REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Implemented by: fhi360

Program:	mSTAR, Subcontract to Design and Conduct Ethnography Studies at USAID Missions
RFP No:	3569-018-2014-001
Authority:	USAID Award No. AID-OAA-A-12-00073
Date of Issuance:	Wednesday, February 19, 2014
Due Date for Questions:	5:00 PM US EST Thursday, February 27, 2014
Response to Questions:	Wednesday, March 5, 2014
Closing Date:	5:00 PM US EST, Wednesday, March 19, 2014
Estimated Award Date:	April 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 PURPOSE STATEMENT

The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to solicit proposals for funding from prospective subcontractors to support FHI 360's implementation of the Mobile Solutions Technical Assistance and Research Program (mSTAR), funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Award No. AID-OAA-A-12-00073. mSTAR is a strategic investment by USAID to advance mobile solutions and close the gaps that hold back access and uptake of mobile technology. The project supports broad-based coordinated action by a range of market stakeholders — including governments, donors, mobile service providers, and their customers.

FHI 360's mSTAR project is issuing this request for proposals to firms with experience in design research and utilizing applied ethnography to study people and their environment. In this activity, the selected subcontractor will perform a study surrounding how two USAID Missions manage data flow, utilize data, and view data as a resource for improved decision-making.

This RFP is issued as a public notice to ensure that all interested, qualified, and eligible organizations have a fair opportunity to submit proposals for funding.

2 OBJECTIVE

The objective of this scope of work is to examine factors surrounding how data both is and is not used during program planning, implementation and reporting, with a focus on USAID Mission-level processes. To achieve this, the project cycle at the Mission level will be thoroughly examined. This will include mapping processes, exploring various stakeholders and analyzing the larger planning and management context. Data stakeholders, both creators and users will be identified. Special attention should be paid to existing uses of data and/or common difficulties, pain points, and bottlenecks that could be addressed by a better use of data as a resource for improved decision-making. The primary output will be a report and a presentation elaborating a rich contextual ethnography accompanied by a concrete set of recommendations about how the DC-based USAID Mobile Solutions team can better work with and support Missions in incentivizing the use of, lowering the barriers to, managing the flow of, and deriving greater value from data with a specific focus on data for management and decision making.

To facilitate a systems approach to knowledge utilization, both ethnographic[1] and design research methodologies will be used. Techniques including social network analysis[2], net-map[3] and direct observation amongst others will facilitate an in-depth understanding of the political

[1] The term ethnography is applied here to mean the field study of a particular group of people in their "natural" surroundings (as opposed to the artificial setting of the experiment) in which the ethnographer aims to capture an empathetic rendering of the meanings events and relationships have for individuals and the group as a whole in their everyday lives. (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995)

[2] Clark, L. (2006) Network Mapping as a Diagnostic Tool Manual. Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT). La Paz, Bolivia.

[3] Schiffer, E. (2007). The Net-Map Toolbox. International Food Policy Research Institute. Washington, DC.

economy of knowledge production and consumption while identifying knowledge processes (channels) and products by institutional and individual actors.

Because the depth and richness of information produced through this exercise will be highly dependent on access to and familiarity with USAID processes, staff and facilities, the work will be undertaken by a research team comprised of personnel from the mSTAR team, as well as the Data and Analytics (Data) Team and the Mobile Solutions (MS) Team at USAID along with the selected firm. The research plan and specific activities in the scope of work will be developed collaboratively through an initial consultation phase in Washington, DC. This will be followed by more extensive field research in select USAID Country Missions. While USAID staff will facilitate access to internal resources and weigh in on lines of inquiry, the selected firm will guide the design with expertise on design research and ethnographic methodologies.

The primary outcome of this study will be an improved understanding with respect to USAID knowledge and decision-making at the mission level. It will also inform the decision making processes and learning agenda at the Mission level. Through synthesis activities and the project deliverables, this work will bring to light both Mission level needs and points of entry for the technical assistance the MS and Data teams are positioned to provide.

