

**USDA LOCAL AND REGIONAL FOOD AID PROCUREMENT
PILOT PROJECT
END OF PROJECT INDEPENDENT EVALUATION
SCOPE OF WORK**

March 28, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. BACKGROUND	2
2.1 Evaluation Audience.....	3
2.2 References.....	3
3. SCOPE.....	4
4. REQUIREMENTS.....	5
4.1 Phase I – Post-Award Meeting	6
4.2 Phase I – Final Work Plan	6
4.3 Phase I – Document Review	6
4.4 Phase II – Domestic Interviews	6
4.4.1 Market Monitoring & The Learning Alliance	6
4.5 Phase II – Pre-Departure Meeting & Field Work Plan.....	7
4.6 Phase III – Field Work.....	7
4.7 Phase IV – Post-Field Work Debrief and Report Outline.....	8
4.8 Phase V – Submit First Draft of Report.....	8
4.9 Phase VI – First Draft Review Meeting.....	8
4.10 Phase VII - Submit Second Draft of Report	8
4.10.1 Second Draft Review Meeting (As Necessary)	9
4.10.2 Submit Third Draft of the Report.....	9
4.11 Phase VIII – Submit Final Report.....	9
4.12 Phase IX – Public Information Session	9
5. REPORTING	9
Quality Assurance Plan.....	10
Monthly Performance Report	10
6. DELIVERABLES.....	10
7. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE	11
8. PLACE OF PERFORMANCE	11
9. TRAVEL.....	11
10. CONTRACT TYPE.....	12
11. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS	12
Team Leader Capabilities	13
Technical Specialist(s) Capabilities.....	13
<i>Annex A: USDA LRP Projects</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Annex B: USDA LRP Project Final Evaluation Requirements</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Annex C: Additional References</i>	<i>18</i>

1. INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Agriculture Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Pilot Project (USDA LRP Project) is a five-year, \$60 million pilot authorized in Section 3206 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Farm Bill) for the purpose of examining the timeliness and efficiency of using local and regional procurement (LRP) as a tool to enhance U.S. Government food assistance programs. The rationale for LRP is based on the premise that providing cash grants for the purchase of food from surplus markets in the recipient country or region may allow for a quicker and more cost-efficient response to a natural disaster or other food crisis.

Although the project's focus is on funding emergency programs, the legislation directed USDA to use a portion of the funds for field-based projects that also provide development assistance. However, development programs were required to be for a period of no less than one year, which in effect prohibited the funding of development programs after October 1, 2010. In addition, the legislation directed USDA to select a diversity of projects, including projects located in multiple geographic regions as well as both food surplus and food deficit regions. However, the legislation also required that USDA ensure that the majority of the field-based projects selected be located in Africa and procure eligible commodities produced in Africa.

The USDA LRP Project is being managed by the Food Assistance Division (FAD) of the Office of Capacity Building and Development (OCBD), Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS), of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). In accordance with the requirements of the authorizing law, USDA seeks to hire an external contractor to conduct an independent evaluation of the USDA LRP Project.

2. BACKGROUND

Under the 2008 Farm Bill, Congress authorized \$60 million in Commodity Credit Corporation funding for USDA to implement a local and regional food aid procurement pilot project in FY 2009 – 2012. The pilot is intended to study the timeliness and effectiveness of using local and regional procurement of food aid in responding to food crises and disasters. The authorizing law required USDA to do the following:

- 1) Complete and submit a report to Congress no later than 180 days after the date of enactment that studied:
 - Local and regional procurements for food aid programs conducted by—
 - other donor countries;
 - private voluntary organizations; and
 - the World Food Programme (WFP) of the United Nations.
- 2) Issue guidelines to carry out field-based projects that take into account the results of the study.
- 3) Provide grants to, or enter into cooperative agreements with, eligible organizations to carry out field-based projects that consist of local or regional procurements of eligible commodities to respond to food crises and disasters.

- 4) Submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that contains the analysis and findings of an independent evaluation no later than four years after the date of enactment (June 17, 2012).

In fiscal year 2009, USDA fulfilled the first requirement of the authorizing law by completing the required report, *The Use of Local and Regional Procurement in Meeting the Food Needs of Those Affected by Disasters and Food Crises*.¹ This study was submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress on January 15, 2009. USDA fulfilled the second requirement by issuing *Interim Guidelines for the Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Pilot Project*² on September 21, 2009. From fiscal year 2009 through 2011, USDA fulfilled the third requirement of the authorizing law by providing funding for the implementation of 23 field-based projects with seven Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) and WFP to implement emergency response and development food assistance programs in Sub-Saharan Africa, Central America and South & Southeast Asia (*see Annex A for a detailed listing of the projects and grant recipients*).

