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FUNDING OPPORTUNITY NUMBER: FAS-MCGOVERN-DOLE PROGRAM-18

ANTICIPATED AWARD TYPE: Cooperative Agreement

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE (CFDA) NUMBER: 10.608

DATES: Applications must be submitted to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) in the Food Aid Information System (FAIS) by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Savings Time (EDT) on March 30, 2018. Applications received after this date will not be considered. The USDA Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) advises applicants to begin the application process early to allow time to address any difficulties that may arise. There will be no exceptions to this application deadline. Comments regarding this Notice of Funding Opportunity will be considered to the extent practicable, and should be submitted to ppded@fas.usda.gov.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: FAS expects to make multiple three to five year awards, totaling up to $190 million, SUBJECT TO AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING. FAS will accept applications for the following priority countries: Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Malawi, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, and Timor Leste. The McGovern-Dole program helps support education, child development, and food security in low-income, food-deficit countries around the world. This program provides for the donation of U.S. agricultural commodities, as well as financial and technical assistance, to carry out school feeding programs that strengthen food security, reduce the incidence of hunger, and improve literacy and nutrition, particularly with respect to girls.

NEW IN FY 2018

This year’s proposal submission changes are outlined below:

- **Project Costs:** All applicants are required to estimate and include their total award cost, specifically noting commodity price(s) and internal transportation, storage, and handling (ITSH), and project implementation costs. This information needs to be included in the proposal. See guidance in Part IV – Application and Submission Information, I. Introduction and Strategic Analysis.

- **Maternal and Child Nutrition (MCN):** In addition to school meals for primary school-age children, USDA encourages applicants to address the nutritional needs of pregnant and lactating women and children under five years of age, as applicable. MCN activities will be carried out using USDA commodities and, where appropriate and not with direct purchase from USDA McGovern-Dole funds, additional locally-available foods (i.e., school or community gardens and orchards, local livestock and fisheries). Applicants should propose activities using evidence-based nutrition information. Please see each country guidance summary located in APPENDIX B.
• **Project-Level Results Frameworks**: All applicants are required to submit a narrative to accompany the Project-Level Results Framework. For more guidance and information see Part IV – Application and Submission Information, IV. Project-Level Results Frameworks and APPENDIX C – Manual for the Use of Results Frameworks.

• **Learning Agenda**: All applicants must include a section in their draft evaluation plan that addresses how their evaluations and/or special studies will align with the APPENDIX G – McGovern-Dole Learning Agenda.

• **Merit and Criteria Scoring Percentages**: Please note the adjusted Evaluative Areas of Criterion percentages in 2018 under, V. Application Review Information, A. Merit and Criteria.

• **Proposal page limits**: Please adhere to the following page limit guidance in FY 2018
  - Introduction and Strategic Analysis – a maximum of 15 pages
  - Organizational Capacity and Staffing – a maximum of 10 pages
  - Graduation and Sustainability – a maximum of 5 pages
  - Project-Level Results Framework – a maximum of 2 pages
  - Plan of Operation and Activities – a maximum of 10 pages
  - Literacy – a maximum of 5 pages
  - Nutrition – a maximum of 5 pages
  - Budget – a maximum of 10 pages
  - Commodity Management – a maximum of 5 pages
  - Monitoring and Evaluation – a maximum of 10 pages
  - Other Details – a maximum of 3 pages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Commodity Credit Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA</td>
<td>Cost of Living Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNS</td>
<td>Dun &amp; Bradstreet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAD</td>
<td>Food Assistance Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIS</td>
<td>Food Aid Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
<td>Foreign Agricultural Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA</td>
<td>Federal Insurance Contributions Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FtF</td>
<td>Feed the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFSS</td>
<td>Global Food Security Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGSF</td>
<td>Home Grown School Feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGSM</td>
<td>Home Grown School Meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Intermediate Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSH</td>
<td>Internal Transport, Storage, and Handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCN</td>
<td>Maternal and Child Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Metric Tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICRA</td>
<td>Negotiated Indirect Cost Recovery Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOFO</td>
<td>Notice of Funding Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTD</td>
<td>Neglected Tropical Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>Office of Management and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPFAR</td>
<td>President’s Emergency Fund for AIDS Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>Personally Identifiable Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>Performance Monitoring Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>Propensity Score Matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVO</td>
<td>Private Voluntary Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;R</td>
<td>Rest and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Randomized Control Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM</td>
<td>Results Oriented Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Results Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM</td>
<td>System for Award Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Standard Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP</td>
<td>School Feeding Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Strategic Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG</td>
<td>United States Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART I – PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

I. Authority

McGovern-Dole is authorized in section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o-1). The regulations governing McGovern-Dole were updated September 12, 2016 and can be found at 7 CFR 1599 (available at www.ecfr.gov).

II. Program Objectives

The McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (McGovern-Dole) feeds school-children, reduces hunger, enhances food security, and improves literacy (especially for girls) in low-income, food-deficit countries around the world. The program provides for the donation of U.S. agricultural commodities, as well as financial and technical assistance, to support school feeding, literacy, maternal and child health and nutrition projects worldwide pursuant to an agreement with USDA-FAS. The program shall include the provisions to “graduation” as stipulated in the legislation. By providing school meals, teacher training, and related education and nutrition support, McGovern-Dole helps boost school enrollment, attendance, and literacy results. McGovern-Dole also provides support to MCN. To increase the use of improved health, nutrition, and dietary practices, McGovern-Dole encourages the inclusion of health- and nutrition-sensitive activities such as the use of micronutrient-fortified products, take home rations, treatments for deworming, and diarrhea, water, sanitation and health (WASH) projects, school garden projects, and curriculum-based nutrition education. McGovern-Dole sees adequate nutrition as fundamental to ending hunger and extreme poverty and as a path towards healthy growth and better educational performance. Please note all proposals are required to address both McGovern-Dole strategic objectives: “Improved Literacy of School-Age Children” (McGovern-Dole SO1) and the recently revised “Increased Use of Improved Health, Nutrition, and Dietary Practices” (McGovern-Dole SO2).

III. Purpose of Funding

FAS is soliciting applications for the FY 2018 McGovern-Dole program. Priority countries and regions are noted below in IV. Priority Countries and Regions. In this solicitation, FAS will give priority consideration to proposals that implement pre- and primary school feeding, support effective literacy and nutrition activities, address the sustainability of the school feeding program through government capacity building, and implement resilient, context-specific food solutions. Under McGovern-Dole, sustainability relates to the ability to transfer the school meals program to the host government for ownership.

IV. Priority Countries and Regions

FAS will consider proposals from all eligible organizations, including current recipients and new organizations. For additional information on the priority countries for this funding opportunity, applicants should refer to APPENDIX B – Country Specific Guidance for a more in-depth understanding.
of the McGovern-Dole priorities. FAS will give priority consideration to eligible applications for the following countries and regions:

### NEW COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Governates of Assiut, Sohag, Beni Suef, Menia, Qena, Aswan, Luxor, Fayoum, Sharkeya, and Qalyoubia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>North, North East, Central, and Estate/Plantation Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor Leste</td>
<td>Nation-wide (Highest need: Manatuto, Baucau, Liquiçá, and Viqueque)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONTINUING COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Center-North Region; Provinces of Bam, Sanmatenga, and Namentenga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>North-West, North, Adamawa, and East Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Afar, Oromia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Department of Quiche (Municipalities: Chajul, Cunén, Nebaj, Sacapulas, San Juan Cotzal, and Uspantán)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Southern and Central Malawi Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Departments of St. Louis and Kolda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Koinadugu District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For continuing projects, FAS expects that proposed activities will build upon current activities reaching and, when and where possible, what has been accomplished to date. Expansion to target regions, beyond the continuing project region(s), is allowable as long as this proposed programming aligns with the country guidance priorities per APPENDIX B – Country Specific Guidance and the overall McGovern-Dole priorities. Applications must focus on transition of McGovern-Dole activities to the host governments and set the path to sustainability. Applicants must work with countries that have a national government that is committed to or is working towards, through a national action plan, the goals of the World Declaration on Education for All through a national school feeding law. Furthermore, applications
must align with the McGovern-Dole project level Results Frameworks as mentioned in Part IV, Section IV.

For a list of continuing McGovern-Dole projects, please visit: https://www.fas.usda.gov/programs/mcgovern-dole-food-education-program.

V. USDA-USAID Memorandum of Understanding on Education

FAS will give priority consideration to eligible applications that align with USDA-USAID Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) priorities and demonstrate evidence of collaboration, where applicable, and that meet the requirements of McGovern-Dole priority countries and regions.

Background: An MOU was signed between FAS and USAID in May of 2014 to leverage each agency’s respective strengths, experiences, technologies, methodologies, investments and resources (human, in-kind, and monetary) in order to facilitate, in collaboration with host country governments, improved student learning outcomes in a manner consistent with each respective agency’s mission.

On September 8, 2017, the Reinforcing Education Accountability in Development (READ) Act was signed into law. This legislation mandates a comprehensive U.S. government strategy on basic education to be submitted to Congress within one year of enactment. The strategy development process will be led by the Senior Coordinator for Basic Education Assistance at USAID and it includes input from USDA’s McGovern-Dole program.

Aligning McGovern-Dole (Results Framework McGovern-Dole SO1) with USAID’s investments in education and reading will maximize cost-efficiency and efficacy, and create a holistic approach to the challenge of ensuring that disadvantaged children are physically, nutritionally, and cognitively fit to succeed in school. A strong USDA-USAID collaboration is likely to increase the impact of U.S. government (USG) investments in education and thereby contribute more significantly to the attainment of the education sector’s goals. It is suggested that proposals include or address, at minimum, the following components in the solicitation and evaluation criteria:

(1) Program Coordination: Programming should be well-coordinated and complementary in countries where McGovern-Dole and USAID both have current programming, keeping in mind where they are located, and seeking to leverage existing materials, lessons learned, or best practices where applicable and appropriate. Where feasible, co-location in designated schools, districts, and regions is desirable in order to leverage resources, to promote cost-efficiency and efficacy, and to increase impact.

(2) Focus on the “5 Ts”: texts, tongue, testing, teachers, and time. Applicants should pay special attention to the 5 Ts and incorporate in their literacy programs as appropriate and applicable.
   1- Texts: provide ample leveled and decodable materials for reading instruction and practice in languages children speak and understand;
   2- Tongue: provide reading instruction in languages children speak and understand utilizing appropriate scope and sequence of skills and speech-to-print strategies;
3- Testing: use continuous assessment such as brief spelling tests and progress monitoring assessments such as adaptations of the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) or the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA);
4 - Teachers: use an evidence-based approach to reading instruction that includes the following instructional routines: scripted instructions for teaching new skills; and
5 - Time: ensure that children receive adequate time for reading instruction.

VI. Deworming

USDA anticipates that applicants will address the McGovern-Dole intermediate results, especially “Reduced Health-Related Absences (McGovern-Dole 1.3.2)” and its contribution to “Improved Student Attendance (McGovern-Dole 1.3).” FAS encourages applicants to include information on the prevalence of neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) transmitted by worms, such as guinea worm disease, lymphatic filariasis, onchocerciasis, schistosomiasis, and soil-transmitted helminths in targeted intervention regions or areas. Research indicates that school-based deworming has significant impacts on child education, health and nutrition. Applicants should describe current efforts underway on the part of host-country governments, international organizations or other actors to mitigate the spread of disease through school-based deworming activities. In areas of high prevalence, FAS expects applicants to include a plan to implement school-based deworming activities in all McGovern-Dole schools if other actors are not currently doing, and the deworming plan must be in coordination with the Ministry of Health or the competent technical host-country government entity. Applicants should plan to report on McGovern-Dole standard indicator 24: Number of students receiving deworming medication(s), in coordination with other actors if necessary. Applicants must verify NTD prevalence rates in targeted intervention regions or areas through sources such as the Global Atlas on Helminth Infections, Ministry of Health data, World Health Organization sources, U.S. government sources on NTDs from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and USAID, and other relevant sources.

VII. Feed the Future and Global Food Security Strategy

The Global Food Security Act of 2016 and corresponding U.S. Government Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) affirms the United States’ commitment to ending global hunger, poverty, and child malnutrition. Where appropriate, entities are strongly encouraged to align proposed interventions with the objectives found in the GFSS and required to ensure that proposed activities are complementary and not duplicative.

USDA Global Food Security Council guidance commits McGovern-Dole to report on select Feed the Future (FtF) indicators, particularly in the area of nutrition and health, which are identified and defined as standard McGovern-Dole performance indicators. Three FY18 McGovern-Dole priority countries are also GFSS Target Countries: Senegal, Guatemala, and Ethiopia. Proposals submitted for these countries should demonstrate contemplated alignment of the proposed McGovern-Dole activities with the GFSS strategy in the country of application. Proposals should describe how and why proposed activities align with GFSS. Proposals that do not align proposed McGovern-Dole activities with the GFSS strategy should demonstrate that alignment was considered and note why McGovern-Dole objectives would be reached without GFSS alignment. USDA expects to incorporate the relevant new FtF indicators, aligned
with the GFSS, into the standard McGovern Dole performance indicator list in 2018 and, if applicable, FY18 funded projects will be required to incorporate relevant indicators during agreement negotiations.

PART II – FEDERAL AWARD INFORMATION

A. Type of Award
All awards will be made in the form of cooperative agreements. In a cooperative agreement, FAS will be substantially involved throughout the award. Substantial involvement may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- FAS specifies the manner, method, performance, or timing of the work in an approved work plan;
- FAS review and approval of one stage of work before a subsequent stage may begin during the performance period;
- FAS review and approval of an evaluation plan;
- FAS review and approval of a monetization plan, if applicable;
- FAS review and approval of proposed sub-grants and contracts, prior to award;
- FAS participation in the selection and approval of the individuals or organizations that will conduct all required evaluations;
- FAS participation in data collection and analysis for required evaluations and other performance reports;
- FAS approval of an organizational chart identifying the names, roles, and responsibilities of all of the participant’s key personnel and any subsequent changes or absences; and
- FAS provision of specific direction or redirection of the work during the period of performance.

FAS strives to make awards to both new and existing projects each year, based upon the merit of proposals received. In order for an existing project to be competitive, FAS expects the proposal to build upon current activities and accomplishments, reaching, to the extent possible, the same targeted beneficiaries, and showing progress toward transferability and sustainability to local governments. FAS will consider awarding proposals from all eligible organizations, including current recipients and new organizations, for both new and existing projects.

B. Expected Funding Amount
FAS anticipates awarding up to $190 million in FY 2018, if the program is funded in FY 2018. This value may change as all projects in this announcement will be funded subject to availability of appropriated funding. FY 2017 awards ranged from $15 million to $30 million in value. Proposals must demonstrate how the requested amount of funding will achieve the most cost-effective use of the funds in supporting and achieving the key objectives of the proposed project.

C. Anticipated Start Date
Funded projects are anticipated to start in October 2018.

D. Period of Performance
FAS seeks proposals for implementation over a three to five year period, except where indicated under APPENDIX B – Country Specific Guidance.
PART III – ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants
In accordance with the McGovern-Dole regulations (7 CFR 1599.3), a private voluntary organization, a cooperative, or another organization that is not an intergovernmental organization is eligible to submit an application to become a recipient under McGovern-Dole.

An entity (including subcontractors/subrecipients) will be considered ineligible if they have been designated by the USG as debarred or suspended in procurements funded by the United States Federal Government or otherwise prohibited by applicable United States law or executive order or United States policies. FAS will review, inter alia:

i) U.S. Department of State, Terrorist Exclusion List:
   http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/other/des/123086.htm

ii) U.S/ Department of Treasury, Specially Designated Nationals List:
    http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/sanctions/SDN-List/Pages/default.aspx

iii) General Services Administration, System for Award Management (SAM):
    http://www.sam.gov

iv) All applicants, recipients, and subrecipients must comply with the conflict of interest requirements in 2 CFR 400.2.

B. Cost Sharing
Cost sharing is not required for eligibility but is encouraged to maximize program impacts and elicit in-country sustainability. Applicants must identify and explain any cost sharing in the budget narrative. Applicants must also document non-Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) cash or non-cash contributions accordingly on the Standard Form 424 (SF-424) associated with their proposal submission, as per 7 CFR 1599.4(d) (7). If an award is made, the applicant will be responsible for obtaining these resources. These resources will not be borne by CCC funding.

PART IV – APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. Address to Request Application Package
This notice of funding opportunity (NOFO) and instructions for submitting the application can be located on the FAIS home page. If you do not have access to the Internet or are having trouble accessing the home page, please contact us at (202) 720-4221 to request the NOFO application and instructions via mail.

B. Content and Form of Application Submission
Each application must include the following sections: I. Introduction and Strategic Analysis; II. Organizational Capacity and Staffing; III. Graduation and Sustainability; IV. Project-level Results Frameworks; V. Plan of Operation and Activities; VI. Literacy; VII. Nutrition; VIII. Budget; IX. Commodity Management; X. Monitoring and Evaluation; and, XI. Other Details.
Applicants are advised to review the FAS guidance for each of these sections. Each of the listed sections will require data to be directly entered into FAIS or provided as an attachment. More detailed information on the contents of each section is provided below. All applicants must refer to the McGovern-Dole Regulations, 7 CFR 1599.4, which outlines the application process. Each proposal will be reviewed and evaluated on its quality and technical merit.

Each page of the proposal containing business sensitive information should be labeled as “BUSINESS SENSITIVE” in the header or footer and the sensitive information should be identified in [brackets]. Applicants should NOT label the entire document as business sensitive.

All McGovern-Dole proposals must include and respond to the following sections either entered into FAIS or included as an attachment:

1. **Introduction and Strategic Analysis**

**Introduction Summary**
Provide a one-paragraph summary of the proposed project. The summary should include the duration of the project, estimated costs, number of direct beneficiaries and the main focus of the intervention.

Under this sub-section, provide the estimated commodity cost; estimated freight cost, ITSH; administration; and, activity costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Type</th>
<th>Total Budget (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total FAS Cash</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Commodities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Ocean Freight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM VALUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Analysis**
Proposals must include a comprehensive analysis of the potential needs, challenges, risks, opportunities, and constraints that may impact the implementation and success of a project in the recipient country. This section should explain the strategy behind the proposed method of intervention, and describe how the project will implement this strategy through proposed activities. The specific activities proposed should be described according to the guidance in **V. Plan of Operation and Activities**. The strategic analysis will be evaluated based on how well the project is aligned with host government laws, policies, and programs;
how well the proposed project will coordinate within the U.S. government, multilateral, private sector, or other stakeholder development strategies or frameworks; and how the proposed program will complement and not duplicate existing projects and programs. This section should cite sources and/or provide an explanation of the analyses undertaken.

Proposals must include a comprehensive analysis of the potential needs, challenges, risks, opportunities, and constraints that may impact the implementation and success of a project in the recipient country. This section should explain the strategy behind the proposed method of intervention, and describe how the project will implement this strategy through proposed activities. The specific activities proposed should be described according to the guidance in V. Plan of Operation and Activities. The strategic analysis will be evaluated based on how well the project is aligned with host government laws, policies and programs; how well the proposed project will coordinate with the USG, multilateral, private sector, or other stakeholder development strategies or frameworks; and how the proposed program will complement and not duplicate existing projects and programs. This section should cite sources and/or provide an explanation of the analyses undertaken.

The following must be included in this section:

- Explanation of the goals and objectives and identification of the targeted beneficiaries, regions, and specific needs of the targeted population, and the rationale for why they were chosen; applicants must sufficiently justify the chosen regions, particularly if the target country is not a GFSS focus country.
- Describe any current programs, policies, and strategies of other stakeholders (recipient government, USG, other donors, private sector, etc.) to promote primary education and literacy and reduce the incidence of hunger through school feeding.
- Include information about MCN activities taking place in the proposed countries and how the applicant will coordinate with other stakeholders in carrying out MCN activities.
- Explain the working relationship with and support from the recipient government, and the collaboration done to develop the proposed project, as well as how the project would leverage other development resources to achieve their results.
- Identify specific in-country constraints, including the potential risks related to weather variability that could obstruct the project’s efforts to address the identified needs.