3 PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Background and Rationale

USAID is committed to using evidence for improved decision-making and results. Reforms under USAID Forward re-institutionalized key elements of the USAID program cycle: Agency-wide policy and strategies, strategic planning, project design and implementation and evaluation and monitoring. For these components to be effective, however, they "must be informed by continuous learning and adapting, influence the annual budget and resource management processes and be focused on achieving results."[4]

The MS and Data Teams have been formed to support the Agency's efforts to utilize evidence in development programming. As a part of this mandate, both teams are prepared to offer assistance with a range of data-related tools and guidance including: the acquisition of data sets, analytical assistance, futures analysis (scenario planning), data visualization capabilities, social media analytics, mobile data collection systems and sensors and sensor networks for collecting project information and improving the capacity of data driven decision making. Despite the potential value of these tools, the most effective insertion points into mission-level planning and learning activities are not thoroughly understood.

In particular, the use of data created by mobile tools, sensors and other digital sources have the potential to dramatically shift the manner in which USAID delivers services. Real-time data surveying, rapid project assessments, iterative feedback and project management, responsive systems, and geocoded crowdsourcing of data are all examples of real-time data approaches that

[4] Program Cycle Overview, 2011, http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pdacs774.pdf

can improve decision-making and help Missions meet program objectives. These data sources, however, are representative of a fundamental shift in the data ecosystem where vast quantities of data can be available faster and less expensively than ever before. This is in contrast with the paradigm before the digital era where data was more typically slow, expensive and not easily shared. The potential of near real-time data can only be realized if Mission staff and implementing partners successfully utilize the information throughout the program cycle. At the same time, management and utilization of these data may require fundamentally different methods, activities and attitudes surrounding data use.

At a structural level, Mission reporting mechanisms reflect external demands for data as well as internal hierarchical, consensus driven information flow. Missions produce data for internal constituents and external parties - internal are the Semi-Annual Performance Reports ((S)APRs), Performance Plan and Report (PPRs), etc. External data include taskers, 'success stories' and narratives. The former are much more empirical but usually limited to higher level aggregation. The latter consists of storytelling, broad narratives, and punchy blogs. Though successful integration of new data and analytics (real-time or otherwise) may require both structural and cultural shifts at the Mission level, they should also be able to contribute to the existing planning and reporting processes. These data tools should be developed such that at a minimum they don’t contribute to the work-load of mission personnel, and ideally make relevant procedures easier, cheaper and more relevant.

It is therefore essential to understand the data ecosystem in the context of the program cycle at the mission level. Capturing this knowledge in a way that sheds light on the behaviors and motivations of program officers and cultural barriers at the Mission level is particularly important.

This information will guide the development of strategies for mission engagement as the MS and Data teams work to implement policy and programs to support the use of data (real-time or otherwise) at the program level. It should also help Missions meet their USAID Forward objectives, ultimately improving strategic planning, program design and learning.

Methodology

To fully capture the processes, structures and cultures surrounding data at the Mission level, an ethnographic approach will be most illuminating. Such an approach focuses more on qualitative characteristics of an organization with respect to data use. This approach recognizes that cultural characteristics at the Mission often influence how data is seen and treated. It also recognizes Missions as complex institutions, comprised of multiple hierarchies of group members - including Foreign Service Officers (FSO), foreign service nationals (FSN), and third country nationals (TCN). These actors are embedded in the overall US Embassy infrastructure in country with its own concomitant structural and ideological context. Incentives can then be structured to directly address the most significant cultural and behavioral obstacles.

The MS and Data Teams envision supporting a qualitative study of data collection, management, and utilization of data at Country Missions. These studies (ethnographies) will help build knowledge of the Mission and its practices surrounding data management by observing Mission staff in action and interviewing them in their natural setting. This in turn will inform the design of subsequent activities, ensuring that future data-related programs are tailored to Mission need.

The principal methodology to be used in the study is participant observation, whereby one or more ethnographer is placed in a Mission and conducts key informant interviews over an extended period of time. The ethnography will need access to data collection sources and examine the process of data transformation across a number of use cases. Attention will be paid to the full program cycle, from strategy development to program conception to execution to monitoring and evaluation. Data flow visualization and modeling, social network analysis, and interviews will inform the ethnographic analysis, resulting in an in-depth analysis of mission data culture, function, and form.

