms and Conditions.**

By Submitting quotation/proposal to Counterpart International, the company or the individual consents to Counterpart’s privacy policy terms and conditions ([https://www.counterpart.org/terms-and-conditions/](https://www.counterpart.org/terms-and-conditions/)), and provides Counterpart International permission to process the company’s or individual’s personal data specifically for the performance of, and purposes identified in, this solicitation document and in compliance with Counterpart’s legal obligations under applicable United States and European Union laws, data protection and regulations and any other applicable legal requirements. The company/Individual may withdraw their consent at any time by contacting privacy@counterpart.org. If consent is withdrawn, Counterpart reserves the right to accept or reject the offer.
SECTION II – TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

1. General Background

Counterpart has been awarded USDA funding for the Bridging the Future project in the Tagant, Brakna, and Gorgol regions of Mauritania. This five-year program (2022 – 2027) will assist the Government of Mauritania (GOM) to improve food security, reduce the incidence of hunger, and improve literacy and primary education to contribute to more self-reliant and productive communities. Counterpart is launching a call for proposals for the recruitment of a firm that will conduct the baseline evaluation before the start of project implementation. The results of the baseline will be used to revise the annual targets of the project's performance indicators and will serve as a benchmark to measure performance on a semi-annual basis, at the baseline, mid-term, and final evaluation. The results of the baseline will also be used by the project management to re-examine the theory of change, refine the project design with input from the technical project management, and answer the learning agenda questions.

2. Program Overview

On September 16, 2022, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) - Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) awarded Counterpart International (Counterpart), a cooperative agreement (# FFE-682-2022/014-00) to implement a McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition (McGovern-Dole) project in Mauritania. The goal of this project, known as “Bridging the Future”, is to improve food security, reduce the incidence of hunger, and improve literacy and primary education and thereby contribute to more self-reliant, productive communities in Mauritania. Throughout the next five years (2022-2027), Counterpart will implement the school feeding project by relying on the donated commodities and funds provided by FAS.

The key objectives of the project are as follows:

- Improve student attendance rates by providing nutritious daily school meals.
- Improve health and dietary practices by providing access to deworming medications and increasing knowledge of nutrition, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), safe food preparation and storage practices.
- Improve school infrastructure and increase access to clean water and sanitation by building storerooms, latrines, and water station systems.
- Improve the literacy of school age children through promotion of bilingual instructional methods and tailored capacity building at the national, regional, and school levels; and
- Increase the capacity of and incentivize local community members and groups including School Management Committees (SMCs) or Comité de Gestion Scolaire (COGES) and Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) or Association des parents d'élèves (APE) to engage in sustainability-focused activities to improve the quality and self-sufficiency of primary schools, and to lead and maintain school feeding programs.

The project will be implemented by Counterpart with Ecole du Développement (EcoDev and regional partner Associates in Research and Education for Development (ARED) as technical advisors and the Government of Mauritania (GOM) through the Ministry of Education (MOE) and the Ministry of
Health (MOH) as a strategic partner. The project will be implemented in the regions of Brakna, Gorgol, and Tagant.

Bridging the Future aims to serve over 115,563 direct beneficiaries, specifically:

- 111,071 students in the 320 primary schools
- 527 teachers
- 181 administrators
- 12 government officials
- 3,772 Parent Teacher Association participants, School Management Committee members, pregnant mothers, lactating mothers, cooks and Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) producers trained

The project main activities are:

- **Training: Management & Supervision for Inspectors and Directors**: The project will deliver training on leadership and management techniques to include more supportive supervision; and develop classroom management guidance for teachers and improve teaching conditions by conducting frequent and random inspection visits at schools to inspectors and school directors.
- **Promote Teacher Attendance & Recognition**: The project will enhance teacher attendance by rewarding teacher with high attendance rate and increase awareness on the importance of teacher’s attendance and create a culture of respect and initiative for the responsibilities of teaching.
- **Training: Teacher Professional Development**: The project will strengthen teachers’ capacity to utilize bilingual teaching methodologies and improve understanding and implementation of evidence-based reading instruction (EBRI) through five holistic teacher professional development interventions.
- **Extra-Curricular Activities**: The project will establish Girls’ Clubs for Grades 4 and 5 in project schools and hygiene kits to participating girls.
Professional Development for Data Management, Analysis & Decision Making: The project will train a corps of government officials in the Education Statistics and Analysis Division to analyze learning data and incorporate data points into their system for documentation to address the lack of data on student performance evaluation at the national level.