Additionally, applicants are required to address the following points per 7 CFR 1599.4 under this section:

a) Explanation of Need: FAS requires applicants to include an explanation of the need for food aid in the targeted country and how the applicant's proposed activities would address that need, as well as an explanation of the need for a school feeding program in the targeted country. Additionally, the applicant must provide information regarding (1) the country's current school feeding operations, if they exist, the length and sessions of a typical school year, and current funding resources; and (2) Teacher training, parent-teacher associations, community infrastructure, health, nutrition, water and sanitation conditions.
b) Local Capacity Building: Applicants must explain how they will involve indigenous institutions as well as local communities and governments in the development and implementation of the activities in order to foster local capacity building and leadership.

c) Commitment to Education: Applicants must provide a statement verifying the commitment of the government of the targeted country to work, through a national action plan, toward the goals of the World Declaration on Education for All (Jomtien Declaration, and the follow-up Dakar Framework for Action of the World Education Forum).

II. Organizational Capacity and Staffing

Information on an applicant’s organizational capacity and staffing are required (7 CFR 1599.4 (b) (7). Applicants must clearly demonstrate their organizational capabilities to develop, manage, implement, monitor, report on, and provide accountability for the proposed project in the target country. Information provided should include the applicant’s project management capability and current and past experience in implementing food aid, education, or health and nutrition projects, including its experience within the target country.

Applicants should propose an overall staffing pattern that demonstrates sound technical expertise and experiences required for efficient and effective project administration and management. The staffing plan should demonstrate a solid understanding of key technical and organizational requirements and an appropriate mix of skills, while avoiding excessive staffing. FAS may request changes to the final staffing plan during award negotiation or project implementation as necessary. The applicant must attach an appropriate and adequate project organizational chart, which must include and note key personnel positions and the roles and responsibilities of each position. Key personnel positions are deemed essential to the successful implementation and completion of all proposed activities and deliverables. The organizational chart should include the following key personnel positions: Chief of Party or Country Director, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, and Finance Director. The applicant may also propose additional key personnel positions. The applicant must specify their key personnel in the appropriate FAIS section and provide the percentage allocation of each position to the proposed project for these positions.

The applicant must identify any subrecipient(s) that would be involved and provide a description of the subrecipient(s) responsibilities and capability to perform those responsibilities. A subrecipient is a non-Federal entity that receives donated commodities, FAS provided funds, program income, or other resources from the applicant for the purpose of implementing in the target country activities described in the agreement and that is accountable to such for the use of such commodities, funds, program income, or resources. As a reminder on subrecipients, while they must be listed, if an award is made, they do not have any direct agreement relationship with FAS, as the prime recipient assumes all that responsibility.

Additionally, applicants must specify any governmental or nongovernmental entities in the recipient country that will be involved in the project and explain how the project will strengthen or increase the capacity of the entities specified to continue to carry out school feeding and improve educational
outcomes once McGovern-Dole funding ends.

Curriculum Vitae for Chief of Party or Country Director
As part of the proposal, the applicant must attach the curriculum vitae (CV) for the lead project manager (e.g. Chief of Party, Country Director, etc.) for the proposed project. This person should provide the major oversight for the proposed project. The CV must clearly demonstrate the lead project manager’s relevant work experience and qualifications. CVs for other designated key personnel are not required during proposal submission; however, they will be required after award announcements are made.

In-Country Registration
An applicant must disclose its registration status to operate in the targeted country. If the applicant is not registered, it must include a plan to become registered and a timeline to complete the registration process (7 CFR 1599.4(c)).

Past Performance Records
Applicants should include past performance records for at least one and no more than two grants or contracts implemented by the organization. Applicants are encouraged to include past performance records of grants or contracts that are similar to the scope and size of programming in the applicant’s proposal. In addition, applicants should include those past performance records of grants or contracts implemented in the proposed country, if applicable, and specifically mentioned in the applicant’s introduction section of the proposal. Applicants should not submit past performance records for grants or contracts for past or active McGovern-Dole awards.

AD-3030
All domestic applicants that are corporations should complete, sign, and attach the one-page AD-3030 form: “Representations Regarding Felony Conviction and Tax Delinquent Status for Corporate Applicants” (A corporation is defined as any entity that has filed articles of incorporation in one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the various territories of the United States including American Samoa, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Midway Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, Republic of Palau, Republic of the Marshall Islands, or the U.S. Virgin Islands. Corporations include both for profit and non-profit entities. An unsigned AD-3030 will not be accepted). Applicants can download the form at: http://www.fas.usda.gov/grants/forms/default.asp.

Guidance for Audited Financial Statements
Applicants should attach the organization’s most recent audited financial statements. If the applicant is subject to the audit requirements contained in the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 (31 U.S.C. 7501-7507) and revised OMB Circular A-133, “Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations,” the submitted financial statements should contain this supplemental document.

Past Performance Records
Applicants should include past performance records for no more than two grants or contracts implemented by the organization. Applicants are encouraged to include past performance records of grants or contracts that are similar to the scope and size of programming in the applicant’s proposal. In addition, applicants should include those past performance records of grants or contracts implemented in
the proposed country, if applicable, and specifically mentioned in the applicant’s introduction section of the proposal. Applicants should submit past performance records for grants or contracts other than for past or active McGovern-Dole awards.

**Guidance for Audited Financial Statements**

Applicants should attach the organization’s most recent audited financial statements. If the applicant is subject to the audit requirements contained in the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 (31 U.S.C. 7501-7507) and revised OMB Circular A-133, “Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations,” the submitted financial statements should contain this supplemental document.

**III. Graduation and Sustainability**

According to 7 CFR 1599.4 (c) (8), applicants must explain (1) how the benefits of education, enrollment, and attendance of children in schools in the targeted communities will be sustained when assistance under McGovern-Dole terminates and (2) the estimated period of time required until the targeted country or the applicant would be able to sustain the program without additional assistance under McGovern-Dole.

Applications should include a detailed timeline that shows the project’s progression towards graduation with measurable and achievable targets at each stage, including work with public, private, and/or local partners. If the graduation of a school feeding activity to the recipient country or eligible organization is not imminent, the applicant must explain the barriers to graduation, and how proposed activities will sustain other program benefits to targeted communities of the recipient country once the provision of commodities and assistance to the recipient country ends.

If an applicant is proposing to continue an existing project, it must be clear if the proposed project will carry forward activities with the same beneficiaries towards the same long-term goals as the prior project, and build upon previous results, demonstrating progression towards sustainability and graduation. Furthermore, the applicant should demonstrate any prior successes regarding graduation of food assistance or education projects, especially those funded by USG agencies.

Applicants should include information on their collaboration with the host government and their efforts to build governments capacity to take over the school feeding activities. All applicants are encouraged to enter into an MOU with the government detailing a path forward on sustainability. Proposals must include information on any type of capacity building training, including possible technical exchanges.

**IV. Project-Level Results Frameworks**

All applicants are required to submit, as an attachment, a project-level Results Framework (RF). An RF is a graphical representation of the project’s theory of change, describing the cause-and-effect linkages outlined in the strategic analysis. The project-level RF must clearly identify and articulate how the proposed project will contribute to McGovern-Dole results, as shown in [Appendix D - McGovern-Dole Results Framework](#). The Project-Level RF must be accompanied by narrative text that identifies critical
assumptions and describes the project’s theory of change, referring to existing research that supports the proposed causal linkages, where possible.

Project-level RFs should:

- Serve as a graphical representation of the set of intermediate results (IR) that must be attained in order to achieve the highest level result or Strategic Objective (SO)
- Identify IRs which are necessary and sufficient to achieve the SO
- Identify critical assumptions
- Provide a cause-and-effect theory of change citing existing research, as appropriate
  - Activities lead to achievement of initial results
  - Lower-level results support achievement of higher-level results
- Create the basis for measuring, analyzing and reporting on results
- Contain well-defined results
- Provide a framework for designing and conducting evaluations
- RFs should contain well-defined results. Results should be:
  - A statement of result, not a process or activity
  - Unidimensional, generally one element per result statement
  - Precise and clearly understood without having to look at indicators or other project document for definition
  - Measurable and objectively verifiable so that it can be monitored and used for management purposes

Finally, the RF should reflect sound, causal thinking. The project logic should follow a chain of cause and effect relationships. This includes activities that lead to specific outputs which lead to initial results or IR which, in turn, lead to the SO of the project. There should be no significant causal gaps or large leaps from one level in the causal hierarchy to the next. Proposed activities should be sufficient to achieve the identified results and all activities should align with selected results. If activities do not align with results, these should be reconsidered and the budget should be revised to include activities that directly support results.

A superior proposal will identify a cause and effect relationship between activities, outputs, and results that are evidence-based and reference existing literature on effective strategies for achieving desired outcomes.

Applicants should use the McGovern-Dole-level RFs as the basis of their project-level RFs. When constructing a project-level RF, applicants should include all activities and results that the proposed project will address. Projects are not required to reach every result in the program-level RF, and proposals reaching more results will not be prioritized over those reaching less. Rather, proposals will be
evaluated on how well they address, through the results framework, identified needs. Applicants should include all results, including mid-level results alongside low and high-level results in the project-level RFs. Additionally, applicants may add results that are not included in the program-level RFs to their project-level RFs if the strategic analysis justifies why the additional result is included. Applicants may not change the specific title of any existing result from the program-level RFs when including it in their project-level RF.

The project-level RF should identify which results are being targeted by the proposed project and which are being targeted by another organization. In such cases where results are being targeted by another organization, the strategic analysis should identify a strong and realistic relationship between the project and external partner, especially with results that are strategic to achieving the highest-level results. Additionally, the project-level results framework should reflect if another external partner, such as the Ministry of Health, is conducting activities to support deworming activities. For existing projects, the project-level RF should identify results that have been achieved during the preceding project period(s).

The application must also include a discussion of critical assumptions. Critical assumptions are defined as external conditions that are necessary for success of the project, over which the project implementers have little or no control. Critical assumptions that have a high probability of occurring, and if realized, would prohibit the project from achieving its desired results, are defined as “killer assumptions.”

Generally, projects should not have killer assumptions.
For additional information on Results Oriented Management in FAS’s food assistance programs, see Appendix C - Manual for the Use of Results Frameworks and Indicators.

Appendix D - McGovern-Dole Results Framework and Illustrative Examples of Foundational Results includes the program-level RF and illustrative examples of foundational results.

V. Plan of Operation and Activities

The Plan of Operation must include a list of each of the activities that would be implemented, with a brief statement of the objectives to be accomplished under each activity and a detailed description of the activity, including the steps involved in its implementation and the anticipated completion date.

The Activities section is evaluated based on the quality and technical merit of the content submitted, including in-depth description of each activity, and how each activity will be implemented. Applicants should demonstrate how their proposed activities will address the needs as identified in the Strategic Analysis section (see above – Section I – Introduction and Strategic Analysis). The activities should accurately capture the project scope, beneficiaries, and deliverables. Furthermore, this section must detail how these activities will lead to the results as stated in the project-level RF. The activities should not only identify the project’s targeted interventions, but also demonstrate how the project will complement existing efforts. Thus, the section should distinguish which activities will be implemented only by the applicant, and those that will be implemented in coordination with other partners. Applicants must provide a brief description of the capacity of all subrecipients and their role in project implementation.
VI. Literacy

The applicant must develop activities and activity-level indicators in support of SO1, improving the literacy of school-age children. To promote literacy of school-age children, these activities should be aligned with evidence-based approaches and best practices in reading instruction, support other complementary activities taking place at the school-level, and existing education activities. Activities designed to improve literacy should be part of a holistic approach to the challenge of ensuring that disadvantaged children are physically, nutritionally, and cognitively fit to succeed in school. These activities should include evidence-based interventions that effectively address the quality of literacy instruction and improve teacher effectiveness by providing continuous support and coaching. Additionally, activities should improve the quality, appropriateness, availability and effective use of reading materials. To complete the holistic approach, activities should encourage community engagement and support for literacy. Where appropriate, literacy activities might also include working at the regional or national levels on curriculum and development activities.

To achieve meaningful improvements in literacy, applicants should design evidence-based and context-appropriate activities that focus on the “5 Ts”: texts, tongue, testing, teachers, and time as outlined in Part I, V. USDA-USAID Memorandum of Understanding on Education.

Applicants should implement effective beneficiary targeting for improved literacy activities, recognizing that limited effectiveness occurs if the activities are implemented only in part. While differing by country, it is recommended that applicants consider utilizing at least five percent of project resources for literacy-focused activities. The design and implementation of activities should incorporate the roles and responsibilities of different education stakeholders, including students, teachers, school administrators, parents and parent organizations and Ministry of Education officials at all levels. The applicant must ensure that all early grade activities are designed and implemented to sustain positive outcomes in improved literacy beyond the life of the McGovern-Dole project.

Per USDA-USAID MOU priorities as stated earlier under Part I, V. USDA-USAID Memorandum of Understanding on Education, a strong proposal will demonstrate good program coordination and complementarity in countries where both McGovern-Dole and USAID have active education and/or literacy activities, while keeping in mind the importance of seeking to leverage “lessons learned” or best practices where applicable. In addition, where feasible (if not, it is important to address why not), co-location in designated schools, districts, and regions is desirable to further the idea of leveraging resources, and to promote cost-efficiency, efficacy, and increased impact. FAS will give priority consideration to eligible applications that align with USDA-USAID MOU priorities and demonstrate evidence of collaboration. If the education and literacy activity is conducted by a sub-contractor or subrecipient, submission of the sub-contractor or subrecipient’s relevant past performance is strongly encouraged.

VII. Nutrition

Ration Justification: The applicant must develop nutrition-sensitive activities and activity-level indicators in support of McGovern-Dole SO2. Provide a clear explanation of how the requested
commodity and ration size helps address the identified nutritional deficiencies of the intended beneficiaries. To meet the full nutritional requirements in this section, applicants must offer at least three food components, i.e., a combination of USDA commodities and locally available foods, especially adding seasonal vegetables, fruits, and/or animal-sourced proteins, when feasible. This will encourage dietary diversity and teach children about nutrition and healthy eating. Applicants who offer additional components beyond USDA commodities will be required to track these additions using one or more custom indicators. Potential custom indicators may include, but are not limited to: number of meals provided that include fruits, vegetables, and/or animal-sourced proteins in addition to the USDA commodities; number of kilograms of fruits, vegetables, and/or animal-sourced proteins provided in addition to the USDA commodities; and/or number of children who receive [x] or more meals per week that include fruits, vegetables, and/or animal-sourced proteins in addition to the USDA commodities.

Describe the ration, including serving size, to be served in school, and whether it will be a snack, drink or meal, and whether it will be USDA commodities alone or combined with locally available foods (provided with non-USDA funds or provided by the community). Applicants must explain the intended (per serving) age-appropriate nutritional contribution from the ration such as calories, protein, carbohydrates and key micronutrients. The goal is to meet age appropriate 1/3 of the daily requirement if one meal is provided, breakfast or lunch, and 1/4 of the daily requirement if a snack is provided. This is comparable with the dietary requirements stipulated under the USDA National School Lunch Program. Describe how to ensure that each child receives his or her portion of food under bulk cooking situations. Explain how the commodity selection was determined in the context of other nutrition programs in the region or country and how the commodity selection would be appropriate for the local diet, as well as how it may fill identified nutrition gaps in the local diet. Provide a description of each nutrition-sensitive activity that supports SO2. If an applicant is a current or past McGovern-Dole implementer, describe successes and challenges from previous experiences and efforts to improve program implementation.

Once the applicant has chosen the commodities for the ration, the total amount of each commodity needed for the project should be calculated. Please use the following formula to calculate the number of metric tons (MT) needed for each commodity:

\[
\text{MT of each commodity} = \frac{\text{Grams per student per day} \times \text{Total number of students receiving commodity} \times \text{the Number of days the ration will be provided}}{1,000,000}.
\]

An example of this calculation is: An applicant is intending to provide 100,000 students with 100 grams of Corn Soy Blend (CSB Plus) per student over a 180 day school year term. The total tonnage of CSB Plus required for that year would be 1,800 MT. The applicant should ensure that commodities and tonnages are split out by the intended delivery month/year to U.S. port within FAIS.

The calculation must be conducted for each commodity that comprises the ration. If applicable, the applicant may provide information on any commodities that would be acceptable substitutions for the proposed commodities.
Maternal and Child Nutrition

In addition to school meals for older children, applicants are encouraged to address the second part of the legislation’s intent, that of nutritional needs of pregnant and lactating women, and children under five years old as applicable with USDA commodities and additional locally available foods, such as from school or community gardens, orchards, local livestock, and fisheries, as well as associated evidence-based nutrition activities. Please see each country guidance section located in APPENDIX B – Country Specific Guidance for country-specific information. Illustrative examples could include, but are not limited to, early childhood development (ECD) centers; growth monitoring and promotion; take home rations; social and behavior change interventions like counseling, peer group education, cooking demonstrations, mass media campaigns, etc. Applicants should consider the need for identification of and medical referrals for childhood illnesses, acute malnutrition, maternal malnutrition, and other related conditions in these vulnerable populations. If applicants chose to target pregnant and lactating women, and children under five years old, they must describe how they will coordinate those activities with the school meals component.

Applicants should describe how their proposed project aligns with existing maternal and child nutrition policies, strategies, and institutional structures at the national and sub-national levels. They should ensure their project is carried out in collaboration with the Ministry of Health or other relevant ministry where possible. Applicants are strongly encouraged to work with and/or build on any existing nutrition activities targeting this age group to maximize impact, including activities implemented by the applicant, other organizations, or host government agencies in the same area. Applicants should describe how they will coordinate with and leverage those existing activities. Applicants should distinguish which activities will be implemented only by the applicant, and those to be implemented in coordination with other partners.

Applicants should link their nutrition activities with pregnant and lactating women, and children under five years old, to the results in the McGovern Dole results framework, including intermediate result “Increased knowledge of nutrition” (McGovern-Dole 2.3), and objective “Increased use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices” (McGovern Dole SO2). Applicants may also add additional, complementary results reflecting maternal and child nutrition work to their project-level framework.

Applicants are encouraged to propose custom indicators to measure maternal and child nutrition results if results are not addressed by McGovern Dole standard indicators. Applicants should review the relevant Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) indicators (see Feed the Future new performance indicators) and Food for Peace indicators (see Food for Peace indicator handbooks), amongst other resources, to identify applicable, established indicators for their proposed changes. During the agreement negotiation phase, successful applicants will be required to add applicable disaggregates for pregnant and lactating women and children under five years old to relevant standard indicators, and will also be required to adopt any new, relevant standard indicators established in USDA’s updated indicator handbook.
VIII. Budget

The Applicant must submit a budget that details the amount of any program income and FAS-provided funds that the applicant proposes to use to fund the administrative costs; inland transportation, storage and handling costs; and activity costs (7 CFR 1599.4 (b)(4)). In order to assess sale proceeds, the overall cost effectiveness of a proposal, FAS requires all Applicants to provide the following budgetary materials:

- A budget summary (using the standard template) that presents the proposed overall funding for administrative, ITSH and activity expenses, and shows funding amounts for the specific line items that make up those expense categories.
- A budget narrative (see Appendix F) that demonstrates in greater detail the composition of each line item, the budget’s overall cost effectiveness, and an adherence to applicable cost principles.
- A current Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA), if applicable to the organization that details the organization’s current indirect rates.
- A completed and signed SF-424.