This request for quote (RFQ) is being issued to fulfill the fourth requirement under the authorizing law, the submission to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that contains the analysis and findings of an independent evaluation (*see Annex B for the detailed requirements of the evaluation as specified in the authorizing law*).

2.1 Evaluation Audience

The main audience for the independent evaluation of the USDA LRP Project report is the appropriate committees of the U.S. Congress. More specifically, the report will be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, and House of Representatives' Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs. Within USDA, the report will be widely circulated, with special attention paid by FAS' overseas posts and agencies. Externally, other U.S. governmental agencies such as the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the PVO community, WFP, universities, foreign governments and the international food security audience writ large will be interested in the findings of this evaluation.

2.2 References

The following references are attached as part of this requirement for the contractor's review:

- The Use of Local and Regional Procurement in Meeting the Food Needs of Those Affected by Disasters and Food Crises³
- INTERNATIONAL FOOD ASSISTANCE: Local and Regional Procurement Can Enhance the Efficiency of U.S. Food Aid, but Challenges May Constrain Its Implementation⁴

¹ <http://www.fas.usda.gov/excredits/FoodAid/LRP/USDALRPStudy.pdf>

² http://www.fas.usda.gov/excredits/FoodAid/LRP/Interim_PPP_Guidelines.pdf

³ <http://www.fas.usda.gov/excredits/FoodAid/LRP/USDALRPStudy.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09570.pdf>

- Market Information and Food Insecurity Response Analysis. Barrett, Bell, Lentz and Maxwell. February 2009.⁵
- Section 3206 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008⁶
- Interim Guidelines for Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Pilot Project⁷
- *See Annex C for Additional References*

3. SCOPE

The contractor is expected to perform the requirements of this contract in two periods as identified in Section 4 below. In addition to the tasks summarized below, within one week of the contract award, the contractor will be required to electronically submit a Quality Assurance Plan to the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR).

In general, the selected contractor will perform the following key activities in the base period:

- Review relevant background documentation including, but not limited to, the documents referenced in Section 2.2, PVO and WFP proposals, agreements and other relevant materials. FAD will provide the Contractor with copies of the relevant proposals and agreements.
- Review PVO quarterly and cumulative procurement and distribution status reports, other programmatic reports, commodity quality inspection reports and other materials that become available. FAD will provide the Contractor with copies of these documents.
- Review final market analysis reports submitted by participants, including reports from project price monitoring databases and other data collected by participants. FAD will provide the Contractor with copies of these documents.
- Meet with Chris Barrett and Erin Lentz from Cornell University to gain a comprehensive understanding of their work and the methodology that the Learning Alliance members are employing.
- Meet with WFP to gain a comprehensive understanding of the market monitoring strategies being employed under the Purchase for Progress initiative and other operations that are conducting local and regional procurements (Emergency Operations {EMOPs}, Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations {PRROs} and Development Operations {DEVs}).
- Meet with the authors of the GAO report to gain a comprehensive understanding of the methodology employed to develop their report and obtain lessons learned from the process.
- Develop a methodology for conducting the evaluation and statistical analysis that fulfills the requirements set out in the authorizing law.
- Develop a work plan to implement the evaluation methodology.
- Visit a sampling of USDA LRP Project field-based projects in each geographic region to collect primary data, including but not limited to: first-person interviews with PVO and

⁵ <http://www.basis.wisc.edu/ept/barrett%20background%20food%20security.pdf>

⁶ http://www.fas.usda.gov/excredits/FoodAid/LRP/Farm_Bill_2008.pdf

⁷ http://www.fas.usda.gov/excredits/FoodAid/LRP/Interim_PPP_Guidelines.pdf

WFP staff, project beneficiaries, participating vendors, project sub-recipients (particularly those involved in the market monitoring component), warehouses and other relevant project stakeholders

In general, the selected contractor will perform the following key activities during option period 1:

- Provide FAD with the initial draft of the report.
 - The report should utilize and build upon the aforementioned GAO report.
 - FAD will assist the Contractor to access data comparable to that used in the GAO report as well as that collected by the PVOs that received funding under the USDA LRP Project.
- Respond to comments and questions from FAD and revise the report as necessary.
- Be available to respond to a second round of questions and comments from FAD, as necessary.
- Finalize the report for the appropriate committees of the U.S. Congress.
- Present the report's findings in a public information session after the report is submitted to appropriate committees of the U.S. Congress.

