



FOUNDATION FOR  
FOOD & AGRICULTURE  
RESEARCH®

# Contracted Work: FFAR Program Evaluations – 2026

*Request For Proposal*

# Table of Contents

Contracted Work: FFAR Program Evaluations – 2026 .....	1
Request For Proposals .....	1
Table of Contents .....	1
About FFAR .....	2
Purpose of this Solicitation .....	3
Available Evaluation Opportunities.....	3
Instructions for Single vs. Multi-Evaluation Proposals.....	3
Scope of Evaluation .....	4
Evaluation 1: Veterinary Student Research Fellowship.....	6
Evaluation 2: New Innovator in Food & Agriculture Research Award .	9
Evaluation 3: Open Market Consortium .....	13
Data Availability & Collection .....	16
FFAR Will Provide.....	16
Evaluator Data Collection Expectations .....	16
Estimated Evaluation Timelines.....	16
Proposal Guidelines .....	17
Proposal Process Timeline.....	18
Proposals Should Contain the Following Sections .....	18
Finalist Presentation Preparation.....	18
Submission Notes.....	19

## About FFAR

The Foundation for Food & Agriculture Research (FFAR)'s mission is to build collaborative partnerships to support audacious science addressing today's food and agriculture challenges. To do so, FFAR has built a research investment model to fill critical knowledge gaps, develop solutions with momentous impact and prepare the scientific workforce to tackle impending challenges head on. FFAR's work requires significant collaboration across the food and agriculture system to foster multidisciplinary expertise, input from stakeholders and support from a range of funding partners. FFAR's convening capabilities and agile approach leverage public funds by building public-private partnerships — resulting in an average of \$1.40 in match to every \$1 of FFAR funding invested in research.

## Purpose of this Solicitation

FFAR is releasing this umbrella Request for Proposals (RFP) to evaluate multiple research programs that have reached maturity and are ready for summative evaluation. Each evaluation may be contracted separately, but they are being solicited jointly to streamline the review and selection process and to allow contractors to respond to one or more evaluation opportunities within a single submission.

Each program evaluation has a distinct scope, timeline and budget, but will follow a consistent evaluation framework and deliverable expectations.

## Available Evaluation Opportunities

1. [Veterinary Student Research Fellowship Evaluation](#) – Budget: \$90,000 max
2. [New Innovator in Food & Agriculture Research Award Evaluation](#) – Budget: \$225,000 max
3. [Open Market Consortium Evaluation](#) – Budget: \$125,000 max

Contractors may submit a proposal for **one, multiple or all** evaluations listed. FFAR encourages teams to apply for more than one evaluation **if capacity, expertise and staffing allow**. FFAR looks for competitively priced, quality proposals.

# Instructions for Single vs. Multi-Evaluation Proposals

## **If Submitting for One Evaluation:**

- Submit a standalone proposal that addresses the program-specific scope, timeline and budget.
- The proposal should demonstrate deep understanding of the specific program area, relevant evaluation expertise and the ability to deliver a comprehensive, evidence-based assessment.

## **If Submitting for Multiple Evaluations:**

- Submit a single, integrated proposal package that clearly identifies which evaluations are included.
- Include separate workplans, timelines and budget narratives for each evaluation.
- Describe how the proposed team structure and capacity will support delivery across multiple projects (e.g., shared evaluation frameworks, dedicated subteams or phased scheduling).
- Identify efficiencies that may result from cross-program analysis or shared methodological tools, where appropriate.
- Clearly articulate any cost efficiencies or added value from conducting more than one evaluation.

FFAR reserves the right to award contracts to one or multiple firms, based on expertise, capacity and best value to the foundation.

## Scope of Evaluation

FFAR seeks to evaluate the success of three distinct programs, each representing a key investment portfolio aligned to FFAR's mission and strategic outcomes.

While each evaluation may result in its own contract and will have distinct workplans, timelines and deliverables, all evaluations will utilize methodological approaches that are appropriate to the type of assessment being conducted.

Depending on the program, evaluations may be:

- formative (i.e., process & implementation assessment): Assessing program management, design, governance and execution efficiency;
- summative (i.e., outputs, outcomes and, where available, impacts assessment): Assessing results achieved, adoption or use of research outputs, policy or practice influence, and contributions to U.S. and global food and agriculture systems; or
- a combination of both.

Methods should be tailored accordingly — ensuring alignment with the specific purpose, evaluation questions, and evidence needs of each program — while maintaining FFAR’s expectations for rigor, transparency and mixed-methods integration where relevant.

