

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

RFP No: LAC-2024-002

Independent evaluator of the REACH activity under the LACETSS Subcontract

<b>CONTRACT:</b>	LAC Education Technical Support Services Contract 47QRAA23D003U
<b>TYPE OF SUBCONTRACT</b>	Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) Subcontract
<b>PROJECT/Task Order:</b>	TO5 REACH Evaluation
<b>ESTIMATED BUDGET CEILING:</b>	Open to offers
<b>Technical Point of Contact</b>	Maria Barreiro Palafox, <a href="mailto:mpalafox@devtechsys.com">mpalafox@devtechsys.com</a>
<b>Contracts Point of Contact</b>	Michelle Samson, <a href="mailto:msamson@devtechsys.com">msamson@devtechsys.com</a>
<b>PLACE OF PERFORMANCE:</b>	Guatemala, Honduras, and Paraguay
<b>QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD:</b>	August 14 - 16, 2024
<b>FINAL SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL DUE BY:</b>	August 23, 2024, 5:00 p.m. EST
<b>TENTATIVE START DATE:</b>	August 30, 2024
<b>COMPLETION DATE BASELINE:</b>	December 30, 2025

## 1. BACKGROUND

The REACH Activity expands on USAID's investments in higher education in the region from its previous Advance (Avanza) Activity, which sought to build the capacity of higher education institutions in the LAC region. REACH is the first time that the USAID LAC Bureau is investing in scholarships for local HEIs in the region. As such, learning what works through this activity to increase access to affordable education for marginalized populations is critical not only for informing learning and adaptation for the current REACH Activity but also in considering whether this type of investment is worth USAID's continued investment.

It is for this reason that DevTech is seeking to subcontract a firm to conduct an independent evaluation of the REACH activity to contribute to learning about how to better increase higher education outcomes (access, retention, and completion) for students from marginalized and underrepresented communities.

Through this evaluation, DevTech hopes to contribute to the wider evidence base in the sector and respond to USAID's thematic inquiry:

### 1) The USAID Higher Education Learning Agenda questions:

- HE LA Q2 - How can financing of HE systems and institutions become more sustainable?
- HE LA Q7 - How can HEIs collaborate most effectively with the private sector to enhance the relevance and quality of teaching and learning, and research and innovation?
- HE LA Q9 - How can HE access, retention, and completion rates be improved for underrepresented populations (e.g., women, indigenous and marginalized populations, and people with disabilities)?
- HE LA Q10 – What institutional and behavioral changes are needed to improve gender awareness and gender equity?

### 2) Learning related to USAID's designated sub-questions for HE LA Q9, elaborated in its Guidance on MEL in USAID Scholarship Activities:

- How can scholarships improve access for underrepresented populations? (HE LA Q9)
- How can extracurricular interventions embedded in scholarship programming increase retention and completion rates for underrepresented populations? (HE LA Q9)

## 2. SOLICITATION

DevTech is soliciting proposals from qualified organizations in evaluation design, data collection, and evaluation reports. The organization will conduct qualitative and quantitative data collection in Honduras, will conduct qualitative data collection in Guatemala and Paraguay. In Paraguay, a subcontractor to DevTech will be responsible for qualitative data collection (FGD and KII).