4. REQUIREMENTS

The Contractor shall facilitate and guide an independent evaluation of all field-based projects implemented under the USDA LRP Project. The primary purpose of the final evaluation is to determine whether local and regional procurement is timelier than in-kind food aid (when considering both the speed of procurement and delivery) and the secondary purpose is to determine whether it is more cost-effective. A third purpose is to assess the market impact of the procurements.

As part of this evaluation, the Contractor is expected to review existing literature, obtain and analyze relevant data, interview relevant stakeholders and other primary sources and conduct an overall analysis of the USDA LRP Project based on the requirements of the authorizing law. Prior to initiating the evaluation, the Contractor will present a detailed implementation plan including the assessment methodology and timeline for conducting the work and how the evaluation findings will be presented to FAD. The Contractor is expected to complete a comprehensive evaluation report that fulfills the requirements denoted in the 2008 Farm Bill (P.L. 110, Section 3206, Part (f)) to be submitted to appropriate committees of the Congress and present the findings in a public information session.

Throughout the course of the evaluation, the Contractor's participation shall be limited to the activity for which the Contractor is responsible under the statement of work. The Contractor's employees shall identify themselves as contractor personnel when in meetings or engaging in activities associated with the requirements in the statement of work.

BASE PERIOD

4.1 Phase I – Post-Award Meeting

Within one week following the contract award, the Contractor will work with the LRP Project Manager to arrange to meet with FAD, in particular the USDA LRP Project staff, to discuss the proposed evaluation methodology. The purpose of this meeting is to provide the Contractor and FAD with an opportunity to obtain mutual clarification regarding the requirements of the statement of work and the proposed evaluation methodology respectively. This meeting will also serve as an opportunity to discuss potential revisions to the evaluation methodology and work plan, as necessary.

4.2 Phase I – Final Work Plan

Within one week of the post-award meeting, the contractor will electronically submit to the COTR and LRP Project Manager a finalized detailed work plan that incorporates feedback from the post-award meeting and includes a chronology of how the requirements in this statement of work will be met. The Contractor will not begin Phase II until it receives written acceptance of the work plan from the LRP Project Manager.

4.3 Phase I – Document Review

The Contractor will gather and study relevant documentation (including, but not limited to, the materials referenced in Sections 2.2 and 3) and existing data sets to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the history of local and regional procurement and accepted methodologies, for project implementation. FAD will provide the Contractor with documents as described in Section 3, and will assist the Contractor to obtain the relevant data sets, as necessary.

4.4 Phase II – Domestic Interviews

In addition to reviewing the relevant documentation, the Contractor will meet with stakeholders in the U.S., including but not limited to: relevant staff at Cornell University, participating PVOs and WFP, as well as the authors of the GAO report. The Contractor will also study the Learning Alliance market monitoring strategy, Learning Alliance market prices database and the dataset used to develop the GAO report.

4.4.1 Market Monitoring & The Learning Alliance

The 2008 Farm Bill outlined market monitoring requirements to ensure that the local and regional procurements did not have a disruptive impact on markets. Specifically, the legislation directed USDA to ensure that locally and regionally-procured food aid was provided to affected populations without significantly increasing commodity costs for low-income consumers who procure commodities from the same markets where the eligible commodities were procured. In addition, USDA was directed to ensure that the procurement and distribution of the commodities did not have a disruptive impact on farmers located in, or the economy of, the recipient country or any country in the region in which the commodities were procured and/or distributed. The

legislation also directed USDA to take precautions to ensure that the procurement of the eligible commodities did not unduly disrupt world prices for agricultural commodities or normal patterns of commercial trade with foreign countries and that the procurements were made at a reasonable market price with respect to the economy of the country in which the eligible commodities were procured.

To ensure the fulfillment of these requirements, six of the seven PVO grantees created a consortium called The Learning Alliance. The Learning Alliance, which includes Cornell University as the technical lead, is a mechanism for the PVOs to develop a standardized strategy for the implementation of the market impact monitoring component of their respective field-based projects. The Learning Alliance members are responsible for implementing 13 of the 14 field-based projects awarded to PVOs under the USDA LRP Project. The Learning Alliance members have also pooled their monitoring and evaluation funds to create an online database in which they record the market prices they have collected throughout the program implementation period.