Budget Summary
The budget summary should contain all elements shown in the standard template and adhere to the same format. It must be uploaded as a proposal attachment in either .xml or .pdf format. Applicants must include any cost sharing in the budget summary.
**Budget Narrative**

Applicants should provide a budget narrative that provides justification for the costs in terms of the proposed project. The account should focus on how each budget line item is required to achieve the...
results of the proposed project and how the estimated costs for the budget line items were calculated. Additionally, an explanation is required for any program income or cash or in-kind contributions that the applicant expects to receive from non-FAS sources that are critical to the implementation of the proposed activities or enhance the implementation of the activities. Wherever possible, provide an estimated dollar amount. Applicants must identify and explain any cost sharing in the budget narrative. Please refer to Appendix F – Budget Narrative for guidance on the proper format and composition of the budget narrative.

NICRA
Applicants should attach the organization’s most up-to-date NICRA. If your organization does not have a NICRA, attach a brief note explaining why it does not have this document. Please note, applicants will be required to have a NICRA in place before starting project implementation.

Guidance for SF-424
Applicants must complete, sign, and upload the SF-424. It is not necessary to include supplementary SF-424 forms (i.e., SF-424A, SF-424B, etc.). Please note that unsigned SF-424s will not be accepted. Applicants can download a blank form on the FAS website at: http://www.fas.usda.gov/grants/forms/default.asp.

IX. Commodity Management
The applicant must clearly describe the appropriateness of each type of commodity selected for the proposed project in the targeted country. All U.S.-donated commodities adhere to food safety standards established by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The application must include a clear explanation of how the requested commodities will be programmed, managed, prepared and served, including ration size. Additionally, the applicant must provide information on the nutritional contributions (e.g. calories, protein and micronutrients) of the ration size as well as nutritional benefits for the intended beneficiaries.

Commodity List
Each proposal must include information on the commodities requested. Applicants must complete the following required information.

- Commodity
- Package Size/Type
- Commodity Usage Type: Select direct feed or monetization to specify how the commodity will be used. The direct feed option includes take-home rations. Barter and Food for Work are also options, but are considered only under extraordinary circumstances.
- Quantity MT: Tonnages should be whole numbers only and in multiples of ten.
- Destination Country
- Delivery to U.S. Port (Month & Year)

Special Needs and Distribution Methods
Each proposal must include detailed information on special needs, applicants commodity management, and distribution standards. Each text section has a 5,000 maximum character limit in FAIS. Please use the following guidance listed below when completing this information.
Transportation and Storage
The applicant must provide a clear description of any port, transportation, storage, and warehouse facilities that would be used with sufficient detail to demonstrate that the facilities would be adequate to handle the requested commodities without undue spoilage or waste, and, in the cases where the applicant proposes to distribute some or all of the requested commodities, a clear description of how they would transport commodities from the receiving port to the point at which distribution is made to the beneficiaries. (7 CFR Part 1599.4(d)(13)). The applicant must address inland transportation, handling and storage (at all levels) of the donated commodities.

Processing or Packaging
The applicant must provide information on any reprocessing or repackaging of the requested commodities that would take place prior to the distribution, sale, if monetized, or barter (7 CFR Part 1599.4(d)(14)). Applicants should indicate if no reprocessing or repackaging of the requested commodities will take place.

Duty-Free Entry
The applicant must indicate that requested commodities for direct distribution will be imported and distributed free from all customs, duties, tolls, and taxes. Additionally, the applicant must provide information on the action it has taken or will take to ensure that any requested commodities for direct distribution will be imported and distributed free from all customs, duties, tolls and taxes (7 CFR Part 1599.8 (a)). If the commodities will not enter duty free, indicate who will be responsible for paying any applicable customs, duties, tolls, or taxes and how this payment will affect the amount of sales proceeds realized from the sale. USDA will not pay for any customs, duties, tolls or taxes. Outline any additional steps taken to ensure seamless entry into each country, including the payment of local expeditors or agents.

Economic Impact
The applicant must include a plan that demonstrates how the requested commodities will be imported and distributed without a disruptive impact upon production, prices and marketing of the same or similar products in the target country. If applicable, the plan must provide information to the extent to which any sale or barter of the requested commodities would displace or interfere with any sales that may otherwise be made by the applicant or any other entity in the target country (7 CFR Part 1599.4(d) (16)).

Monetization
If an applicant proposes to monetize all or a portion of the requested commodities, the applicant must include information on the proposed sale of commodity(ies). Please use the following guidance when entering this information:

Note: applicants who do not propose to monetize donated commodities may skip this section.

Impact on Other Sales
The applicant must provide credible information that demonstrates that commercial markets and local production will not be adversely affected by the sale of commodities.
Private Sector Participation in Sales of Commodity
The applicant must provide a description of how the commodities will be sold (i.e., open tender, tender with negotiation, direct negotiation) and why this method of sale was selected. The applicant must also discuss any constraints that could hinder or aid the sales process, (e.g., number of buyers, number of banks, letter of credit fees, storage facilities at processing plants, etc.).

Sales Proceeds Usage
The applicant must describe how the proceeds from the monetization will be accounted for as well as allocated among ITSH line-item expenses. Additionally, applicants must include a statement of how unexpected increases or decreases in proceeds or additional funds due to reduced ITSH costs will be handled.

Assuring Receipt Procedures
The applicant must outline a plan to ensure that payments are received from the sale of the commodity and that the proceeds generated are deposited into a separate, interest-bearing account. The applicant must provide a description of how the account will be monitored and audited. Additionally, the applicant should describe any actions needed to safeguard deposits particularly if special banking rules and regulations apply.

Expected Interest Earned
The applicant must provide the expected interest earned from the monetization proceeds during the life of the project.

X. Monitoring and Evaluation

Applicants must provide an evaluation plan that explains how the applicant proposes to monitor the program and assess project outcomes and impact.

Applicants must also provide a table identifying appropriate project standard and custom performance indicators and annual and life of project targets.

Performance Indicators
Applicants must identify and submit a table of both standard and custom performance indicators and annual and life of project targets for each indicator. Applicants should use the format provided in Appendix E – Performance Indicators Illustration when submitting information on the project’s performance indicators. Performance indicators identify how to recognize the success of the project and help to clarify results.

Standard McGovern-Dole performance indicators are required, where appropriate. See https://www.fas.usda.gov/sites/default/files/2016-10/indicator_handbook_updated_august_2016_final_8-16-16.pdf for McGovern-Dole standard definitions. If a proposal addresses a result that has a corresponding standard indicator, the applicant must include the standard indicator in the McGovern-Dole Standard Indicators Summary. Furthermore, applicants must propose corresponding indicators to measure project performance for each result. FAS does not require a specific number of indicators per
result, however the proposed indicators should include a sufficient number of indicators for monitoring the proposed project’s performance in achieving each result.

Each project performance indicator must meet a basic level of standard. As defined in the FAS Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, high-quality performance indicators should be direct, objective, adequate, and practical.\(^1\)

Performance indicators that seek to measure progress or outcomes associated with results in the applicant’s proposed results framework must be provided in the performance indicator table in the Results section. Additionally, performance indicators that seek to measure progress or outcomes associated with the applicant’s proposed activities must be provided in the performance indicator table in the Activities section.

If an award is made, the applicant will be required to submit a full performance monitoring plan (PMP), which will include additional detail and information regarding indicator definitions, units of measurement, data sources, frequency of data collection, roles and responsibility for data collection, and how and when the data will be used. During agreement negotiation, applicants will also be responsible for describing how the project will ensure and maintain the quality of monitoring data collected by field staff/monitors through the analysis and reporting process. Criteria, defined in the Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, for assessing data such as accuracy, validity, reliability, timeliness, and integrity must be considered. Applicants should discuss the monitoring process to be undertaken to verify and validate the data collected.

**Evaluation Plan**

According to 7 CFR Part 1599.13, all recipients must, as provided in the agreement, submit to FAS an interim and final evaluation of the implementation of the agreement. Applicants must also submit baseline data information for performance monitoring indicators and an evaluation baseline report. All evaluations must be conducted by an independent third party that:

i. Is financially and legally separate from the participant's organization;
ii. Has staff with demonstrated knowledge, analytical capability, language skills and experience in conducting evaluations of development programs involving agriculture, education, and nutrition;
iii. Uses acceptable analytical frameworks such as comparison with non-project areas, surveys, involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation, and statistical analyses;
iv. Uses local consultants, as appropriate, to conduct portions of the evaluation; and,

---

\(^1\) For more information see the FAS Monitoring and Evaluation Policy [https://www.fas.usda.gov/sites/default/files/2014-03/evalpol.pdf](https://www.fas.usda.gov/sites/default/files/2014-03/evalpol.pdf)
v. Provides a detailed outline of the evaluation, major tasks, and specific schedules prior to initiating the evaluation.

Applicants must submit a draft evaluation plan as an attachment. Each evaluation plan should include a comprehensive approach to evaluating the project’s performance and impact. All McGovern-Dole projects must include, as part of their evaluation plan, key evaluation questions that aim to assess the project’s effect on improving early grade reading outcomes of school-age children, including how the project intends to measure changes in reading outcomes, particularly the use of a context-appropriate early grade reading assessment. Evaluation plans should also address plans to measure the use of health, nutrition and dietary practices.

The evaluation plan should be developed as a stand-alone document that can be shared with key project partners, stakeholders and the public. FAS expects the evaluation plan submitted as part of the application process to be no more than 10 pages (excluding annexes). The applicant must include an evaluation plan that includes, at a minimum, the following information:

**Introduction**
Provide a brief description of the purpose of the evaluation plan and how it will be used by the project and its partners.

**Project Overview**
Provide a summary description of the project strategy including the project strategic objectives and expected results. The project-level Results Framework should be included here. Provide a brief description of the project activities and corresponding targeted project beneficiaries. The project overview will provide important context to the evaluation plan and methodology proposed. All awardees will be required to ensure that their reports can be made publicly available on USDA’s website, in accordance with Office of Management and Budget Guidelines for Federal Departments and Agencies that Administer United States Foreign Assistance.

**Alignment with the McGovern-Dole Learning Agenda**
Review the Learning Agenda provided in APPENDIX G – McGovern-Dole Learning Agenda. The Learning Agenda was designed to address key research and evaluation questions that align not only with the theory of change outlined in the McGovern Dole program-level Results Framework, but also the broader school meals program theory. Recognizing that some questions posed in the Learning Agenda lend themselves to broad research, the project-level evidence developed in the course of implementing a McGovern Dole project can contribute to building the evidence base for many of the questions. Applicants must include a short section in their evaluation plan explaining which questions in the Learning Agenda their proposed evaluations and/or special studies will help answer, and how.

**Baseline Study**
Baseline data will be collected for two purposes: (1) to measure progress on performance indicators and (2) to assess project outcomes and impacts using evaluation methods. The evaluation plan should provide a description of the organization’s plan to establish performance indicator baseline information and targets for which the project will regularly measure performance every six months of the fiscal
year in required progress reports. The baseline information for performance indicators and evaluation assessments must be measured and established prior to the start of project activities. Please also describe data collection techniques and methodologies proposed for establishing baseline information for evaluation activities.

The evaluation plan should describe the quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods that will be used throughout the length of the project (i.e., an evaluation design may include a randomized control trial (RCT), propensity score matching (PSM) design, repeat cross-sectional designs, or panel studies and also may include direct observations, key informant interviews, and secondary data analysis). These methodologies should be described in detail including sample design, expected sample sizes, and key informants. The methodological description of the baseline should also be linked to the midterm and final evaluations. For example, the evaluation plan should describe in detail if the project plans to use a PSM design with data collected at the baseline, midterm and final stages.

**Midterm Evaluation**
Provide a description of the project’s midterm evaluation strategy and activities. The evaluation plan should identify the purpose and scope of the evaluation, preliminary key evaluation questions, methodology, selection of the evaluation team, and key audience for the evaluation. These questions should be organized according to standard evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. The evaluation plan should include a timeline for the conduct of key evaluation activities and a description of how the project plans to utilize the evaluation findings and recommendations.

**Final Evaluation**
Provide a description of the project’s final evaluation strategy and activities. The evaluation plan should identify the purpose and scope of the evaluation, preliminary key evaluation questions, methodology, and the key audience for the evaluation. The evaluation questions should be organized according to standard evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. The evaluation plan should describe the methodology selected and the strengths and weaknesses in the proposed methodology for measuring impact and assessing attribution. The evaluation plan should include a timeline for the conduct of key evaluation activities and address issues of independence, coordination and the use of participatory methods. The evaluation plan must include a description of the expected qualifications of the evaluation team and provide a list of key stakeholders.

**Special Studies (where applicable)**
Proposals may include plans to conduct special studies focused on a particular intervention, sector or thematic area that may aid in identifying project effectiveness, impact, or lessons learned complementary to the required midterm and final evaluations. Proposals may also conduct qualitative or anthropologic studies that help to triangulate evaluation information, provide context to evaluation findings, or offer a better understanding of evaluation findings.

**Evaluation Management**
Briefly describe an evaluation management structure that reflects standards and principles of evaluation independence and credibility. If the organization maintains an evaluation unit, FAS
requires that the evaluation is managed by the organization’s evaluation unit. If the organization does not have a dedicated evaluation unit, the review should be managed by a project staff person or organizational staff person with significant knowledge and expertise concerning evaluation. Ideally, the organization would maintain an evaluation unit that is separated from the staff or line management function of the project being evaluated. Such a structure helps to ensure the independence and impartiality of the evaluation process and report of findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The evaluation plan should also address the roles and responsibilities of the project partners and key stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Additionally, the evaluation plan should address the regular review and updating of the evaluation plan throughout the life of the agreement, and should describe the project’s dissemination strategy for improving the knowledge base and sharing evaluation findings and lessons learned. More detailed descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of the applicant’s Monitoring and Evaluation staff should be included in the staffing plan and organizational chart as described in the II. Organizational Capacity and Staffing section above.

**Evaluation Budget**

An evaluation budget is directly related to the purpose, scope, timeline, and approach of the evaluation (includes all baseline, midterm and final evaluations). It is dependent on the required skills and expertise, specified deliverables, and any provisions provided by the evaluation commissioners. The FAD Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Policy states that proposals should allocate a minimum of three percent (3 percent) of the total project budget to M&E (p. 10). Costs vary considerably across evaluations and typical budget line items for evaluation include: costs for third-party evaluation contractors; costs associated with the development of a beneficiary monitoring system or data collection equipment and tools; and other costs for translators, data processors, meeting space, and support staff. The minimum three percent is exclusive of the applicants’ M&E employee staff costs. For evaluation plans which include the conduct of impact evaluations, FAS expects the M&E costs to range between five to ten percent (5-10 percent) of the project budget, but no less than three percent. Evaluation budget information should be included as described in Appendix F – Budget Narrative.

**XI. Other Details**

The overall quality of the proposal will be evaluated on submission of an “Other Details” section and the consistency of all sections as well as the extent to which it is clearly and concisely written.

All applicants must complete an “Other Details” section regarding the results entered in their proposal. Applicants should use the following guidance for this information:

- **Method of Educating the Public**: The proposal will describe the methods of notifying consumers in the recipient country of the source of donated commodities and/or funding for program activities. In cases where beneficiaries will receive commodities directly, describe how they will be educated regarding preparation and consumption.

- **USDA Branding**: The proposal will describe how the project will adhere to USDA branding.

- **Method of Choosing Beneficiaries**: Briefly identify the criteria and methodology used to target the geographic area(s) and the beneficiary group(s). Criteria and methodology should help to distinguish why some regions or beneficiary groups will receive resources (funds or agricultural
products) while others may not. Applicants should consider the following questions when preparing a response:

a) Why and with what methodology did you select the particular geographic area(s), institutions, and/or beneficiaries?
b) Which sources of information did you use (i.e. government agency survey, computer database, interviews, assessments, etc.)?
c) With whom did you collaborate to target particular regions, institutions, or beneficiaries?

• **Target Geographic Area:** List the targeted geographic areas where the proposed activities will take place; the inclusion of maps for illustration is encouraged and can be uploaded in FAIS as an attachment.

In addition, please include the following attachments with the application: **Dun and Bradstreet Universal Numbering System (DUNS) and System for Award Management (SAM)**

Applicants must include a valid DUNS number in the organizational unit section of Block 8 of SF-424. All subrecipients listed in the proposal must have a current DUNS number. Organizations that do not have a DUNS number can receive one at no cost by using the web-based form available at [http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform](http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform).

In addition to having a current DUNS number, applicants must be registered in the System for Awards Management (SAM) prior to submitting an application to this solicitation. Instructions for registering in SAM can be found at [https://www.sam.gov](https://www.sam.gov). If awarded a grant, a recipient and all subrecipients must maintain an active SAM registration number with current information throughout the duration which it has an active federal award or an application under consideration. To remain registered in the SAM database after the initial registration, the recipient is required to review and update the registration every 12 months from the date of initial registration to ensure the information is accurate.

**C. Method of Submission**

The entire application package must be submitted electronically through the proposal entry module of FAS’s FAIS, located at: [https://apps.fas.usda.gov/fais/public](https://apps.fas.usda.gov/fais/public). **Any automatic response from FAIS that the proposal has been received does not constitute a statement that the proposal is complete.**

Comments and questions regarding this NOFO will be considered to the extent practicable and should be submitted to [ppded@fas.usda.gov](mailto:ppded@fas.usda.gov). FAS will respond to the comments and questions on the FAIS home page so that all applicants have access to the comments and questions. FAS staff will not respond to questions that are not submitted to the above e-mail address. The final day for submission of questions is March 16, 2018.

**D. Submission Dates and Times**

Applications are due in FAIS by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Savings Time (EDT) on March 30, 2018. FAS will run a report from the FAIS system showing all submissions prior to 5:00 p.m. on March 30, 2018 and applications received after this time will not be considered.
FAS advises applicants to begin the application process early, to allow time to address any difficulties that may arise. **There will be no exceptions to the application deadline.**

**PART V – APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION**

**A. Merit and Criteria**

Prior to selecting the recipients of the McGovern-Dole award, applicants are evaluated on their responses to the areas of criterion below. The guidance required for each area of criterion is detailed above in **Part IV – Application and Submission Information.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Areas of Criterion</th>
<th>Merit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and Strategic Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Capacity and Staffing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation and Sustainability</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-Level Results Framework</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan of Operation and Activities</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity Management</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Details</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I. Negative Factors**

FAS seriously considers an applicant’s past performance on both agency and USG-wide programs. To determine suitability for receiving and responsibly managing federal awards, the following negative factors will be considered for each applicant:

- FAS or other USG agency has formally expressed concerns – either via letter or e-mail – regarding past performance on previous FAS-funded projects.
- FAS has terminated an agreement with the organization within the past 3 years as a result of a violation of the agreement by the organization.
• The organization has failed to pay a single substantial debt, or a number of outstanding debts (not including sums owed to the Federal Government under the Internal Revenue Code) owed to any Federal agency or instrumentality, provided the debt is uncontested by the organization or, if contested, provided that the organization's legal and administrative remedies have been exhausted.

• The organization has failed to submit to FAS, or has submitted more than 5 business days after the due date, at least two required reports within the past 3 years. Required documentation includes logistics and monetization (logmon) or semi-annual performance reports, financial reports, evaluation plans, baseline data, interim and final evaluations, A-133 audits, subrecipient agreements and all other documentation required in the organization’s agreement.

• The organization has, on at least two occasions within the past 3 years, failed to respond, or responded more than 5 business days late, to a FAS deadline for documents required during a compliance review or during the close-out of an agreement.

• The organization has been designated high-risk by FAS (per 2 CFR 200.205), another Federal Government Agency (as designated in SAM), or external auditor within the past three years and/or the organization’s most recent A-133 identifies material weaknesses.