The selected evaluator(s), in collaboration with FFAR, will define criteria and standards of success (i.e., metrics) for each program. Evaluations are expected to use mixed-methods approaches — including qualitative analyses (e.g., interviews, surveys, focus groups) and quantitative analyses (e.g., cost-effectiveness modeling, data synthesis or counterfactual comparisons) — to assess program performance and real-world influence.

Program evaluations (e.g., evaluations encompassing more than one awarded project) must include a comprehensive spreadsheet comparing projects across all measures and evidence-based recommendations. Single project evaluations, like the Open Market Consortium, must include a comprehensive spreadsheet tracking all evaluation measures.

FFAR intends each evaluation to include one or more exemplar case studies that illustrate meaningful contributions, pathways to impact, or realized and prospective economic outcomes resulting from funded research or funded intervention.

Exemplar case studies are in-depth analyses that use a mixed methods approach, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative evidence. Depending on the program, exemplar cases may include:

- economic impact modeling;
- cost-effectiveness analyses;
- use of counterfactuals or comparison conditions;
- assessment of innovation adoption or value chain influence;
- assessment of research skill development and professional growth;
- illustrative workforce pathway analyses;

- integration of stakeholder perspectives or practice-based evidence.

The number of exemplar case studies to be produced for each evaluation will be finalized during the early stages of the project (e.g., during data collection) through collaboration between the evaluator and FFAR.

FFAR anticipates up to four exemplars per evaluation (not including the Open Market Consortium evaluation), but the exact number will depend on data availability and project maturity. Applicants should not propose a range (e.g., “3–5 exemplars”). Instead, proposals must:

- provide a fixed cost for one exemplar; and
- include options for up to four exemplars

The maximum cost should include the calculated fixed costs for the four potential exemplars.

## Evaluation 1: Veterinary Student Research Fellowship

The FFAR Veterinary Student Research Fellowship (Vet Fellows) was established in partnership with the American Association of Veterinary Medical Colleges (AAVMC) in 2018 to strengthen the pipeline of veterinary researchers prepared to address complex food security and public health challenges. It provides a yearlong fellowship that places veterinary students in hands-on research opportunities with qualified mentors at AAVMC member institutions, culminating in a presentation at the annual Veterinary Scholars Symposium. Since inception, the program has supported 92 veterinary students, representing a total FFAR investment of \$672,634.

### Program Aims

1. Strengthen the veterinary research workforce pipeline by providing veterinary students with early, mentored research experiences that prepare them for research and public service careers in food and agriculture.
2. Expand veterinary student exposure to food and agriculture-relevant research through interdisciplinary approaches that extend beyond traditional biomedical science, including research related to food systems, animal production, public health and environmental considerations.
3. Foster professional development and scholarly engagement by enabling fellows to disseminate research findings and engage with peers and experts.

This evaluation will assess how effectively the Veterinary Student Research Fellowship advanced FFAR's mission through investments that strengthen the veterinary research workforce pipeline and prepare students for research and public service careers in food and agriculture.

This evaluation is a dual formative and summative assessment.

The evaluator will:

- Assess program design and implementation, including appropriateness of research areas, mentorship structure, fellow selection and placement, stipend adequacy and consistency of the fellowship experience across cohorts and institutions.
- Examine fellow skill development and career trajectories, including acquisition of research skills, exposure to food and agriculture research, and entry into research or research-adjacent career pathways.
- Capture short-term project-level outputs, including research activities, presentations, and other tangible products generated during the fellowship period.
- Conduct cross-cohort analysis to identify patterns, variation, and trends in fellow experiences, outputs and early outcomes over time.
- Develop a small number of illustrative case studies, and where feasible, assess the prospective economic or workforce value of the Vet Fellows program using qualitative and quantitative evidence.
- Provide evidence-based recommendations to strengthen program design, mentorship structure, participant selection and long-term workforce outcomes, informed by evaluation findings and cross-cohort analysis.

## Evaluation Questions

### *Process & Implementation Focused:*

- 1) To what extent is the design and implementation of the Vet Fellows program — including mentorship structure, fellow selection and placement and program administration — effective in delivering a high-quality, consistent fellowship experience across cohorts and institutions?
- 2) To what extent does the program provide fellows with meaningful, mentored research experiences that are appropriate for early-stage veterinary students and aligned with food and agriculture research priorities?

- 3) To what extent does program implementation support exposure to food and agriculture research beyond traditional biomedical topics, including interdisciplinary approaches and real-world research contexts?