Provide School Meals and Take-Home Rations: The project will provide nutritious breakfasts and lunches as well as take home rations (THR) for cooks and Pregnant and lactating women (PLW).

National Attendance Database and Operating Procedure: The project will work with the GoM Division of Planning and Coordination to develop a prototype student attendance registry system and the accompanying operating procedures.

Training: SMC/COGES, PTAs/APES, Civil Society Groups: The project will strengthen school management committees (SMC/COGES) and parent teacher associations (PTA/APES) to improve the student’s experience.

Advocacy and Awareness Raising: The project will collaborate with MoE’s Direction de l'Animation Socio-Educative to raise awareness on the benefits of children staying at school beyond Grade 5. The project will also facilitate MoE officials’ participation at key international conferences including the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) conference and Global Child Nutrition Foundation (GCNF) conference.

Training: Good Health, Hygiene, and Nutrition Practices: The project will conduct social, and behavior change communications (SBCC) interventions to improve nutrition, health, and hygiene practices of mothers and their children under five as well as PLW and provide the THR in Maternal and Child Nutrition (MCN) activities and host Health/Nutrition/WASH themed fairs.

Training: School Food Management Systems: The project will establish training capacity within the Division of School Nutrition and Health (DNES) unit to conduct training at the departmental level.

Building/Rehabilitation: Pipeline Extensions and Water Storage Systems and Cook Stations, Cafeteria, Food Storage Units: The project will install or rehabilitate water systems facilities to increase access to clean water, construct or rehabilitate sanitation systems, including handwashing stations with faucets and basins or latrines, install a cook station and provide energy-efficient stoves, and construct eating areas.

Campaigns – Distribution of deworming medication, vitamins, and minerals: The project will reduce schistosomiasis and other parasitic infections by conducting deworming campaigns in all schools.

Building Capacity: Local and Regional Procurement: The project will purchase locally and regionally sourced commodities to school meals in addition to import commodity while strengthening local and regional supply chains and market systems and enhance the GoM’s capacity in LRP management.

This project will be implemented in parallel with the McGovern-Dole FFE-682-2019/003-00 known as The Future is Ours (TFIO) which is implemented in 209 primary schools in the regions of Brakna and Gorgol. The Future is Ours was signed on September 23, 2019 and will be implemented through September 30, 2024. The Bridging the Future project will be implemented in 111 primary schools in Tagant (86) and Brakna and Gorgol (25) from 2022 to 2024; starting in project year 3, Bridging the Future will absorb the 209 schools from the Future is Ours project, totaling 320 target primary schools over the life of project.
### Table 1: Activity & MEAL Rollout, According to Prior (The Future is Ours, FY19 Award FFE-682-2019/003-00) & New (Bridging the Future, FY22 Award FFE-682-2022-014-00) Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target schools</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Y1 (2022-2023)</th>
<th>Y2 (2023-2024)</th>
<th>Y3 (2024-2025)</th>
<th>Y4 (2025-2026)</th>
<th>Y5 (2026-2027)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Future is Ours (Prior Intervention)</td>
<td>School Feeding (SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in=209 TPIO schools) Brakna &amp; Gorgol (n=209 TPIO schools)</td>
<td>MTL ongoing</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAL</td>
<td>Endline evaluation of TPIO serves as baseline for legacy schools</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Endline, Monitoring &amp; Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging the Future (New Intervention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=155 new treatment schools) Tagant, Brakna, Gorgol regions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF (School Feeding)</td>
<td>Start-up</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrH (TrH: cooks, LRP, WASH/nutrition, literacy (ES3-10y))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging the Future (New Intervention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=111 new treatment schools) Tagant (n=111 new treatment schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF (School Feeding)</td>
<td>Start-up</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrH (TrH: cooks, LRP, WASH/nutrition, literacy (ES3-10y))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Objectives**

The results of the independently contracted baseline evaluation will be used to establish certain baseline targets, to revise the annual targets of the project's performance indicators and will serve as a benchmark to measure performance every six months of the fiscal year and at the mid-term and final evaluations.

**a. Objectives of the Assignment**

To carry out the baseline study, the Evaluator must perform the following tasks.