• The organization has experienced a significant commodity loss valued at $20,000 or greater for which it was responsible during the past three years and/or the organization failed to notify FAS within 15 days of any commodity loss valued over $1,000 during the past 3 years.

II. Other Factors

The selecting official will consider the following desirable program policy factors in the selection process:

• Projects that build upon existing program activities to reach the benefits of graduation and sustainability.

• Projects that collectively represent diverse countries, types of projects, and sizes of applicant organizations.

• Projects implemented by applicant with documented past Federal Award performance with respect to achieving program results.

• A well-reasoned cost sharing component that will maximize program impacts and elicit in-country program sustainability, the applicant is encouraged to include this in the application.

• Consideration of climate risks and appropriate resilience options in project strategic analyses.

While these factors are not indicators of the application’s merit, they may be essential to the process of selecting the application(s) that, individually or collectively, are most likely to achieve the program objectives. Such factors may be beyond the control of the applicant. Applicants should recognize that very good applications may not receive an award because they do not fit with a set of projects that maximize the probability of achieving FAS’s overall food assistance objectives.
B. Review and Selection Process

I. Review Process

FAS will review all complete applications that are submitted by the deadline in FAIS. FAS will invite comments from other USG and USDA agencies on its award recommendations, but FAS will make the final determination on which applications to fund.

II. Anticipated Notice of Selection and Award Dates

FAS plans to notify applicants that have been selected for award around June 1, 2018 and finalize agreements by September 25, 2018. All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funding.

PART VI – FEDERAL AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Award Notices

FAS will notify each applicant through the Food Aid Information System (FAIS) of its decision to consider the organization for funding.

B. Negotiation of Award

FAS will enter into negotiations with all selected organizations. These negotiations may include but are not limited to:

- Appropriateness of the budget for the proposed project;
- Appropriateness of proposed staff;
- Appropriateness of proposed locations;
- Scope and type of activities to be implemented;
- Suitability of proposed indicators;
- Ability of recipient to comply with applicable regulations; and
- Any special terms and conditions.

Failure to satisfactorily resolve such elements of the agreement identified by FAS may prevent a timely signing of agreement.

C. Signing of Cooperative Agreement

Once negotiations have been completed, FAS will enter into a cooperative agreement with the funding recipient. The selection of this funding instrument entails substantial involvement, which exists when responsibility for the management, control, direction, or performance of the agreement is shared by FAS and the recipient. The agreement will incorporate the details of the project as approved by FAS and in accordance with the McGovern-Dole regulations, 7 C.F.R. part 1599. Substantial involvement may include, but is not limited to, the following:
• FAS specifies the manner, method, performance, or timing of the work in an approved work plan;
• FAS review and approval of one stage of work before a subsequent stage may begin during the performance period;
• FAS review and approval of an evaluation plan;
• FAS review and approval of monetization plan, if applicable;
• FAS review and approval of proposed sub-recipients and contracts, prior to award;
• FAS participation in the selection and approval of the individuals or organizations that will conduct all required evaluations;
• FAS participation in data collection and analysis for required evaluations and other performance reports;
• FAS approval of an organizational chart identifying the names, roles and responsibilities of all of the participant’s key personnel and any subsequent changes or absences; and
• FAS provision of specific direction or redirection of the work during the period of performance.

D. Key Personnel

Upon signature by both parties, FAS requires that a recipient receive approval for key personnel in the form of an organization chart, which must be submitted within 30 days. FAS considers any staff that have general management responsibility to be key personnel, such as the Chief of Party or Country Director, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, Education or Literacy Program Manager, Health and Nutrition Manager, Logistics Manager and Finance Director and critical technical staff, who oversee activity implementation. After approval of these staffing positions, the Recipient must notify FAS within one week of the departure of any key person and must obtain written approval prior to either their absence for more than 3 months or for a reduction of level of effort equal to or surpassing 25 percent.

E. Budget

While applicants are required to provide a budget summary and budget narrative as part of their proposal(s), those proposals selected for negotiations will be required to ensure that all costs in their budget summary and budget narrative comply with 2 CFR 200 Subpart E: Cost Principles.

F. Administrative Standards and Provisions

The cooperative agreements awarded under McGovern-Dole are administered under 7 CFR Part 1599 and 2 CFR Part 200. In addition to the above regulations, recipients of funding under McGovern-Dole agree to comply with:

• 2 CFR Part 25 - Universal Identifier and System for Award Management
• 2 CFR Part 170 – Reporting Subaward and Executive Compensation Information
• 2 CFR Part 175 – Award Term for Trafficking in Persons
- 2 CFR Part 180 - OMB Guidelines to Agencies on Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement)
- **Appendix XII to 2 CFR Part 200**—Award Term and Condition for Recipient Integrity and Performance Matters
- 2 CFR Part 400 – Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards
- 2 CFR 415, subparts A and B – General Program Administrative Regulations
- 2 CFR Part 416 – General Program Administrative Regulations for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Government
- 2 CFR Part 417 – Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension
- 2 CFR Part 418 – New Restrictions on Lobbying
- 2 CFR Part 421 – Requirements for a Drug-Free Workplace (Financial Assistance)
- 2 CFR Part 422 – Research Institutions Conducting USDA funded Extramural Research; Research Misconduct
- 7 CFR Part 1, subpart A – USDA implementation of the Freedom of Information Act
- 7 CFR Part 1b – National Environmental Policy Act
- 7 CFR Part 1c – Protection of Human Subjects
- 7 CFR Part 1c.120 – Evaluation and disposition of applications and proposals for research to be conducted or supported by a Federal Department or Agency
- 7 CFR Part 3 – Debt Management
- 7 CFR Part 15, subpart A – Nondiscrimination in Federally-Assisted Program of the Department of Agriculture
- 42 CFR Part 73 – Select Agents and Toxins
- Agriculture Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2002, as implemented at 7 CFR part 331 and 9 CFR part 121
- 41 U.S.C. 6306 – Interest of Member of Congress
- 29 U.S.C. 794 (section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973), as implemented in 7 CFR Part 15b
- Executive order 13513, “Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging While Driving”
- Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (PL 80-544, as amended, 7 USC §§ 2131 et.seq.)
- National Institutes of Health, DHHS, Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules
- 15 U.S.C. 205a et seq. “”the Metric Conversion Act as amended by the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act””
- 41 U.S.C. 4304, specific costs not allowable, and 41 U.S.C. 4310, Proceeding costs not allowable
- Environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (b) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (c) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (d) assurance of project
consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 USC §§ 1451 et seq.); (e) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 USC §§7401 et seq.); (t) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (PL 93-523); and (g) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (PL 93-205).

- Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 USC § 470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 USC §§ 469a-1 et seq.)
- Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646)

G. Audit Compliance

A recipient shall submit to FAS, in the manner specified in the agreement, an annual financial audit in accordance with 2 CFR 200.501 and the Single Audit Act. The recipient must comply with the timeframes established in those regulations for the submission of their audits to the Federal Audit Clearinghouse. Recipients must provide a copy of each single audit conducted within the timeframe of the USDA-funded project to FAIS at the time it is submitted to the Federal Audit Clearinghouse. In addition, if FAS requires an annual financial audit with respect to a particular agreement, and FAS provides funds for this purpose, the participant shall arrange for such audit and submit it to FAS, in the manner specified in the agreement.

H. Reporting

An organization receiving McGovern-Dole funding will be required to provide the following: semi-annual financial reports, semi-annual performance reports, an evaluation plan, a PMP, a baseline study, a mid-term evaluation, a final evaluation, a work plan, an annual travel plan, organizational chart identifying the names, roles and responsibilities of all of the participant’s key personnel and any subsequent changes or absences, and subrecipient and subcontractor agreements, as provided in the cooperative agreement. All reports must be submitted using FAIS and organizations must follow a reporting cycle with required deadlines for specific reports. All organizations receiving funding will be required to report against the indicators in the agreement at each reporting cycle.

I. Monitoring and Evaluation

FAS has published a Monitoring and Evaluation Policy which explains the required elements of the monitoring and evaluation protocols for cooperative agreements. A recipient shall submit to FAS an evaluation plan, a baseline study, a Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP), a mid-term and a final evaluation of the agreement implementation. The recipient shall provide to FAS additional information or reports relating to the agreement if requested by FAS. Please go to https://www.fas.usda.gov/programs/resources/monitoring-and-evaluation-policy for more detailed information.
FAS reserves the right to conduct an evaluation of the project through its own third-party evaluation contractor hired and managed by FAS at any time during the implementation of the project. The evaluation may be funded directly by FAS and will not be included in the funding of this agreement unless otherwise specified in the agreement. The evaluation will be managed by the FAS M&E Staff. The recipient is expected to take part in such an evaluation to the capacity deemed appropriate by FAS or the FAS managed third-party evaluation contractor.

PART VII – FEDERAL AWARDING AGENCY CONTACT

For general questions related to this NOFO, applicants and other interested parties are encouraged to contact:

School Feeding and Humanitarian Branch  
Food Assistance Division  
Office of Capacity Building and Development  
Foreign Agricultural Service  
U.S Department of Agriculture  

Address:
1400 Independence Ave, SW, STOP 1034  
Washington, DC 20250

Phone: (202) 720-4221  
Fax: (202) 690-0251  
Email at: ppded@fas.usda.gov

Individuals with questions regarding the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) must submit the questions in writing to the above email address. Answers to all questions regarding the NOFO will be posted on the FAIS Homepage (https://apps.fas.usda.gov/fais/public) within three days of receipt.

If you do not have internet access, and would like access to the questions and answers, please contact us at the number or address above and provide your address or fax number and FAS will send you the questions and responses to all questions asked regarding the NOFO.
APPENDIX A - Application Content Checklist for Submitting Proposals in FAIS

I. Application Requirement
   - Register with SAM and maintains an active account
   - DUNS number for applicant’s organization
   - DUNS number for all grant subrecipients

II. Proposal Summary Section
   - Past Performance Records - Attachments
   - CV of proposed Chief of Party or Project Director - Attachment
   - AD-3030 - Attachment
   - Audited Financial Statements - Attachments
   - Letters of Support – Attachment(s) (Not Required)

III. Introduction Section
   - All required cells are entered for country, project dates, etc. in FAIS
   - Introduction and Strategic Analysis uploaded as attachment. The document contains the following sections:
     - One paragraph summary of proposed project
     - Strategic Analysis

IV. Results Section
   - Performance Indicators for Results and Activities uploaded as attachment
   - Evaluation Plan uploaded as attachment
   - Project Level Frameworks uploaded as attachment

   Results Tab
   - Each result depicted on the proposal’s Project Level Frameworks in FAIS has a Result selected

   Activities Tab
   - All necessary Activities are selected

   Mapping Tab
   - All activities are mapped to at least one result

   Other Details Tab
   - Cash and Non-Cash Contributions section completed
   - Subrecipients section completed
   - Government and Non-Government Agencies section completed
   - Method of Choosing Beneficiaries section completed
   - Method of Educating Beneficiaries section completed
V. Commodity Section

**Commodity Tab**
- All proposed commodities are selected including basic information and monetization and direct feed details where applicable

**Special Needs & Distribution Methods Tab**
- Transportation and Storage section completed
- Processing and Packaging section completed
- Duty Free Entry section completed
- Economic Impact section completed
- Ration Justification/Other Remarks section completed and includes program specific information requested in guidance

**Monetization Tab (if applicable)**
- Impact on Other Sales section completed
- Private Sector Participation in Sale of Commodity section completed
- Sales Proceed Usage Activity Implementation section completed
- Assuring Receipt Procedures section completed
- Expected Interest Earned section completed

VI. Budget Section

- Budget Summary uploaded as attachment
- Budget Narrative completed in FAIS or uploaded as an attachment
- NICRA uploaded as attachment
- SF-424 uploaded as attachment
APPENDIX B - Country Specific Guidance

Competitive proposals should demonstrate a significant contribution to the highest-level strategic objectives within the McGovern-Dole literacy and nutrition frameworks. A competitive proposal will include activities to improve literacy through improved literacy instruction, while addressing key issues in the education sector including teacher absenteeism and lack of qualifications. Complementary activities should be designed in conjunction with community partners and school-based organizations to address the specific needs of different school communities to serve daily school meals in a healthy environment with adequate access to improved sanitation and water facilities.

To address the McGovern-Dole goal of creating sustainable, nationally-owned, school feeding programs, competitive proposals will also need to demonstrate how the applicant will work with the government to support their national school feeding program at the national, regional/departmental, and community/local level. A competitive proposal will also demonstrate the sustainability of activities that address literacy and health and nutrition, through close collaboration with the Ministries of Education and Ministry of Health at the national, regional/departmental, and community/local level. FAS encourages applicants to include information on the prevalence of neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) transmitted by worms such as guinea worm disease, lymphatic filariasis, onchocerciasis, schistosomiasis, and soil-transmitted helminths in targeted intervention regions or areas.

I. NEW COUNTRIES

EGYPT

TARGET AREAS: Governates of Assiut, Sohag, Beni Suef, Menia, Qena, Aswan, Luxor, Fayoum, Sharkeya, and Qalyoubia

KEY PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES:

Towards the goal of graduating potential McGovern-Dole funded schools toward host government ownership, a competitive proposal will seek to establish and strengthen a strong working relationship with the government (at all levels) toward improving the management and administration of its existing National School Feeding Programme (NSFP) through capacity building, technical assistance, and the development of a National School Feeding Strategy. In May 2016, the government agreed that the areas of intervention most needed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the NSFP were: (1) improvements in supply chain optimization, (2) cost effectiveness through synergies with food value chains, and (3) Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) systems. Applicants will align McGovern-Dole interventions with the government’s “Education for All” strategy aimed at meeting Egypt’s “Vision 2030” of zero hunger focusing on strengthening the NSFP in collaboration with the Ministry of Social Solidarity and other stakeholders. Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate and align McGovern-Dole interventions with USAID and USDA Food for Progress interventions in the food safety value chains.

A strong proposal will provide appropriate McGovern-Dole interventions targeting government-supported “community schools” located in the most vulnerable and remote rural areas to fill prevailing gaps in the
NSFP. Applicants will need to address the lack of canteen infrastructure in the community schools. A competitive proposal will improve the quality of the learning environment in the community schools through intensive teacher training for community school teachers and inspectors in coordination with the Ministry of Education. Applicants will need to coordinate with existing stakeholders including USAID and other donors on literacy and school feeding projects to establish early grade reading activities that address low primary school literacy rates, especially in girls.

Given issues with stunting in the targeted regions, applicants will need to coordinate with existing stakeholders including USAID and others on activities to improve maternal and child nutrition through the development of interventions that address chronic malnutrition in pregnant and lactating women and stunting in children 0-59 months old. A strong application will target the high rates of contaminated drinking water and inadequate sanitation through activities aimed at improving access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH). Applicants will need to address poor school attendance through reducing health related absences through the provision of deworming medication, water supply, gender-sensitive hygiene and sanitation facilities, and improved community school infrastructure. Finally, applicants will need to create activities that reduce gender gaps in education participation to avoid hazardous child labor and early marriages, particularly of girls.

SRI LANKA

TARGET AREAS: North, North East, Central, and Estate/Plantation Sector

KEY PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES:

Sri Lanka’s home-grown school meals (HGSM) consists of three modalities: a) government-funded catered lunches provided to nearly a third of the country’s pre- and primary schools; b) government-funded “Glass of Milk a Day” 150 milliliter packet distributed to another third of the country’s pre- and primary schools; and c) World Food Programme’s in-kind school lunches targeting pre- and primary schools primarily in the north. Under a FY 2017 Food For Progress award, the International Executive Service Corps (IESC) is implementing the Market-Oriented Dairy (MOD) project in the Northern Province, Eastern Province, and in the Estate Sector.

Key programming activities that can strengthen the Government of Sri Lanka’s HGSM program include an effective plan (i.e., take-home rations, etc.) to reducing gender inequality, particularly in the area of girls’ school attendance and retention. A successful proposal will demonstrate an achievable plan for reducing high wasting levels among primary school children and addressing micronutrient deficiencies, which are 50 percent attributable to iron deficiency, especially anemia in children aged 6-59 months and women of reproductive age. The applicant will need to demonstrate an ability to coordinate closely with the Ministry of Education, which administers the “WASH in Schools” program, to ensure that pre- and primary schools have adequate water for their needs, especially for handwashing and drinking, and a sufficient number of gender-segregated toilet facilities.

Towards the goal of graduating McGovern-Dole funded schools to host country ownership, a competitive proposal will also need to demonstrate an appropriate response to providing technical assistance and
capacity building to the government (at all levels) to address existing gaps in food security and nutrition policies and programmatic responses, particularly in the areas of: a) improving coordination among the various government stakeholders and institutions, as this is presently fragmented; b) harmonizing the government’s food security and nutrition strategies and actions, as this is currently handled separately by various ministries, towards a more unified approach; c) assisting the government in rallying around a central theme in its HGSM program which is presently divided into three different school feeding modalities; d) assisting the government in passage into law of the national school meals policy; e) expanding the government’s “Glass of Milk a Day” program to include lunch and seeking potential linkages with USDA’s Food for Progress dairy program; and f) providing technical assistance to the government in resolving delays in the “Greenery Fund” cash disbursements to government-paid pre- and primary school meal caterers.

A strong proposal will also show close coordination and alignment with the Government of Sri Lanka’s plans, actions, and approaches, particularly in these districts: a) Nuwara Eliya, Badulla and Ratnapura where low birth weight, which is evidence of the need for improved maternal nutrition, is the highest in the country, and access to and use of health services is highly disparate relative to the rest of the country; b) Nuwara Elya and Badulla where stunting is nearly three times higher than urban areas; and c) Kilinochchi and Monaragala where wasting of children is the highest in the country. A competitive proposal will also demonstrate coordination with the U.S. government and other school feeding stakeholders in the country to ensure alignment of objectives and efforts.

TIMOR LESTE

TARGET AREAS: Nation-wide (Highest need: Manatuto, Baucau, Liquiçá, and Viqueque)

KEY PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES:

Towards the goal of graduating potential McGovern-Dole funded schools to host government ownership, a competitive proposal will seek to establish and strengthen a strong working relationship with the government (at all levels) toward improving the management and administration of its existing national school feeding program through capacity building, technical assistance, and the development of a National School Feeding Policy. Due to Timor Leste’s relatively small population, strong proposals will offer a comprehensive project reaching multiple beneficiary groups located in the most vulnerable and remote rural areas as applicable to fill prevailing gaps in coverage in Timor Leste’s existing national school feeding program.

Given the high malnutrition rates in Timor Leste, applicants will need to provide appropriate interventions to address chronic undernutrition in school-age populations and pregnant and lactating women as well as the extremely high stunting rates in children 0-59 months old. Rations for all targeted age groups will need to be selected and designed to provide the optimal nutritional contribution and the appropriate micronutrient profile given nearly one in three children and two in five women of reproductive age are anemic. A strong application will coordinate with existing in-country global health activities (USAID, UNICEF, etc.) targeting the delivery of high-quality and high-impact basic health care services in reproductive, maternal, and newborn health. Successful applicants will work to build the
capacity of Ministry of Health staff in delivering these services in reproductive, maternal, and infant health. Applicants will need to establish activities that aim to improve the high levels of infant and under-five mortality rates due to diarrhea and respiratory infections. Successful proposals will target the high rates of contaminated drinking water and inadequate sanitation through activities aimed at improving access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH).

A competitive proposal will establish early grade reading activities to address low literacy rates, especially in girls, leveraging existing approaches and best practices related to the new bi-lingual curriculum. Applicants will need to coordinate with existing in-country agricultural activities (USDA, USAID, FAO, etc.) to promote nutrition and support increased food production, agricultural income, and women’s empowerment. Key programming activities will include activities targeting domestic and sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) and address poor school attendance by reducing health related absences through the provision of deworming medication and improved school infrastructure.