In addition to leading the development of the Learning Alliance's market impact monitoring strategy, the Cornell University staff, led by Chris Barrett, are assisting PVOs with their pre-purchase analyses, the collection and analysis of secondary data and are providing ongoing technical support.

Cornell University is also conducting in-depth evaluations with counterfactuals for three field-based projects (CRS - Burkina Faso, CRS – Guatemala and Land O'Lakes - Zambia). These in-depth project evaluations will utilize matched communities and in-kind food aid projects as benchmarks against which the market impacts, and effectiveness, of local and regional procurements can be more effectively assessed. Thus, the work conducted by Cornell University under the Learning Alliance is an integral component of the USDA LRP Project that the Contractor is expected to assess comprehensively.

WFP and PVO(s) not involved in the Learning Alliance are employing other approaches to market monitoring and are ensuring that their procurements do not result in disruptive market impacts. The Contractor is expected to also examine the methodologies employed by these organizations.

4.5 Phase II – Pre-Departure Meeting & Field Work Plan

Prior to conducting the field work, and no later than July 15, 2011, the Contractor will contact the LRP Project Manager to schedule a meeting with FAD to provide feedback from the domestic interviews and discuss a detailed work plan for the upcoming field work. At least three business days prior to the meeting, the Contractor will electronically submit the detailed field work plan to the COTR and the LRP Project Manager. The Contractor will not begin Phase III until it receives written acceptance of the field work plan from the LRP Project Manager.

4.6 Phase III – Field Work

Following the approval of the field work plan, but not later than July 30, 2011 the Contractor will begin travel to the agreed upon USDA LRP Project field-based projects to conduct primary research for the evaluation. The field work must be concluded by September 30, 2011. The Contractor will meet with LRP Project stakeholders, including but not limited to: PVO and WFP staff, external organizations involved in monitoring the projects' impacts on markets, beneficiaries, participating vendors, grantee sub-recipients, warehouse staff and other relevant project stakeholders. The Contractor will review relevant documentation from the field-based projects including but not limited to: proposals, project implementation plans, procurement files, market monitoring reports, financial documents related to procurements and voucher activities, food quality inspection reports and warehouse inventory reports. The Contractor will collect additional commodity price data as necessary. The Contractor will also review all available PVO quarterly and cumulative procurement and distribution reports, end of project implementation and market analysis reports/data.

OPTION PERIOD 1

4.7 Phase IV – Post-Field Work Debrief and Report Outline

Within two weeks of the completion of Phase III, the Contractor will contact the LRP Project Manager to schedule a meeting with FAD. The meeting must take place no later than October 21, 2011. At least five work days prior to the meeting the Contractor will electronically submit an outline of the evaluation report to the COTR and the LRP Project Manager. At the meeting, the Contractor and FAD will discuss the findings from the field work and outline of the evaluation report to ensure that the Contractor's work aligns with the requirements of the authorizing law prior to beginning to draft the report. The Contractor will not begin Phase V until it receives written acceptance of the outline of the evaluation report from the LRP Project Manager.

4.8 Phase V – Submit First Draft of Report

No later than December 30, 2011 the Contractor will electronically submit the first full draft of the evaluation report to the COTR and LRP Project Manager.

4.9 Phase VI – First Draft Review Meeting

Within 15 days of the submission of the first draft of the report, the Contractor and LRP Project Manager will schedule a Draft Review Meeting. At this meeting, FAD will pose questions and provide feedback to the Contractor regarding the submitted report. At the end of the meeting the Contractor will provide a list of outstanding issues and/or revisions that will be addressed in the subsequent version of the report.

4.10 Phase VII - Submit Second Draft of Report

No later than 45 days after the Draft Review Meeting, the Contractor will submit a revised draft of the report that addresses all of the comments and questions from the Draft Review Meeting, to the COTR and LRP Project Manager.

4.10.1 Second Draft Review Meeting (As Necessary)

If deemed necessary by FAD, within 15 days of the submission of the second draft of the report, the Contractor and LRP Project Manager will schedule a Second Draft Review Meeting. At this meeting, FAD will pose questions and provide feedback to the Contractor regarding the submitted report. At the end of the meeting the Contractor will provide a list of outstanding issues and/or revisions that will be addressed in the subsequent version of the report.

