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**Amendment**

The following outlines modifications to No. FS – MR – 1113 - 00001 originally issued on December 16, 2022. **All other sections not mentioned here remain unchanged.**

1.1 **Remove**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Date: December 16, 2022  
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

And replace with

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Date: December 16, 2022  
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

1.2 **Remove**

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.
1. Introduction

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

1.3 Remove

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.

And replace with

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 five months from contract signature to submission of final report to USDA.

1.4 Section III, RFP Questions and Answers is added to the list of sections.

1. Pg. 3 of the RFP states, “Counterpart is hereby soliciting bids from Mauritania based evaluators for the baseline evaluation of the Bridging the Future project in Mauritania…” does this mean organizations not based in Mauritania are ineligible to bid on this evaluation?
   a. No, bidders not based in Mauritania are also eligible to submit

2. Could Counterpart provide an estimated overall budget ceiling for the baseline evaluation?
   a. The estimated overall budget for this evaluation is $195,000 USD. This budget is estimated, and final selection is subject to the final evaluation committees selected vendor.

3. Pg. 4 of the RFP states, “It is important to note that the baseline survey will not exceed three months from contract signature to submission of final report to USDA.” Further, pg. 16 states, “The total estimated duration of the consultation is approximately five months.” – Can Counterpart kindly clarify the anticipated timeline?
a. Counterpart has updated the pg. 4 statement to read, “It is important to note that the baseline survey will not exceed 5 months from contact signature to submission and approval of final report to USDA.”

4. Pg. 11 of the RFP states, “Primary data collection tools and sampling plan will be developed by the consultant in close collaboration with the Bridging the Future team.” Could Counterpart clarify which tools already exist (and will be reused from TFIO) and which will need to be newly developed? Including, importantly, if it is expected that IE will use an existing EGRA tool or adapt a new version?
   a. Counterpart already has on hand a good number of tools that include surveys for cooks, students, teachers, school directors, parents and EGRA. The consultant may decide to use, adapt, or develop new tools to conduct the evaluation.

5. Could Counterpart explain the rationale for surveying students across all 6 grades? Could Counterpart explain the rationale for testing reading skills using the EGRA instrument across students in three grades (1-3)?
   a. The anticipated baseline surveying model will survey students in grades 1 through 6 to collect data for indicators such as attendance, enrollment, school meals, etc. For grades 1 through 3 we will be using the EGRA instrument to collect data on the standard McGovern-Dole MGD1 indicator and other related custom indicators.

   The sample size for the EGRA survey is based on finding a minimum detectable effect of one key McGovern-Dole indicator: “SO1: Percent of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text.” Since EGRA is conducted for students in grade three, but surveys are collected for multiple grades, the sample for EGRA is different than that of the other student-level indicators.

   The sample is a two-stage cluster design:
   i. Schools were randomly selected to be geographically representative.
   ii. Students entering third grade are randomly selected by enumerators on the day of their visit.

   To estimate the minimum sample size for learning outcomes, we assume that 10 percent of the sample will meet a minimum literacy threshold at midline, and we want to detect the case in which 17.5 percent or more students who pass the minimum learning requirement at midterm or endline.

6. Could Counterpart further explain the sampling table on pg. 12 of the RFP? Will the evaluator be sampling comparison schools as well? The table only appears to list respondents in treatment schools. Further, what constitutes the total of 524 teachers/head teachers if 3 are surveyed across all 108 schools sampled (n=324)? Can Counterpart clarify the discrepancy between table 1 which lists 108 schools in the baseline sample vs. table 2 which lists 111 schools?
a. Counterpart will not use comparison school for this evaluation.

7. The context, mandate, objectives of the Mission and expected results have been very clearly defined. However, we would like to obtain a little insight into the team of experts to be proposed. The RFP lists only two CVs to be provided, those of the principal evaluator and the associate consultant. The request is therefore to know if there is a possibility of adding to these two profiles the summary of additional experts' CVs if the Consultant considers it relevant to achieve the set objectives.
   a. Counterpart welcomes the idea of including additional experts on the evaluation team, but it will not affect the total ceiling which is $195,000. Counterpart’s evaluation criteria are based on the requested RFP provision of only two CV’s, the principal evaluator and associate consultant. If any other CVs are added to the proposal, Counterpart asks that their role be clarified. The additional CV’s will not count towards the overall evaluation of a successful proposal.