*Outcome & Impact Focused:*

- 1) To what extent has participation in the Vet Fellows program contributed to fellows' development of research skills and preparedness for research or public service careers in food and agriculture?
- 2) To what extent have fellows' short-term research projects generated tangible outputs, such as research activities, presentations or other scholarly products, during the fellowship period?
- 3) To what extent has the program influenced fellows' career intentions or early career trajectories, including continued engagement in research, advanced training, or food and agriculture-related career pathways?
- 4) To what extent do illustrative case studies demonstrate meaningful value of the Vet Fellows program, including contributions to the veterinary research workforce pipeline and, where feasible, the prospective economic or workforce value of the program?

Expertise desired:

A successful team will include individuals with evaluative methods expertise, particularly experience evaluating workforce development, education or research training programs, as well as individuals with sufficient technical breadth in veterinary science, animal health, food systems, public health or related agricultural disciplines to assess the quality, relevance and impact of mentored research experiences. Teams should also demonstrate experience assessing career trajectory outcomes, research skill development and interdisciplinary exposure in early-career or student populations.

Estimated budget:

\$90,000 max

Estimated performance period:

~7 months (Q2 2026 to Q4 2026)

Expected Products & Deliverables:

1. Standalone external-facing executive summary of findings (2-5 pages)
2. Cross-project master spreadsheet with all compiled data
  - Built for easy data analysis via Pivot-tables

3. Slide deck presentation of preliminary findings for both formative and summative evaluations
4. Process and Implementation Final Report (10 page maximum) describing:
  - Methodology (as appendix item),
  - Strengths and weaknesses of the current structure, governance and management
  - Assessment-related, evidence-based recommendations for modifications
5. Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts Final report (30 page maximum) describing:
  - Evaluation background,
  - Methodology (as appendix item),
  - Findings including data visualization, interpretations of findings,
    - i. final report findings and recommendations should be evidence-based with references to supporting evaluation data (e.g., survey findings, cross-project comparison table).
  - Conclusions.
6. Exemplar cases (15 page maximum each)
  - An agreed-upon number of in-depth exemplar case studies that illustrate meaningful outcomes by highlighting clear, evidence-based pathways from fellowship participation to research skill development, professional growth and early career trajectory in food and agriculture-related fields. Case studies should integrate qualitative and quantitative evidence and may include workforce pathway analysis, assessment of mentorship influence, comparison conditions or counterfactual considerations, and —where feasible — prospective workforce value or cost-effectiveness analysis.
7. Slide deck presentation of final report(s)

## Evaluation 2: New Innovator in Food & Agriculture Research Award

The New Innovator in Food & Agriculture Research Award (NIA) program is FFAR’s flagship early-career investigator investment, designed to support exceptionally creative and innovative new research faculty conducting research that advances U.S. food and agriculture systems. Since inception, the NIA program has supported 83 funded awards, representing a total program investment of \$40,961,560, including \$30,516,695 in FFAR funding. As of the time of this evaluation, approximately 43 projects have submitted final reports, with additional projects still in progress.

### Program Aims

- 1) Promote the career advancement of exceptionally talented and creative early-career faculty who intend to make a long-term commitment to research in food and agriculture.
- 2) Provide stability in funding during faculty researcher's critical early career years and reducing time spent on writing applications.
- 3) Support highly creative and innovative research that expands the availability of food and brings ground-breaking research initiatives and thinking to bear on problems facing food and agriculture.
- 4) Encourage cross-disciplinary research teams, especially those that include disciplines not traditionally associated with food or agriculture science, to explore innovative solutions.
- 5) Encourage investigators to seek unique perspectives through participatory stakeholder engagement.
- 6) Require applicants to outline how their proposed research program supports at least one of FFAR's Priority Areas.
- 7) Support investigators who demonstrate an inclination to question paradigms and work with intellectual uncertainties.

This evaluation will assess how effectively the NIA program advanced FFAR's mission through investments that enabled early-career scientists to conduct innovative research that addresses problems facing food and agriculture and propelled them into successful research careers.

This evaluation is a dual formative and summative assessment.

The evaluator will:

- Analyze research outputs and outcomes across the NIA program.
- Assess how the structure of NIA (e.g., funding mechanisms, match requirements, partner diversity) and its implementation (e.g., application timeline and reporting requirements) influenced research and program performance.
- Evaluate the novelty and innovativeness of funded research.
- Evaluate scalability, adoption and applicability of funded innovations.
- Examine whether NIA outputs have contributed to measurable systems, policy or market changes.
- Produce exemplar case studies highlighting significant outcomes with economic impact modeling.

- Provide evidence-based recommendations to strengthen the design, implementation and strategic positioning of the NIA program, informed by evaluation findings on innovation, research performance, scalability and downstream impact.