## Evaluation Design Overview

Evaluation Question	Design	Sources	Instruments	Timeline	Notes
<b>1.</b> What differences in enrollment rates exist for marginalized students who receive a REACH scholarship versus those who apply for and do not receive a scholarship? Why do those differences exist?	1-Quasi-experimental (Propensity Score Matching) 2- Qualitative method	REACH M&E system  HEI enrollment data  Primary data collection	1- Desk Review of secondary data 2- Baseline Survey 3- FGD and KII	Q3 2024	The quasi-experimental design will be focused on Honduras, specifically with UTH.
<b>2.</b> What differences in retention and graduation rates exist for marginalized students who receive a scholarship versus those who apply for and do not receive a scholarship? Why do those differences exist?	1-Quasi-experimental design ( Propensity Score Matching) 2- Qualitative method	REACH M&E system  HEI enrollment data  Primary data collection	1-Desk review of secondary data 2-Endline Survey 3-KII	Q2 2027	The quasi-experimental design will be focused on Honduras, specifically with UTH.
<b>3.</b> Holding constant scholarship size, scholarship coverage of tuition and non-tuition expenses, and other complicating factors, what differences, if any, arise in scholar access, retention, and completion rates for scholars awarded scholarships through a centralized mechanism versus those awarded through a specific higher-education institution? Why do key stakeholders believe these differences exist?	Performance Evaluation (cross-section analysis)	REACH M&E system  HEI data/records on tuition and fees, enrollment, retention, and completion for REACH scholars  Primary data collection (qualitative)	1-Desk review 2-KII	Q2 2027	

Evaluation Question	Design	Sources	Instruments	Timeline	Notes
4. What differences, if any, exist in the diversity of students applying for and receiving scholarships through a centralized mechanism versus a specific higher-education institution? Why?	Performance Evaluation (cross-sectional analysis)	REACH M&E system HEI enrollment data Primary data collection (qualitative)	1-Desk review 2-KIIs	Q3 2024	To facilitate comparison in diversity among both mechanisms a diversity index will be estimated using principal component analysis

Evaluation Question	Design	Sources	Instruments	Timeline	Notes
<p>To what extent is advertising for the scholarship reaching youth from low-income households, women, Indigenous youth, those from rural communities, Afro-descendants and other marginalized ethnic groups, and students with disabilities effectively? How are current outreach practices by local partners and participating HEIs strengthened or enhanced by REACH technical support to be more inclusive of vulnerable populations? How might outreach be improved to better reach these populations? <i>(HE LA Q9 and HE LA Q10)</i></p>	<p>Performance Evaluation (cross-sectional analysis)</p>	<p>FHI360 monitoring system for technical support activities</p> <p>Secondary data (international and local evidence on best practices for scholarship outreach)</p> <p>Primary data collection (qualitative) with REACH staff, HEI staff, scholars and parents, local partners, and other local scholarship programs</p>	<p>1-Desk review 2-KIIs 3- FGD</p>	<p>Q3 2024</p>	

Evaluation Question	Design	Sources	Instruments	Timeline	Notes
<p>6. What prevents youth from low-income households, women, indigenous youth, those from rural communities, Afro-descendants and other marginalized ethnic groups, and students with disabilities from applying for REACH-supported scholarships? Why? And how might these barriers be addressed?</p>	Formative Evaluation	<p>Secondary data (literature review on barriers to access)</p> <p>REACH M&amp;E system</p> <p>Primary data collection</p>	<p>1.Desk Review</p> <p>2.online survey</p> <p>3.KII</p> <p>4.FGD</p>	Q3 2024	<p>The online survey is a cost-effective alternative (up to \$5,000) that will complement the qualitative data from applicants who dropped out and expand the data to include potential eligible candidates who were unaware of the scholarship's existence. The choice between using closed or open-ended questions can be made by the firm responsible for the evaluation</p>

Evaluation Question	Design	Sources	Instruments	Timeline	Notes
<p><b>7.</b> To what extent and how are REACH-supported wrap-around services supporting scholars' access, retention, and completion rates? To what extent do these results vary by marginalized demographic groups? How might wrap-around services be improved and/or expanded to better provide support?</p>	<p>Formative Evaluation (cross-sectional analysis)</p>	<p>REACH M&amp;E system</p> <p>HEI records on students accessing support services and their access, retention, and completion rates</p> <p>Primary data collection</p>	<p>1.Desk review of secondary data</p> <p>2.Online survey with scholars</p> <p>3.FGD 4.KIIs</p>	<p>Q2 2027</p> <p>Ideally, Midline (2025) if the budget permits</p>	<p>The evaluability assessment team suggested modify the question to focus exclusively on scholars. The rationale is that it is more cost-effective to gain a deep understanding of scholars' experiences rather than allocating resources to collect information about non-scholars.</p>
<p><b>8.</b> To what extent are REACH-supported wrap-around services likely to be sustained? What challenges exist to their sustainability, and what solutions might help address those challenges?</p>	<p>Performance Evaluation (snapshot)</p>	<p>Secondary information about best practices of wrap-around services</p> <p>Primary data collection (qualitative)</p>	<p>1.Desk Review</p> <p>2.KIIs</p> <p>3.FGDs</p>	<p>Q2 2027</p>	