8. Can the evaluation team propose a different sampling strategy. We feel that a census of all schools will have a high impact on the data collection cost, without necessarily providing better data, since a lot of time will be spent on travelling to the different schools?
   a. Yes, the evaluation team may propose a different sampling strategy. Per pg. 9 of the RFP, “primary data collection tools and sampling plan will be developed by the consultant in close collaboration with the Bridging the Future team.” Can Counterpart share the list of school with location to better evaluate data collection travelling cost? The project will target 320 schools of which 111 are new schools:
      i. Tagant: 86 new schools
      ii. Brakna: 138 schools of which 15 are new schools
      iii. Gorgol: 96 schools of which 10 are new schools

9. Will Counterpart be able to provide tablets for data collection?
   a. Counterpart will provide 25 tablets for the study

10. Does Counterpart have a suggestion for the location for the enumerators training (Which city)?
    a. The training could be done in Nouakchott or in the field. Counterpart suggests conducting the training in the field tentatively in Tidjikja or Aleg.

11. Are cooks already in place/ been selected in new Schools?
    a. The activity will only take place once the data collection is done in the new schools, so cooks are not selected for now.
12. Can Counterpart share the current school calendar?
   a. Current school year 2022/23 is as follow:
      i. School Year started on Oct 3, 2022
      ii. Winter vacation: December 30, 2022, to January 8, 2023
      iii. Spring vacation: March 24 to April 3, 2023
      iv. Schools close on June 1, 2023

13. Which activities can happen during Ramadan? Such as KII with MoE and other stakeholders, training of enumerators, school data collection…
   a. We can conduct most of the activities in Ramadan period but from 9am to 2pm, beyond 2pm people are not always available, also during this time, school feeding will not take place.

14. Can you elaborate on the meaning of question #10 “What are mitigating factors to uptake of pro project activities?”
   a. Please refer to our Risk Management that highlights that the selected IE will be required to take reasonable measures to mitigate any potential risks to research participants and the delivery of the evaluation. Therefore, the IE will be required to propose contingency to mitigate any occurrence of each of the identified risks, including COVID-19, health-related, and logistics-related risks, and specific safeguarding risks for both children and adults and mitigating strategies.

15. Can you elaborate on the methodology (calculation) used for the following indicators:
   • Percentage of beneficiaries who can demonstrate knowledge of effective health and hygiene practices as a result of USDA assistance
   • Percentage of students washing hands before eating and after using the latrine (at school)

   a. Please refer to the definition below of the indicators per our PMP:

   **Percentage of beneficiaries who can demonstrate knowledge of effective health and hygiene practices as a result of USDA assistance**

   Surveys and observation will be conducted to assess the change in hygiene knowledge and practices such as frequency of handwashing (before preparing food, before eating), and handwashing methods such as using soap. This indicator counts the application of hygiene practices developed through USDA sponsored training, whereas the count of individuals trained is reported under MGD Indicator 23. The number of people demonstrating use of new practices can be
used as the numerator, and the number of people trained in new practices as the
denominator, to calculate the percentage of trainees who demonstrate what they
learned. USDA and recipients may use this calculation to meaningfully discuss
training effectiveness and project implementation.

It will include any trained beneficiary who can demonstrate the effective use of
health and hygiene practices.

Unit of Measure: percent of Individuals
Disaggregation: Location, Sex, Practice
(e.g., handwashing with soap, handwashing before eating, before preparing food)

**Percentage of students washing hands before eating and after using the latrine (at school)**

Definition: Survey will be conducted to assess if students, cooks, and other
project participants wash their hands at home and school, when they wash their
hands, and what they use to wash their hands. This indicator counts the
application of hand washing practices before eating and after using the latrine.
The number of people applying these practices before the intervention can be used
as the numerator, and the number of people applying these practices after the
intervention as the denominator.