4.10.2 Submit Third Draft of the Report

No later than 15 days after the Second Draft Review Meeting the Contractor will submit a revised draft of the report that addresses all of the comments and questions from the Second Draft Review Meeting.

4.11 Phase VIII – Submit Final Report

The Contractor will electronically submit a copy of the final report to the COTR and submit 125 bound hard copies of the final report printed in color and professionally finished for approval to the LRP Project Manager no later than April 2, 2012. The Contractor will receive written approval of the report from the LRP Project Manager. Once the report has been officially approved, the Contractor and LRP Project Manager will schedule a date for the Contractor to present the report in a public information session.

4.12 Phase IX – Public Information Session

After the submission of the report to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Contractor will present the evaluation findings in a public information session that will be open to all interested individuals and organizations. The public information session must be held no later than July 13, 2012. The Contractor will electronically submit the power point presentation with detailed speaking notes to the COTR and LRP Project Manager for review and feedback no later than 10 business days prior to the presentation date. The Contractor will electronically submit the revised power point presentation to the COTR and LRP Project Manager for final approval no later than three work days prior to the presentation. The Contractor will not complete Phase IX until it receives written acceptance of the power point presentation from the LRP Project Manager.

5. REPORTING

The Contractor shall provide all of the reports below to enable the LRP Project Manager and COTR to monitor progress and ensure compliance. All reports prepared by the Contractor shall be submitted to the LRP Project Manager and COTR for review and approval.

Quality Assurance Plan

The Contractor shall provide a written Quality Assurance Plan that defines the activities, roles and responsibilities planned to ensure successful completion and performance in accordance with the requirements. The plan should identify how the Contractor will ensure the timeliness and acceptability of deliverables; monitor and track productivity and resolve problems in a timely manner. This report shall be submitted electronically to the COTR within one week of the contract award.

Monthly Performance Report

The Contractor shall provide a written monthly report that tracks progress toward completion of tasks identified throughout section 4 above and deliverables identified in the table in section 6 below. The monthly report will be due the last working day of each month and should be a maximum of 3 pages. In addition to the narrative update, the monthly report should include a table that lists the tasks and deliverables in this requirement and their completion dates. The Contractor’s final monthly report shall be a closeout report.

6. DELIVERABLES

The Contractor shall provide the items listed in the table below to the USDA LRP Project staff and COTR throughout the contract’s period of performance. The table provides the due date and phase each deliverable will occur. The table also estimates the level of effort that may be expended on each deliverable as expressed as a percentage.

BASE PERIOD				
Deliverable Description	SOW Reference	Estimated Deliverable Due Date	Unit of Issue	
Quality Assurance Plan	Section 5	Within 1 week of contract award	(1) one	
Monthly Performance Reports	Section 5	Last working day of each month	(3) three	
Post Award Meeting	Section 4.1	Within 1 week of contract award	N/A	
Submit Final Work Plan	Section 4.2.1	Within 1 week of post award meeting	(1) one	
Submit Field Work Plan	Section 4.5	Three Days Prior to Pre-Departure Meeting	(1) one	
Pre-Departure Meeting	Section 4.5	Week of July 18, 2011	(1) one	

OPTION PERIOD 1				
Deliverable Description	SOW Reference	Estimated Deliverable Due Date	Unit of Issue	
Monthly Performance Reports	Section 5	Last working day of each month	(6) six	
Submit Outline of Evaluation Report	Section 4.7	Five Days Prior to Post-Field Work Debrief Meeting	(1) one	
Post-Field Work Debrief and Report Outline Review Meeting	Section 4.7	Week of October 17, 2011	(1) one	
Submit First Draft of Report	Section 4.8	December 30, 2011	(1) one	

First Draft Review Meeting	Section 4.9	Week of January 16, 2012	(1) one	
Submit Second Draft of Report	Section 4.10	March 2, 2012	(1) one	
<i>As Necessary:</i> Second Draft Review Meeting	Section 4.10.1	Week of March 19, 2012	(1) one	
<i>As Necessary:</i> Submit Third Draft of Report	Section 4.10.2	Week of April 2, 2012	(1) one	
Submit Final Report	Section 4.11	April 6, 2012	(1) one	
Submit Power Point Presentation	Section 4.12	10 Days Before Presentation	(1) one	
Public Information Presentation	Section 4.12	No later than July 13, 2012	(1) one	

7. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The period of performance for the Base Period will begin on award date through September 30, 2011. The period of performance for Option period will be October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012.