## Data Collector Tasks

The following is a list of the anticipated tasks the data collection subcontractor will be responsible for:

- Evaluation design
- Data collection
- Evaluation reports
- Work in consortium with a local firm to conduct qualitative data collection in Paraguay.

## 3. DELIVERABLES AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE

To meet the requirements of the subcontract, the selected organization or vendor will develop and submit the following deliverables:

Deliverable	Details	Deadline
Evaluation work plan and budget	The work plan should propose any revisions to the details included in this SOW, including methods, as well as an evaluation team and initial draft budget. It should also include a timeline and plan for implementing each of the below deliverables.	2 weeks after signed contract
Evaluation design	The final design should include: details on how treatment and comparison groups will be selected; how all data will be collected following details obtained in the evaluability assessment; draft power calculations (assuming some attrition) and sample selection methodologies; a data collection and analysis plan; a quality-assurance plan; and a Gantt chart.	
Draft data collection tools	All quantitative and qualitative data collection tools should be drafted and submitted for review. These should include consent statements as well as structured or semi-structured questions, prompts/probes, or facilitated discussion guides (depending on the tools).	2 weeks after approval of the evaluation design.
Final data collection tools	All surveys (as relevant), desk review protocols, FGD guides, and youth-led barrier analysis guides must be piloted after incorporating USAID feedback and before they are finalized.	2 weeks after approval of the draft instruments.
Quantitative findings presentation	Preliminary presentation of findings in PPT to DevTech for feedback collection.	Three weeks after last day of data collection.
Draft findings and conclusions workshop	Following qualitative data collection, the evaluation team will present its draft findings to USAID, FHI360 and its partners, and possibly HEIs and other stakeholders. This will be an opportunity to both share learning but also	One week after DevTech's review



Deliverable	Details	Deadline
	validate the findings and ensure no additional data collection is needed.	
Recommendations workshop	Following any necessary revisions/additions to findings, the evaluation team will develop initial draft recommendations, which it will present in a workshop to USAID, FHI360 and its partners, HEIs, and other stakeholders (as determined by USAID). The workshop will be an opportunity to explore the feasibility of any draft recommendations, identify additional details stakeholders will need to implement recommendations, and to co-design any other recommendations desired.	2 weeks after the findings workshop
Draft evaluation report	The draft evaluation report should include the findings, conclusions, and recommendations workshopped with key stakeholders as well as	4 weeks after the recommendations workshop
Final evaluation report; draft summary stakeholder memo and/or video; draft action plan for implementing recommendations	The final report should incorporate all stakeholder feedback and should also include a stakeholder memo and/or video (to be determine by those stakeholders themselves) that can stand alone and be distributed to students, HEIs, nonprofit organizations serving marginalized youth, and other key stakeholders. It should also include an action plan as an annex, with actions that various parties have agreed to take as a result of the evaluation recommendations, responsible parties, and deadlines for those actions.	2 weeks after receipt of stakeholder feedback
Final stakeholder memo and/or video and action plan	The final versions of these deliverables should be submitted, incorporating key stakeholder feedback.	2 weeks after receipt of stakeholder feedback
Final presentation of results	This will include one presentation to USAID, FHI360 and its partners, and possibly HEI staff, and other stakeholders as well as dissemination of results to either via presentation or the stakeholder memo/video to students and other key stakeholders.	TBD in coordination with key stakeholders
Action plan follow-up	The evaluation team will check back in with the implementing partner, USAID, HEIs, and others (as relevant) according to the agreed action plan and timeline to ensure actions have been taken.	TBD in the action plan

All deliverables must be approved by DevTech's Technical team prior to payment.