The ethnographic study will focus on Mission-level needs in the data space from the perspective of individuals and groups within the project cycle, with an eye to where specific data and analytical resources may be relevant. In particular the ethnography will identify: 1) specific barriers to incorporating the data tools listed above into program planning and management; 2) opportunities for incorporating these tools into Mission activities; 3) incentives to encourage Mission staff to act on data; 4) ways to improve internal practices with an eye towards data utilization; and 5) key Mission staff who can promote or utilize the data tools approaches listed in the background.

We anticipate engagement with 2 missions, with their selection based primarily on willingness and openness to the exercise. These missions will be recruited and selected by the MS and Data Teams.

Internal Stakeholder Participation

The project will be guided throughout the process by three distinct groups internal to USAID.

1) The USAID MS and Data teams will form a working team who will interact extensively and concretely with the external consultants. In particular, this team will work with the consultants to co-create the research design, accompany and assist the consultant team on significant portions of the work in the missions, and participate in synthesis activities.
2) For each mission, a technical working group at the mission will be formed to engage with the research team. This working group will be comprised of FSO, GS, FSN, TCN and/or other staff who have a stake in improving internal processes around data and learning. These representatives will help guide mission-specific research design, implementation and dissemination of findings at the mission level.
3) An extended research team will be formed of other USAID stakeholders who are working on data issues in the agency. This group will likely include representatives from the geocenter, the open data team and other pillar and regional bureaus including Policy, Planning and Learning (PPL) and M bureau. This group will meet intermittently to receive updates and offer suggestions.

Scope of Work

FHI 360 seeks a contractor to design and implement a qualitative study of data collection, management, and utilization of data at USAID Missions. These studies (ethnographies) will help build knowledge of the Mission and its practices surrounding data management by observing Mission staff in action and interviewing them in their natural setting. The results of these studies will inform USAID's programming and decision making, allowing future mobile data programs to be responsive to Mission's needs.

Specific activities will include:

1. **Phase I: Design.** Work with USAID's MS and Data teams to develop the conceptual framework for ethnographic studies in a first phase, and then with selected mission teams to create country specific action plans:
   - Kick-off meeting with mSTAR and the USAID Data and MS Teams to understand the objectives and goals.
   - Interview Washington based USAID employees who have relevant Mission based expertise, and potentially remotely interview mission based staff if necessary.
   - Develop a conceptual overview of how data flows fit into the larger planning and management cycles of the Agency through process exploration such as reviewing relevant chapters from the ADS.
   - Develop a methodological approach for mapping project and planning cycles at the Mission-level, including a process for the identification of primary stakeholders with respect to data (both creators and users) and mapping the flows of data.
   - Develop a methodological approach for understanding stakeholder roles and responsibilities as well as a clear understanding of incentives, attitudes and behaviors of in the project and planning cycles. A focus on limits to the stakeholders' ability to act should be understood.
   - Create a methodology for understanding where data and evidence are and are not utilized during the program cycle and, ideally, identifying specific information gaps key barriers to mobile data implementation, including *why* key barriers exist at the Mission level.
   - Employ methodological techniques including process mapping of how data use functions in practice to understand how novel data collection and analytical tools may evolve or change existing processes, observation of Mission staff in an on-site context to understand the subtle forces that influence behavior surrounding data use, and group and one-on-one interviews focusing on attitudes and ways of thinking that relate to data management.
   - Present draft research design for approval by mSTAR and the USAID MS/Data Teams' staff and revise as necessary.

2. **Phase II: Implementation.** Execute the agreed upon mission action plans:
   - Travel to selected Missions as necessary, and with sufficient time to conduct in-depth field research. Expected activities include:
     - Conduct group interviews with Mission staff to understand the Mission perspective on the key challenges in data management (collecting, curating and using), identify candidates for individual interviews, and understand the roles and responsibilities of

various Mission staff.
  - Based on results of group interviews, conduct individual interviews to gain a more granular understanding of data usage over the course of the program cycle.
  - Identify and conduct interviews with other data stakeholders, such as key implementing partner personnel and/or program beneficiaries.
  - Review the degree to which Missions and/or Mission staff are interested in incorporating new data technologies into program activities.
  - Explore the factors associated with (if any) cultural and/or structural resistance to incorporating new data techniques.
  - In addition to identifying *what* barriers to the utilization of different data and analytical tools, understand and summarize *why* each barrier exists.
  - Develop relationships with USAID Mission staff who can inform the design process and prototype and test solutions.