II. CONTINUING COUNTRIES

BURKINA FASO

TARGET AREAS: Center-North Region; Provinces of Bam, Sanmatenga, and Namentenga

BACKGROUND:

Burkina Faso is an important country for regional stability and security in West Africa as conflict plagues neighboring countries. Despite high levels of poverty and food insecurity, Burkina Faso has hosted an influx of Malian refugees and the Government of Burkina Faso remains dedicated to being a stabilizing force in the region while addressing the development needs of the Burkinabe population.

To date, McGovern-Dole has committed a total of $37.4 million over 7 years (FY 2011-18) to Burkina Faso. Major McGovern-Dole achievements include: a) significant increases in enrollment and attendance rates, and in the number of students who can read and understand grade-level text; b) strong community and government commitment to a national school meals program, including significant local contributions to complement McGovern-Dole schools for part of the year; and c) a rising trend in the number of girls regularly attending school and strong promotion of girls’ education.

KEY PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES:

A strong proposal will build upon existing achievements to strengthen the capacity of communities, local, regional and national governments to take over McGovern-Dole project activities in Bam and Sanmatenga, with the possibility of expanding coverage to areas of need in Namentenga. A competitive proposal will include working with the government to ratify the National School Meals Policy, and building the capacity and engagement of local, regional and national governments to increase their contributions and monitoring activities under the national program. A strong proposal design should include increasing the capacity and engagement of local organizations and communities, in addition to
government, as part of a realistic roadmap for graduating McGovern-Dole-supported schools including Early Childhood Development (ECD) centers.

A competitive proposal will include appropriate activities to increase knowledge and use of health, hygiene, and dietary practices; nutrition; and safe food preparation and storage practices by providing the proper training and equipment. A strong proposal will include an evidence-based approach for improving access to quality primary education, particularly for girls and vulnerable boys who face multiple barriers to education.

A strong proposal design will build efficiencies and partnerships around existing U.S. government multilateral and multi-sectoral technical and structural investments in the target regions, and planned programming in the areas of Maternal Child Nutrition (MCN), food security, and resilience.

**CAMEROON**

**TARGET AREAS:** North-West, North, Adamawa, and East Regions

**BACKGROUND:**

Cameroon currently faces a triple-border socio-political and economic crisis – the Anglophone protests primarily in the South-West, the Boko Haram and Islamic State threats in the Far North, and the Central African Republic refugee influx from the Central African Republic in the East. USG efforts and objectives in Cameroon are three-pronged: win the war, win the peace, and win the future. McGovern-Dole supports the latter two.

To date, McGovern-Dole has committed a total of $38 million over ten years (FY 2008-18) to Cameroon and major achievements include: a) a National School Meals Policy; b) a draft National Nutrition Policy; c) establishment of a technical team in the Ministry of Basic Education to operationalize a national school meals program; d) ongoing discussions among Ministry of Basic Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Finance on establishing a national budget for school meals; and e) Strong PTA engagement. Due in large part to McGovern-Dole programming, PTA school garden yields in North-West Cameroon are a source of complementary food for school lunches and means of income generation for schools.

**KEY PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES:**

A strong proposal will include appropriate McGovern-Dole MCN interventions to address prevalent and significant malnourishment in pregnant and lactating women and stunting in children aged 0-59 months in proposed priority areas, particularly in communities targeted under USAID’s U.S. President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) initiative in East Cameroon.

A competitive proposal will also need to demonstrate a clear plan to establish a collaborative working relationship with the government – particularly the Ministry of Basic Education, as well as other partners in Health, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Water and Energy Resources, and Ministry of Finance –
toward the goal of developing and legislating a national school meals program modality (or modalities) for the government to operationalize under the National School Meals Policy and draft National Nutrition Policy. A competitive proposal will also demonstrate the ability to: a) integrate adaptive early grade reading learning approaches, in and outside the classroom, to improve the learning experience for school children; b) include nutrition-sensitive activities throughout, but particularly aimed at pre-adolescent girls with incentives (i.e., take-home rations, etc.) to increase girls’ school attendance and retention where needed; c) include both Francophone and Anglophone populations in school meals provisions and other McGovern-Dole activities; d) sustainably engage parents, teachers, the local community, and all levels of government in the learning, hygiene and nutritional activities in targeted schools; e) and develop a concrete plan on engaging the local community and all levels of government to sustain and scale-up existing benefits achieved under past McGovern-Dole funding, particularly introducing innovative approaches to build upon the home-grown school garden model of supplying food for school lunches.

ETHIOPIA

TARGET AREAS: Afar, Oromia

BACKGROUND:

USDA has provided over $54 million in school meals assistance to Ethiopia since 2008 under the McGovern-Dole program. In August 2015, USDA supported a Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) workshop which established a National Action Plan. In 2016, a National Strategy for School Meals was presented to the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) for approval, but has not been approved to date. Ethiopia continues to be affected by climatic events, internal displacement arising from conflict, and the influx of refugees from neighboring countries, most notably, Eritrea, South Sudan, Somalia, and Yemen. In response to the 2015/2016 drought, the GoE appropriated funds for an emergency school meals programs in severely affected areas. In 2016, the Government of Ethiopia appropriated approximately 600 million Ethiopian Birr (ETB; $26.5 million) for the implementation of emergency feeding in schools in Afar, Amhara, Dire Dawa, Harange, Oromia, Somali Tigray. In 2017, the GoE appropriated approximately 190 million ETB ($8.4 million) for the implementation of emergency feeding in schools in Oromia and Somali.

KEY PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES:

In accordance with McGovern-Dole strategic objectives, applicants should seek to improve student attendance, attentiveness, and literacy outcomes for pre-primary and primary school children. Proposed interventions should improve access to quality primary education, increase skills and knowledge of teachers and school administrators, and leverage U.S. government investments in the development of mother-tongue literacy instruction materials to support the improved quality of literacy instruction in traditional school settings as well as in the context of alternative basic education centers, as applicable. Applicants should also seek to improve the use of health, nutrition, and dietary practices for pre-primary and primary school children and consider integrating water, sanitation, and hygiene activities in McGovern-Dole schools to support nutrition outcomes and community resilience overall. Deworming and micro-nutrient support for targeted beneficiaries is strongly encouraged. Competitive proposals will
include interventions designed to meaningfully build the capacity of the government and communities to take over the school meals program and strengthen government and other key stakeholders’ awareness of the importance of school meals. In particular, capacity building at the local, regional, and national level should be designed to support the implementation of a national strategy that outlines specific objectives, milestones, targets, and sectoral responsibilities for the provision of school meals. Proposals should also include activities designed to improve the abilities of communities to participate in program design, implementation, management, evaluation, and resource contribution to school meals, including through building resilience of targeted communities to climactic shocks.

For any proposed programs in Oromia, applicants must demonstrate how they will work with or complement the government’s existing program, in a way that contributes to improved school meal implementation and graduation. All proposals should address the priorities of the Government of Ethiopia’s National Social Protection Policy (2014), National School Health and Nutrition Strategy (2012), Education Sector Development Programme V (2015/2016-2019/2020), and Second Growth and Transformation Plan (2015-2020).

GUATEMALA

TARGET AREAS: Department of Quiche (Municipalities: Chajul, Cunén, Nebaj, Sacapulas, San Juan Cotzal, and Uspantán)

BACKGROUND:

USDA has provided over $160 million USD in school meals assistance to Guatemala since 2003 under McGovern-Dole. In 2008, the Government of Guatemala (GoG) began transferring funds to PTAs for the local administration of the rural school snack program. In 2016, a bill was introduced in the Guatemalan Congress to expand the existing snack program, and in 2017, the GoG, with the support of McGovern-Dole implementers and other stakeholders, passed a National School Feeding Law. The law has been published in the federal register and implementation is expected to begin in January 2018. The law mandates funding to increase from the current $0.15 per child per day to $0.40 in 2018 and $0.55 in 2019; it will benefit close to 2.2 million children in 33,000 public schools. The law also places a strong emphasis on decentralized administration and local procurement, further highlighting the important role of PTAs and the need for strong linkages with agricultural producers and small businesses in support of increased local procurement.

Currently, USDA has four active projects in the Western Highlands of Guatemala, valued at $94.4 million, which provide daily school meals to over 120,000 school-age children. These projects they have demonstrably improved student attentiveness and academic performance in bilingual and multicultural educational environments. They have also increased the use of health, dietary, and nutrition practices in line with program objectives and the GoG’s “Healthy Schools” initiative. Guatemala’s project implementation challenges continue, particularly in the linking of agricultural producers and small businesses to schools, and in increasing the levels of PTA participation. The Ministry of Education is strengthening its partnerships with the Ministries of Agriculture, Public Health and Social Assistance, and the Secretariat of Food and Nutrition Security in anticipation of implementation of the National Program.
of School Meals (PNAE). This is likely to be the last award(s) made to Guatemala, providing the country maintains its economic growth trajectory and barring unforeseen circumstances.

KEY PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES:

Applicants should seek to build on prior project successes in strengthening the skills and competencies of teachers to continue to improve the quality of literacy instruction. The use of formative and summative assessments, in addition to the national literacy assessment, to measure student academic performance is encouraged. Additionally, applicants should design interventions that promote the use of health, nutrition, and dietary practices in addition to safe food preparation and storage practices for members of the school community. Competitive proposals will demonstrate close collaboration with the GoG at the national, departmental, and municipal level to sustain the benefits of the proposed interventions under the McGovern-Dole project and other U.S. government efforts. Applicants should build the capacity and technical knowledge of entities engaged in the provision of school meals so that they will be able to successfully transition McGovern-Dole activities. Applicants should continue to support the development of improved policy and regulatory frameworks to guide the implementation of the PNAE. Proposals should focus on increasing the capacity and engagement of local organizations such as parent-teacher organizations and community groups, including local producers and small businesses. Applicants must demonstrate coordination with government entities, local civil society organization, and other key stakeholders to advocate for sustainable school meals and quality education. Applicants should target proposed interventions in the Department of Quiche due to demonstrated commitment from the departmental and municipal governments, support from local communities, and established relationships with the private sector. The Department of Quiche has been prioritized under U.S. government initiatives such as the Alliance for Prosperity and Feed the Future. All proposed interventions should be aligned with the National School Feeding Law and Ministry of Education’s Strategic Plan for Education (2016-2020).

MALAWI

TARGET AREAS: Southern and Central Malawi Regions

BACKGROUND:

USDA’s McGovern-Dole program has provided approximately $92 million in school meals assistance to Malawi since 2003. Currently, USDA has one active program in the Central Region and Southern Region of Malawi valued at $22 million. With McGovern-Dole support, the government has finalized a multi-sectorial school health and nutrition (SHN) policy aimed at strengthening the legal framework for school feeding. McGovern-Dole support has provided capacity building to the government toward strengthening its administrative authority over school meals, but the government still lacks training and support to complete the National School Meals strategy, provide adequate monitoring of the school meals, and provide technical support to schools. The McGovern-Dole program has helped improve teacher motivation and attendance, and student enrollment and attendance rates. Parent and community participation and contributions to the school meals program have also increased, although the burden of volunteering falls more heavily on women. Female students face very strong barriers to continuing their
education, including pressure to marry early and drop out of school. A McGovern-Dole supported campaign to promote girls’ education has resulted in at least 31 girls returning to school at the beginning of the 2017/2018 school year. In 2016, USDA invested additional resources to support girls’ education in Malawi and would like to build upon those investments in future programs.

**KEY PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES:**

USDA has prioritized sustainability, transition, and handover to the National School Feeding Program (NSFP) in Malawi. A strong proposal should demonstrate how the organization will work with the Government of Malawi to implement the National School Health and Nutrition Policy, including but not limited to supporting the government to create a school meals strategy.

Proposals should complement USAID’s Education programming through literacy activities that supplement the new national reading curriculum and encourage parents and community members to read with students or otherwise support a culture of reading. Organizations seeking to work in Malawi will need to build efficiencies around existing U.S. government multilateral multi-sectoral technical and structural investments in the target regions, including PEPFAR DREAMS and Orphan and vulnerable Children programming. Activities should promote dietary diversity and good nutrition practices, particularly through use of school gardens as an educational tool, while integrating WASH activities to support good health and nutrition outcomes. Implementers will need to address barriers to girls’ education and implementers should address lack of classroom space and overcrowding in schools through appropriate activities. Organizations will need to describe how they will build the government’s capacity and school feeding management to ensure they are able to deliver commodities to school and monitor activities properly and efficiently. Organizations should consider how to incorporate take home rations into their program design as a tool to encourage female and vulnerable boy children to stay in school, and encourage community participation in projects to improve school infrastructure. Applicants should consider expanding school meal support and caregiver training to early childhood development centers. Applicants should also consider how to integrate in pre- and primary schools the Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability, and Social Welfare’s Early Childhood Strategy to address stunting and assist children with disabilities and those affected by HIV/AIDS.

**SENEGAL**

**TARGET AREAS:** Departments of St. Louis and Kolda

**BACKGROUND:**

Senegal continues to be a priority country for multiple U.S. Government initiatives in West Africa, including the Global Food Security Strategy. Effective partnerships and coordination between activities are required to assist Senegal in reducing the incidence of poverty and Senegal’s position as a stabilizing country in West Africa.

To date, McGovern-Dole has committed a total of $20.5 million over ten years to Senegal from FY 2007-17. Major McGovern-Dole achievements include: a) significant improvements in the quality of school
infrastructure, including classrooms, latrines and water stations; and b) strong community and
government (local, regional and national) commitment to school meals, including significant local
contributions through community farms, and an increased funding commitment from the national-level
Government of Senegal.

KEY PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES:

A strong proposal will build upon existing achievements to strengthen the capacity of communities, local,
regional and national governments to take over McGovern-Dole project activities in St. Louis, and
possibly expanding coverage to schools in Kolda. While building towards and achieving graduation in St.
Louis, Kolda would be a new region of school feeding in Senegal, and new programming should strongly
align with the priorities of the GFSS and Feed the Future.

To promote graduation of schools in St. Louis, a competitive proposal will work closely with the national
Government to develop a National School Meals Policy and/or legislation, and build the capacity and
engagement of Government of Senegal’s Division of School Feeding on administration and monitoring
under the national program. A strong proposal will work with government, schools, and communities to
implement the education budget circular for school meals, and increase the Government of Senegal’s
financial commitment to school meals.

In both St. Louis and Kolda, a competitive proposal will include appropriate activities to increase
knowledge and use of health, hygiene, and dietary practices; nutrition; and safe food preparation and
storage practices by providing the proper training and equipment. A strong proposal will include an
evidence-based approach to improve access to quality primary education, particularly for girls and
vulnerable boys. Literacy interventions should be evidence-based and leverage existing materials
developed by USAID and other education development partners, aligning with the national curriculum.

A strong proposal design will build efficiencies and partnerships around existing U.S. government
multilateral and multi-sectoral technical and structural investments in the target regions, including
planned programming in the areas of Maternal Child Nutrition (MCN) and agricultural development.
Applicants are encouraged to include appropriate MCN interventions to address prevalent and significant
malnourishment in pregnant and lactating women and children aged 0-59 months in the proposed target
areas.

SIERRA LEONE

TARGET AREAS: Koinadugu District

BACKGROUND:

USDA has provided a total of $37.89 million in school meals assistance to Sierra Leone since 2008 under
McGovern-Dole. Currently, USDA has one active project in five chiefdoms of the Koinadugu District
valued at $18.2 million. McGovern-Dole has produced many significant achievements in Sierra Leone
despite the challenges of the Ebola Virus epidemic that forced school closures for almost a year. The
most notable successes include significant improvements in student attendance and literacy performance at McGovern-Dole-supported schools. Additionally, national government engagement has engendered creation of a plan for a nationally-led school meals program under the National School Feeding Directorate, and to the successful advocacy of school registration leading to its approval by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST).

KEY PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES:

Great strides have been made in the areas of improving student achievement and increasing national government engagement towards support of the national school meals program in Sierra Leone. A strong proposal will outline activities to continue to establish and strengthen a working relationship with the government, particularly MEST and the National School Feeding Directorate toward developing and operationalizing a national school feeding program modality (or modalities). Organizations are required to align and coordinate efforts with the Government of Sierra Leone and its social and economic strategic goals, especially as outlined in its Agenda for Prosperity, which includes: a) Improving Access to and Quality of Education, b) Improving Access to Potable Water, c) Environmental Sanitation and Hygiene, and d) Strengthening Social Protection Systems. A strong proposal will also include activities to intensify school registration advocacy and MEST engagement especially on certification of schools, ensuring national government support.

Underscoring the importance of sustainability of school meals activities, organizations will be required to engage and mobilize local communities to advocate for school meals programs and education, particularly for girls, who face especially significant socio-cultural and economic barriers to educational success in Sierra Leone. Organizations will also be required to include activities that increase knowledge and use of health, hygiene, dietary practices, nutrition, and safe food preparation and storage practices through provision of proper training and equipment.
APPENDIX C – Manual for the Use of Results Frameworks and Indicators

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

This manual was developed to guide recipients in their use of results-oriented frameworks and performance indicators when applying for FAS food aid programs. The goal is to ensure that our integration and implementation of the Results-Oriented Management (ROM) system is transparent, easy to understand, and simple to apply. This policy applies to all entities and organizations that apply to FAS food aid programs.

FAS’s adoption of the results-based approach in food aid is being used to strengthen the delivery of more efficient and effective food aid programs through a greater focus on results and accountability of taxpayer resources. This approach also provides a platform for more meaningful program evaluations and opportunities to learn what interventions are working well and why others may not. Increasing demands and resource constraints are perhaps some of the most compelling reasons for using a results-based approach in the management of food aid programs.

FAS expects to improve its ability to measure the impact of FAS food aid programs by: 1) clarifying program strategy; 2) identifying results we expect to achieve; 3) linking measurable indicators to results, and 4) mapping program objectives and results back to the agency’s strategic plan. In turn, organizations will be expected to identify results that their project can achieve and verify that they have achieved them.

To this end, FAS has developed results frameworks and measurable indicators for McGovern-Dole. The frameworks are key tools in communicating the intent of FAS’s food aid programs both internally and externally. Food aid frameworks are also used in support of the “whole of government” effort to coordinate across U.S. Government agencies and focus the conversation on results, rather than process and activities.

This manual serves to define key ROM terminology and to explain McGovern-Dole-level results frameworks.

MCGOVERN-DOLE RESULTS FRAMEWORK EXPLANATION

The McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program legislation seeks to use the procurement of agricultural commodities and the provision of technical assistance to improve literacy and primary education of school-age children in developing countries. McGovern-Dole projects should involve indigenous institutions as well as local communities and governments in developing and implementing the programs to foster local capacity and leadership to achieve lasting results. McGovern-Dole legislation states that programs should be able to graduate from FAS assistance by building the capacity and commitment to manage and implement the project activities after the program terminates. McGovern-Dole works to provide long-term benefits to its recipients and sustain the benefits to the education, enrollment, and school attendance of children within the target communities. In keeping with
key goals of the legislation, the Food Assistance Division of FAS has developed two results frameworks, each of which depicts a development hypothesis or a theory about how the highest-level results (the strategic objectives) can be achieved based on a cause-and-effect logic. Each RF shows how the achievement of lower-level intermediate results (IRs) leads to the achievement of the next highest level of results, ultimately achieving the framework’s strategic objectives (SO). These Program-Level Frameworks provide FAS and its partners with a strategy by which to design projects and assess their effectiveness in achieving McGovern-Dole’s goals. FAS recognizes that within a particular country context, it may be necessary to address additional intermediate results (IR) that are not included in the Program-Level RFs. Similarly, a particular McGovern-Dole project may not need to address all the IRs in the program-level framework because certain IRs have either been addressed or are being addressed to an acceptable extent by the host government, local partners, or other donors. While results may be achieved over a period of years, FAS expects that the SOs of the two frameworks can begin to be achieved in whole or in part within a 4-6 year time period.