For purposes of scope clarification, a representative breakdown of the estimated price is shown in the table below.

Base Period	Not-to-Exceed \$603,313.00
Option Period 1	Not-to-Exceed \$359,409.00

Please note that the Government estimate is only put in place for Contractors to ascertain the approximate or estimated level of effort for the base period and option period 1. However, this is not to be construed as either mandatory or necessarily the best technical approach. It is only in place as a reference to allow Contractors to better understand the general scope of this effort from the Government's perspective. The Government is seeking the best level of effort and labor mix your company feels is right to accomplish the SOW.

8. PLACE OF PERFORMANCE

The place of performance for this contract will be the Washington D.C. Metro Area, except for travel as specified in Section 9. All work will be performed at the Contractor's facilities. The Contractor will be responsible for making all arrangements to visit with and interview relevant stakeholders. Likewise, the Contractor will be responsible for making all travel arrangements to visit the field-based projects and for obtaining necessary work space or other accommodations.

9. TRAVEL

The Contractor is expected to visit a number of the field-based projects funded under the USDA LRP Project to conduct primary research. The Contractor is also expected to travel to Ithaca, NY to meet with the relevant Cornell University staff. The Contractor should denote each planned

trip in the quote, including: the countries to be visited, number of days per country and number of staff per trip (*see Annex A for a detailed listing of the projects and grant recipients*).

All travel shall be approved, by the COTR, prior to commencement of travel. The contractor shall be reimbursed for actual allowable, allocable, and reasonable travel costs incurred during performance of this effort in accordance with the Federal Travel Regulations currently in effect on the date of travel.

Arrangements for and costs of all travel, transportation, meals, lodging, and incidentals are the responsibility of the contractor. Travel costs shall be incurred and billed in accordance with FAR Part 31. Costs for these expenses will be reviewed and certified by the COTR and approved by the Contracting Officer. All travel and transportation shall utilize commercial sources and carriers provided the method used for the appropriate geographical area results in reasonable charges to the government. The Government will not pay for business class or first-class travel. All travel shall be reimbursed in accordance with the Federal Travel Regulation.

Invoices for travel must include the following:

- Dates and destination of each trip.
- A summary and description of travel expenses being charged to the Government
- Receipts for airfare, hotel, rental car and any other expense exceeding \$75.00.
- Receipts must be legible.
- You must include an explanation for all charges under \$75.00.
- All expenses for each trip must be submitted on the same invoice.

Travel will be separate from the Firm Fixed Price amount.

10. CONTRACT TYPE

This is a fixed price contract.

11. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS

The Contractor shall provide staff to perform listed requirements within the statement of work in whatever mix of labor categories and whatever quantity of personnel/man-hours it determines to be appropriate to optimally meet the requirements stated herein. The mandatory specific personnel labor required are the Team Leader and Technical Specialist(s) (see below). These positions are designated as Key Personnel. The individuals proposed for these Key Personnel positions are considered by FAD to be essential to task order performance. The Contractor must re-confirm the availability of the individuals proposed for the Key Personnel positions, for the duration of the task order, prior to the execution of the contract. The Contracting Officer must be notified in writing at least 60 days prior to the Contractor removing or changing any of the Key Personnel from the order.

The Contractor shall submit curriculum vitae for each Key Personnel. The contractor shall demonstrate that each Key Personnel proposed possesses the required skills and experience. The Contractor shall detail the percentage of each Key Personnel staff member's time that shall be devoted to this project versus other projects throughout the duration of the evaluation. After award, any changes to the Key Personnel must be approved by the COTR and LRP Project Manager. Any proposed replacement must possess similar and comparable skills and expertise when compared to the original proposed Key Person. Hence, all Key Personnel curricula vitae must be reviewed and approved prior to new Key Personnel beginning work under this contract.

