

HPI IQC RFTOP # USAID/M/OAA/GH/OHA/10-0001

IQC Holders' questions submitted 12/16/2009:

- Question 1. There is a broad range of activities indicated beyond cost and impact analysis that plays a key role in the use of the data generated by decision-makers, and its impact on quality of care and service delivery. These activities could include facilitating policy dialogue, stakeholder engagement, strategic planning, and policy and implementation strategy development and have the potential to either be a minor or significant component of the proposed approach. Offerors request guidance on the relative priority and level of effort associated with cost and impact modeling compared with the subsequent activities to integrate this data into policy development and decision-making.
- Response 1. The primary focus of this task order is to provide direct technical assistance to USAID Missions, other US Government supported programs, and multilateral organizations to evaluate and assess resource allocation for public health programming and cost-effective policy priorities. Secondly, the focus of the task order is to provide national, regional and local leaders and stakeholders with reliable costing data to be used to develop policy and inform programmatic decision-making for health service delivery and system priorities. The scope of this task order does not cover the entire breadth of facilitating policy dialogue and stakeholder engagement as these types of activities are covered under other existing USAID agreements. The main thrust of this task order is to meet the demand by Missions for costing-related work to inform decision-making for HIV/AIDS programs. The anticipated percentage of the Total Estimated Cost for each Objective is provided in the subject RFTOP.
- Question 2. To what extent is the proposed work supposed to be HIV-focused? The RFTOP mentions activities in other health sectors "as needed" (health systems, human resources, integrating planning) which can be understood within only the context of the section on Integration (Page 9), or should budget be reserved for discrete activities in these other areas?
- Response 2. The predominance of expected work in this task order will be for HIV/AIDS programs and projects however, other global health areas can buy into the project through core or field support. The purpose of the "Integration" section on page 9 is to highlight the need to cost programs as packages of interventions rather than costing discrete interventions irrespective of the program context in which they reside. Since human resources are an integral part of HIV service delivery and health systems strengthening. Human resources, as they relate to USAID funded programs should be considered a part of the overall technical areas referenced in Objective 2.
- Question 3. Is there a percentage of work envisioned for sub-Saharan Africa versus those for Asia and the Latin America/Caribbean region? An illustrative set of values on regional emphasis would provide useful guidance for the budgeting exercise.
- Response 3. Historically the majority of costing activity for HIV Core and field-supported activities have been carried out in sub-Saharan Africa. At present, the anticipated costing work demand comes from sub-Saharan Africa. However, this is a global task order and it will accept work from all regions where USAID has a presence.
- Question 4. The RFTOP contains a great deal of language about the costing of interventions (on Page 7, for example). Costing interventions feeds into the application of models, but is a different type of

effort. What percentage of the overall project would be devoted to this type of effort? To what extent is USAID expecting the successful contractor to develop new models?

Response 4. New model development will be based on need and demand by either USAID Missions or USAID/Washington. Application of models in-country will depend on Mission buy-in to a large extent, although some will likely be core funded. Application of selected models in-country will also link with Objective 1.

Question 5. Please clarify whether the performance monitoring and evaluation plan can be included as an Annex.

Response 5. The Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan can be included as an Annex.

Question 6. Are Adobe files acceptable for both the electronic and CD submissions of the technical proposal?

Response 6. Yes.

Question 7. Please clarify whether the page limit for the technical portion of the proposal is 30 pages or 25 pages. Section V.1, paragraph 1 states 30 pages in one sentence, but later states 25 pages.

Response 7. Please see RFTOP Amendment 1.

Question 8. Section VI, Evaluation Criteria, states that there are three criteria and displays them in “descending order of importance/weight.” What are the specific weights among the three criteria?

Response 8. Please see Amendment 2.

Question 9. With reference to the Personnel Annex would the presentation of short-term experts/consultant staff as biosketches be acceptable?

Response 9. Yes.

Question 10. With reference to Cost Proposal Format, Page 18, Section J. Paragraph c. states, A current resume and USAID biodata form, in sufficient detail to support the proposed Functional Labor Category, for all U.S. and professional non-U.S. personnel, please clarify that resumes are only to be included in the Technical Proposal Submission and not the Cost Proposal as well.

Response 10. Resumes are to be included as part of the technical application. Bio-data sheets are needed for US and Non-US Personnel for all proposed professional labor categories.

Question 11. On Page 18 the instructions are lettered a) and then c)' please confirm, is one missing or is this simply a skipped letter?

Response 11. This is simply a skipped letter.

Question 12. With reference to Cost Proposal Format, Page 17, Paragraph d. Field Office Costs, some Indirect Costs may be applicable to other than personnel and Fringe Benefit costs, for example, G&A. We assume this section is interpreted such that Indirect Costs applicable to Field Costs, excluding those associated with personnel and Fringe Benefits will be reimbursed. Is this assumption correct?

Response 12. Yes. Allocable, allowable and reasonable costs are reimbursable. The intent of the line item is for direct costs only. Indirect costs associated with field offices should be in the indirect cost CLIN.

Question 13. With reference to Cost Proposal Format, Page 17, Paragraph d. Field Office Costs and Section IV. Task Order Content, Schedule, there is no mention of Field Office requirements in the Statement of Work. We assume the reference in the Cost Proposal Format section referenced above is meant to refer to the project office that is to be located in Washington, DC or its environs. Is this assumption correct? If not, please provide the location of the Field Office and its requirements.

Response 13. The assumption is correct.

Question 14. In reference to Cost Proposal Format, "...certification of salary for all proposed CCN Direct Labor" ... Since locations for field work are not defined in the RFTOP, we assume the requirement for a certification of "...all proposed CCN Direct Labor" does not apply to direct labor CCNs not identified by name. Is this assumption correct? If not, please provide further clarification or field work locations.

Response 14. The assumption is correct.