The two results frameworks for McGovern-Dole are:

- **RF 1: Literacy Results Framework**: The strategic objective of this framework is the Improved Literacy of School-Age Children. Achievement of this SO is dependent upon the achievement of three “result streams” related to Improved Student Attendance, Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction, and Improved Attentiveness.

- **RF 2: Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices Results Framework**: The strategic objective of this framework is the Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices, primarily by school age-children but also by those who influence school-age children’s health and well-being, such as parents, families, and school staff. The achievement of the SO is intended to support the IR Reduced Health-Related Absences in RF 1. RF 2 is complementary to RF 1.

**McGovern-Dole Results Framework #1:**

The strategic objective of this framework is the Improved Literacy of School-Age Children. In order to achieve this SO, children need to attend school regularly and consistently, to be alert and attentive in class, and to receive high-quality literacy education. This logic corresponds to the three IRs leading up to the SO. These three IRs include Increased Quality of Literacy Instruction, Improved Attentiveness, and Improved Student Attendance. Achievement of each of these three results is based on a cause-and-effect logic of lower-level IRs being achieved. The following discussion describes the logic behind each of the three ‘results streams.’

**Results Stream 1: Improved Student Attendance**

Improvement of school attendance rates requires achievement of a set of lower-level intermediate results, which include the following:

- *Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives (or Decreased Disincentives)* may be achieved by any number of activities that ease the economic burden of attending school for children or reduce cultural barriers to attendance by a particular group, such as girls or ethnic minorities. A major
component of McGovern-Dole is school feeding, which provides meals and rations to students. As illustrated in the framework, Increased Access to Food through a school feeding program provides a strong incentive for children to attend school, especially girls. Other examples of incentives include subsidies for books or school uniforms, transportation to school, or a more flexible school year to accommodate the needs of the local community.

- **Reduced Health-Related Absences** is a necessary result for improving the consistency of attendance. If children increase their use of good health and dietary practices—such as hand washing after using latrines, drinking clean water, and eating a nutritious diet—then they will be less likely to be sick and thus absent from school. RF 2 provides a theory of change as to how the use of improved practices can be achieved.

- **Improved School Infrastructure** may be achieved through a wide array of infrastructure projects that could make attending school more practical, more enjoyable, and more acceptable for children. Illustrative examples include building or repairing new schools, adding new classrooms, adding kitchens, or creating separate latrines for boys and girls.

- **Increased Student Enrollment** is typically a precursor to attendance, as children usually must be enrolled in order to attend class. In some instances, administrative paperwork, enrollment fees, or other factors can serve as barriers to enrollment. Overcoming such barriers to enrollment, along with the achievement of the other results on the same level in this stream of the RF, is expected to lead to increased attendance.

- **Increased Community Understanding of the Benefits of Education** is a necessary result for improving attendance, since the value and importance that parents and community leaders place on educating their children is an important factor in determining whether children attend school regularly. As such, activities that increase a communities understanding of, and support for, primary school education should contribute to increased attendance rates.

Results Stream 2: Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction
In order to improve the quality of literacy instruction for school-age children, it is necessary to achieve a set of lower-level intermediate results that include:

- **More Consistent Teacher Attendance** is a necessary result for improving the quality of literacy instruction. Projects should seek to support activities and approaches that promote and incentivize consistent and punctual teacher attendance. Illustrative examples may include distributing take home rations, additional classroom supplies and awards to teachers that meet attendance and time in instruction project goals, as well as building teacher housing near schools in remote areas.

- **Better Access to School Supplies and Materials** is necessary for quality instruction, since without proper supplies such as paper, pencils, chalk, blackboards, desks, and books, teachers will be limited in how and what they can teach, and students will be limited in their ability to practice and learn new literacy skills.
• **Improved Literacy Instructional Materials** means that teachers have access to higher-quality tools for teaching literacy. Instructional materials may include a literacy curriculum, teacher guidelines, workbooks, pacing guides, and other supplemental teaching materials that use information and communication technology.

• **Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers** to effectively teach literacy to children of different skill levels is essential to improve the overall quality of instruction. This result could be achieved through a number of interventions such as enhanced pre-service, in-service, and distance trainings, mentoring, capacity building, and hiring practices that raise the minimum qualifications of teachers.

• **Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators**, such as school principals or superintendents, will support the improved quality of literacy instruction by fostering an environment that promotes quality teaching and that is conducive to student learning and inclusive education. Illustrative enabling examples of activities include training administrators how to evaluate literacy instruction and the quality of educational materials, increased collaboration with nearby schools, and enhancing the overall learning atmosphere by reducing pupil-teacher ratios or class sizes where possible.

Results Stream 3: Improved Attentiveness Stream
Hungry children typically have low levels of energy and are unable to concentrate and focus in the classroom. Through its traditional school feeding projects, McGovern-Dole seeks to increase access to food for children through provision of snacks, take-home rations, and meals to reduce short-term hunger and subsequently improve attentiveness.

• **Increased Access to Food** is the result of the school feeding program. The purpose of the school feeding program, as illustrated in the RF, is to both reduce short-term hunger and to provide an incentive for students to attend school. This key component of McGovern-Dole supports the achievement of results in two results streams.

RF 1: Foundational Results
To increase the likelihood of achieving the SO and intermediate results, as well as the likelihood of sustaining those results after FAS assistance ends, a set of foundational results that are common to the two McGovern-Dole frameworks has been identified. The achievement of foundational results will help foster the capacity and commitment of the host government, local community groups, and other actors to support the achievement of other results in the framework and eventually graduate from FAS assistance.

Foundational results are defined by three characteristics: (a) they feed into one or more higher-level results, (b) they target critical actors or areas that increase the potential for lasting outcomes, and (c) causal relationships exist between some of the foundational results. In designing and implementing projects, partners are expected to incorporate foundational results into their projects as appropriate. The foundational results are:
Increased Capacity of Government Institutions: This refers to increased knowledge and skills of staff in local ministries and educational institutions to manage and administer activities in support of the results in the framework. Increased capacity also includes the development or attainment of the tools, methods, and procedures necessary to perform the activities.

Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework: This result is focused on the development, implementation, and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the framework. These could include policies and regulations at the local, regional, or national level.

Increased Government Support: This result refers to increased budgetary support, human resources (e.g., teachers, principals, health professionals, and administrators), and infrastructure (e.g., schools, classrooms, and equipment).

Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups: This result involves increasing the knowledge, skills, and opportunities of community members and groups (including parents, PTAs, community leaders, community organizations, and the private sector) to directly support the achievement of results in the framework.

McGovern-Dole Results Framework #2:

The strategic objective of the second McGovern-Dole RF is the Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices. This SO is aimed primarily at improving practices of school-age children, as well as those that can have a direct impact on children’s health and diet, such as their parents, families, school cooks, and food handlers. The achievement of the SO is intended to link to RF 1 and supports the result Reduced Health-Related Absences. The achievement of the SO for RF 2 is predicated on the achievement of six intermediate results that are related to increasing the knowledge of various health, nutrition, and dietary practices, and increasing access to the inputs, such as clean water and preventative medicine that are necessary to engage in good health and dietary practices.

Intermediate Results

The intermediate results include the following:

- **Improved Knowledge of Health and Hygiene Practices**: A critical factor in changing behavior related to the use of good health and hygiene practices involves equipping beneficiaries with the knowledge of good health and hygiene practices and an understanding of how the practices can reduce the spread of bacteria, viruses, and parasites that cause illness. Activities in support of this result might include training and information campaigns (posters, flyers, etc.) that promote practices like hand washing after using the bathroom, brushing one’s teeth after meals, or visiting a doctor for an annual check-up.

- **Increased Knowledge of Safe Food Prep and Storage Practices**: This result seeks to increase cooks’ and food handlers’ knowledge of food borne illnesses, as well as how good food preparation and storage practices (e.g., wiping down countertops and cooking and storing food at
the appropriate temperatures), can prevent the transmission of food borne pathogens. Examples of activities to support this result could include training and the production of posters and checklists for display in food preparation and storage locations.

- **Increased Knowledge of Nutrition**: This result aims to increase knowledge and understanding of nutrition and healthy eating practices. The more informed that beneficiaries are about good nutrition, the more likely is it that they will be to eat a balanced and diverse diet with the right nutrients.

- **Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services**: In order to practice good health and hygiene, beneficiaries need access to clean water and sanitation services. Activities to support this result could include building and maintaining wells and latrines for children’s use in targeted schools.

- **Increased Access to Preventative Health Interventions**: Access to preventative health interventions may include factors such as access to check-ups with a health professional, access to preventative medicines, and access to basic health and hygiene supplies like toothpaste, toothbrushes, and soap. Examples of activities in support of this result may include the provision of health and hygiene products or making a doctor or nurse available at school.

- **Increased Access to Requisite Food Prep and Storage Tools and Equipment**: In order to practice good food preparation and storage practices, cooks and food handlers may need access to different types of equipment and supplies such as storage containers, ovens, refrigerators, sinks with clean running water, detergents, and cleaning products. Activities that make these available (for example, in a school kitchen) will help achieve this result.

**RF 2: Foundational Results**

To increase the likelihood of achieving the SO and intermediate results, as well as the likelihood of sustaining those results after FAS assistance ends, a set of foundational results that are common to the two McGovern-Dole frameworks has been identified. The achievement of foundational results will help foster the capacity and commitment of the host government, local community groups, and other actors to support the achievement of other results in the framework and eventually graduate from FAS assistance.

Foundational results are defined by three characteristics: (a) they feed into one or more higher-level results, (b) they target critical actors or areas that increase the potential for lasting outcomes, and (c) causal relationships exist between some of the foundational results. In designing and implementing projects, partners are expected to incorporate foundational results into their projects as appropriate. The key foundational results are the following:

- **Increased Capacity of Government Institutions**: This refers to increased knowledge and skills of staff in local ministries and educational institutions in managing and administering activities in support of the results in the framework. Increased capacity also includes the development or attainment of the tools, methods, and procedures necessary to perform the activities.
• Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework: This result is focused on the development, implementation, and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the framework. These could include policies and regulations at the local, regional, or national level.

• Increased Government Support: This result refers to increased budgetary support, increased human resources (e.g., teachers, principals, health professionals, and administrators, etc.), and infrastructure (e.g., schools, classrooms, and equipment).

• Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups: This result is about increasing the knowledge, skills, and opportunities of community members and groups (including parents, PTAs, community leaders, community organizations, and the private sector) to directly support the achievement of results in the framework.

McGovern Dole Foundational Results Matrix

The “Illustrative Examples of Foundational Results” matrix of this document shows how key results in the Literacy Results Framework (RF 1) can be directly supported and enhanced by the achievement of each of the foundational results. In the following table, foundational results are presented horizontally across the top of the page, and results from the main body of the RF are presented vertically. Where the two types of results intersect, a description of possible capacity that can be developed in support of the result is discussed along with a few examples of possible activities that an implementing partner could undertake to build the capacity. The information presented in the following table is not meant to be exhaustive or prescriptive but rather to provide examples and ideas.

The following are definitions for the capacity building results:

• Increased Capacity of Government Institutions: This refers to increased knowledge and skills of staff in local and national government to manage and administer activities in support of the results. In addition, increased capacity also includes the development or attainment of the tools, methods, and procedures (i.e. inputs) necessary to perform the activities in support of the results.

• Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework: This result is focused on the development, implementation, and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of results in the framework. These could include policies and regulations at the local, regional, or national level.

• Increased Government Support: This result refers to increased budgetary support, human resources (e.g., teachers, principals, and administrators), and school infrastructure (e.g., schools, classrooms, and school equipment).

• Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups: This result refers to increasing the knowledge, skills, and opportunities of communities (including parents, PTAs, community leaders, community organizations, and the private sector) to directly support the achievement of results in the framework.
STANDARD AND ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS

Standard Indicators
Program applicants are required to use the standard indicators developed by FAS when applying to McGovern-Dole. All projects are required to collect data against the standard set of indicators, if applicable. The standard indicators will allow FAS to report progress among all of its projects across results areas (i.e., literacy, good health and dietary practices, agricultural productivity, and trade) or country specific achievements. The standard indicators are available online: Guidance on Food Aid Program Standard Indicators.

Custom Indicators
Applicants also may choose to develop custom indicators because the FAS standard indicators alone may not fully address all results. Applicants may design custom indicators using FAS’s list of illustrative indicators as a guide. The illustrative indicator lists are intended to provide examples of indicators that implementing partners may use to track progress towards results.
APPENDIX D – McGovern-Dole Results Framework and Illustrative Examples of Foundational Results

McGovern-Dole Results Framework #1

Improved Literacy of School-Age Children (MGD 501)

- Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction (MGD 1.1)
- Improved Attentiveness (MGD 1.2)
- Improved Student Attendance (MGD 1.3)

More Consistent Teacher Attendance (MGD 1.1.1)
Better Access to School Supplies & Materials (MGD 1.1.2)
Improved Literacy Instructional Materials (MGD 1.1.3)
Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers (MGD 1.1.4)
Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators (MGD 1.1.5)
Reduced Short-Term Hunger (MGD 1.2.1)
Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives (or Decreased Disincentives) (MGD 1.3.1)
Reduced Health-Related Absences (MGD 1.3.2)
Improved School Infrastructure (MGD 1.3.3)
Increased Student Enrollment (MGD 1.3.4)
Increased Community Understanding of Benefits of Education (MGD 1.3.5)

Increased Access to Food (School Feeding) (MGD 1.2.1.1, 1.3.1.1)
Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices (Sec RF #2) (MGD 502)

Foundational Results
- Increased Capacity of Government Institutions (MGD 1.4.1)
- Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework (MGD 1.4.2)
- Increased Government Support (MGD 1.4.3)
- Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups (MGD 1.4.4)

A Note on Foundational Results: These results can feed into one or more higher-level results. Causal relationships sometimes exist between foundational results.
McGovern-Dole
Results Framework #2

Increased Use of Health,
Nutrition and Dietary Practices
(MGD SO2)

- Improved Knowledge of Health and Hygiene Practices
  (MGD 2.1)
- Increased Knowledge of Safe Food Prep and Storage Practices
  (MGD 2.2)
- Increased Knowledge of Nutrition
  (MGD 2.3)
- Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services
  (MGD 2.4)
- Increased Access to Preventative Health Interventions
  (MGD 2.5)
- Increased Access to Requisite Food Prep and Storage Tools and Equipment
  (MGD 2.6)

Foundational Results
- Increased Capacity of Government Institutions
  (MGD 2.7.1)
- Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework
  (MGD 2.7.2)
- Increased Government Support
  (MGD 2.7.3)
- Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups
  (MGD 2.7.4)

A Note on Foundational Results: These results can feed into one or more higher-level results. Causal relationships sometimes exist between foundational results.
## Illustrative Examples of Foundational Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased Capacity of Government Institutions</th>
<th>Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework</th>
<th>Increased Government Support</th>
<th>Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **More Consistent Teacher Attendance**       | **What**: Build local skills, knowledge and tools necessary to monitor teacher attendance and address constraints.  
**How**: Development of tools, processes and procedures for tracking and reporting; Assessments of constraints and plans to remove barriers/increase incentives. | **What**: Support the development, implementation and enforcement of policies and regulations that lead to more consistent teacher attendance.  
**How**: Help school officials draft attendance policies for teachers, including reporting and enforcement procedures. | **What**: Increase government support for teachers through increased teacher salaries; hiring of more teachers; providing improved benefits to teachers.  
**How**: Help school officials advocate for more teachers or for increases to teacher salaries. | **What**: Improve ability of communities, including parents, PTAs, local community groups and the private sector to have an impact on the consistency of teacher attendance.  
**How**: Train as teacher's aids and/or substitute teachers; increase awareness of attendance through newsletters; empower communities to help address obstacles - e.g., housing, transport. |
### Illustrative Examples of Foundational Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased Capacity of Government Institutions</th>
<th>Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework</th>
<th>Increased Government Support</th>
<th>Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduced Short-Term Hunger</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Building the operational and administrative capacity of local partners and/or government to carry out a school feeding program. <strong>HOW</strong>: Activities may include providing technical assistance to local institutions with the skills, tools, and procedures necessary to implement a school feeding program. Development of school feeding plans, procurement procedures, quality control guidelines, financial management tools, etc.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Development and implementation of school feeding policy and regulations. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to draft mission and meal timing guidelines, guidance on program strategies to ensure highest potential impact on attendance and meal quality, etc.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Increasing government resources to provide school meals for children with food insecurity. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines on food insecurity, and providing technical assistance to develop outreach strategies and ongoing support to carry out school feeding programs in targeted areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives (or Decreased Disincentives)</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Building the capacity of local organizations and/or government to provide incentives for school-aged children to attend school. <strong>HOW</strong>: Providing financial incentives to local organizations and/or government to provide incentives for school-aged children to attend school. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that incentivize attendance or address barriers to non-attendance.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Providing resources to increase incentives or decrease disincentives for school-aged children to attend school. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that incentivize attendance or address barriers to non-attendance.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Increase the ability of communities to advocate for and support programs and policies that address barriers to attendance. <strong>HOW</strong>: Creating awareness for parents, communities, and school administrators to address barriers to attendance and to develop solutions for overcoming them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduced Health-related Absences</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Building the capacity of local communities and/or government to implement programs and activities that support good health and dietary practices. <strong>HOW</strong>: Developing local capacity to implement programs and activities that support good health and dietary practices. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Developing and implementing policies and guidelines aimed at reducing the risk of illness for school-aged children. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Increase the ability of communities to advocate for and support health initiatives, particularly as they relate to school-aged children. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved School Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Building the capacity of local communities and/or government to build and repair school infrastructure. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Providing technical assistance to design, implement, and maintain processes to reduce risks of illness for school-aged children. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Increase the ability of communities to advocate for and engage in repairs and building of school infrastructure. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased Student Enrollment</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Building the capacity of local organizations and/or government to improve enrollment policies and procedures. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Developing and implementing policies and guidelines aimed at increasing enrollment in schools. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Increase the ability of communities to advocate for and engage in enrollment efforts. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased Community Understanding of the Benefits of Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Building the capacity of government and local organizations to effectively engage communities on the importance and benefits of primary education for children. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Developing and implementing policies and guidelines aimed at increasing community understanding and buy-in for primary education. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
<td><strong>MAINTAIN</strong>: Increase the ability of communities to advocate for and engage in education promotion. <strong>HOW</strong>: Assistance to develop policies and guidelines that addresses the risk of illness for school-aged children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The highest level result of Result Framework 2 [RF2] (Increased Use of Good Health and Dietary Practices) contributes to reduced health-related absences. Therefore, elements of RF2 reflected in this row of the matrix.*
## APPENDIX E – Performance Indicators Illustration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Standard or Custom</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Life of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO 1</td>
<td>Number of individuals benefiting directly from USDA-funded interventions</td>
<td>Standard #27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>362,000</td>
<td>362,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>362,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SO 1</td>
<td>Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions</td>
<td>Standard #28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>1,708,000</td>
<td>1,708,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SO 1</td>
<td>Percent of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text</td>
<td>Standard #26</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MGD 1.1.2</td>
<td>Number of students regularly (80%) attending USDA supported classrooms/schools</td>
<td>Standard #1</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MGD 1.1.4</td>
<td>Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Standard #2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MGD 1.1.1</td>
<td>Percent of teachers in target schools who attend and teach at least 90 percent of the scheduled school days</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MGD 1.3.2</td>
<td>Percent of students who report a decrease in health-related absences</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Standard or Custom</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Life of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Fuel Efficient Stoves</td>
<td>Number of fuel efficient stoves provided as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Capacity Building: National Level</td>
<td>Number of Ministry Officials participating in round table discussion on improved school feeding programs</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Establish libraries</td>
<td>Number of school libraries established as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F – Budget Narrative

McGovern-Dole:

Country:

Fiscal Year of Award:
Applicant (Organization):

Point of Contact (Preparer):

OVERVIEW

The Budget Narrative provides an opportunity for the applicant to demonstrate the organization’s capabilities to manage project finances in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200-Subpart E Cost Principles, as well as to detail the cost-effectiveness of this particular proposal. The budget narrative should explain how the costs relate to the implementation of the project as outlined in the proposal. Narratives should be written in such a way that someone not specifically familiar with the project can conceptually understand the rationale, purpose, and calculation of the anticipated costs identified. The budget narrative, should clearly correspond to the associated budget summary spreadsheet. In the interest of consistency, applicants should adhere to the following outline when creating a budget narrative.

