

CADMUS

REQUEST FOR QUOTES (RFQ)

Business Model Innovation

TO: Potential Bidders

FROM: Darlene Irby, Project Director
The Cadmus Group
Digital Forward
Contract No. 7200AA23C00131

ISSUANCE DATE: Monday, January 6, 2025

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF QUESTIONS: Friday, January 10, 2025, 5:00 PM EST

SUBMISSION DATE: Friday, January 31, 2025, 5:00 PM EST

USAID Digital Forward is seeking technical and price proposals from eligible firms capable of identifying promising examples of business model innovations that are enabling service providers (including both commercial, non-profit, and governmental) to deliver digital agriculture solutions to smallholder farmers in LMICs independently of ongoing donor subsidization.

Cadmus, as the prime implementor of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)-funded Digital Forward project intends to award a firm-fixed-price type contract for this activity. The start date of this activity is on/about February 24, 2025. The total estimated value of this RFQ is up to USD \$100,00.00.

This RFQ is open to qualified companies with experience in what is required in the scope of work under Section C.

All potential offerors are also informed that the contractor that is awarded a contract pursuant to this RFQ will not be eligible to participate in any subsequent RFQs that involves evaluation of work done under this RFQ, or any other activity that may result in conflict of interest because of the work performed under this RFQ.

Questions regarding this RFQ are due by Friday, January 10, 2025, 5:00 PM EST. Proposals are due in electronic copy only by Friday, January 31, 2025, 5:00 PM EST. Questions and proposals are to be submitted to Arthur Muchajer at Arthur.Muchajer@CadmusGroup.com and Nazir Sediqi at Nazir.Sediqi@CadmusGroup.com.

This RFQ, including this cover letter, in no way obligates Cadmus to award a contract nor does it commit Cadmus to pay for any costs incurred in the preparation and submission

of a proposal in response hereto. Furthermore, Cadmus reserves the right to reject any and all offers, if such action is considered to be in the best interest in USAID.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

Darlene Irby

4F68315E6062448
Darlene Irby, Project Director
The Cadmus Group
Digital Forward

SECTION 1: DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/STATE OF WORK

Digital Forward Background

Launched in February 2024, the Digital Forward Mechanism aims to bolster USAID and implementing partner efforts to design, support and implement digital technology programs; accelerate open, inclusive and secure digital ecosystems; and disseminate knowledge within USAID and the development community on the digital technology's best practices, successes, and lessons learned from programs. The Activity will implement work that advance two mutually reinforcing objectives:

- Objective 1: Support USAID with Digital Development-focused technical assistance, research, training, strategic thinking, digital-sector partnerships, and behavior change that will equip USAID programming for the digital age, and
- Objective 2: Support the growth of open, inclusive, and secure digital ecosystems in partner countries through work with USAID.

Digital Forward is managed through the Innovation, Technology, & Research Hub's Technology Division (ITR/T) within the Bureau for Development, Democracy, and Innovation (DDI).

Activity Background

The number of digital agriculture solutions operating in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) has grown significantly over the past decade, from an estimated 175 solutions in 2012 to 1,357 active solutions identified in 2022, according to the [Digital Agriculture State of the Sector report](#). Of that number, roughly 45 percent were started in the last five years (from 2022), while more than 130 solutions also went inactive during that same period.

Moreover, the report estimated that as much as half of digital agriculture companies in LMICs are operating at or above breakeven, based on self-reported data, although within sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia, that number stands at less than 40 percent. Nevertheless, this still represents an improvement from the 26 percent of companies in Africa four years prior that were at or above breakeven as estimated in the [Digitalisation of African Agriculture Report 2018-2019](#).

These figures are not far off from more established markets. For example, the [2020 Global Startup Outlook Survey](#), which was heavily skewed towards startups in the US, UK, Canada, and China, found that only 56 percent were profitable. The Digital Agriculture State of the Sector report found that 67 percent of providers in Latin America and the Caribbean reported being profitable or at breakeven, likely in part due to greater focus on business to business (B2B) offerings in that geography. Interestingly, the proportion of profitable firms reporting profitability or breakeven across all LMIC geographies surveyed was highest amongst those with the smallest number of users. The report found that 64 percent of firms with less than 50,000 users reported being profitable or breakeven, a number that fell to just 35 percent for firms with between 50,001 to 500,000 users. A deeper understanding of

what types of digital agriculture services are profitable or at breakeven would be useful for donors, governments, and investors to understand in order to help them better target their own investments.