- Work with mSTAR and the USAID MS and Data teams to synthesize the research outputs:
  - Organize research outputs for a large group synthesis activity including mapping all relevant processes, organizing artifacts and preparing notes for synthesis.
  - Research additional literature, processes or activities as necessary prior to synthesis.
  - Run a synthesis workshop or set of workshops to outline major insights, observations, outstanding questions and actions.

- Produce an engagement strategy that details how USAID can and should address Mission-specific data issues by:
  - Developing user personas of stakeholders in the project and planning cycles.
  - Developing process maps laying out project and planning cycles.
  - Reviewing, summarizing, and cataloging data management flow inside each Mission.
  - Summarizing internal operating procedure within missions.
  - Examining the full data life-cycle, from collection by implementing partners to the why data is transferred, utilized, and managed by Mission staff.
  - Determining how and to what degree Missions incorporate data into the decision-making process and highlighting opportunities where specific data collection, management and analytical tools could play a high value-added role.
  - Identifying key Mission staff most likely to champion new data-related techniques and tools.
  - Providing concrete recommendations for entry points to engage mission staff on increased data usage and incentivize more active use of data and technology enabled decision making processes.

Deliverables
Upon award, the Subcontractor will be expected to deliver:

1. **Phase I: Design**
   - Detailed work plan

- Conceptual Framework and Methodological Approach
  - A short overview of the decided upon methodologies and strategy for engaging with USAID effectively including clear definition of goals of the exercise, ethnographic and design research methodologies to be utilized, clear definition of the outputs, etc.
- Mission Action Plans
  - A plan for engaging with each Mission including team composition, timelines, processes to be explored, stakeholders to be interviewed, specific research questions, hypotheses to be tested, contextual information to be collected, a clear delineation draft survey instruments to be used, etc.

2. **Phase II: Implementation**

- Mission Trip Read Out(s)
  - A short report that outlines goals of each Mission trip, summarizes what was accomplished on the trip, stakeholders met with, and any key initial findings.
  - A draft landscape report for each mission including how each Mission is organized with respect to data management and initial observations on where mobile data may fit within the program's objectives and activities.
- Synthesis Workshop
  - A facilitated multi-day workshop with mSTAR and the USAID MS and Data teams in DC to apply design research synthesis methodologies to all data collected. The workshop will also be used to shape the form of all final deliverables.
- Final Ethnography -- a full report articulating all research findings from missions, headquarters, and stakeholders.
  - An executive summary that succinctly defines key barriers and pain points to incorporation and use of mobile data for programming.
  - A gap analysis demonstrating where mobile data could enhance existing activities.
  - List of recommendations for how USAID can prioritize their resources to create an enabling environment for mobile data solutions.
  - A chart showing how data flows at each Mission and where key barriers and contacts reside within the organization.
  - A stakeholder feedback note that summarizes key messages/takeaways from internal and external interviews with Mission staff.
  - Addresses the ethnographic findings regarding incentives, motivations and attitudes, processes and systems, as well as articulate barriers and opportunities for more effective and widespread data usage within USAID.
  - Incorporates detailed and rich context as well as specific recommendations that relate to the various data tools explored during our planning and synthesis.
  - To be written with the USAID MS and Data Teams as the primary audience, but with a greater audience of technical USAID staff in mind.
  - The report should have visual and info-graphic elements where necessary.
  - Complete requirements for the final ethnography will be defined during the synthesis workshop.
- A summary presentation in Washington, DC made for USAID staff interested in project cycles and data usage at Missions and within the organization as a whole, covering key findings, results, and recommendations and reflecting the final ethnographic report.
- A post-presentation forum in Washington, DC to host participation and discussion

around findings.
- The set of ethnographic tools (survey instruments, etc.), utilized in the research, packaged in a way that allows reuse; any raw data and photos that are sharable.

