FY 2026 Food for Progress Notice of Funding Opportunity
Questions and Answers

June 3 – June 9, 2026

23. **Q**: **Bolivia: The NOFO identifies the highlands (below 4,000 meters elevation) as the target geography. Could USDA clarify whether inter-Andean valleys are included in this definition? Also, may applicants engage with dairy value chain actors in the lowlands when doing so supports outcomes in the target area?**

    A: Yes, inter-Andean valleys are included in this definition for Bolivia. The prioritization of activities should be focused on the target geography(ies). While linkages to dairy value chain actors in the lowlands may be included as part of the value chain, the applicants should prioritize the farmers located in the target geography(ies).

24. **Q**: **Could USDA/FAS please clarify if citations mentioned in Section 4.1.a should be included as footnotes or endnotes. If included as endnotes, do the citations could towards the page limits?**

    A: Applicants should use endnotes which will not count towards page count.

25. **Are rehabilitation, renovation, or limited construction activities allowable under this NOFO? If so, are there any restrictions or limitations applicants should consider when proposing such activities?**

    A: Applicants should refer to 7 CFR 1499 and 2 CFR 200 for guidance on rehabilitation, renovation, or construction activities.

26. **The NOFO states: "To strengthen local ownership and long-term viability, applicants are encouraged to incorporate minimum cost-share requirements, ideally 50 percent or more for infrastructure-related investments, including cold chain assets." Would USDA please confirm whether the 50% contribution is considered a co-investment or official cost share?**

    A: If applicants decide to incorporate cost share, they should determine the proper mechanism, such as cost share defined in 2 CFR 200.306 and 7 CFR 1499.2, which will lead to increased local ownership and long-term viability. When adhering to cost share, applicants must comply with 2 CFR 200. Per the NOFO Section 2.6, Cost Share/Match Requirement, any cost sharing or matching contributions that applicants voluntarily include in their application will become binding upon award, and award recipients will be responsible for securing and providing these contributions.

27. **Morocco: The NOFO states: "Targeted Areas: USDA/FAS has identified Settat area, Rabat Kenitra, and Souss Massa as potential regions for assistance." Could USDA please clarify whether these references apply only to the specific provinces named in the guidance, or whether applicants may propose activities throughout the broader administrative regions of Casablanca-Settat, Rabat-Salé-Kénitra, and Souss-Massa?**

    A: Applicants may propose activities throughout the broader administrative regions of Casablanca-Settat, Rabat-Salé-Kénitra, and Souss-Massa. Per the NOFO, please refer to Appendix B – Country Guidance for Morocco: "Applicants should present targeted and practical strategies for improving rural slaughterhouses and advancing small-scale cold storage capacity in the livestock value chain, consistent with the GOM's Generation Green Strategy."

28. **In Appendix B, the Bangladesh Country Guidance on Page 39 states "FFPr is seeking proposals that clearly demonstrate how proposed activities will contribute to the FFPr strategic objective: Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products." Could USDA please confirm that applicants need not address Strategic Objective 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity?**

    A: Correct. Applicants are not required to address Strategic Objective 1: Increase Agricultural Productivity in proposals for Bangladesh.

29. **The budget narrative template provided in Appendix D (pp. 56-66) appears to duplicate substantial information already included in the detailed MS Excel budget, including numerous line-item dollar values and calculations. This requirement is reasonable for other USDA programs where Applicants are not required to provide an Excel budget. Given that, for this program, Applicants are also required to submit a detailed budget in Excel, this creates an additional requirement that may increase the risk of inconsistencies or clerical errors. Would USDA please confirm that applicants are permitted to submit a streamlined MS Word budget narrative that explains the composition of line items in accordance with the instructions provided in Section 4.2.g.3 (p. 21), but without having to recreate all tables with cost per item, other numerical data etc.?**

    A: No, Applicants are not permitted to submit a streamlined narrative. Per the NOFO Section 4.2.g, Budget: all budget-related documents, including the Budget Summary, Budget Narrative, and Detailed Budget, are required in full to meet the submission requirements.

30. **Under "New In Fiscal Year 2026" (pg 4), in reference to the Results Framework, the NOFO states "Applicants should ensure that the graphic is comprehensive and accurately reflects the program's goal, outcomes, and indicators." Can USDA please confirm that indicators should be included in the graphic in the "Project-Level Results Framework: 2-page limit" as well as "Performance Indicators: 5-page limit." (as titled under Section 4.1b Required Content and Forms [pg 11])?**

    A: No, indicators do not need to be included in the Project-Level Results Framework graphic, but these should be in the Performance Indicators Table. The project-level results framework graphic should display the project's activities and align each with the result(s) the activity will help achieve.

31. **Q**: **Under Section 4.2.e. Monitoring and Evaluation, given the 3-page limit for the M&E Brief, what level of methodological detail is USDA/FAS expecting regarding sampling, attribution approaches, and data systems?**

    A: Applicants should provide as much detail as possible within the 3-page limit, and it is up to applicants to determine how best to respond to the two key sections of the Monitoring and Evaluation Brief described in Section 4.2.e, Monitoring and Evaluation, in the NOFO.

32. **Q**: **Does USDA have guidance documents on the Results Frameworks depicted in Annex E that detail the objectives of the different results?**

    A: No, USDA does not have guidance documents on the Results Framework in Annex E.

33. **Q**: **Given the complexity of the required Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework—including the development of indicators, data collection methodologies, and alignment with the Results Framework—would USDA consider allowing an increase in the M&E brief page limit to up to five (5) pages? This additional space would support applicants in providing sufficiently detailed and responsive descriptions to meet the NOFO's technical expectations.**

    A: No, the page limit cannot be increased.