Willingness to pay, or lack thereof, has long been identified as a challenge for some types of digital agriculture services, especially those targeting smallholder farmers, such as extension and advisory services. There is also a history of donors either directly (through grants) or indirectly (through their programs paying for digital agriculture services on behalf of others) subsidizing digital agriculture solutions in ways that may blur the true financial viability of such solutions. Yet despite these challenges and at times distortionary external influences, there have been a number of business model innovations that digital agriculture providers have been experimenting with that have enabled them to independently achieve breakeven or profitability. These innovations can take different forms, including:

- bundled services where only some offerings or user segments generate profit;
- loss leaders that help bring users onto a platform that generates revenue through other types of services;
- delivery models where third-parties, such as multinational brands, pay for the service because it provides them a benefit for smallholder farmers to use the it;
- models that seek revenue by providing services to larger businesses and/or governments (such as selling market research) and partnerships;
- creative licensing and co-investment approaches for digital public goods;
- and others.

Of course, business models are only one aspect of profitability. Other hypotheses have been put forward to explain the profitability challenges faced by digital agriculture service providers across the globe, even though they might have business models that would otherwise be sound in another country. These include unsupportive local ecosystems, poor telecommunications infrastructure (notably in rural areas in Africa, for example), and the fragmentation of digital agriculture service offerings (which implies the need for greater market concentration). It will, therefore, be important for this activity to examine other factors that impact profitability beyond business models alone, as well as which types of business models are more likely to succeed given different ecosystem scenarios.

Activity Objectives

The objective of this activity is to identify promising examples of business model innovations that are enabling service providers (including both commercial, non-profit, and governmental) to deliver digital agriculture solutions to smallholder farmers in LMICs independently of ongoing donor subsidization. Attention should also be paid to those models that are enabling the uptake of digital agriculture solutions by underrepresented and marginalized populations, with the study noting when

and how a given innovation has enabled such uptake. In addition to highlighting these innovations, the study should identify key factors that facilitate the success of each business model innovation (such as business enabling environment, access to capital, underlying digital infrastructure, ecosystem level support for startups, consumer demand, and others). This activity also aims to develop a practical tool to help donors and their implementing partners assess the likely financial viability of a given digital agriculture solution. It should build off of previous research done on this topic, such as the [Business models and key success drivers of agtech start-ups report](#) published by CTA in 2019.

Activity Tasks

It is envisioned that this assignment will entail the following tasks, although bidders are welcome to propose additional tasks or modifications to the proposed tasks if they feel that such changes will be more effective at achieving the overall objectives of this assignment.

1. TASK 1: Rapid Analysis

The rapid analysis will seek to identify promising business model innovations of digital agriculture solutions in LMICs and key influencing factors. It should include:

- Desk research of existing literature on business model innovations for digital agriculture
- Key informant interviews with industry experts in this space, as well as with digital agriculture providers with existing business model innovations that show promise. Bidders are required to include the minimum number of people they will speak with. The list of proposed informants will be developed by the selected firm and are not required as part of the proposal, although illustrative informants are welcome.

2. TASK 2: Report and Guidance Development

The findings from the rapid analysis will be synthesized into a report that includes, at a minimum, the following content:

- An overview of the key findings, including types of business model innovations (BMI), core components of each model (who pays, how it is structured, etc.), how common each model is, what types of services they are being used with, and key factors (internal and external to the organisation deploying the solution) influencing the ability to leverage each model to deliver digital agriculture solutions to smallholder farmers (and underrepresented and marginalized groups, as relevant).
- A summary on external factors which that are likely to support or prevent achievement of profitability
- A list of tangible and actionable recommendations for policymakers (e.g. enabling factors that can support BMI and digital agriculture service provider success), donors (e.g. how they can catalyze BMIs rather than create dependency), technology companies (e.g. how to test and validate BMIs, how to collaborate within the ecosystem), agribusinesses (e.g. how they can

partner with providers to implement BMIs), and other relevant stakeholders related to how they can support and operationalize (as relevant) these types of business model innovations, as well as advance new business model innovations.