## 4. ELIGIBILITY

This RFP is open to universities, research institutions and data collection institutions located in Latin America and the Caribbean, with extensive experience in evaluation design, qualitative data collection, and evaluation reports. The ideal institution will demonstrate:

- Experience conducting qualitative research, performance evaluations or impact evaluations in the field of education or related technical field.
- Knowledge and use of systems approach, system in a room technique for data collection a plus.
- Excellent Spanish writing skills and speaking ability for Colombia, Honduras, and El Salvador, French/Creole for Haiti. English is a plus.
- Understanding of the culture and operating environment of the assigned country.
- Proven experience conducting quantitative research and leading impact evaluations.
- Experience conducting economics, economics of education, higher education implementation and/or research, youth development analysis and research, and Latin America higher education systems.
- Principal investigators (PIs) or Senior Researchers with proven experience in conducting high quality international development research and coordinating data collection for similar scale projects, with knowledge of USAID programming or other international development agencies.
- A core team / personnel with excellent organizational skills to manage and coordinate data-collection projects, including the administrative and budget aspects of a sub-contract.

## 5. ORGANIZATIONAL MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

The organization should possess the following experience and qualifications:

- Have the institutional and financial capacity to perform all duties outlined in this scope of work.
- Be a certified, legally registered entity that by law can sign a contract.
- Not be under court supervision due to bankruptcy or business activities being discontinued.
- Not be affiliated with any criminal associations or activity.
- Have and be able to present verified references that document work performed on at least three similar jobs.
- Have a Unique Entity ID (UEI) generated in SAM.gov.
- Standard certification, representations, and assurances.

## 6. PERSONNEL

The Offeror should provide at minimum the following personnel. Key Personnel must be approved by DevTech and cannot be replaced without DevTech permission.

- A. **Senior Researcher / Team Lead (TL) (Key Personnel).** Review all the inputs, project documents, and impact evaluation scope of work before refining the evaluability assessment research questions. The Team Lead will then submit a revised SOW for the evaluability assessment with key activities and milestones including data collection and analysis leading to the final study design reports per country. The Team Lead will present the evaluability assessment findings to USAID and develop the PPT presentation.

Qualifications

- Master's degree in economics
  - Proven experience conducting quantitative research and leading impact evaluations.
  - 10+ years of experience conducting economics, the economics of education, higher education implementation and/or research, youth development analysis, and research.
  - Proven experience working in Latin American higher education systems.
  - Excellent Spanish and English writing skills and speaking ability.
  - Understanding of the culture and operating environment of Honduras, Guatemala, and Paraguay.
- B. **Senior Technical Advisor.** Provide guidance on the development and implementation of this impact evaluation to understand if the scholarship program: (1) was effective at improving equitable enrollment for marginalized students in higher education institutions; (2) if modalities of service delivery had different effects on enrollment, retention, completion of two year degrees, and inclusion of diverse populations; and (3) if wrap-around services are associated with changes in enrollment and retention, and how sustainable these services are likely to be.
- Master's degree in Economics, PhD a plus.
  - Proven experience, including published papers, showing use of quantitative research and leading impact evaluations.
  - 15+ years of experience conducting economics, economics of education, higher education implementation and/or research, youth development analysis and research.
  - Proven experience working in Latin America higher education systems.
  - Excellent Spanish and English writing skills and speaking ability.
  - Understanding of the culture and operating environment of Honduras, Guatemala, and Paraguay.
- C. **Data Quality Specialist.** Review the study design, and the data collection instruments in coordination with the TL. Guide the selection of the sample and conduct the data collection. The DQS will provide the raw data to the TL and support the analysis. The DQS will read the final report and provide comments/recommendations.
- A bachelor's degree in the field of international education or a related technical field. Master's degree or PhD is an advantage.
  - At least three years of experience conducting qualitative research, performance evaluations or impact evaluations in the field of education or related technical field.
  - Knowledge and use of systems approach, system in a room techniques for data collection a plus.
  - Excellent Spanish and English writing skills and speaking ability.