Team Leader Capabilities

The Contractor shall ensure that one of the key personnel will be the Team Leader who will bear the overall responsibility for the evaluation. The Team Leader shall be a Senior-level person with at least 15 years of experience leading evaluation teams to conduct complex economic analyses in developing countries, including primary research. The Team Leader must possess a history of successfully completing high-profile evaluations for the U.S. government. Previous experience completing comparable work for USAID and/or previous experience writing Congressional reports is preferred. The Team Leader is expected to have a strong background in multiple facets of food assistance programming, preferably from the perspective of both an implementing organization and a donor. The Team Leader should have a demonstrated capacity for conducting original econometric analyses. The Team Leader is expected to have significant experience living/working overseas in multiple geographic regions, including Sub-Saharan Africa. The Team Leader should also have strong communication (spoken, written and presentational), management and leadership skills including the ability to defend or explain difficult issues or positions. The quote must include the Team Leader's detailed CV, including a reference (preferably a supervisor and/or donor representative) for each position held for a minimum of the past five years or five positions (whichever is greater). In addition, a writing sample for which the Team Leader was the primary author must be submitted with the quote.

Technical Specialist(s) Capabilities

The Technical Specialist(s) will assist the Team Leader in the design, analysis and writing of the project evaluation. The Technical Specialist(s) shall be a Mid/Senior-level person with at least five years of experience working on evaluation teams focused on conducting complex economic analyses in developing countries, including collecting primary research. The Technical Specialist(s) must possess a history of participating on successfully completed high-profile evaluations for the U.S. government. Previous experience working on comparable evaluations for USAID and/or previous experience writing Congressional reports is preferred. The Technical Specialist(s) is expected to have a strong background in food assistance programming, preferably from the perspective of both an implementing organization and a donor. The Technical Specialist(s) should have a demonstrated capacity for conducting original econometric analyses. The Technical Specialist(s) is expected to have significant experience living/working overseas in multiple geographic regions. The Technical Specialist(s) should also have strong communication (spoken, written and presentational) skills including the ability to defend or explain difficult issues or positions. The quote must include the Technical Specialist's(' detailed CV, including a reference (preferably a supervisor and/or donor representative) for each

position held for a minimum of the past five years or five positions (whichever is greater). In addition, a writing sample for which the Team Leader was the primary author must be submitted with the quote.

Organizational Past Performance Records

In addition to the capabilities of Key Personnel, the Contractor must provide details of their past performance on previously-executed contracts to conduct independent evaluations of government projects. In particular, the Contractor should provide details on the organization's previous experience conducting evaluations of food assistance programming, food security-related issues, other international development projects, as well as market analyses and econometric analyses. For each previously-executed contract, the Contractor must provide contact details for the Contracting Office or other client-side point of contact.

Annex A: USDA LRP Projects

	Fiscal Year	Organization	Recipient Country	Program Type
1	2009	WFP	Mali	Development
2	2009	WFP	Malawi	Development
3	2009	WFP	Tanzania	Development
4	2010	Mercy Corps	Niger	Emergency
5	2010	Land O'Lakes	Bangladesh	Development
6	2010	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	Guatemala	Emergency
7	2010	CRS	Mali	Development
8	2010	CRS	Benin	Development
9	2010	CRS	Burkina Faso	Development
10	2010	International Relief and Development	Cambodia	Development
11	2010	Land O'Lakes	Zambia	Development
12	2010	WFP	Mali	Development
13	2010	Fabretto Children's Foundation	Nicaragua	Development
14	2010	WFP	Congo, Republic of	Emergency
15	2010	WFP	Cameroon	Emergency
16	2010	WFP	Chad	Emergency
17	2011	World Vision	Uganda	Development
18	2011	WFP	Cameroon	Emergency
19	2011	United Methodist Committee on Relief	Zimbabwe	Emergency
20	2011	World Vision	Kenya	Emergency

21	2011	CRS	Niger	Emergency
22	2011	WFP	Mozambique	Emergency
23	2011	WFP	Pakistan	Emergency

Annex B: USDA LRP Project Final Evaluation Requirements

(Due to Congress by June 17, 2012)

The primary purpose of the final evaluation is to determine whether local and regional procurement is timelier than in-kind food aid (when considering both the speed of procurement and delivery) and the secondary purpose is to determine whether it is more cost-effective. A third purpose is to assess the market impact of the procurements.

The evaluator will have to take into consideration whether a program is for emergency or development assistance, as the authorizing law requires that USDA provide funding for both types of programs. The expeditious procurement and delivery of food assistance during an emergency is especially critical. The speed of the procurement and delivery is also important for development programs, but in general, this element is less critical as development programs tend to address chronic food insecurity in situations in which lives are not immediately at stake. Cost is an important element to examine for both emergency and development assistance programs.