1. Establish values for indicators with non-zero baseline values against which to measure future progress against expected results.
2. Establish questions to test the project Theory of Change.
3. Collect data which will be used to answer the research questions.
4. Produce a reference report containing a) descriptive statistics of the reference values, including, where appropriate, disaggregated by sex, department, year, and preschool vs primary school. In addition to descriptive statistics, the report will include recommendations on methodology for the implementation of subsequent evaluations.
4. **Research Questions**
The evaluation will be based on the five standard evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The main evaluation questions are as follows:

1. Student reading proficiency, behaviors, attitudes and background (EGRA)
2. What are linguistic, home and socio-economic factors associated with reading performance?
3. What is teachers’ classroom performances and instructional competencies in Reading? (Observation)
4. What is the relationship between teacher performance in reading instruction and student learning outcomes?
5. What is school director and deputy director performance, behaviors, attitudes and background?
6. What is community support for school; engagement with children and reading activities?
7. What is the school involvement in extra-curricular and student support activities; interaction with parents and community?
8. What is the prevalence of students with disabilities (i.e, hearing, visual, etc.)? How can MOE better plan for how to best meet the needs of vulnerable students?
9. What are the influencing factors in project schools from non-USDA funded activities and their impact?
10. What are mitigating factors to uptake of project activities?
11. What are baseline levels for indicators?

**MGD and LRP Outcome Indicators that Require Baseline Values:**

*Please refer to the attached PMP and Evaluation Plan for the anticipated outcome indicators.*

5. **Methodology**
The firm will use a combination of document analysis, stakeholder mapping and stakeholder consultations to create a situational overview of the current public environment, discourse and stakeholder interaction in relation to the program objectives. Primary data collection tools and sampling plan will be developed by the consultant in close collaboration with the Bridging the Future team. A shared understanding of key concepts and how to best measure them is key for a valid baseline measurement. Furthermore, quantitative tool(s) should be developed that allow for accurate measurement of the relevant indicators and concepts. The focus of quantitative data collection should be on the ultimate target group.

For a more in-depth understanding and analysis of quantitative findings, it is advised to combine the quantitative data collection with more qualitative data from the primary target groups as well as other relevant stakeholders. Especially concerning subjects that are sensitive and difficult to measure through quantitative techniques, such as barriers to attending schools for girls, a well-described and culturally sensitive methodology is requested. Tools should be piloted prior to full scale data collection to resolve any issues with formulation, length, or data entry.
a. **Design approach and sampling**

Counterpart will contract an Independent Evaluator (IE) to conduct the baseline prior to the start of interventions in the Tagant region. The baseline evaluation in Tagant will serve to (1) establish values for indicators with non-zero baseline values against which to measure future progress against expected results, (2) establish comparability of treatment and comparison schools in Tagant, and (3) establish questions to test the project theory of change (ToC). Findings from the baseline will build a solid foundation and will be used to revise yearly targets for the project’s performance indicators and will be used as a reference upon which to measure performance every six months of the fiscal year and in the midterm and final evaluations. The findings of the baseline will also be used by the project leadership to re-examine the ToC, refine the program design with input from the project’s senior technical management, and answer learning agenda questions.

b. **Document review**

Documents to be reviewed as part of the baseline study include the evaluation plan, the performance monitoring plan, the work plan, the proposal, USDA Monitoring and Evaluation policy as well as baseline studies and evaluations for other McGovern-Dole projects.

c. **Pilot survey**

The awardee is required to conduct a pilot survey to test all questionnaires. The pilot is especially important because questions phrasing will be used for the subsequent evaluations and must elicit accurate responses. Sufficient time must be allocated for updating all instruments based on pilot findings.

d. **Sampling**

The proposed sampling strategy should produce a minimal detectable effect size (MDES) for the results of the student survey of 0.2, which is consistent with best practices. The evaluator will randomly select McGovern-Dole schools from the 111 participating in the project. Within each sample school the evaluator will also survey teachers, including one head teacher, as well as one director and the observation tool will be used in McGovern-Dole schools. Parents’ perceptions of changes in their children related to McGovern-Dole can be best assessed through qualitative interviews or focus groups.