#### Evaluation Questions to be Answered

##### *Process & Implementation Focused:*

- 1) To what extent is the design of NIA (e.g., award size, duration, flexibility of research aims, optional matching funds) appropriate for supporting the career advancement of early-career faculty in food and agriculture research?
- 2) To what extent do the nomination and selection processes effectively identify exceptionally talented and creative early-career investigators with the potential for long-term research careers in food and agriculture?
- 3) To what extent did NIA enable investigators to change research direction, take intellectual risks, or pursue uncertain lines of inquiry, without informal or structural constraints limiting that flexibility in practice?
- 4) To what extent has the program provided stability in funding during awardees' critical early-career years, including reducing time spent on writing grant applications and enabling focus on research?

##### *Outcome & Impact Focused:*

- 1) To what extent has participation in NIA contributed to the career advancement of awardees, including establishment of independent research programs, follow-on funding and sustained commitment to food and agriculture research?
- 2) To what extent have NIA-funded projects contributed to the development of new partnerships and cross-disciplinary collaborations, including engagement with disciplines and stakeholders not traditionally associated with food or agriculture science?
- 3) To what extent did NIA support the advancement of innovative and creative research agendas, including novel, high-risk or non-traditional research directions that may not have been feasible without this award?
- 4) To what extent have NIA-funded projects generated research outputs relevant to FFAR Priority Areas and U.S. food and agriculture challenges?

##### Expertise desired:

A successful team will include individuals with evaluative methods expertise, particularly experience evaluating research investment portfolios and early-stage or

investigator-driven programs. Teams should also include individuals with sufficient technical breadth in food and agriculture research to assess innovation across diverse scientific domains and technical depth in scientific workforce development; including capacity building.

Relevant technical breadth may include familiarity with agricultural production systems, agroecosystems and environmental sciences, plant or animal biology, food systems and supply chains, biotechnology or data-enabled agriculture or other scientific domains aligned with FFAR [Priority Areas](#). Teams are not expected to demonstrate deep subject-matter expertise in every funded area but should show the ability to credibly interpret diverse research outputs across a heterogeneous portfolio.

Estimated budget:

\$225,000 max

Estimated performance period:

~11 months (Q2 2026 to Q1 2027)

Expected Products & Deliverables:

2. Standalone external-facing executive summary of findings (2-5 pages)
3. Cross-project master spreadsheet with all compiled data
  - Built for easy data analysis via Pivot-tables
4. Slide deck presentation of preliminary findings for both formative and summative evaluations
5. Process and Implementation Final Report (10 page maximum) describing:
  - Methodology (as appendix item),
  - Strengths and weaknesses of the current structure, governance and management
  - Assessment-related, evidence-based recommendations for modifications
6. Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts Final report (30 page maximum) describing:
  - Evaluation background,
  - Methodology (as appendix item),
  - Findings including data visualization, interpretations of findings,
    - i. final report findings and recommendations should be evidence-based with references to supporting evaluation data (e.g., survey findings, cross-project comparison table).
  - Conclusions.

7. Exemplar cases (15 page maximum each)
  - An agreed-upon number of in-depth exemplar case studies that illustrate meaningful outcomes by highlighting clear, evidence-based pathways from project outputs to the monetized value of outcomes and impacts, featuring economic impact modeling, including quantitative cost-effectiveness analysis and the use of counterfactuals.
8. Slide deck presentation of final report(s)

### Evaluation 3: Open Market Consortium

The Open Market Consortium (OMC): Creating Economic Opportunities for Small and Mid-Size Growers is a FFAR-funded, AgLaunch-led research and pilot initiative designed to address structural barriers that limit market access, transparency and economic opportunity for small and mid-size specialty crop producers. The project was implemented over a four-year period (January 2021–December 2024) with a total investment of \$4,563,634, including \$2,257,034 in FFAR funding, and matching support from a consortium of partners including Mississippi State University, Tennessee State University, The Seam, the Wallace Center at Winrock International, the Tennessee Department of Agriculture and other public and private collaborators. Through this investment, FFAR supported the development and pilot testing of an open-source, blockchain-enabled marketplace framework intended to improve traceability, reduce transaction costs and enable valuation of differentiated specialty crop attributes in regional and institutional food markets.