Unit of Measure: percent of Individuals
Disaggregation: Location, Sex, Practice
(e.g., handwashing with soap, handwashing before eating, before preparing food)

16. 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. Is this Consultancy reserved to Mauritanians only? Can a firm located in another
country present a proposal with a mixed Team of International and Mauritanian
consultants?
   a. This consultancy is not reserved for Mauritanian’s only. The evaluator(s) can be
      in another country and be a mixed team of any nationality of consultants.

17. Does the proposal need to only show the CV of the Lead Evaluator and Associate
    Evaluator? Do both consultants have to be Mauritanian citizens?
    a. The proposal requests two CVs of the Lead Evaluator and the Associate
       Evaluator. Neither consultant is required to be a Mauritanian citizen.

18. If the proposal is submitted by a consortium of partners, the qualifications of each
    proposed partner should be presented. Does the consortium of partners have to be of
    Mauritanian origin only?
    a. No, the consortium of partners does not need to be of only Mauritanian origin.
19. 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. Can an individual submit an application or is Counterpart expecting proposals from registered firms only?  
   a. Counterpart welcomes application from firms or individual consultants

20. Please confirm that the target population for this Baseline study is the 111 new schools and will not include the 209 schools of The Future is Ours that Bridging the Future will eventually absorb. Also confirm that the Baseline Study will be conducted in the Tagant Region only. 
   a. Correct, the target population for this Baseline study is the 111 new schools and will not include the 209 schools of The Future is Ours that Bridging the Future will eventually absorb
   
   No, the baseline study will include the 25 new schools in Brakna and Gorgol as well.

21. When will the Endline evaluation of The Future is Ours will take place?  
   a. Counterpart anticipates the endline for The Future is Ours to take place in the spring of 2024 as the award end date is September 30, 2024.

22. Should the Baseline Evaluation for Bridging the Future be comparable to the Baseline of The Future is Ours? Will the Consultants be expected to use the same tools, or will a new set of tools be designed?  
   a. They are two different projects. We encourage the consultants to use, adapt or develop new tools, if need be, to conduct the study.

23. Will the Consultants be given access to the Baseline and Midterm evaluation of The Future is Ours?  
   a. Yes, the Baseline evaluation will be provided. The Midterm evaluation will be in the process of being finalized, and Counterpart will seek approval from USDA to share the midterm evaluation in advance of it/while it is being finalized.

24. Will the indicator for The Future is Ours be modified as a result if the Baseline of Bridging the Future? Or will the indicators for the 209 schools be modified according to the results of the endline survey?  
   a. TFIO indicators have already been adjusted -- this baseline is independent to this project and will not impact the TFIO indicators.

25. Has this EGRA Reading tool been developed yet for Mauritania? Will the Consultant be responsible for administering the test?
26. Will the EGRA Classroom Observation also be performed to measure the Teachers’ Performance? Is the Consultant responsible for administering this tool? Teachers’ performances and instructional competencies in reading will be based on observation tools in EGRA classrooms.
   a. Yes, the consultant is responsible for administering this tool

27. What role will ARED play in the Baseline Study, if any?
   a. ARED, as a partner organization to this program, can be included in interviews for this Baseline evaluation. ARED will have no formal role beyond potentially participating in interviews for the assessment.

28. 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. Is this in reference to the Counterpart Evaluation Team or the Independent Evaluation team? Does the Team Leader have to be an International Program Evaluator? Please clarify in conjunction of above.
   a. This refers to the Independent Evaluation team. It is not a requirement that the Team Leader be an international Program evaluator, the Team Leader will be evaluated on experience conducting international program evaluations as a third-party evaluator based off of the submitted CV in the full proposal.

29. Can you please clarify flexibility required due to Ramadan holiday for 1) Field work: testing of the data collection tools and calibrate, travel and/or remote interviews, and training of data collectors*and 2) Field Work: data collection (in field or remote) and analyses*? Does it mean that data collection cannot be conducted during Ramadan and will take place after April 22nd? If this is the case, it appears there will be a long period between the time the Inception Report is approved and the start of the data collection.
   a. We can conduct most of the activities in Ramadan utilizing a modified working schedule from 9am to 2pm.