Timeline
A detailed timeline for consultations, submission of draft deliverables, and other project milestones will be developed once the firm is in place upon consultation with mSTAR and USAID. The entire activity is estimated to take four to six months.

A proposed breakdown of timing is as follows:
- 1 month - Develop conceptual framework, methodology and Mission Action Plans
- 2-3 months - Research in Missions
- ½-1 month - Synthesis Sessions
- ½-1 month- Report Writing and Presentation

The firm will be expected to be able to provide research teams that can travel to USAID Missions within the estimated timeframes. Draft travel reports for each Mission should be submitted within two weeks after the conclusion of the Mission visit. The final reports and summary presentation should be completed within six months of starting the assignment.

4 INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS

4.1 OFFERORS ELIGIBILITY

This competition is open to any non-governmental, non-profit or for-profit entity. To be minimally eligible for funding, offerors must comply with the following conditions:
- Organizations must be legally registered or otherwise authorized to conduct business in their country or countries of operation.
- Organizations must have a DUNS number.
- Organizations must have experience in qualitative research, specifically ethnographic/cultural in nature.
- Organizations must submit their proposal in English.

4.2 FUNDING AND ESTIMATED PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The mechanism for funding will be a Cost Reimbursable Subcontract. FHI 360 will issue payment(s) based on submission and FHI360 acceptance of invoices and associated deliverables or measurable project milestones. Once an award is issued, it will include an invoicing schedule as well as a schedule of deliverables/milestones specified in the Scope of Work. The estimated ceiling budget for this activity is $300,000.

The subcontract is anticipated to commence in April 2014 and final deliverables are anticipated to be submitted in September 2014.

4.3 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE

Proposals may be submitted at any time before 5:00 PM EST on the date specified on the cover page of this RFP. Submissions received after the deadline will not be considered. Additional opportunities for applying, however, may be made available in the future.

4.4 SUBMISSION METHOD FOR QUESTIONS AND PROPOSALS

Submit Questions and Proposals electronically to: Erica Buckingham at ebuckingham@fhi360.org with copies to Kelly Cheung at kcheung@fhi360.org. FHI 360 is not receiving paper applications for this RFP. All questions and answers will be shared with all interested offerors.

Technical proposals and attachments may be submitted in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF. Budgets must be submitted in Microsoft Excel.

The email subject line should read "Subcontract to Design and Conduct Ethnography Studies–[Name of Organization submitting proposal]".

4.5 REVIEW PROCESS

Proposals will be reviewed and awarded by an evaluation panel. FHI 360 will lead and coordinate the evaluation panel. A technical evaluation committee will review all technical proposals using the Evaluation Criteria detailed below.

It is anticipated that the award will be made within 4-6 weeks after the submission deadline, as stated on the cover of this RFP. Final negotiations and award will be managed by FHI 360.

4.6 PROPOSAL CONTENTS

Offerors will develop their proposals based on their understanding of needs, their prior institutional experience and their determination of the approaches that would be feasible and successful within the context provided above. In all cases, offerors shall clearly explain the rationale for the proposed approaches chosen.

Proposals should include submission of a technical proposal with attachments and a cost proposal. Technical proposals should not exceed 6 pages. Proposals must remain valid for at least sixty (60) days. The format should include the following:

Part A: Technical Proposal

1. Organization's legal name
2. Contact name
3. Contact person's position
4. E-mail address

5. Telephone number

6. Technical approach, including proposed implementation plan and projected timeframe for design and implementation

7. Staffing Structure

8. Corporate capabilities and past performance

Technical Attachments *(Please submit the following attachments with the Technical Proposal. Note that they do not count towards the 6 page limit)*

1. Please provide the CVs of the key personnel who will perform the study (maximum 4 pages per CV).

2. Please provide two references for each of the proposed staff. Include contact information (names, company or organization, phone number and email).