- At least 5-7 brief case studies of two to three pages describing different business models, how they work, what prerequisites (if any) have facilitated them, what challenges they have faced, how they have overcome them, and other relevant information to be determined during the course of this assignment. These case studies should be made available as standalone documents, although components of them should also be incorporated into the full report.
- Practical guidance for donors and their implementing partners, in the form of a user-friendly tool, to assess the likely financial viability of a given digital agriculture solution, with a particular focus on evaluating projected and actual revenue streams relative to expenses, while also paying attention to how supportive of an ecosystem they are operating within. It should also provide questions to help readers determine whether a particular business model is likely to be directly or indirectly subsidized by donors, as well as helping readers to assess whether there is a short-term catalytic role that they can play. The guidance should build upon existing tools and resources that already exist, such as [this guidance](#), [this technical note](#), [this brief](#), and others, rather than replicating them. This should also be made available as a standalone document, as well as included as an Annex in the report.

3 TASK 3: Stakeholder feedback sessions

Once a draft report is developed, the key findings, recommendations, and practical guidance will be presented to key stakeholders, including key informants interviewed during Task 1, select USG staff, its partners, and other invited parties, as proposed by the selected firm and USAID. The purpose of these sessions will be to solicit feedback from participants to strengthen the final product. It is anticipated that two sessions will be held to enable individuals from all time zones to participate, with both conducted virtually.

4. TASK 4: Promotion and Dialogue

The final report's key findings, recommendations, and practical guidance will be presented during at least two virtual or in-person events (either standalone or as part of a relevant, pre-existing event) aimed at both promoting awareness and facilitating stakeholder dialogue in an inclusive manner that includes stakeholders representing the technology sector, relevant government agencies, and development organizations, the agriculture sector (both agribusinesses and farmer organizations), and civil society. Bidders are encouraged to propose a high-level structure for the event(s) and approach to increasing the likelihood that the promotion results in potential action.

In addition to the above, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations' Regional Office for Africa will co-organize webinars to discuss the findings with stakeholders in sub-Saharan Africa, which the selected bidder will be expected to present at.

PROGRAM TASK MILESTONES

The below is an illustrative general timeline for this work. If firms have a different proposed timeline they recommend they are welcome to propose it.

TASK MILESTONES	TIMEFRAME
Rapid Analysis (desk research and key stakeholder interviews)	March-May 2025
Report outline	May 2025
Draft Report (including standalone case studies and guidance)	June 2025
Stakeholder feedback sessions (and accompanying slide deck)	July 2025
Final Report (including standalone case studies and guidance)	August 2025
Promotion (and relevant materials, such as a slide deck and social media content)	September - October 2025

Travel

No travel is required for this activity.

Place of Performance

This activity is strictly remote.

Activity Period of Performance

The period of performance for this activity is anticipated to be six to eight months (March - October 2025).

Reporting

The selected bidder will work closely with Digital Forward/Cadmus and USAID throughout the period of performance.

[End of Section 1]

SECTION 2: INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS

Proposals are due in electronic copy only, in MS Word, MS Excel, and/or PDF formats, by **Friday, January 31, 2025 at 05:00 PM EST**. Tables or charts in MS Excel format should be labeled appropriately.

Technical proposals shall consist of no more than ten (10) pages and include details of the approach, timelines for completion of the project, a summary of qualifications of personnel who would be assigned to the project, and necessary contact information. Additional tables, technical instructions, and CVs of key personnel, not to exceed two pages in length each, should be included in an appendix to the technical proposal and will not count towards the 10-page limit (margins should be 1 inch on each side, text should be single spaced, and font should be no less than 11 point).

A separate financial proposal shall be provided. No cost information shall be provided in the technical proposal. Detailed specifications of the technical and financial proposals are shown below. Offerors must submit a financial proposal along with their technical approach, which should be in a separate Microsoft Excel file.

Your proposal shall be accompanied by a letter of transmittal prepared on your company letterhead stationery and signed by an individual authorized to commit the company to the proposal. The cover letter shall identify the following as well as all enclosures being transmitted as part of the proposal:

- The name, and address, of your company
- Name of the RFQ
- Point of Contact name, title, telephone number, and email address
- Unique Entity Identifier (UEI)
- Acknowledgement that it transmits an offer in response to the RFQ that is valid for a minimum of 60 days from the proposal due date.

1. Technical Approach

A. Understanding of Requirements:

Offerors must describe a clear and concise understanding of the project's objectives, scope of work, and expected deliverables.