An illustrative sample for each survey is shown below and will be finalized in collaboration with USDA and Counterpart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table: Proposed baseline sample size for SSME and EGRA Stakeholder</strong></th>
<th><strong>McGovern-Dole (Treatment)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students grades 1-6 (x 9)</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGRA only students grades 1-3 (x 6)</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers including Head Teachers (x 3)</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors (x 1)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation tool</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Counterpart and the Ministry of Education team have agreed to the school selection criteria below.

i. School with six (completed cycles/full-scale) cycles/grades will be prioritized but the Ministry highlighted that it is difficult to find schools which meet this requirement especially in rural areas. Only 31 percent of primary schools in Mauritania are complete (full-scale) schools.
ii. Schools that in proximity of least 1 to 2 kilometers to local villages. This increases enrollment of students in that locality and is in line with the Mauritania Government policy.

iii. Engagement and active participation of the community toward the project.

iv. Schools shall be accessible anytime for commodity transportation.

v. Schools will have infrastructure such as storerooms, latrines, and water sources.

e. Reading Tools

The evaluations will use Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) methodologies. EGRA is another reading assessment tool that has been used with McGovern-Dole evaluations in other countries. A baseline EGRA, Snapshot of School Management and Effectiveness (SSME) survey, and a language mapping assessment will inform the design of materials, teacher training and community mobilization activities.

f. Data entry, cleaning and analysis

The local data collection firm is responsible for entering all data collected under this evaluation. This includes double-entry of all survey data. Survey data must be entered in Excel files. Supervisor(s) will conduct thorough data checks and submit to Counterpart a final, clean dataset. Data collection firm will also prepare and deliver a codebook to accompany the final dataset. Survey data analysis will be carried out using an appropriate statistical package such as R or Stata. Analysis will include means and means comparisons by gender, grade and department, along with tests of statistical significance.

**Firms with capacity to collect data using tablets or smart phones are encouraged to propose conducting electronic data entry using tools such as ODK, KoboToolbox, or others. While using electronic data collection, the firm must explain the methodology of programming/testing surveys, cleaning, and submitting electronic data.**

The evaluation firm will identify and recruit local enumerators for data collection who should have a bachelor’s degree and experience conducting applied research, surveys and evaluations. Given the nature of the research, Counterpart has a strong preference for both female and male enumerators. During the data collection training, supervisors can be identified.

The evaluation firm will be responsible for developing a Data Collection Manual for review by the Counterpart team prior to training. The firm will also be responsible for printing all data collection instruments for training, incorporating (and translating) any revisions to instruments following the training and pilots, and printing all instruments for data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Baseline, Midterm &amp; Endline Summary of Sample &amp; Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School sample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline: 111 schools (Census of new schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD #1 indicator reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Ethical considerations and Other Conditions.

Some ethical considerations should be taken into account during the survey:

- Research participants should not be subjected to harm in any way whatsoever.
- Respect for the dignity of research participants should be prioritized.
- Full consent should be obtained from the participants prior to the study.
- Individuals who do not have the legal capacity to provide consent (e.g., children or cognitively impaired adults) should not be interviewed in the survey or otherwise involved in the research without the consent of a parent or guardian.
- The protection of the privacy of research participants must be ensured.
- Adequate level of confidentiality of the research data should be ensured.
- Anonymity of individuals and organizations participating in the research must be ensured.
- Any deception or exaggeration about the aims and objectives of the research must be avoided.
- Affiliations in any form, sources of funding, as well as any possible conflicts of interests have to be declared.
- Any type of communication in relation to the data collection should be done with honesty and transparency.

To mitigate risks specific to COVID-19:
- Surgical masks will be worn by data collectors and respondents.
- Social distancing will be used during focus groups and interviews.
- Each person will be provided with antiseptic hand gel.

7. Staff Structure

A. Evaluation lead (Counterpart):
The evaluation team will comprise one international program evaluator (Team Leader), an Associate consultant, and two or more local or international consultants or members of a consulting firm selected for their technical expertise. To the extent possible, the evaluation team will be gender balanced. For full qualifications, see ITB, Section I, 4. Content of Bid, I. Qualifications.

The main tasks and responsibilities of the evaluation lead are to:
- Select the evaluator from the offers received in response to the RFP (a collaboration between the Mauritania team and HQ).
- Coordinate with all relevant stakeholders the implementation of the evaluation.
- Perform quality control throughout the evaluation process (provide feedback to the evaluation team, comment on drafts of the initial report, and preliminary and final evaluation reports, and approve the final report).
- Organize the meetings of the technical committee for monitoring the evaluation.
- Advise relevant stakeholders on evaluation issues.
- Organize a workshop for the presentation of the evaluation results.

B. Technical team (Counterpart):
The main tasks and responsibilities of the technical monitoring team are as follows:
- Oversee the evaluation process.
- Provide the consulting team with all available documentation on the project.
- Facilitate meetings between the evaluation team and various stakeholders.
- Review all draft deliverables and provide feedback to the evaluation team.
- Ensure that all feedback is incorporated in the final version of the evaluation report.
- Share the final evaluation report.