Part B: Cost Proposal

1. Please submit a summary and detailed line item budget broken down by Phase I (design) and Phase II (implementation), budget narrative, and supporting documentation that clearly describe how the budgeted amounts are calculated. See Attachment A for budget template.
   a. A brief narrative explanation and justification for each line item must be included in a separate section entitled "budget narrative" and include data to support actual costs and/or methodologies to support cost estimates. The budget narrative serves as justification for each cost included in a budget; should be presented in such a way as to be easily referenced from the budget; and should provide sufficient information so that FHI 360 may review a proposed budget for reasonableness. All projected costs must be in accordance with the organization's standard practices and policies.
   b. Budgets must be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate reasonableness and completeness. Offerors including budget information determined to be unreasonable, incomplete, unnecessary for the completion of the proposed project, or based on a methodology that is not adequately supported may be deemed unacceptable.
   c. Budgets should be submitted in applicant's local currency. Please note that FHI 360 cannot honor exchange rates included in a budget. Payments will be made according to the exchange rate at the time of payment.
   d. Please indicate the inclusion/exclusion of any applicable taxes such as VAT.
   e. Please include travel to the Missions (one in Asia and one in Africa), as well as to Washington DC for project debrief if necessary.

2. Please include a signed biodata form (Attachment B) for any proposed staff or consultants who have a daily rate greater than $50 USD. See Attachment B for FHI 360 template.

Part C: Attachments

1. Certifications (Attachment C); Certifications are required by FHI 360 and USAID and must be signed by the authorized official, dated and included in the proposal. Recipients will be required to comply with the content of the certifications as part of the contractual agreement when/if funding is approved.
2. Registration certificate for the organization.

4.7 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The criteria presented below have been tailored to the requirements of this RFP. A total of 100 points are possible for the complete proposal. The relative importance of each criterion is indicated by approximate weight by points.

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Technical Approach - Comprehensiveness of proposed approach. Clarity and appropriateness of proposed technical approach for USAID Missions. - Implementation plan and proposed timeline are realistic and include all proposed elements of the activity.	25 points
Personnel - All key personnel (from the chosen external firm) identified to perform this work must have a proven track record in design research as well as qualitative and cultural research design and study. - Personnel should also ideally be knowledgeable with ICT4D practices; organizational change management; data analysis; stakeholder communications; performance metrics; and program design, planning, and development. - Personnel should also be familiar with and, ideally, have experience working with USAID. - Personnel should have excellent written and oral communication skills in English.	30 points
Corporate Capabilities and Past Performance - The extent to which the organization has successfully performed ethnography studies previously and the data was used to change processes, behaviors, increase efficiency, save costs, and/or change design of programs. - The extent to which the organization has successfully employed mobile data collection techniques or data-driven change analysis for development. - The proposed management structure is reasonable and sufficient to implement this work. - Proposed staff person(s) who will be responsible for implementation have the relevant skills and past experience to successfully complete the assignment.	20 points
Cost Application	25 points

- Reasonableness of proposed budget based on scope of activities being proposed - Summary budget, detailed budget, and budget notes included - Signed FHI 360 biodata forms included - In local currency, follows budget template (see Attachment A), indicates inclusion/exclusion of any applicable taxes. Total price will be evaluated by FHI 360. In evaluating the proposed budget, FHI 360's concerns include determining whether: o Proposed price reflects a clear understanding of the requirements stated in this RFP, and is consistent with the various elements of the Offeror's proposal. o Proposed price is reasonable in comparison with proposed prices received in response to the solicitation. o Proposed price is reasonable in comparison with prices with FHI 360's independent cost estimate. Unrealistically low or high proposed prices, initially or subsequently, may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition either on the basis that the Offeror does not understand the requirement or the Offeror has provided an unrealistic proposal.	
TOTAL	**100 points**

5 TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Offerors are responsible for review of the terms and conditions described below and in the award budget template attached. If relevant, particular attention should be paid to clauses regarding USAID geographic code, marking and branding requirements and equipment and commodity purchases.