Narratives for each line item identified above should identify:

- All subcomponents of the line item;
- The amount budgeted for each subcomponent; and
- The manner in which calculations were made

Note that subrecipient costs should include only the total subcontract cost and purpose of the work under the appropriate category; it is not necessary to include the details of the separate cost components of each subcontract.

If it is unclear how to categorize a particular cost, please send an e-mail to PPDED@fas.usda.gov and the reply will be posted on the Frequently Asked Questions page for the benefit of all applicants. Please note that following the proper format is important, because it affects the overall score of the proposal. An example budget narrative can be found on the FAS website under Training Material and User Manual: https://apps.fas.usda.gov/fais/public.
SECTION 1: GENERAL EXPLANATORY COMMENTS

Please describe general and cross-cutting issues, for example, cost escalations expected during this project, and the manner in which they are accounted for in the budget and an explanation of any program income which may be earned by the proposed project. Additionally, this section should include a description of your organization’s financial capacity, the cost application methodology used for the proposal, a summary of how the budget components will contribute to the implementation of the project, and overall cost effectiveness. Summarize the indirect rates applied to the proposed budget, and their base of application across Administrative, ITSH, and Activity expenses. Please note that this section should be no longer than two pages.

SECTION 2: ADMINISTRATIVE

This section should be used to describe costs that are project-wide, or standard “costs of doing business” that are not connected to any specific task. In general, these are the costs incurred by headquarters and/or the primary overseas project office. Use this section to clearly articulate and detail each applicable Administrative line item contained in the budget summary as listed below. Also itemize the amount budgeted for each subcomponent, and describe the manner in which calculations were made (see example).

Salaries

Positions should include the Chief of Party, finance team, and monitoring and evaluation staff. Do not include staff whose time is covered by professional services contracts or subawards. The Deputy Chief of Party, Grants Officers, and others may also be included in this section if their work cuts across multiple activity areas.

Please identify the total Level of Effort percentage that each position will spend on the project.

Benefits (Fringe)

Depending on the organization, this may include FICA, COLA, danger pay, housing, children’s education tuition allowance, home leave, R & R, training, sick and vacation time, bonuses, etc.

Travel

Include travel performed by staff billing their time to the Administrative section (for example, monitoring trips by home office staff and international travel by the Chief or Party or home office staff). Include vehicle fuel here.
Professional Services

Professional services apply to work that is done via contracts. This may include audits, monetization services, and the baseline, mid-term, and final evaluations. It could include subrecipients, but they are generally included under activities.

- Please include the name, the total cost, and a brief description of the purpose. The total cost should include the subcontractor’s indirect costs as a direct cost. Itemization is not necessary.

Please explain in detail the overall M&E budget, including the overall percentage of the total budget dedicated to M&E and its components, such as:

- Funds budgeted for headquarters M&E staff;
- Funds budgeted for field M&E staff;
- Funds budgeted for Third Party evaluations;
- Funds budgeted for the creation and/or support of M&E tools and systems, and;
- Any additional costs associated with M&E activities.

Equipment

- Include equipment purchases over $5,000 that is not tied to a specific Activity.
- Include vehicles, vehicle repair and maintenance.

Office

Include most office-related expenses. Examples of costs in this activity include: rent for main field office, communication costs (Internet, telephone, and mobile phone charges), bank fees, postage/shipping fees, insurance, furniture, and office utilities.

Supplies

This category includes supplies (including office supplies), equipment costs under $5,000, and related maintenance expenses on such equipment.

Other

Any expenses included under the “Other” line must be defined by the PVO, and approved by FAS.
Administrative Indirect

Describe the indirect costs for the Administrative category.

Cost Share

Describe any cost share (cash or in-kind) contributions that fit in the Administrative category.

SECTION 3: ACTIVITIES

For each Activity, please describe the following costs. Please group all direct costs for a given activity together.

Salaries

Positions should include technical specialists and other staff who are dedicated to a specific activity. Do not include staff whose time is covered by professional services contracts or sub awards. Please identify the total amount of time each position will spend on each activity as a percentage.

Benefits (Fringe)

Depending on the organization, this may include FICA, COLA, danger pay, housing, children’s education tuition allowance, home leave, R & R, training, sick and vacation time, bonuses, etc.

Travel

Include travel for day-to-day project work.

Include vehicle fuel here.

Professional Services

Professional services apply to work that is done via contracts.

Sub awards/Subrecipients

Please include the name, the total cost, and a brief description of the purpose. Itemization is not necessary.

For total costs, please include the subcontracts and/or sub awardee’s indirect cost as a direct cost.

Equipment

Include equipment purchases over $5,000 that is tied to a specific Activity.

Include vehicle repair and maintenance.
Office
Include expenses for an office that is dedicated to a specific activity (include field office expenses here). Examples of costs in this activity include: rent for main field office, communication costs (Internet, telephone, mobile phone charges), bank fees, postage/shipping fees, insurance, furniture, and office utilities.

Supplies
This category includes supplies (including office supplies), equipment costs under $5,000, and related maintenance expenses on such equipment.

Other
Any expenses included under the “Other” line must be defined by the PVO, and approved by FAS.

Cost Share
Describe any cost share (cash or in-kind) contributions that fit in the Activities category.

Activities Indirect
Describe the indirect costs for the Activities category. This should be the total amount for all activities.

SECTION 4: Commodity and Food Purchases (Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) only)
Use this section to clearly articulate and detail each applicable Commodity and Food Purchase item as contained in the budget summary, including:

Commodity Procurement
Describe purchases of commodities in-country or in the region.

Food Vouchers
Describe food vouchers used for providing food assistance.

Cash Transfers
Describe cash transfers for providing food assistance.
Commodity and Food Purchases Indirect

Describe the indirect costs for the Commodity and Food Purchases category.

Cost Share

Describe any cost share (cash or in-kind) contributions that fit in the Commodity and Food Purchases category.

SECTION 5: INTERNAL TRANSPORTATION, STORAGE AND HANDLING (ITSH)

Use this section to clearly articulate and detail each applicable ITSH line item as contained in the budget summary, including:

Salaries

Include salaries of staff related to the transportation and storage of commodities paid for under this award.

Benefits

Include benefits association with ITSH staff.

Internal Transportation

Include all costs associated with internal distribution of commodities.

Professional Services

This includes services relating directly to warehouse costs which are not covered under Internal Transportation, such as fumigation or other infrequently recurring payments.

Warehouse storage costs

Includes warehouse leases and other costs associated with storage.

Supplies

This category includes supplies, equipment costs under $5,000, and related maintenance expenses on such equipment.
Other

Any expenses included under the “Other” line must be defined by the PVO, and approved by FAS.

ITSH Indirect

Describe the indirect costs for the ITSH category.

Cost Share

Describe any cost share (cash or in-kind) contributions that fit in the ITSH category.
APPENDIX G – McGovern-Dole Learning Agenda

Objective of the School Meals Learning Agenda

The Foreign Agricultural Service’s (FAS) Office of Capacity Building and Development (OCBD) created the School Meals Learning Agenda for the McGovern-Dole (McGovern-Dole) International Food for Education and Child Nutrition program as a tool to highlight key research and evaluation questions in the area of school meals. The key research and evaluation questions highlighted in the Learning Agenda are intended to identify gaps in the knowledge base within the school meals literature that should be addressed as a matter of priority. The Learning Agenda was designed to address key research and evaluation questions that align not only with the theory of change outlined in the McGovern-Dole program-level Results Framework, but also with the broader school meals program theory. Collectively, addressing the school meals evidence gaps will improve the design and implementation of interventions, and ultimately lead to improvements in education and nutrition for children and the sustainability of school meal programs.

A substantial body of literature exists in the area of school meals. However, key gaps in the knowledge base remain on which interventions or combination of interventions, have the greatest impact, are the most cost-effective, lead to long-term benefits, and improve the sustainability of school meal programs. Decreasing the evidence gaps is essential to prioritizing limited and often scarce resources and developing effective school meal programs and policies. As school meal programs are implemented around the world in high and upper-middle income countries and in low to lower-middle income countries using various modalities and at differing levels of scale and targeting, closing the evidence gaps is critical.

The school meals theory of change and impact pathways is complex. Evidence demonstrates an effect of school meals on educational outcomes including school participation, school performance, and cognitive development (specifically memory), in addition to strengthening linkages to complementary health and nutrition interventions, such as micronutrient fortification, deworming, and water and sanitation interventions. Take-home rations, which have also been provided as components of school meal programs, show effects on children’s attendance at school, particularly among girls, but also on the nutrition of younger children in the home. Further, the more recent focus on linking school meal programs with local agricultural markets, often referred to as “Home-Grown School Feeding” and “local and regional procurement,”
introduces additional impact pathways that can have an effect on the local economy, jobs, and agricultural production. The Learning Agenda provides a research platform to systematically study the complex linkages between school meals and the health, education, nutrition, and agricultural sector outcomes. FAS will use the Learning Agenda to prioritize research and evaluation activities in future years. FAS also hopes that other governments, implementing organizations, international organizations, research institutions, and academics will use the Learning Agenda to prioritize school meals research with the aim of collectively closing the evidence gaps and improving the impact and sustainability of school meal programs.

**Development of the Learning Agenda**

The Learning Agenda was developed through systematic reviews and consultations with researchers, academics, policy-makers, and practitioners with expertise in implementing school meal, health, nutrition, and education interventions from a wide range of organizations, research institutions, and universities. To reflect the complexities of school meal programs and the linkages between school meals and other interventions, the Learning Agenda is organized around four primary themes: education, nutrition, health, and agriculture. In addition to the organization around the four central themes, the Learning Agenda considers important cross-cutting themes that the evidence shows can influence school meal outcomes, such as gender and target age groups.

**Measurement and Methodological Gaps**

There are specific measurement and methodological gaps in the current literature that are not identified as specific research and evaluation questions in the Learning Agenda, but are critical to informing the design of future studies aimed to address the literature gaps. The current literature on school meals is often characterized by studies with small sample sizes, short duration, and implemented in limited contexts. More longitudinal studies conducted at scale and designed to measure the long-term impacts of school meal programs are needed across the health, nutrition, education, and agricultural sectors. In addition, studies conducted across a variety of contexts are necessary in order to understand why and how context matters.

There is a significant need for research that generates economic evaluation evidence that considers cost-effectiveness of different school meal modalities, nutritional composition of meals and products, local procurement, and new technologies. There is also a need for consistency in the measurement of educational outcomes, in addition to a focus on the measurement and standards of health and nutrition outcomes for children over the age of five. It is well understood, for example, that the greatest health and nutritional benefits occur in children under the age of five. However, gains in health and nutrition status may be achieved and/or sustained in children over the age of five. Limited research exists on the physical growth and health impacts for children over five, including the studies that assess the minimum acceptable diet for this population of children.
Evidence Gaps

The research questions outlined in this section are familiar questions of school meal effectiveness. An important distinction between the questions of effectiveness outlined in the Learning Agenda, and previously published studies of effectiveness, is that the Learning Agenda seeks to address the gap in evidence of effectiveness at scale. The results from three systematic reviews commissioned by FAS and additional published literature indicate that the reliability and validity of results is often low due to small sample sizes and short duration of the study. The inherent features of the Learning Agenda questions are to measure school meal program interventions at scale and over time.

Another key objective of the Learning Agenda is to provide additional evidence to high-level impacts of school meal programs on student learning and cognition. The research literature includes a number of studies that demonstrate school meal programs can increase short-term measures of school participation, including enrollment and attendance, but research has produced less compelling results on the effect of school meals on actual student learning\(^2\). Furthermore, there have been no rigorous evaluations of the long-term impacts of school meal programs on economic productivity, morbidity and mortality, and any spillover effects on to the next generation.

The Learning Agenda is segmented into five general categories of outcome inquiry. The first section focuses on the broad systematic level of outcomes of school meal programs, while the remaining four sections focus on areas of outcomes relevant to school meal interventions including: education, health, nutrition, and agriculture. The research questions presented are followed by an overarching discussion of the ways in which sustainability fits into the School Meals Learning Agenda.

School Meal Program Implementation

There are a variety of interventions and implementation systems that comprise international school meal programs. Each system requires a set of complex stakeholder relationships that are often region or country specific and therefore difficult to measure and compare. Over the past five years, McGovern-Dole alone has worked with 24 implementing partners to leverage U.S. agricultural food commodities, as well as financial and technical resources, to provide assistance to numerous school systems in developing countries. These partners in turn must cultivate bilateral, municipal, and community relationships in order to coordinate efforts and to maximize the impact of school meals on health, education, and nutritional outcomes. The research questions presented in this section focus on the systems required to leverage resources and improve the sustainability, effectiveness, and overall impact, both short and long-term, of school meal programs.

\(^2\) The studies have largely been limited by small sample sizes and lack of standardization regarding measures of learning.
Key Questions:

1. What are the key institutions (i.e. international, national, provincial/district and local stakeholders) and governance structures required to effectively deliver, implement, and sustain school meal interventions? What relationship structures among these institutions yield the most successful and effective school meal programs?

2. What community-level systems of governance and management are required for the successful implementation and sustainability of school meal programs?

3. Which components of school meal programs, including food production, procurement, and preparation of meals, are the most sustainable in terms of operational efficiency and why? Does the cost-effectiveness of these programs change over time and if so, how and why?

4. What variables impact the resiliency of school meal program community support systems and in what ways?

5. What types of incentives (and in which contexts) are the most effective at securing local or national government investment into school meal programs? What are the barriers and challenges in securing investment?

6. What are the most effective methods for ensuring food safety within school meal programs taking into consideration the different systems of national, regional, local and community governance?

7. What aspects of school meal interventions are the most sensitive to internal and external system pressures? For example, internal pressures may include changes in policy related to human resources and external pressures may include fluctuations in local agriculture commodity prices. Moreover, are there combinations of interventions that are more or less resilient to these pressures?

8. What are the most successful policies affecting the success of school meal programs, and what are the necessary conditions for these policies to be implemented and to be effective?

9. In what ways do school meal programs impact health equity in terms of poverty, gender, or geography?

10. How do health and educational outcomes linked to school meal programs differ in rural versus urban school settings?

Eduction/Literacy Evidence Gaps
Existing literature on educational outcomes linked to school meals indicate a significant correlation between school meals and positive impacts on school participation, measured through attendance and enrollment. Research has also shown a greater effect on girls. The evidence correlating school meals, cognitive function and learning achievement is more limited, with some indication that there is little to no
effect across the combined school meal interventions of in-school meals and take-home rations. However, the provision of take-home rations correlated with a greater effect on educational outcomes than the in-school provision of food. Generally, learning takes longer to materialize and observe through the limited short-term studies available. In addition, the achievement pathway for learning may be less direct than school participation because of the dependence on education quality. In terms of cognitive development, studies are limited primarily to memory outcomes, with evidence lacking related to verbal fluency and reasoning.

There are multiple ways to increase student attendance with school meals being just one. The complexity of interactions when measuring educational outcomes of school aged children is evident and the literature suggests that school meals may be one valuable tool in a range of instruments to achieve a more effective education system. For example, the literature indicates school meal programs may be more effective if combined with quality education programs, including an appropriate curriculum, quality teachers, high teacher to student ratios, and suitable textbooks. Further, for optimal results, school meals and quality education systems may need to be implemented in combination with supplementary services such as health and nutrition interventions.

A solid understanding of the desired intermediary outcomes and community context is essential in the selection of an intervention or combination of interventions and in the interpretation of evaluation results. For example, the impact of school meals is larger when school participation rates are low and nutritional deficits are high. However, if school attendance is already satisfactory and nutritional deficits are high, a health intervention providing nutritional supplements may be a more cost-effective way to address nutritional deficiencies. Additionally, if poor school performance is attributed to poor quality instruction and/or a lack of teaching resources, interventions that directly target school quality and instruction may be more effective at achieving educational improvements.

Researchers consulted during the development of this Learning Agenda agreed on several additional educational outcomes linked to school meal programs or interventions supplementing school meals. For example, providing breakfast or mid-morning meals produces better student concentration than just the provision of lunch. Also, access to light and reliable electricity is linked to improved school performance. In addition, school enrollment is positively impacted by better, more reliable teacher housing, as well as interventions designed to improve safety and security, like improving transportation or providing separate latrines for students and teachers by gender. Finally, according to researchers there is discussion in the literature on the importance of the language of instruction and the provision of culturally appropriate learning materials. However, there is still debate surrounding the right context for its implementation or the right combination with other interventions.

The research questions listed below were designed first and foremost to address issues of effectiveness. In addition, there are two other important research domains: (1) process and context evaluations that provide qualitative data to answer the ‘why’ and ‘how’; and (2) economic evaluation data that provides critical evidence on cost-effectiveness, cost-benefit, and value for money. In order to avoid repetition, each question outlined below would also include a qualitative research component, and when applicable, an economic evaluation component.

**Key Questions:**

1. In what ways do the combination of school meal interventions and educational interventions improve education and literacy levels? How can these combinations improve cost-effectiveness?

2. What school meal modality (breakfast, lunch, snack, or a combination thereof) is the most effective at improving immediate outcomes, such as attendance or concentration, versus longer-term outcomes, such as cognitive development or learning achievement?

3. How do educational outcomes linked to school meal interventions among preschool children compare with the impacts among primary school aged children? What factors affect any differences in outcomes?

4. What are the differences in educational outcomes from school meal programs between children from families living below the national poverty line and those above the poverty line?

5. What are the differences in educational outcomes from school meal programs between malnourished or undernourished children and those who are not?

6. What are the long-term impacts of school meals on economic productivity and well-being into adulthood?

7. In what ways do school meal interventions impact the resources of teachers, such as classroom time, teacher incentives, and teacher capacity?

8. What is the impact on educational outcomes of school meal program interventions that require teachers to deliver health and nutrition curriculum, or training in a school setting, in addition to the standard academic curriculum?

**Health Evidence Gaps**

This Learning Agenda considers both the physical health, as well as educational outcomes of school-age children.
children. Specific emphasis is given to linking the health implications of malaria, deworming, and water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) interventions with educational outcomes and school meal programs. Preventable diseases like malaria contribute to significant declines in school attendance. Malaria alone is estimated to account for 13-50 percent of school days missed per year.\(^5\) Prevention activities delivered in school settings, such as the distribution of bed nets and education on malaria risk factors, symptoms, and treatment have been very successful at decreasing malaria rates. Other preventative interventions, such as human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) education among school-age children, have also contributed to a decrease in high burden diseases such as HIV and tuberculosis. The delivery of common disease treatments in a school setting has proven to have high levels of acceptability by students, parents, and teachers, to be efficient to administer, and cost-effective. A review of relevant literature indicates that malaria treatment positively correlates with increased math and language test scores of school children, with chloroquine treatment demonstrating the greatest impact.

