

Reponses aux questions RFQ CPI-FFE_1131/MEAL-GENOP-00518-01-2026_evaluations

- 1. Eligibility and contracting modality:** Can a team of individual consultants submit a proposal without being registered as a legal firm, provided one consultant serves as Team Leader and contractual focal point? **No, Counterpart only works with an individual (which for this complex evaluation is not possible) or with a legally recognized entity/firm.**
- 2. Technical proposal length and structure:** Is there a preferred or maximum page length for the technical proposal, and are annexes counted separately? **Please see the RFQ. Annexes are separate.**
- 3. Evaluation questions:** Should the proposal replicate the TOR evaluation questions verbatim, or is Counterpart open to a consolidated analytical framing aligned with OECD-DAC criteria, to be finalized during the inception phase? **Yes, Counterpart is open to a consolidated analytical framework aligned with OECD-DAC criteria to be finalized during the inception phase.**
- 4. Combined endline/baseline approach:** Does Counterpart have preferences regarding integrated versus separate analytical treatment of Sukaabe Janngo II and III findings? **Data analysis and findings must be separated for the endline and the baseline**
- 5. Sampling and comparison groups:** Can the EGRA sample size and allocation specified in the TOR be followed strictly, or is there flexibility to adjust during inception if required by field realities? **The sample size must be equal to what is specified in the RFQ; however, if an applicant wants to increase the sample, that will be welcomed.**
- 6. Use of digital and AI-supported analytical tools:** Is Counterpart open to the responsible use of AI-supported tools for qualitative analysis support, under full human oversight and data protection safeguards? **Yes**
- 7. Language and deliverables:** Should all deliverables be produced in both English and French, or only the final report? **The inception report, final report (all drafts) should be produced in French and English.**

- 1. Pourriez-vous confirmer l'exactitude du passage suivant des TDR : 57.182.780 millions de repas scolaires nutritifs préparés principalement à partir de 8.690 tonnes de produits donnés par les USA et 2.366 tonnes de niébé achetées localement ? **Nous avons calculé ces objectifs sur la base de rations nécessaires pour le repas d'un élève, 5 fois par semaine avec un nombre de jours de repas par mois pour 398 écoles ciblées. Le nombre de repas par mois distribué par le projet peut varier d'une année à une autre.****

Reponses aux questions RFQ CPI-FFE_1131/MEAL-GENOP-00518-01-2026_evaluations

2. Les écoles contrôles sont-elles déjà définies ou à identifier par le consultant retenu ? Pour le baseline, c'est au consultant à définir, et pour le endline, les écoles de contrôles sont déjà identifiées.

3. Pouvez-vous nous apporter plus d'éclaircissements sur ces deux points (comment se présenteront ces confirmations dans l'offre financière) :

a. Une confirmation que **Counterpart prévoit de conclure un ou deux contrats à prix fixe (FFP)** à la suite de cet appel d'offres.

b. Une déclaration confirmant que **le budget total proposé** ne doit pas dépasser un total de **180 000 USD (120 000 USD pour l'évaluation quantitative/qualitative et 60 000 USD pour l'EGRA)**. Counterpart **préfère attribuer un seul contrat** intégrant les données EGRA ; toutefois, s'il n'y a pas d'offre unique répondant aux besoins, deux FFP peuvent être attribués.

- Nous voyons deux parties de l'évaluation : l'enquête EGRA (seul les élèves) et l'enquête globale (quanti/quali) avec toutes les parties prenantes. C'est pareil pour le baseline et le endline).

- Un soumissionnaire peut postuler pour l'enquête EGRA et l'enquête globale, ou bien seulement soit l'un soit l'autre. Le budget maximum pour chaque enquête est note dans le RFQ.

4. Devons-nous présenter deux offres financières distinctes pour l'évaluation (quantitative/qualitative et l'EGRA) ou une proposition consolidée avec ventilation par composante ? Oui, une proposition consolidée si vous postulez pour les deux parties de l'évaluation.

5. Dans les TDR, on a relevé plusieurs références au *Soudan* au lieu du *Sénégal* — pourriez-vous confirmer qu'il s'agit d'erreurs rédactionnelles ? Oui, tout est au Sénégal. Nous republions le RFQ avec les corrections.

Table 1 presents Activities with Anticipated Result & Associated Indicator for SJIII.

6. Can we assume that activities and indicators are the same for SJII? No, they are not exactly the same.

1. Should we expect to have different data collection in the SJII and SJIII schools? Yes

2. Is the provider expected to produce two evaluation reports (an endline for SJII and a baseline for SJIII) or can the results be harmonized in one document? Please read the RFQ. Two reports are required.