The authorizing law also *requires* that the following factors in relation to market impact be specifically addressed in the evaluation:

- i. with respect to each relevant market in which an eligible commodity was procured, a description of:
 1. the prevailing and historic supply, demand and price movements of the market (including the extent of competition for procurement bids);
 2. the impact of the procurement of the eligible commodity on producer and consumer prices in the market;
 3. each government market interference or other activity of the donor country that might have significantly affected the supply or demand of the eligible commodity in the area at which the local or regional procurement occurred;
 4. the quantities and types of eligible commodities procured in the market;
 5. the timeframe for the procurement of each eligible commodity;
 6. the total cost of the procurement of each eligible commodity (including storage, handling, transportation and administrative costs);
 7. an assessment regarding whether the requirements of 3206(e) and (f) have been met;
 8. the impact of different methodologies and approaches on:
 - a. local and regional agricultural producers (including large and small agricultural producers);
 - b. markets;
 - c. low-income consumers; and

- d. program recipients; and
- 9. the length of the period beginning on the date on which the Secretary initiated the procurement process and ending on the date of delivery of the commodities;
- 10. a comparison of different methodologies used ...with respect to:
 - a. the benefits to local agriculture;
 - b. the impact on markets and consumers;
 - c. the period of time required for procurement and delivery;
 - d. quality and safety assurances; and
 - e. implementation costs; and
- 11. to the extent to which adequate information is available, including the results of the initial study conducted under the USDA LRP Project, a comparison of the different methodologies used by other donor countries to make local and regional procurements.

Annex C: Additional References

A Market Analysis and Decision Tree Tool for Response Analysis: Cash, Local Purchase and/or Imported Food Aid? Daniel G. Maxwell, Erin C. Lentz, and Christopher B. Barrett, Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE), May 2007.

http://aem.cornell.edu/faculty_sites/cbb2/Papers/Decision%20Tree%20Tool%20%20May%2023%202007.pdf

Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement: An Assessment of Experience in Africa and Elements of Good Donor Practice, David Tschirley, and Anne Marie Del Castillo, Michigan State University International Development Working Paper No. 91, 2007.

Year: 2001-2005

Country: Kenya, Uganda, Zambia and Mozambique

Commodity: Corn and corn/soy blend

The United States' International Food Assistance Programs: Issues and Options for the 2007 Farm Bill, Christopher B. Barrett, February 2007.

Year: 2007

Country: United States

Commodity: Not applicable; general discussion of U.S. food aid

The Development Effectiveness of Food Aid: Does Tying Matter? Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2006

Year: 2002-2003

Country: Various donating and recipient countries

Commodity: Wheat, corn, cornsoy blend, vegetable oil, and rice

World Food Program Studies/Reports:

Food Procurement in Developing Countries, World Food Program, Executive Board, First Regular Session, Feb. 2006, Rome.

- Report summarizes other WFP studies on LRP in Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Nepal, South Africa, Uganda, and Congo

World Food Program Local and Regional Food Procurement-An Analytical Review (Ethiopian Case Study), Final Report. Addis Ababa: June 2005.

Year: 2001-2004

Country: Ethiopia

Commodity: Corn and wheat

Local and Regional Food Procurement in Uganda an Analytical Review, A study report prepared for the Economic Analysis and Development Policy Unit in the Strategy, Policy and Program Support Division of the World Food Program, Serunkuuma and Associates Consult, June 2005.

Year: 2001-2004

Country: Uganda

Commodity: Corn and beans

Food Aid Procurement in South Africa: an Analytical Review of WFP Activities; Nick Vink, Thulasizwe Mkhabela, Ferdie Meyer, and Johann Kirsten; April 2005.

Year: 2001-2004

Country: South Africa
Commodity: Corn

Democratic Republic of Congo Food Procurement Assessment Mission Euateur, Katanga, Orientale, North Kivu and South Kivu Provinces; World Food Program; May 2007.

Years: 2001-2006

Country: Democratic Republic of Congo

Commodity: Corn and pulses

Impact of WFP's Local and Regional Food Purchases (A Study Case on Burkina Faso) Final Report Submitted by Institut de Sahel Comite' Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte Contre La Secheresse dans le Sahel, Mali.

Year: 2002-2005

Country: Burkina Faso

Commodity: Corn, corn meal, sorghum, and cowpea