B. Proposed Methodology:

Offerors must describe their methodology to be utilized for the design, development, implementation, and achievement of the stated Tasks and Deliverables provided in the RFQ. The Offeror shall articulate how it intends to address each of the required tasks as well as desired system functionalities, features and project deliverables listed, in addition to any suggestions and recommendations to these areas while demonstrating the project management approach and framework to be utilized.

When evaluating the **Technical Approach**, the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) will consider the requirements from the RFQ with a focus on the following points:

- **Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of the development context and Statement of Work Comprehensiveness of proposed approach.**

- **Clarity and appropriateness of proposed activity.**
- **Realistic Implementation plan and include all proposed elements of activity.**
- **Offeror to propose well-determined and effective approaches and solutions to achieve the tasks.**

2. Personnel/Staffing

Offerors must demonstrate their capability to perform the scope of work, tasks, and deliverables based on team composition, and ability to comply with contract requirements. The proposal must identify, in summary format of 2-3 sentences, the names, anticipated positions of the field team leaders, and essential personnel proposed to perform the requirements of this scope of work, tasks, and deliverables. The narrative shall include the percentage of staff time of principals and managers on this activity.

The approach should include the organizational structure of the entire project team and explain how the staffing plan will result in successful implementation of the proposed technical approach and accomplish the objectives of the activity. If the Offeror anticipates using any sub-awards, include the roles and responsibilities of each sub-awardee and the lines of authority and communication.

CVs (not to exceed two pages each) that clearly describe education, experience and professional credentials, and biodata forms shall be completed and attached for the proposed personnel and submitted to Annex. These pages do not count towards the page limitation for this section.

When evaluating Personnel/Staffing, TEC will consider the requirements from the RFQ with a focus on the following points:

- Organizational competence relative to the Tasks and Deliverables, including knowledge of an at least 7 years' experience working in the areas of digital agriculture and/or business model innovation;
- The quality and appropriateness of the proposed personnel, including the extent to which they meet qualification requirements, have relevant past performance and experience, and convincingly demonstrate the Offeror's ability to effectively and successfully achieve the contract's objectives.

3. Past Performance and Experience

Offeror must include a description of how the past performance of the Offeror and its team (including all partners of a coalition/joint venture) is relevant to performance of the Contract. The Offeror shall submit a list (up to five) of current and past similar work and assignments completed in the past five years that were similar in size, scope, and complexity.

Offerors must provide a past performance annex with the following information: Name of Project, Period of Performance, Total Estimated Cost, Geographic Location of Implementation, Summary of what the project was, Name of Client/Funder, Point of Contact Name, Phone Number, and Email.

The past performance annex will not count against the page limit.

When evaluating Past Performance/References, the TEC will consider the requirements from the RFQ and the Offeror’s overall, previous successful experience implementing similar activities, including:

- Timeliness;
- Technical Expertise and Capability;
- Communication and Collaboration;
- Compliance with USAID Regulations (if applicable);
- Quality of work;
- Problem-solving and flexibility;
- Staffing and personnel management;
- Financial management and budget compliance;
- Cultural sensitivity and local engagement; and
- Risk management.
- Inclusion of at least 5 relevant past performance examples of similar feasibility studies. References provided by past clients for these examples and their evaluation of the Offeror’s ability to deliver on time and within quality and budget expectations.

Cadmus reserves the right to seek additional sources of past performance as it sees fit in order to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of an offeror.

4. Cost Proposal

Using the budget template under Section 5, Offerors are required to provide a cost estimate for major cost categories/line items (e.g. labor, materials, equipment, ODCs) without breaking down each category in great detail.

Offerors are required to provide a cost summary narrative utilizing the ‘Narrative’ tab in the budget template. It must provide sufficient detail to support how the Offeror arrived at the fixed price proposed.

Using the table below, Offerors must propose a milestone payment schedule based on the activity deliverables in the Scope of Work as a part of their cost proposal. Offerors can add additional rows as they see fit to accommodate the number of milestones/deliverables.

Milestone/Deliverable	Payment Amount	Due Date
Rapid Analysis (desk research and key stakeholder interviews)	\$	
Report outline	\$	
Draft Report (including standalone case studies and guidance)	\$	
Stakeholder feedback sessions (and accompanying slide deck)	\$	
Final Report (including standalone case studies and guidance)		
Promotion (and relevant materials, such as a slide deck and social media content)		

TOTAL	\$	
--------------	-----------	--

5. Eligibility Criteria:

Offerors must be registered in the **System for Award Management (SAM)** at sam.gov and comply with all applicable federal regulations. Offerors must provide a copy of their Representations and Certifications in sam.gov with their proposal.