34. **Q**: **Section 4 (Application Contents and Format) instructs applicants to "reduce file size to the greatest extent that is reasonable." To ensure compliant submissions, could USDA please clarify whether there is a maximum allowable file size for individual attachments and/or for the complete application package? If specific limits exist, kindly provide guidance for each required component.**

A: The maximum size for an individual file is 2 MB. We are not aware of any specific limits regarding the complete application package.

35. **Q**: **Page 21 states that "The budget must be submitted in U.S. dollars (USD) and present figures using two decimal places in all documents." The example budget narrative in the solicitation rounds figures to the nearest dollar. Does the requirement to use two decimal places apply to the budget narrative or just the budget documents.**

    A: Applicants should present figures using two decimal places in all budget documents. Values should be consistent across the application package.

36. **Q**: **Page 15 states that "Applicants must also provide a rationale for the involvement of each subrecipient, including experience and expertise, in the proposed project. If the allocation to a subrecipient is 20% or more of the proposed operating budget, Applicants should provide details in the budget narrative." Please confirm that USDA requires budget narratives thoroughly describe major subrecipients' budgeted costs and activities, not that subrecipients must provide standalone narratives.**

    A: USDA does not require subrecipients receiving 20 percent or more of the proposed operating budget to submit standalone budget narratives. Instead, applicants must provide a clear justification within their own budget narrative.

37. **Q**: **Solicitation Reference: 1.9, Page Number: 6, Relevant Solicitation Language: "Application Submission Deadline: July 6, 2026 at 5:00 P.M. EDT." In responding to this NOFO, we seek to "closely consult with existing service providers, as well as national authorities" (NOFO page 12). To allow applicants sufficient time to engage stakeholders and develop thoughtful proposals that meaningfully respond to NOFO and country guidance priorities, would USDA kindly extend the closing date for receipt of proposals to July 20, 2026?**

    A: The deadline per the NOFO Section 1.9, Key Dates, is firm.

38. **Q**: **Solicitation Reference: 4.1.a, Page Number: 11, Relevant Solicitation Language: "Cite source information (with at least author and year) and/or provide an explanation of the analysis." Could USDA please clarify if weblink citations are acceptable for source information?**

    A: Yes, weblinks are acceptable forms of source information.

39. **Q**: **On page 49, USDA writes, “To promote sustainable technology adoption, Applicants can include a grants program to provide for postharvest equipment, processing upgrades, digital tools, or nursery improvements and should require a minimum 50 percent cost share from beneficiaries to encourage ownership. Improved technologies.” Can USDA please clarify if this means grant applicants must provide 50% of the total funding they’re applying for as cost share?**

    A: Yes, if applicants include a grants program as an intervention to provide for postharvest equipment, processing upgrades, digital tools, or nursery improvements, grant applicants should include a 50% cost share. If a different approach is proposed, the proposal should clearly explain why it would provide a more sustainable or longer-lasting outcome.

40. **Q**: **We seek clarification on one of the examples of potential USDA substantial involvement at Part 3.2 of the subject NOFO. At bullet 3 of Part 3.2 USDA indicates “review of proposed procurement in accordance with 2 CFR 200.325 and 2 CFR 200.318” as potential substantial involvement. 2 CFR 200.318 describes Recipient and Subrecipient responsibilities for procurement documentation and contract oversight and does not include agency review or approval of Recipient procurements; was 2 CFR 200.308(f)(6) meant instead of .318, as relates to USDA approval of subawards?**

    A: 2 CFR 200.318 was cited to reference the general standards that USDA may utilize when reviewing procurements in accordance with 2 CFR 200.325.

41. **Q**: **On page 10, the NOFO states that “A 10-point font is permissible for tables, textboxes, and graphs.” Will USDA allow a 10-point font for footnotes as well?**

    A: Yes, 10-point font size is permissible for footnotes.

42. **Q**: **In the Q&A released on June 5, USDA confirmed that no narrative Theory of Change was required in the M&E section. Does USDA expect the applicants to include a narrative Theory of Change in any other section of the proposal?**

    A: No, a narrative theory of change should not be provided as part of the proposal.

43. **Q**: **On page 16, under 4.2, e.1, the NOFO states, “The RF should be a graphical representation of the project’s theory of change.” Can USDA clarify if it considers the Results Framework graphic itself the graphical representation of the Theory of Change? Or is a separate graphic of the Theory of Change expected in addition to the two Result Framework graphics?**

A: Yes, the Results Framework graphic itself is a graphical representation of the project's theory of change. No separate or additional graphic is expected. Applicants should create a project-level graphic results framework (RF) that clearly identifies how the proposed project will contribute to the FFPr Program-level RF, as described in Section 4.2.e.1, Results Framework, in the NOFO.

44. **Q**: **Are applicants for Ecuador Trade Facilitation and Sanitary and Phytosanitary Modernization required to include both Food for Progress Strategic Objectives 1 and 2 in the results framework? Or can a proposal for Ecuador be successful using just SO2?**

    A: A strong proposal will generally include both Strategic Objectives (SO) 1 and 2, though an SO2-focused design may be competitive if it aligns with the country guidance.

45. **Q**: **Bolivia: USDA indicates target areas must be higher than the lowlands and below 4,000 meters in elevation. Can USDA provide additional guidance on what constitutes lowlands?**

    A: The lowlands are usually classified as land lying at relatively low altitudes usually below 1,000 meters and not considered the Altiplano or inter-Andean valley regions in Bolivia.

46. **Q**: **Is there a bidders list with contact information that we can get a copy of?**

    A: USDA does not have a list of bidders or their contact information for distribution.