5.1 SOURCE OF FUNDING AND GEOGRAPHIC CODE

Any award issued under this RFP will be financed by USAID funding and will be subject to U.S. Government and USAID regulations. The authorized USAID geographic code for this RFP and any resulting award is Code 937. All commodities and services supplied under any subcontract resulting from this RFP must meet this geographic code in accordance with the US Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 22 CFR §228.

5.2 WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSALS

Offerors may withdraw proposals by written notice via email received at any time before award.

5.3 RIGHT TO SELECT/REJECT

FHI 360 reserves the right to select and negotiate with those firms/individuals it determines, in its sole discretion, to be qualified for competitive proposals and to terminate negotiations without incurring any liability. FHI 360 also reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received without explanation.

5.4 DISCLAIMER

1. Offerors will not be reimbursed for the cost incurred in preparation and submission of a proposal. All preparation and submission costs are at the Offeror's expense
2. This RFP represents only a definition of requirements. It is merely an invitation for submission of proposals and does not legally obligate FHI 360 to accept any of the submitted proposals in whole or in part, nor is FHI 360 obligated to select the lowest priced proposal.
3. FHI 360 reserves the right to negotiate with any or all firms, both with respect to price, cost and/or scope of services.
4. FHI 360 reserves the right to independently negotiate with any offeror, or to make an award without conducting discussion based solely on the written proposals if it decides it is in its best interest to do so. FHI 360 reserves the right to fund any or none of the proposals received.
5. FHI 360 reserves the right to disqualify any offer based on offeror failure to follow solicitation instructions.
6. FHI 360 may choose to award only part of the activities in the solicitation, or issue multiple award based on the solicitation activities.
7. FHI 360 reserves the right to waive minor proposal deficiencies that can be corrected prior to award determination to promote competition
8. FHI 360 reserves the right to check applicant's donor reference

5.5 OFFER VERIFICATION

FHI 360 may contact offerors to confirm contact person, address, bid amount and to confirm that the bid was submitted for this solicitation.

5.6 FALSE STATEMENTS IN OFFER

Offerors must provide full, accurate and complete information as required by this solicitation and its attachments. Failure to submit correct, complete and accurate information shall lead to automatic disqualification.

5.7 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Offerors must provide disclosure of any past, present or future relationships with any parties associated with the issuance, review or management of this solicitation and anticipated award. Failure to provide full and open disclosure may result in FHI 360 having to re-evaluate selection of a potential offeror.

5.8 RESERVED RIGHTS

All RFP responses become the property of FHI 360 and FHI 360 reserves the right in its sole discretion to:

- Disqualify any offer based on offeror failure to follow solicitation instructions;
- Waive any deviations by offerors from the requirements of this solicitation that in FHI 360's opinion are considered not to be material defects requiring rejection or disqualification; or where such a waiver will promote increased competition;

- Extend the time for submission of all RFP responses after notification to all offerors;
- Terminate or modify the RFP process at any time and re-issue the RFP to whomever FHI 360 deems appropriate;
- Issue an award based on the initial evaluation of offers without discussion;
- Award only part of the activities in the solicitation or issue multiple awards based on solicitation activities.

5.9 GOVERNING LAW AND LANGUAGE

This solicitation and any resulting contract shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the U.S. Government -. The English language version of this solicitation and any resulting contract shall govern, and all notices pursuant to the provisions of this solicitation and any resulting contract shall be in English.

5.10 CERTIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT PRICE DETERMINATION

(a) The offeror certifies that--

(1) The prices in this offer have been arrived at independently, without, for the purpose of restricting competition, any consultation, communication, or agreement with any other offeror, including but not limited to subsidiaries or other entities in which offeror has any ownership or other interests, or any competitor relating to (i) those prices, (ii) the intention to submit an offer, or (iii) the methods or factors used to calculate the prices offered;

(2) The prices in this offer have not been and will not be knowingly disclosed by the offeror, directly or indirectly, to any other offeror, including but not limited to subsidiaries or other entities in which offeror has any ownership or other interests, or any competitor before bid opening (in the case of a sealed bid solicitation) or contract award (in the case of a negotiated or competitive solicitation) unless otherwise required by law; and

(3) No attempt has been made or will be made by the offeror to induce any other concern or individual to submit or not to submit an offer for the purpose of restricting competition or influencing the competitive environment.