6. Proposal Submission:

Proposals should be submitted via email to Arthur Muchajer at Arthur.muchajer@cadmusgroup.com and Nazir Sediqi at Nazir.sediqi@cadmusgroup.com no later than **January 31, 2025 at 05:00 PM EST**.

[End of Section 2]

Section 3: Evaluation Criteria

Offerors will be evaluated against the following criteria and Cadmus will utilize a trade-off analysis approach in determining the most responsible offeror. An award will be given to the responsible offeror whose proposal offers the best value, considering both cost and non-cost factors.

The submitted technical information will be scored by a technical evaluation committee using the technical criteria shown below. The evaluation committee may include individuals who are not employed by Cadmus.

1. Technical Approach (35 points)

- Understanding of Requirements (15 points)
- Proposed Methodology (20 points)

2. Personnel/Staffing (35 points)

3. Past Performance and Experience (20 points)

4. Price (10 points)

- Cost Reasonableness and Realism (5 points)
- Value for Money (5 points)

Cadmus will assess if the proposed price is fair and reasonable, including alignment with market rates and justifiable for the scope of work deliverables.

Cadmus reserves the right to request additional information if it is necessary to better understand the basis of the proposed price to verify that it is reasonable. Cadmus reserves the right to evaluate price realism if there are concerns that the price proposed is too low to meet the contract requirements.

Best Value: Cadmus intends to award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the factors as set forth in this solicitation. An award to a higher priced Offeror could be made if a determination is made that the higher technical evaluation of that Offeror merits the additional cost/price, and therefore represents the best value.

Price will be evaluated for reasonableness. Offerors are encouraged to discount their rates. If price discounts are offered, identify the percentage of price discount and/or price reduction offered. Offerors should ensure that their initial proposal constitutes their best offer in terms of both price and the technical solution being proposed.

[End of Section 3]

Section 4: Terms and Conditions

1. Contract Type:

Cadmus intends on awarding a firm-fixed-price (FFP) purchase order.

2. Payment Terms:

Payment will be made in **US Dollars** via Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT). Cadmus will pay the Subcontractor within thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of a proper invoice and acceptance of deliverables and in accordance with the proposed milestone/deliverables table in their cost proposal.

3. Applicable Provisions:

The following provisions flow down from the prime contract and will be applicable as indicated, in the Agreement.



Digital Forward
Contract Provisions.

4. Applicable Clauses:

The following clauses set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and agency acquisition regulation, as amended and modified below, will be applicable as indicated, in the Agreement. Without limiting the Agreement provisions, the FAR clauses are incorporated by reference into this Agreement with the same force and effect as though set forth in full text. The dates of the FAR clauses incorporated by reference are the same as the corresponding clause in the Prime Contract or higher-tier subcontract. The following definitions shall apply to this section except as otherwise specifically provided. Offerors shall include in each lower-tier subcontract the appropriate flow-down clauses as required by the FAR.

FAR

52.202-1	Definitions
52.203-5	Covenant Against Contingent Fees
52.203-6	Restrictions on Subcontractor Sales to the Government
52.203-8	Cancellation, rescission, and Recovery of Funds for illegal or Improper Activity
52.203-17	Contractor Employee Whistleblower Rights
52.203-19	Prohibition on Requiring Certain Internal Confidentiality Agreements or Statements
52.204-6	Unique Entity Identifier (applicable if exceeds \$30,000)
52.204-10	Reporting Executive Compensation and First-Tier Subcontract Awards
52.204-23	Prohibition on Contracting for Hardware, Software, and Services Developed or Provided by Kaspersky Lab Covered Entities
52.204-24	Representation Regarding Certain Telecommunications and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment

52.204-25	Prohibition on Contracting for Certain Telecommunications and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment
52.204-26	Covered Telecommunications Equipment or Services— Representation
52.204-27	Prohibition on a ByteDance Covered Application
52.204-30	Federal Acquisition Supply Chain Security Act Orders—Prohibition
52.209-6	Protecting the Government's Interest when Subcontracting with Contractors Debarred, Suspended, or Proposed for Debarment (applicable only if exceeds \$35,000)
52.215-2	Audit and Records - Negotiation (applicable only if exceeds \$150,000)
52.222-2	PAYMENT FOR OVERTIME PREMIUMS
52.222-3	Convict Labor
52.222-21	Prohibition of Segregated Facilities
52.222-26	Equal Opportunity (applicable only if US subcontractor/vendor)
52.222-36	Equal Employment for Workers with Disabilities
52.222-37	EMPLOYMENT REPORTS ON VETERANS
52.222-40	NOTIFICATION OF EMPLOYEE RIGHTS UNDER THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT
52.222-41	Service Contract Labor Standards
52.222-50	Combating Trafficking in Persons
52.222-55	Minimum Wages for Contractor Workers Under Executive Order 14026
52.222-62	Paid Sick Leave Under Executive Order
52.223-6	Drug-Free Workplace (applicable only to US subs exceeding \$150,000 not applicable to purchases of commercial items at any amount)
52.223-18	ENCOURAGING CONTRACTOR POLICIES TO BAN TEXT MESSAGING WHILE DRIVING
52.225-13	Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases
52.227-1	Authorization and Consent (applicable only to US subs exceeding \$150,000)
52.227-2	Notice and Assistance Regarding Patent and Copyright Infringement (applicable only to US subs exceeding \$150,000)
52.227-3	Patent Indemnity (applicable only to US subcontractors/vendors)
52.227-9	Refund of Royalties
52.228-3	Workers' Compensation Insurance (Defense Base Act) (applicable only to US subcontractors/vendors)
52.228-4	Workers' Compensation and War-Hazard Insurance Overseas
52.228-9	Cargo Insurance (applicable only when procuring goods that will be transported)
52.232-1	Payments
52.232-25	Prompt Payment
52.232-34	Payment by Electronic Funds Transfer-Other than System for Award Management
52.232-39	Unenforceability of Unauthorized Obligations
52.232-40	Providing Accelerated Payments to Small Business Subcontractors
52.233-1	Disputes

52.233-4	Applicable Law for Breach of Contract Claim
52.243-1	Changes – Fixed Price
52.246-23	INSPECTION OF SERVICES FIXED-PRICE
52.246-23	Limitation of Liability (applicable only if purchasing an item valued under \$150,000)
52.246-24	Limitation of Liability – High-Value Items (only if purchasing an item exceeding \$150,000)
52.246-25	Limitation of Liability - Services (applicable only for services)
52.247-63	Preference for U.S. Air Flag Carriers (applicable only when international travel will occur)
52.249-4	Termination for Convenience of the Government (Services)(Short-Form)

AIDAR

752.202-1	Definitions, Alternate 70 USAID Definitions Clause - General Supplement for Use in All USAID Contracts & Alternate 72 USAID Definitions Clause - Supplement for USAID Contracts Involving Performance Overseas
752.209-71	Organizational Conflicts of Interest Discovered After Award
752.211-70	Language and Measurement
752.222-70	USAID Disability Policy
752.225-70	Source and Nationality Requirements
752.228-3	Workers Compensation Insurance (Defense Base Act)
752.228-7	Insurance -- Liability to Third Persons
752.228-9	Cargo Insurance (applicable only when procuring goods that will be transported)
752.228-70	Medical Evacuation (MEDEVAC)
752.245-70	Government Property-USAID Reporting Requirements (applicable only when subcontractor/vendor required to procure non-expendable property)
752.245-71	Title to and Care of Property (applicable only when sub required to procure non-expendable property)
752.7009	Marking (Jan 1993)
752.7025	Approvals (Apr 1984)
752.7027	Personnel (Dec 1990)
752.7032	International Travel Approval and Notification Requirements (applicable only when international travel is authorized)
752.7033	Physical Fitness (applicable only to International Subcontractor/vendor when International travel is authorized)
752.7034	Acknowledgement and Disclaimer (applicable only for the purchase of publications, videos, or other information/media products)
752.7035	Public Notices (Dec 1991)
752.7036	USAID IMPLEMENTING PARTNER NOTICES (IPN) PORTAL FOR ACQUISITION
752.7037	CHILD SAFEGUARDING STANDARDS
752.7038	NONDISCRIMINATION AGAINST END-USERS OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

[End of Section 4]

Section 5: LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS, AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS

1. Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors



Cadmus Reps and
Certs (\$10K+).doc

2. Budget Template



Budget Template
(Procurement).xlsx

[End of Section 5]