C. Evaluation team (External evaluator):
The evaluation will be carried out by a team of independent evaluators who will:
- Plan, organize, and execute the data collection.
- Be accountable for the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation.
• Report weekly by email to the Evaluation Manager (every Friday) on the progress of the evaluation process.
• Produce all deliverables on time and ensure high quality. Final report must be submitted in English and French.
• Lead evaluator must be fluent in French and have strong writing skills in English. The lead evaluator must be physically present in Mauritania during the evaluation until the post data collection debriefing.

8. Qualifications.

Bidders will be evaluated based on their ability to meet the below criteria and to respond to the methodology, core services, and specific tasks. See Section I, 16.2 for baseline criteria and priority rank.

Within the technical response, bidders should include information which will allow Counterpart to adequately assess the following qualifications:

• Evaluation Team Lead must have a masters or PhD degree in a social science discipline or related field
• Minimum 8 years experience designing and leading quantitative data collection and analysis in developing countries
• Experience designing and managing surveys
• Ability to research and write at a high level of technical mastery
• Ability to research and conduct interviews with key informants
• Skill with statistical software such as Stata or R.
• Experience working in Mauritania required
• French speaker required and strong writing skills in English

9. Monitoring and Reporting

The purpose of the evaluation: The purpose of the evaluation must be clearly defined, including why it is necessary, what information is needed, who needs it and how it will be used.

Results Framework: (refer to Annex - A)
Theory of Change: (refer to Annex - B)
Critical Assumptions: (refer to Annex - C)

Project Implementation Strategy: The project will be implemented by Counterpart with Ecole du Développement (EcoDev and regional partner Associates in Research and Education for Development (ARED) as technical advisors and the Government of Mauritania (GOM) through the Ministry of Education (MOE) and the Ministry of Health (MOH) as a strategic partner.

Locations: The project will be implemented in the regions of Brakna, Gorgol and Tagant.

Target Population: Bridging the Future aims to serve over 115,563 direct beneficiaries, specifically:

• 111,071 students in the 320 primary schools
• 527 teachers
• 181 administrators
• 12 government officials
3,772 Parent Teacher Association participants, School Management Committee members, pregnant mothers, lactating mothers, cooks and Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) producers trained.

Accountability to affected populations is tied to Counterpart’s commitments to include beneficiaries as key stakeholders in Counterpart's work. As such, Counterpart is committed to ensuring Gender Equality in the evaluation process, with participation and consultation in the evaluation by women, men, boys and girls from different groups.

Stakeholder Roles: Several stakeholders, both inside and outside of Counterpart have interests in the results of the baseline evaluation. Some of these actors will be asked to play a role in the process. The firm will use a combination of stakeholder mapping and consultations to create a situational overview of the current public environment, discourse and stakeholder interaction in relation to the program objectives.

Phase (new/continuing): (Refer to Program Overview section)

Project Budget: Activities related to (1) M&E Design and Monitoring (start-up workshop, quarterly/annual partners meetings and visits, adaptive management activities) and (2) Learning (program orientation events, learning events and dissemination, learning agenda events) have been allocated to specific activities costs.

Timeline:

**Assignment Duration and Deliverables**
The total estimated duration of the consultation is approximately five months. The table below presents the main deliverables of the evaluation process with the corresponding deadlines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A – Questions due to Counterpart</td>
<td>January 6, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline of bids submission</td>
<td>January 30, 2023 5 p.m. EST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Selection of firm</td>
<td>February 10, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing of contract</td>
<td>February 17, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Draft Baseline Evaluation Workplan to Counterpart:</td>
<td>March 3, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Literature review, evaluation design including data collection and analysis methodology; draft sampling strategy, and intended respondents /key informants; quality assurance plan; draft evaluation schedule; and draft data collection tools)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Baseline Evaluation Workplan, data collection tools, and evaluation schedule</td>
<td>March 24, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work: testing of the data collection tools and calibrate, travel and/or remote interviews, and training of data collectors*</td>
<td>March 24, 2023 - April 22, 2023 (flexibility required due to Ramadan holiday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work: data collection (in field or remote) and analyses*</td>
<td>April 23, 2023- May 12, 2023 (flexibility required due to Ramadan Holiday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing on preliminary findings at Counterpart Field Office and/or Counterpart HQ</td>
<td>May 26, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of first draft report</td>
<td>June 16, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and comment of first draft (and subsequent drafts as necessary) by Counterpart International</td>
<td>June 29, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final report, datasets and tools to USDA by Counterpart</td>
<td>June 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Field work must take place on or around the suggested dates. Data collection at schools (not Nouakchott) will most likely need to be conducted after the month of Ramadan because of early closures and cultural sensitivities (Ramadan is anticipated to occur March 22, 2023- April 22, 2023).