- Understanding of the culture and operating environment of Honduras, Guatemala, and Paraguay.
- D. **Quantitative Economist.** Review all the inputs, project documents, and impact evaluation scope of work before refining the evaluability assessment research questions. The Econometrician will then submit a revised SOW for the evaluability assessment with key activities and milestones including data collection and analysis leading to the final study design reports per country. The Econometrician will support the Team Lead to present the evaluability assessment findings to USAID and develop the PPT presentation.
- Master's degree in Economics
  - Proven experience conducting quantitative research and leading impact evaluations.
  - 3+ years of experience conducting economics, economics of education, higher education implementation and/or research, youth development analysis and research.
  - Proven experience working in Latin America higher education systems.
  - Excellent Spanish and English writing skills and speaking ability.
  - Understanding of the culture and operating environment of Honduras, Guatemala, and Paraguay.
- E. **Qualitative Specialist.** Review all the inputs, project documents, and impact evaluation scope of work before refining the evaluability assessment research questions. The QS will then submit a revised SOW for the evaluability assessment with key activities and milestones including data collection and analysis leading to the final study design reports per country. The QS will support the Team Lead to present the evaluability assessment findings to USAID and develop the PPT presentation.
- Master's degree in Economics or Social Sciences
  - Proven experience conducting qualitative research and leading performance evaluations.
  - 3+ years of experience conducting social sciences, economics of education, higher education implementation and/or research, youth development analysis and research.
  - Proven experience working in Latin America higher education systems is a plus.
  - Excellent Spanish and English writing skills and speaking ability.
  - Understanding of the culture and operating environment of Honduras, Guatemala, and Paraguay.
- F. **Junior Economist.** Work with the Team Lead and Qualitative Economist to review the study design developed by the regional inclusive education specialist and will provide local adaptations to the selection of the sample, data collection tools, and content of the questionnaires review reports. The JE will support the TL during the data collection process along with the logistics coordinator/analyst. The JE is expected to travel to meet with the stakeholders along with the team.
- Bachelors' degree in Economics, Education, Social Sciences or related field
  - 1+ years of experience conducting social sector research including quantitative and qualitative.
  - Excellent Spanish writing skills and speaking ability. English a plus.

- Understanding of the culture and operating environment of Honduras.

## 7. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

The offeror's proposal must be accompanied by a cover letter typed on official organizational letterhead and signed by an individual who has signatory authority for the offeror. The offeror must submit a complete proposal package on or before the due date and time indicated on page 1 of the RFP.

Proposals must be submitted by email only and with the subject line "RFP No: LAC-2024-002".

The proposals must be prepared in two separate volumes: i) Technical Proposal; and ii) Cost Proposal. The technical and cost proposal must be kept separate. Technical proposals must not refer to or include any pricing data so that DevTech can evaluate the technical proposal strictly based on technical merit.

The proposal must contain the following information and documentation:

### Technical Proposal

The Technical proposal shall describe how the offeror intends to accomplish all the requirements stated in the Scope of Work. It should be concise, specific, complete, and demonstrate a clear understanding of the work to be undertaken and the responsibilities of all parties involved. It must demonstrate the offeror's eligibility, as well as their capabilities and expertise in conducting each step of the activity.

Offerors shall include only information necessary to provide a clear understanding of the proposed action and the justification for it. Greater detail than necessary, as well as insufficient detail may detract from a proposal's clarity. Assume that the reader is not familiar with the context in which the project will be implemented. Minimize or avoid the use of jargon and acronyms as much as possible. If acronyms or abbreviations are used, include a separate page explaining the terms.