According to the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), more than 32 percent of the world’s population (2.4 billion people) in 2015 still lack access to improved sanitation facilities, and 663 million people still use unimproved drinking water sources.\(^6\) The United Nations estimates that more than 340,000 children under five (almost 1,000 per day) die annually from diarrheal diseases due to poor sanitation, poor hygiene, or unsafe drinking water. In addition to saving lives, research has shown that WASH interventions positively correlate with improved educational outcomes such as increased enrollment and reduced school absences and dropouts, particularly among girls. Further, research shows that these positive outcomes result from a combination of all WASH interventions, including hand washing, water quality, water supply, and sanitation as opposed to a subset of WASH interventions with water supply a determining factor in success. The impact of WASH programs on student health is less understood and little is known about the sustainability of school-based WASH programs.

Stunting is a condition that affects an estimated 171 million children (167 million in developing countries). Globally, childhood stunting decreased from 39.7 percent in 1990 to 26.7 percent in 2010. In Africa, stunting has remained relatively consistent since 1990 (approximately 40 percent) and little improvement is anticipated.\(^7\) Stunting starts before birth and is caused by many factors including poor maternal nutrition, poor meal practices, poor food quality, and frequent infections that can slow down growth.\(^8\) Given that many school age children are stunted when they start school, and stunting cannot be reversed, school meal programs have limited value at increasing growth. However, little is known about the effect of school meals in combination with health interventions that can decrease infections (i.e.


\(^8\) http://data.unicef.org/nutrition/malnutrition.html
deworming) on mitigating stunting during the second growth spurt that occurs in adolescence.

Over 270 million preschool-age children and over 600 million school-age children live in areas where soil-transmitted helminthes caused by parasitic worms are intensively transmitted, and are in need of treatment and preventive interventions. Deworming programs are relatively easy to implement in school settings. Teachers need only a few hours of training to understand the rationale for deworming, to learn how to give out the pills, and how to keep a record of their distribution. Although deworming outcomes in school settings are based on a limited number of countries, indications are that it has minimal impact on school attendance. However, the limited research does indicate some impact on improving weight, physical well-being, and cognition. Further research is needed on the effectiveness of deworming interventions in various prevalence settings and on the cost-benefit of deworming at various prevalence levels.

The various combinations of health treatment and prevention interventions coupled with school meals are largely known to be effective in achieving program outcomes of increased student attendance and enrollment. However, the most cost-effective combinations and frequency across various socio-economic and age groups are less understood. Moreover, the long-term impacts on literacy and cognition are uncertain.

**Key Questions:**

1. Which combination of school meal programs and disease treatment (i.e. malaria) and/or prevention interventions (i.e. diarrheal illnesses) reduce and/or prevent health related absences?

2. What are the impacts of using local health resources (i.e. local community nurses) to deliver health interventions through school meal programs?

3. How does the provision of public health training and services to children in a school setting compare with other avenues of similar service delivery in terms of health outcomes and behavior change? What are the specific variables that affect the differences in outcomes?

4. What systems of community health care governance are the most effective at sustaining the delivery of health interventions through school meal programs?

5. How do WASH programs impact learning and literacy outcomes?

6. What are the impacts of providing WASH infrastructure for adolescent girls and what are the best

---

ways to quantify these impacts?

7. What are the best practices in sustaining WASH interventions delivered through a school meal programs? What are effective exit strategies used by programs to ensure sustainability after donor funding has been removed?

8. Over the long-term (greater than two years), how effective are deworming interventions, in combination with school meals in mitigating stunting during the second growth spurt occurring in adolescence?

9. What is the effect of school meals on the growth of school-age children who are malnourished compared to adequately nourished children?

10. What intergenerational effects (i.e. low birth weight) do school meal programs have on the children of females who were enrolled in school meal programs?

11. What are the priority health interventions that are required to meet specific program outcomes? For example, if an outcome of a school meal program is to increase the body mass index (BMI), what are the necessary health interventions that must be in place to achieve this outcome?

**Nutrition Evidence Gaps**

The McGovern-Dole program results framework recognizes that improved nutrition and knowledge of nutrition will support the ultimate objective of improving literacy in school-age children by reducing health related absences and improving attendance. A recent analysis of school meal programs by the World Food Programme (WFP) recommended fortified foods as a routine part of school-based programs.\(^{10}\) The WFP made clear that a major gap in the evidence is identifying the operational challenges and facilitators of success associated with delivering micronutrient programs in school settings (versus health care settings).\(^{11}\)

A substantial gap remains in the evidence about micronutrient supplementation among children beyond the common “first thousand days.” Justifiably, nutritional interventions have focused on ensuring that pregnant women, infant, and young children during the first two-year postpartum period, receive essential micronutrients. There is a lack of evidence of the cost-effectiveness of micronutrient supplementation delivered through school settings for older school children (ages 15 and older), and for girls of reproductive age. However, there are other specific nutrition benefits that deserve a more in-depth examination to determine what impacts beyond school attendance that nutrition may have on literacy and

\(^{10}\) World Food Programme (2013). State of School Feeding Worldwide.

education. For example, there is a direct relationship between the intake of micronutrients and student energy levels. However, there may be a lack of reliable research on the effectiveness of blended fortification and how effective, iron supplements may be in impacting cognition or psychomotor skills. There is also no consistent measure to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of school meal programs on the delivery of micronutrients. In addition, the long-term benefits and cost-benefit return of fortification versus supplementation are less understood in the context of improved education and health status.

**Key Questions:**

1. What are the immediate and long-term effects on health outcomes as a result of improved nutrition between fortified school meals versus unfortified school meals?

2. What is the effect of school based micronutrient supplementation and/or fortification on long-term educational outcomes such as cognition and knowledge acquisition?

3. How effective are school based micronutrient supplementation interventions at preventing and/or decreasing health related absences?

4. How are nutritional outcomes affected by different food sourcing modalities of school meal programs? Outcomes to consider may include iron deficiency, body mass, and other measurements or behavior changes related to nutritional intake and dietary diversity.

5. What are the most effective pedagogical approaches to teaching nutrition through school meal programs and to what age group?

6. How does the provision of nutritional training to children in a school setting compare with other avenues of similar behavior change interventions in terms of nutritional outcomes? What are the specific variables that affect the differences in outcomes?

**Agriculture Evidence Gaps**

Food sourcing is a crucial element of school meals, both as a program input and as an area of potential economic outcomes relevant to local communities. There has not been extensive research on the impact of locally sourced and produced food, not only as it relates to nutrition and education, but also in terms of sustainability and the impact on the local agricultural production systems and markets. Similarly, the impact of school meal programs on government policies surrounding subsidies, supporting infrastructure, food diversity, and the structure of social safety nets are areas for further examination.
It is well established that school meal activities greatly benefit from private sector involvement. As far back as 2003, the WFP stated that active private-sector involvement had greatly helped develop capacity and expertise among key political and economic leaders. The WFP stated that the early involvement of the private sector into school meal programs was critical to success and sustainability. However, the WFP also stated that more studies were needed in order to monetize the value of the private sector contribution or generate return on investment (ROI) data in order to incentivize the private sector.

Global and regional partnerships have emerged that are attempting to link a broad array of actors to strengthen ties between the health, education, and production or supply aspects of school meal programs. These include national governments and international agencies like the World Bank, UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the Global Partnership for Education, and WFP. For example, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has supported a “structured demand” model based on a theory of change that large, predictable sources of demand, such as school meal programs, can be linked to small farmers as a way to encourage improvements to local agricultural production systems, increase quality and incomes, and reduce risk. One well-known example of such a model is Home-Grown School Feeding (HGSF), but others exist including local and regional food aid procurement (LRP), and in India, the Public Distribution System (PDS). Studies of these systems focus on impacts on local pricing, the importance of local market analysis, and benefits to commercial food traders or middlemen. For example, a study of HGSF in Kenya suggests that one pitfall is the overall production capacity of local systems. Often schools are located in areas not equipped with agricultural production resources, so care must be taken that systems have adequate support from local and national leadership and have ways to monitor issues related to corruption or market favoritism that can disrupt the fabric of the safety net, in this case school meals.

The following questions explore gaps in these aspects of school meal programs relative to food sourcing and agricultural production.

**Key Questions:**

1. How do the impacts of local procurement models and other community and nationally sourced models compare with those that rely on international food sources?

2. How can a combination of local procurement during harvest time be supplemented with international food aid to promote locally and/or nationally sustainable school meals programs?
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3. What are the long-term impacts (five or more years) of school meal programs on local agriculture production and food safety and what variables affect these changes?

4. What long-term impacts do school meal programs have on local agriculture markets, employment, and infrastructure development, given the potential for a sustained and predictable demand?

5. What kinds of partnerships with the private sector and/or host country governments are the most effective at ensuring program sustainability? Among successful partnerships, who are the key players and what are their roles? In what contexts do private sector and/or government partnerships work best and which contexts may be more challenging?

6. In what ways does the additional demand of school meals impact decision making on agricultural policies related to subsidies and the promotion of diversity in production?

**Sustainability**

A common and overarching thread linking gaps in research and evidence across all of the sectors discussed in this Learning Agenda is the issue of sustainability of school meal programs and outcomes. While several research questions presented here directly and indirectly seek to address sustainability, it is important to recognize that there are many layers to and definitions of the term. Topics related to sustainability discussed above include policy level decision-making, programmatic efficiency, and cost-effectiveness. There is no common measurement for the level of sustainability of school meal programs because the term itself can be applied to these and other layers of programming. For example, sustainability in the context of school meal programs might refer to funding and political support from a partner government with the aim of operating programs after donor support has ended. Or it might be specifically focused on the local sourcing of food to help maintain the necessary supply chain. Additionally, sustainability may be defined by the longevity of observable outcomes and benefits of the program. Sustainability may even refer to the level of inclusiveness required to gain momentum and support at the local and community levels. All of these nuances cut across the sectors presented here in which researchers and implementers attempt to measure the outcomes and impacts of school meal interventions. While this Learning Agenda cannot define and differentiate all of these perspectives on sustainability, an attempt has been made to incorporate the most important or relevant issues of sustainability into the selection of questions presented.
APPENDIX H – McGovern-Dole Priority Country Selection Methodology and Process

In alignment with McGovern-Dole Regulations (7 CFR 1599.3), the program’s results-oriented focus, and organizational objectives, in FY 2018, USDA/FAS completed its preliminary country prioritization process by first using a selection of indices to include:

a. Gross National Income (GNI) Per Capita < $40,352\(^{21}\);
b. Youth Literacy Rate (age 15-24) < 80%\(^{22}\);
c. Adult Literacy Rate (age 15+) < 80%\(^{22}\);
d. Primary Net Enrollment Rate < 80%\(^{22}\);
e. Underweight >10%\(^{23}\);
f. Wasting >5% and Stunting > 20%\(^{23}\);
g. Government Expenditure on Education as % of GDP > 5%\(^{24}\); and
h. Effective Governance (Rank) > 40%\(^{25}\).

Second, to finalize the FY 2018 priority country selection process, USDA/FAS collected and reviewed these official and publicly available social, economic, health/nutrition, political and overall human development indices data and then integrated these into the country-level analyses using input from: a) USDA/FAS Agricultural attachés (regional or in-country) and/or USAID and State Department colleagues in the selected country; b) McGovern-Dole and/or Food Assistance Division staff findings from in-country monitoring and/or scoping visits; c) other relevant U.S. government stakeholder feedback; and d) a standardized/weighted scoring system and prioritization method.

Although USDA uses these selection indices as a starting point to understand each country’s overall context, it is incumbent upon all applicants to conduct their own internal investigation and analyses to more accurately capture gaps, disparities, and discrepancies within and beyond these official data sources.

Official data sources for priority country indices and country guidance:
\(^{21}\)World Bank (http://data.worldbank.org/); FAO (http://www.fao.org)
\(^{22}\)UNESCO (http://data.uis.unesco.org/)
\(^{23}\)WHO (www.who.int); WFP (www.wfp.org)
\(^{24}\)CIA (https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/)
\(^{25}\)http://info.worldbank.org/
APPENDIX I – Glossary of Terms

- **Agreement Executor**: The person in the organization that carries out the terms of the agreement.
- **Applicant**: The person or entity that makes the formal application for the food aid proposal.
- **Barter**: The method of exchanging commodities for goods, services, or activities.
- **Baseline Data**: Initial data that serves as the basis of comparison for measuring project results.
- **Beneficiary**: Recipient of funds or other benefits, including food aid.
- **Capacity Building**: Development process by leaders, coalitions and other agents of change that brings about changes in sociopolitical, policy-related, and organizational factors to enhance local ownership for and the effectiveness and efficiency of efforts to achieve a development goal.
- **Climate Resilience**: The capacity of a community, program, or natural environment to prevent, withstand, respond to, and recover from a disruption.
- **Commodity**: Any good or service which has monetary value, including any crops which are internationally traded on spot, or derivatives markets.
- **Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC)**: A government-owned and operated entity that was created to stabilize, support, and protect farm income and prices. CCC also helps maintain balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities and aids in their orderly distribution.
- **Contributor**: In FAIS, a person nominated by the proposal creator or director to work on a section of a proposal.
- **Consumer**: Any person reliant on purchases to meet their basic requirements, including food purchases.
- **Corporation**: An entity that has filed articles of incorporation in one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the various territories of the United States.
- **Cost Sharing**: Arrangement under which costs of a program are shared by FAS and the organization.
- **Critical Assumption**: External conditions that must hold in order for the results in a results framework to be achieved. These assumptions are beyond the control of the implementing organization.
- **Custom Indicators**: Additional performance indicators which are not included in FAS’s list of standard indicators. These indicators can be drawn from or based upon FAS’s list of illustrative indicators.
- **Direct Beneficiary**: People or organizations that are directly affected by the proposed project.
- **Direct Feed**: Process of food aid commodities transferred directly to intended recipients, including school feeding programs.
- **Duty Free Entry**: Permission given by a government for an entity to export goods into the country without having to pay tax.
- **eAuthentication**: The system used by USDA agencies to enable customers to obtain accounts that will allow them to access USDA Web applications and services via the Internet.
- **Food Assistance Division**: Main division responsible for the food aid portfolio of FAS, including the Food for Progress and McGovern-Dole food aid programs.
- **Food Aid Information System**: An integrated information system through which the Food Assistance Division (FAD) of FAS manages and administers its food aid programs, while interacting with its strategic food aid partners, both within and outside the U.S. government.
• **Food Insecurity**: Exists when people are at risk of, or actually are consuming food of inadequate quality, quantity (or both) to meet their nutritional requirements.

• **Food Safety**: All measures taken during food production, processing, transport and handling, cooking, consumption and disposal which limit the risks of food borne illness in an individual or group.

• **Food Security**: Exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to food which is consumed in sufficient quantity and quality to meet their dietary needs and food preferences, and is supported by an environment of adequate sanitation, health services and care, allowing for a healthy and active life.

• **Foundational Results**: Results for all FAS Results Frameworks which are defined by three characteristics: they feed into one or more higher-level results; they target critical actors or areas that increase the potential for lasting outcomes; and a causal relationships exists among some of the foundational results.

• **Household**: Any household for which the primary livelihood activity, and/or the largest source of income is derived from agricultural activities.

• **Household Income**: The sum of all receipts, in money or in kind, which are received regularly and are recurring, including food.

• **Hunger**: Result when people do not have access to the amount of dietary energy needed for their normal level of activity, often leading to undernutrition or stunting.

• **Hygiene**: Any and all practices related to limiting the spread of disease from any source, and are pertinent to food handling, preparation, consumption, and disposal practices.

• **Illustrative Indicators**: Example indicators provided by FAS.

• **Indicator**: A specific variable, or combination of variables, that gives insight into a particular aspect of a situation. It is a value that can be used to evaluate or assess different types of impact.

• **Indirect Beneficiary**: People or organizations that are indirectly affected by the proposed project (i.e., family members of direct beneficiaries).

• **Internal Transport, Shipping and Handling**: Movement of Title II food aid to storage and distribution sites, storage of the food aid, and distribution of the food aid in all emergency programs and in non-emergency programs in least developed countries that meet the poverty and other eligibility criteria established by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for financing the International Development Association.

• **Intervention**: Targeted action to improve a situation or condition.

• **Legal Signatory**: Person in the entity or organization responsible to sign the agreement contract or other legal document with the USDA.

• **Malnutrition**: All deviations from adequate nutrition resulting from an inadequacy of food (or excess food) relative to need. This includes acute malnutrition (wasting), chronic malnutrition, growth retardation, micronutrient deficiencies, and over-nutrition.

• **Micronutrient**: All vitamins and minerals required by humans for normal physical and cognitive development.

• **Monitoring and Evaluation**: A continuing function to provide management and main stakeholders of an ongoing intervention with early indications of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of results. Whereas *evaluation* is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project or program, including the design, implementation and results.
• **Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement**: The ratio between the total indirect expenses and some direct cost base. It is a device for determining fairly and conveniently within the boundaries of sound administrative principles, what proportion of indirect cost each program should bear.

• **Outputs**: The immediate and tangible results of a project’s inputs, such as number of children fed, number of schools built, number of trainings provided, etc.

• **Performance Indicators**: Directly measure achievement of results. These indicators can be either FAS standard or illustrative indicators or custom indicators. Performance indicators are essential for monitoring program performance.

• **Performance Indicator**: Quantifiable measures that an entity uses to measure or associate performance in terms of meeting its strategic or operational goals.

• **Performance Monitoring Plan**: A document to devise and manage the collection of performance data which includes plans for data analysis, reporting, and use.

• **Performance Record**: Results of past programs undertaken by the applicant that is similar to the type and size of programming in the applicant’s proposal.

• **Private Public Partnership**: Arrangements between the public and private sectors with certain service obligations of the public sector are provided by the private sector, with clear agreement on shared objectives for delivery of public infrastructure and/or public services.

• **Poverty**: Encompasses different dimensions of scarcity that relate to human capabilities including consumption, food security, health, education, food security, and decent work. It is commonly measured by income per capita.

• **Program-level Results Framework**: FAS’s graphical representation of the set of low- and mid-level results that lead to the achievement of a program’s strategic objective.

• **Recipient**: Person(s) authorized by the participant organization to create Food Aid proposals and manage signed Food Aid agreements.

• **Project-level Results Framework**: A graphical representation of the linkages between activities and results, which lead to the achievement of a highest level result.

• **Randomized Control Trial**: A study design that randomly assigns participants into an experimental group or a control group.

• **Resilience**: The ability to recover from setbacks, shocks, and to adapt well to change.

• **Results Framework**: A results framework should illustrate how results contribute toward the highest level result strategic objective.

• **Results Oriented Management**: A strategic course of action within the USDA that focuses on higher-level program results such as the outcomes and the impact of programs, while also monitoring program activities, inputs, and outputs.

• **Result Stream**: A level within the McGovern-Dole results frameworks used to analyze, describe, and improve the flow of information or materials required for the applicant in creating a product or service.

• **Sanitation**: The provision of facilities and services for the safe disposal of animal and human waste.

• **Standard Indicators**: A common set of mandatory indicators identified by FAS that must be used by all projects that address results, if applicable.

• **Strategic Objective**: Highest-level result in a results framework.
• **Subrecipient**: A third-party recipient that receives a sub-award—a portion of an award that is distributed by the recipient (pass-through entity) of the original award to conduct a portion of the project works in compliance with the sponsor's terms and conditions.

• **Undernutrition**: Aggregate measure of all forms of inadequate food intake at the population level, arising from the deficiency of one or more nutrients.

• **Wasting**: Based on World Health Organization (WHO) growth standards, it is considered a measure of moderate malnutrition based on low weight-for-height. If not treated, it can progress towards severe acute malnutrition (severe wasting).