**Evaluation questions and criteria:** The evaluation report should specify the evaluation questions as well as the evaluation criteria.

**Methodology:** The report should contain a clear description of the methodology and the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation. It will detail what data will be collected, how it will be collected and by whom, as well as the possible limitations of the evaluation, etc.

**Evaluation results:** The results will be objectively presented with data and evidence. The limitations/gaps in the data as well as the unanticipated results will be also presented and discussed. The reasons for non-realization of certain activities must be identified as much as possible. Finally, the results must be presented with clarity, logic, and consistency.

**Conclusions:** should address evaluation objectives and key issues, be evidence-based, and logically linked to the evaluation findings. It will provide an overview of the issues and successes.

**Lessons learned:** are contributions to general knowledge. They must be well supported by the results and conclusions presented.

**Recommendations:** The report will provide recommendations, including consultation with stakeholders, and should identify the target group for each recommendation.

**Appendices:** should contain the table of indicators with a comparison with baseline and midterm evaluation values and project targets, list of interviewees and sites visited, with additional information on methodology, data collection tools, etc.

### 10. Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluator will be responsible for all the deliverables listed in the TOR and will be free to draw its own conclusions free from political or organizational pressure. The evaluator will coordinate with Counterpart staff including Associate Director, Program Officer, MEL Manager and Counterpart Mauritania Chief of Party with regards to the overall scope, direction, and completion of this assignment. USDA will provide guidance as needed along with feedback on the initial draft, to be included in the final report. USDA will also be consulted as a key informant prior to evaluation fieldwork.

Counterpart staff will provide all relevant reports, data and related information necessary to prepare the evaluator for the assignment. And as needed, Counterpart staff will facilitate field logistics, including potential meetings with all relevant stakeholders during the field visit in Mauritania. The HQ point of contact will be the Associate Director while the in-country point of contact will be the Chief of Party. Counterpart HQ Associate Director is responsible for approving evaluation deliverables.

### 11. Evaluation Criteria

Bidders should include information which will allow Counterpart to adequately assess the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Number of Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation team previous experience in conducting evaluations and feedback from references</td>
<td>30 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed overall methodology including sampling method</td>
<td>28 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of data collection and entry procedures</td>
<td>12 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule for delivery of evaluation deliverables</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality control methods</td>
<td>12 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>12 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When drafting the proposal, the evaluation team must ensure that all the information requested above is included. Failure to submit a complete application will result in the rejection of the proposal. In the final selection process Counterpart International requires a final screening call with the top selected candidate prior to moving forward into the contracting phase.

12. **Baseline Report**

The following table outlines requirements for the Final Baseline Report:

| Report Length | Maximum of 40 pages, excluding the Table of Contents, Acronym List, and Annexes and should be written in English; Times New Roman font size 12. |
| Illuistrative Report Outline | Acknowledgement |
| | Table of Contents |
| | Table of Exhibits |
| | Acronym List |
| | Executive Summary (in English and French) |
| | Chapter 1. Evaluation Purpose and Research Questions |
| | Chapter 2. Project Background |
| | Chapter 3. Evaluation Method |
| | 3.1 Methodologies |
| | 3.2 Sampling Framework |
| | 3.3 Data Sources and Data Collection Methods |
| | 3.4 Field Work |
| | 3.5 Analysis Plan |
| | 3.6 Strengths and Limitations |
| | Chapter 4. Findings |
| | Chapter 5. Conclusion and Recommendations |
| | 1.1 Summary of Key Findings |
| | 1.2 Lessons Learned |
| | 1.3 Recommendations |
| | References |
| | Annexes |
| Executive Summary | Include an Executive Summary that provides a brief description of the evaluation purpose, target audience, anticipated use of evaluation results, results framework, theory of change, critical assumptions, project implementation strategy, locations, target populations, stakeholder roles, timeline, phase (new/continuation) project budget project background, evaluation questions, methods, findings, and conclusions. |
### Questions
Address all evaluation questions in the Terms of Reference which should also take into account unintended consequences.

### Methods
- Explain evaluation methodology in detail.
- Disclose evaluation limitations (e.g. selection bias, recall bias, etc.).

NOTE: A summary of methodology can be included in the body of the report, with the full description provided as an annex.