The Technical Proposal must adhere to the 5-page limit and should include the following sections:

- A. **Organization Overview** - Legal name; year of incorporation; number of employees; description of the services and products supplied. This will not count against the page limit.
- B. 1 Page - **Staffing Plan** - Provide a proposed staffing plan to conduct the task under this SOW. This will include who is the Key Personnel described in Section 6, as well as the Team Lead, Sr Technical Advisor, Data Quality Specialist, Quantitative Economist, Qualitative Specialist and Junior Economists. The organization can propose a different combination of personnel, as appropriate. The staffing plan should include a description of the experience of the different staff proposed.
- C. **Curriculum Vitae** of proposed key personnel (up to two pages) along with two references each. CV will not count towards page limit.

The proposal should **not exceed 5 (five) pages**, excluding CVs and contact information.

## Cost Proposal

The offeror should submit their most competitive and complete cost proposal. The cost proposal shall be submitted in a separate volume from the technical proposal. The cost proposal shall be submitted as a firm-fixed price proposal in United States currency. The cost proposal shall include the following:

- A. Cover sheet with organization information, including name, address, email, phone, Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) number, and contact person. If your organization does not have a UEI (generated in sam.gov), you will need to request one. You can request this for FREE at [www.sam.gov](http://www.sam.gov). For more information, please visit, <https://sam.gov/content/entity-registration>
- B. Audited Financial Statements for the past three years.
- C. Evidence of Responsibility (see Annex A)
- D. DevTech Supplier Form (see Annex B)
- E. Representations, Certifications, and Other Statements of Bidders (see Annex C) or a statement to confirm that the bidder is duly registered on SAM.gov, and the Representations & Certifications statements have been reviewed and are current in SAM.gov.
- F. A budget template in Excel and budget narrative instruction are provided with this solicitation. The budget will be considered an unburden fixed price budget for this activity. The prize to be awarded will be fixed price. No profit, fee or additional costs can be included after the award. All items/services must be clearly labeled and included in the total offered price. The budget must be completed in the attached budget template (see Annex D). The proposed budget will be structured in accordance with the payment schedule in Section 3 above. Applicants are to include all costs deemed necessary to execute this SOW in the budget.
- G. A detailed budget narrative in word or portable document format (PDF) that justifies the cost as appropriate and necessary for the successful completion of proposed activities and deliverables (see Annex E). The budget narrative should clearly describe the project and cost assumptions. All proposed costs must be directly applicable to performing the work under the award and budgeted amounts should not exceed the market cost/value of an item or service. The budget narrative should be of sufficient detail so that someone unfamiliar with your organization or the activity could review and adequately understand and grasp the assumptions, reasonableness and calculation method used.

## 8. LANGUAGE

The proposal, as well as correspondence and related documents, should be in English.

## 9. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals shall be submitted according to the Proposal Submission instructions above. The Technical Proposal will be evaluated separately from the Cost Proposal. An award will be made to Offeror that submits the best value for money which is demonstrated by offeror's proposal in showing the most advantageous combination of cost, quality, and effort to meet SOW requirements.

Proposals will be evaluated first to ensure that they meet all mandatory requirements and are responsive. To be determined responsive, a proposal must include all documentation as listed in the Proposal Submission Requirements section. Proposals that fail to meet these requirements will receive no further consideration. A non-responsive proposal to any element may be eliminated from consideration.

Responsive proposals will be evaluated and ranked by a committee on a technical basis according to the criteria below. Proposals that are technically acceptable shall then be evaluated in terms of cost.

Evaluation factors are as follows:

No.	Criteria	Points
1	Demonstrated understanding of the Scope of Work	20
2	Capabilities and Past Performance: Previous experience and demonstrated capabilities coordinating and managing research and events in comparable size and complexity	30
3	Relevant experience of proposed personnel to deliver SOW tasks	20
4	Feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the budget proposal	30
	Total	100

## 10. SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Please submit your complete proposal electronically to [mpalafox@devtechsys.com](mailto:mpalafox@devtechsys.com) and [msampson@devtechsys.com](mailto:msampson@devtechsys.com) by the date and time provided in the cover page of this RFP. Proposals must be in English and clearly marked "RFP No: LAC-2024-002".