(b) Each signature on the offer is considered to be a certification by the signatory that the signatory--

(1) Is the person in the offeror's organization responsible for determining the prices being offered in this bid or proposal, and that the signatory has not participated and will not participate in any action contrary to subparagraphs (a)(1) through (a)(3) above; or

(2) (i) Has been authorized, in writing, to act as agent for the principals of the offeror in certifying that those principals have not participated, and will not participate in any action contrary to subparagraphs (a)(1) through (a)(3) above;

(ii) As an authorized agent, does certify that the principals of the offeror have not participated, and will not participate, in any action contrary to subparagraphs (a)(1) through (a)(3) above; and

(iii) As an agent, has not personally participated, and will not participate, in any action contrary to subparagraphs (a)(1) through (a)(3) above.

(c) Offeror understands and agrees that --

(1) Violation of this certification will result in immediate disqualification from this solicitation without recourse and may result in disqualification from future solicitations; and

(2) Discovery of any violation after award to the offeror will result in the termination of the award for default.

5.11 AWARD AND NOTIFICATION OF SELECTED PROPOSALS

1. Prior to the expiration period of proposal validity, FHI 360 will notify the successful offeror who submitted the highest scoring proposal in writing by registered letter, email, or facsimile and invite it to negotiate the contract.
2. The aim will be to reach agreement on all points, and draft an initial contract by the conclusion of negotiations.
3. Negotiations will commence with a discussion of the offeror's technical proposal, schedule of activities, staffing and any suggestions you may have made to improve upon the Scope of Work. Agreement must then be reached on the final deliverables, staffing, logistics and reporting. Special attention will be paid to define clearly the inputs required from FHI 360 to ensure satisfactory implementation of the assignment.
4. Changes agreed upon will then be reflected in the financial proposal, using proposed unit rates.
5. Having selected the Subcontractor on the basis of an evaluation of proposed key professional staff among other things, FHI 360 expects to negotiate a contract on the basis of the staff named in the proposal and, prior to contract negotiations, will require assurance that these staff will be actually available. FHI 360 will not consider substitutions during contract negotiations except in cases of unexpected delays in the starting date or incapacity of key professional staff for reasons of health.
6. The negotiations will be concluded with a review of the draft form of the contract. FHI 360 and the offeror shall finalize the contract to conclude negotiations.
7. The contract will be awarded after successful negotiations with the selected offeror. If negotiations fail, FHI 360 will invite the offeror having obtained the second highest score to contract negotiations.
8. Any selected firm will be required to complete a Financial Pre-Award Assessment in order for FHI 360 to ascertain that the organization has the capacity to perform successfully under the terms and conditions of the proposed award. As part of the Pre-Award Assessment process the firm will also be requested to submit a financial audit report from the previous fiscal year. In addition, payroll records and other financial information may be requested to support budgeted costs.
9. Issuance of this Request for Proposal does not constitute an award commitment on the part of FHI 360 nor does it commit FHI 360 to pay for the costs incurred in the submission of a proposal to the RPP. Furthermore, FHI 360 reserves the right to reject any or all offers received and to negotiate separately with an offeror, if such action is considered to be in the best interest of FHI 360's client organization, the U.S. Agency for International Development.
10. FHI 360 may evaluate offers in response to this solicitation without discussions and will award a contract to the responsible offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, will be most advantageous to FHI 360 based on the technical factors specified in this solicitation and the price.

FHI 360 reserves the right to:

(a) Reject any or all offers;

(b) Accept other than the lowest-price offer; and/or

(c) Waive informalities or minor irregularities in offers received.

11. Please note that if you consider that your firm does not have all the expertise for the assignment, there is no objection to your firm associating with another firm to enable a full range of expertise to be presented. However, joint ventures between firms on the shortlist are not permitted without the prior approval of FHI 360. The request for a joint venture should be accompanied with full details of the proposed association.

6 ATTACHMENTS

The following documents under are considered part of this RFP.

A) Budget Template
B) FHI 360 Biodata Form
C) Certifications