Reponses aux questions RFQ CPI-FFE_1131/MEAL-GENOP-00518-01-2026_evaluations

3. Why is the EGRA target calculated at Gr 4 and 5 if the indicator SO1 speaks of "after two years of primary schooling"? We are using MGD1 at present but in a modified form to address the grades targeted by the project.
4. Can you clarify if the EGRA is in French or Pulaar? how many subtasks are included? We are currently planning to use both languages, but this is subject to change. There are five subtasks.
5. Can data collection happen during the month of May? No, we prefer it to be done in March/April.
6. Will tablets be provided by Counterpart Senegal? We have approximately 20 tablets that could be used.

1. The RFP states that the sampling frame will be provided by Counterpart in partnership with the Academic Inspection at the regional level (IA). The baseline sample will be stratified using multiple criteria, including geography by department. Can Counterpart please confirm if this sample will include schools visited as part of the Sukaabe Janngo II baseline study? The sample for the SJII endline is the same as the baseline and midterm. If so, how many intervention and control schools were included in the baseline and midline? 65 schools for each arm at baseline and midterm. Can the Sukaabe Janngo II baseline report be shared? The final reports for the baseline and midline will be shared with the consultant who is selected for this RFQ.
2. Is Counterpart open to feedback on the research questions on pages 11-12 of the RFP, and potentially revising them (e.g., to narrow and tighten the scope) based on input from the selected evaluator? Yes.
3. Will Counterpart share all of the data collection tools used for baseline and midline in order to ensure comparability with endline? Yes
4. For the EGRA tool, will the evaluator be provided with a tool that has already been piloted/tested to ensure that it equates with the tool used at baseline/midterm? Yes
If not, is this process expected to be done by the evaluator? N/A
5. On page 19, the RFP states "The sampling framework will be conducted by Counterpart in partnership with the Academic Inspection at the regional level (IA), and the final sample size will be reviewed in coordination with MEN prior to commencing field work." A very thorough and clear outline of the sample is also provided, short of individual school selection. On page 20, the evaluation criteria include "Proposed overall methodology, including sampling method." Could Counterpart please clarify what they expect from bidders, in terms of a sampling methodology? Applicants are asked to

Reponses aux questions RFQ CPI-FFE_1131/MEAL-GENOP-00518-01-2026_evaluations

propose an overall methodology for the evaluation, with approaches that must address the needs for a baseline and endline (quanti, qauli, EGRA). Applicants are asked to show an expert understanding for the sample selection, for which the size has been noted, but not the methodology.

1. Could you please confirm whether the two required CVs (Lead Evaluator and Associate Evaluator) are included within the 15-page limit for the Technical Proposal, or if they may be submitted as annexes outside of the page limit? Annexes, including CVs, are outside of the page limit.
2. For sampling and field logistics planning purposes, could you kindly clarify whether the preschools are generally located in close proximity to the elementary schools within the same communities, or if they are typically situated in separate locations? Schools are spread out all over the target regions.

1. Did Counterpart use a QED for the baseline and/or midterm of the Sukaabe Janngo II project? Please refer to the RFQ, section on methodology.
Page 11, bullet #2 alludes to a QED for SJII - Produce an endline evaluation report containing a) comparisons between the baseline and endline situations, as well as between beneficiary schools and a comparable control group. However, good to get confirmation here.
2. If so, can these documents be made available to bidders? The final reports for the baseline and midline will be shared with the consultant who is selected for this RFQ.
3. How many schools does Counterpart anticipate will be included for classroom literacy observations? The highest number possible.
4. How will the language(s) of EGRA administration be determined? Page 18 notes that EGRA will be conducted in French and/or local languages (Pulaar, Wolof, etc.), and clarification on the selection criteria would be helpful. This will be discussed with the implementing consultant, ARED, Counterpart, and IA.
5. Could Counterpart clarify whether EGRA is required for all specified grades at both baseline and endline, and in particular whether Grade 6 students are expected to be followed longitudinally? Given that Grade 6 students at baseline may transition to middle school by midline or endline, clarification would be helpful regarding feasibility and implications for difference-in-differences analysis. EGRA is for endline (4th, 5th, and 6th grades) and the baseline (4th and 5thgrades).

Reponses aux questions RFQ CPI-FFE_1131/MEAL-GENOP-00518-01-2026_evaluations

6. Can Counterpart clarify how many formal review and revision rounds are anticipated for the draft evaluation reports prior to submission to USDA? Please refer to the calendar in the RFQ. There will be multiple exchanges between Counterpart and the consultant.
7. For bilingual deliverables, would Counterpart prefer full professional translation of all annexes and technical appendices, or only the core reports excluding annexes. Please refer to the RFQ. The evaluation reports, including the inception report, must be in French and English. Annexes do not have to be translated.
8. Looking ahead to Sukaabe Janngo III, does Counterpart anticipate issuing separate RFPs at each evaluation milestone, or is there an intention to engage a firm to partner across multiple evaluation. Each evaluation will be contracted based on an RFQ.