All questions should be submitted by the dates established on cover page to [mpalafox@devtechsys.com](mailto:mpalafox@devtechsys.com) and [msampson@devtechsys.com](mailto:msampson@devtechsys.com).

No late submissions will be accepted.

Disclaimer: This RFP does not constitute a commitment by DevTech or USAID to award any contract or subcontract. DevTech does not commit to pay for costs incurred in the preparation

and submission of a proposal. Furthermore, DevTech reserves the right to reject any or all proposals at its sole discretion, if such action is considered to be in the best interest of DevTech and/or USAID.

## **TERMS OF AWARD**

This document is a request for proposals only, and in no way obligates DevTech Systems or its donor to make any award. Please be advised that under a fixed price contract the work must be completed within the specified total price. Any expenses incurred in excess of the agreed upon amount in the sub-contract will be the responsibility of the sub-contractor and not that of DevTech or its donor. Therefore, the offeror is duly advised to provide its most competitive and realistic proposal to cover all foreseeable expenses related to providing requested goods/services.

All deliverables produced under the future award/sub-contract shall be considered the property of DevTech. DevTech may choose to award a sub-contract for part of the activities in the RFP.

## **PROPOSAL VALIDITY**

The Offeror's technical and cost proposals must remain valid for not less than 120 calendar days after the deadline specified above. Proposals must be signed by an official authorized to bind the offeror to its provisions.

## **PAYMENT TERMS**

DevTech payment cycle is net 30 days upon receipt of deliverables, goods/services, inspection and acceptance of goods/services as in compliance with the terms of the award and receipt of vendor invoice. Full cooperation with DevTech in meeting the terms and conditions of payment will be given the highest consideration.

## **FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

Offerors which are firms and not individuals must include in the capabilities statement that they have the financial viability and resources to complete the proposed activities within the period of performance and under the terms of payment outlined below. DevTech reserves the right to request and review the latest financial statements and audit reports of the offeror as part of the basis of the award.

## **AUTHORIZED GEOGRAPHIC CODE**

The authorized geographic code for procurement of goods and services under this award is "935". Local procurements are to be accomplished in accordance with AIDAR 752.225-70 and ADS 311. Geographic Code 935 is defined as (any area or country including the recipient country, but excluding any country that is a prohibited source.

## **NEGOTIATIONS**

The offeror's most competitive proposal is requested. It is anticipated that any award issued will be made solely on the basis of an offeror's proposal. However, the Project reserves the right to request responses to additional technical, management, and cost questions which would help in negotiating and awarding a sub-contract. The Project also reserves the right to conduct



negotiations on technical, management, or cost issues prior to the award of a sub-contract. In the event that an agreement cannot be reached with an offeror the Project will enter into negotiations with alternate offerors for the purpose of awarding a sub-contract without any obligation to previously considered offerors.

## **REJECTION OF PROPOSALS**

DevTech reserves the right to reject any and all proposals received, or to negotiate separately with any and all competing offerors, without explanation.

## **INCURRING COSTS**

DevTech is not liable for any cost incurred by offerors during preparation, submission, or negotiation of an award for this RFP. The costs are solely the responsibility of the offeror.

## **MODIFICATIONS**

DevTech reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to modify the request, to alter the selection process, to modify or amend the specifications and scope of work specified in this RFP.

## **CANCELLATION**

DevTech may cancel this RFP without any cost or obligation at any time until issuance of the award.

## **USAID REGULATIONS**

The entity will ensure that all work activities conducted under this contract towards the successful completion of this scope of work is completed in accordance with all applicable USAID and USG regulations, including but not limited to 22 CFR, CFR 200, FAR and FAR 31.3 and AIDAR 731.3 for educational institutions, and AIDAR.

## **SPECIAL CONTRACTING REQUIREMENTS and PRIME CONTRACT CLAUSES**

(see Annex E)