### Findings
- Tables with baseline results, disaggregated by gender, department, and grade.
- Brief description of each table, including any context or explanation needed to help the reader in interpreting and understanding.
- Detailed description of findings for methodological research questions and key indicators as described in the Terms of Reference.

### Recommendations
- Support recommendations with specific findings.
- Provide recommendations that are action-oriented, practical, and specific.

### Annexes
Include the following as annexes, at a minimum:
- Terms of Reference
- All evaluation tools (questionnaires, checklists, discussion guides, surveys, etc.).
- A list of sources of information (key informants, documents reviewed, other data sources)

Only if applicable, include as an annex Statement(s) of Differences regarding any significant unresolved differences of opinion on the part of funders, implementers, and/or members of the evaluation.

All deliverables must be approved by Counterpart.

### 13. Method of payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Payment %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report Validation</td>
<td>20 % of the total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Data Collection and Field Work with Debriefing</td>
<td>20 % of the total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Draft Evaluation Report Submission with all Data</td>
<td>25% of the total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Final Report by USDA</td>
<td>35 % of the total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14. Accompanying Technical Attachment Documents

Attachment A – Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan
Attachment B – Performance Monitoring Plan
Attachment C – Performance Indicators
Attachment D – Results Framework
1. **Annexes**
   
   **A. Results Framework**

**Figure 1: Results Framework (RF) #1 Improved Literacy of School Age Children**

- **Key**
  - MoE = MoE
  - MoE = MoE
  - TAG = UNICEF
  - WB = World Bank
  - Communities

- **Improved Literacy of School Age Children (MDG 1.1)**
  - Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction (MDG 1.1.2)
  - Improved Attendance (MDG 1.2)
  - Improved Student Attendance (MDG 1.3)

- **In partnership with MoE**

- **Activities**
  - Activity 2: Promote Teacher Attendance & Recognition
  - Activity 3: Training, Teacher Professional Development
  - Activity 4: Girls' Clubs & Multimedia Programs
  - Activity 5: Training, Teacher Professional Development
  - Activity 6: Training, Management & Supervision for Inspectors & Directors
  - Activity 7: Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)
  - Activity 8: Increased Use of Health, Nutrition, and Dietary Practices (See RF 7)
  - Activity 9: Advocacy & Awareness Raising
  - Activity 11: Increased Governmental Support (MDG 1.4.1)
  - Activity 12: Training, School Food Management Systems, Food Preparation of Hygienically Compliant Commodities
  - Activity 13: Advocacy & Awareness Raising

- **Increased Capacity of Government Institutions (MDG 1.4.1)**
- **Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework (MDG 1.4.2)**
- **Increased Governmental Support (MDG 1.4.3)**

- **Activity 5:** Professional Development for Data Management, Analysis, and Decision Making
- **Activity 6:** School Feeding, student meals planning, preparation, and distribution, including TDR for Costs
- **Activity 7:** National Attendance Database & Operating Procedures
- **Activity 8:** Training, 522C/COGES, PTAs/APEs, Civil Society Groups
- **Activity 9:** Advocacy & Awareness Raising
- **Activity 10:** See activities under MDG results 2.4 & 2.6

Figure 2: RF #2 Increased Use of Health, Nutrition, and Dietary Practices

- Activity 10: Training: Good Health, Hygiene and Nutrition Practices
- Activity 13: Training: School Food Management Systems, Safe Preparation of Hygienically Compliant Commodities
- Activity 14: Building: Rehabilitation: Pipeline, treatment & water storage systems
- Activity 11: Campaigns: Distribution of deworming medication, vitamins & minerals
- Activity 12: Distribution of THR to PLW during MCN events

- Improved Knowledge of Health and Hygiene Practices (MGD 2.1)
- Increased Knowledge of Safe Food Prep and Storage Practices (MGD 3.2)
- Increased Knowledge of Nutrition (MGD 3.3)
- Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services (MGD 7.4)
- Increased Access to Preventive Health Interventions (MGD 3.7)
- Increased Access to Essential Food (MGD 3.6)

- Increased Capacity of Government Institutions (MGD 1.4.1)
- Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework (MGD 1.4.2)
- Increased Government Support (MGD 1.4.3)
- Increased Engagement of Local Organizations & Community Groups (MGD 1.4.4)
Figure 3: LRP RF Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local & Regional Procurement

Key:
- Taarouq, Commissariat de Sécurité Alimentaire, Division of School Nutrition and Health, Regional Direction of National Education

Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement (LRP 501)

- Improved Cost-Effectiveness of Food Assistance (LRP 1.1)
- Improved Utilization of Nutritious and Culturally Acceptable Food that Meet Quality Standards (LRP 1.3)

Increased Leverage of Private-Sector Resources (LRP 3.4.4)

Activity 12:
Training School Food Management Systems, Food Preparation of Hygienically Compliant Commodities

Activity 16:
Capacity Building for LRP food supply chain management, including tendering, procurement, and safe storage of hygienically compliant local commodities

Activity 17:
Local & Regional procurement of food baskets

Activity 6:
School Feeding, student meals planning, preparation, and distribution, including THS for Cooks

Activity 18:
Liason building for public-private partnerships for school food procurement
B. Theory of Change

PROJECT THEORY OF CHANGE NARRATIVE

I. Cause-and-Effect Linkages

Counterpart’s Results Framework (Figures 1, 2, and 3 above) depict the causal linkages between each activity, intermediate results, and strategic outcomes (SOs) of the project. Our program design is multi-layered to encompass USDA’s three strategic objectives: MGD SO1 – Improved Literacy of School-Age Children, MGD SO2 – Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices, and LRP SO1 – Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement. Bridging the Future’s theory of change (TOC) posits:

If children are provided with an enabling environment that sustainably maximizes learning outcomes, including skilled teachers and pupil support via extracurricular activities;

If children benefit from daily nutritious school meals, using effective procurement systems;

If schools are provided with targeted and needs-based infrastructure improvements;

If children and families use improved health, nutrition, and hygiene practices;

If parents are engaged in their children’s school and education,

If government makes demonstrable progress to institutionalize interventions,

Then, literacy outcomes will improve for children today and in the future.

Our TOC is built upon

- Kremer, Brannen, and Glennerster’s (2013) systematic review cites several effective practices to improving learning outcomes divided into the broad categories of increasing access to education – including preventative health and nutrition measures – and improving quality of education – including improved teacher training and pedagogical coaching.¹

- Evidence that school feeding programs correlate to positive impacts on school participation, as measured through student attendance and enrollment.²

- Ganimiam and Murmane’s (2016) study, which found that community engagement through coaching parents about benefits of schooling, informing parents of factors of high-quality schooling, and guiding parents in using developmentally appropriate parenting practices increase student achievement.³

- Evidence that children’s literacy is predicated on an enabling environment at the school level, child well-being, and host-country government commitment and capacity for sustainability.⁴

C. Critical Assumptions

Our ability to achieve the intermediate results and long-term outcomes of the Results Framework depends on critical assumptions about the activities:

1. The project activities and local system will continue to support successful activities in existing schools and project activities can transfer to new intervention schools.
2. A sufficient number of teachers and school directors are employed and retained at each school for multiple years, to facilitate the transformation of practices to support children's learning, protection, and feeding.

3. Schools have access to safe drinking water within a reasonable geographical distance.

4. Community members participate in school governance and school-based activities.

5. The project’s school meals are delivered in a timely manner.

6. The Ministry of Education (MoE) will provide resources for school feeding programs.

7. Key stakeholders view the project’s activities and McGovern-Dole as non-controversial.

8. Project activities to engage PTA and SMC/COGES members will be sufficient to maintain their continued interest in taking a more active role in supporting children’s learning, protection, and feeding.

The following **external risks** could disrupt or negatively affect our ability to implement activities as planned and achieve the outcomes described in the Results Framework: (I) Disruptions to schooling (due to COVID-19, political instability, or teacher strikes); (ii) Climate change events including serious drought conditions leading to decreases in crop yield and household income that prevent parents from sending their children to school. (iii) Aggravation of wheat and fuel prices due to the war in Ukraine.

Our **MEL design and activities** are based on the following assumptions:

1. Access to schools is supported throughout the LOP.

2. School feeding, literacy, preventative health and nutrition, and LRP activities will occur in all project schools; infrastructure and rehabilitation activities will be dictated by school need; and other interventions will occur at the regional and national levels.

3. Teacher attrition and pupil movement between schools is comparable year over year (i.e., systematic biases are the same at each evaluation point).

4. The program design accounts for exposure to non-USDA interventions through selection criteria and therefore is not incorporated in MEAL design (e.g., sample stratification).

5. Needs assessment and GoM data will provide needed sampling and stratification information for sampling.

6. The project’s sustainability approach will be guided by and aligned with the World Bank-funded Education Sector Program Implementation Grant to Mauritania.  