#### Program Aims:

1. Reduce market access barriers for small and mid-size specialty crop producers by lowering transaction costs and improving the efficiency of contracting with institutional and regional buyers.
2. Improve traceability, transparency and trust in specialty crop value chains through the development and testing of open, standardized and verifiable data systems.
3. Develop and pilot an open-source, blockchain-enabled marketplace framework that enables decentralized governance and avoids reliance on proprietary supply-chain technologies.
4. Enable valuation and monetization of differentiated specialty crop attributes, including quality, nutrient density, production practices and environmental characteristics not well served by commodity markets.

5. Generate empirical evidence on producer and buyer willingness to participate in an open digital marketplace, including behavioral, economic and informational factors influencing adoption.

This evaluation will focus on assessing the outcomes and impacts of the Open Market Consortium, which supported research aimed at developing and piloting an open-source, blockchain-enabled marketplace framework to improve traceability, reduce transaction costs and expand economic opportunities for small and mid-size specialty crop producers.

The evaluator will:

- Synthesize evidence across the research and pilot phases to assess what was developed, tested and demonstrated through the Open Market Consortium, including progress toward an open-source, blockchain-enabled marketplace framework.
- Assess how cross-sector stakeholder engagement (e.g., producers, buyers, technology partners, academic and nonprofit collaborators) led to sustained partnerships and influenced project design, implementation and early outcomes.
- Examine producer and buyer perspectives, including specialty crop producers' insights on value, feasibility, risks and conditions for success in participating in an open digital marketplace.
- Assess early evidence related to market access, traceability, transparency and transaction efficiency, recognizing the project's pilot nature and the exploratory status of outcomes.
- Synthesize lessons learned and implications for future FFAR investments in open, non-proprietary market infrastructure and approaches to supporting small and mid-size specialty crop producers.

### Evaluation Questions

#### *Outcome & Impact Focused:*

- 1) To what extent did the Consortium develop and pilot an open-source, blockchain-enabled marketplace framework?
- 2) To what extent did the Consortium enable the valuation and monetization of differentiated specialty crop attributes?
- 3) To what extent did the Consortium generate empirical evidence on producer and buyer willingness to participate in an open digital marketplace?
- 4) To what extent did the Consortium improve traceability, transparency and trust in specialty crop value chains, where appropriate?

- 5) To what extent did the Consortium reduce market access barriers for small and mid-size specialty crop producers?
- 6) Where evidence allows, to what extent does the project suggest prospective economic or system-level value relative to existing proprietary or fragmented market approaches?

Expertise desired:

A successful team will include individuals with evaluative methods expertise, particularly experience evaluating research, pilot or demonstration investments, as well as individuals with sufficient technical and analytical breadth in agricultural institutional procurement from regional food systems, market or economic analysis, and data-enabled or platform-based innovations to assess feasibility, value and early outcomes across a multi-partner consortium.

Estimated budget:

\$125,000 max

Estimated performance period:

~11 months (Q3 2026 to Q2 2027)

Expected Products & Deliverables:

1. Standalone external-facing executive summary of findings (2-5 pages)
2. Cross-project master spreadsheet with all compiled data
  - Built for easy data analysis via Pivot-tables
3. Slide deck presentation of preliminary findings for the summative evaluation
4. Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts Final report (30 page maximum) describing:
  - Evaluation background,
  - Methodology (as appendix item),
  - Findings including data visualization, interpretations of findings,
    - i. Final report findings and recommendations should be evidence-based with references to supporting evaluation data (e.g., survey findings, cross-project comparison table).
  - Conclusions.
5. Exemplar cases (15 page maximum each)
  - An agreed-upon number of in-depth exemplar case studies that illustrate meaningful outcomes by highlighting clear, evidence-based pathways from project outputs to the monetized value of outcomes and impacts, featuring

economic impact modeling, including quantitative cost-effectiveness analysis and the use of counterfactuals.

6. Slide deck presentation of final report(s)

## Data Availability & Collection

### *FFAR Will Provide*

- Contact information for applicants, awardees, consortium participants (i.e. members) and matching funders, where applicable.
- Contact information for relevant FFAR staff
- High-level budget information for research projects
- Annual and final reports submitted by grantees
- Project proposals for all grants (e.g., completed, still in progress and non-awarded applicants, where applicable)

### *Evaluator Data Collection Expectations*

- Desk review of all FFAR project-related documents
- Survey and/or interviews of applicants, where appropriate, awarded project PIs/Co-PIs, consortium participants, match partners, value chain next- and end-users and other experts in the field of study
  - For programs in FFAR's Scientific Workforce Priority Area, survey and/or interviews with current and past Fellows, their mentors/advisors and leadership of partnered organizations.
- Other data mining as deemed necessary (e.g., USDA NASS, literature synthesis, etc.)

## Estimated Evaluation Timelines

FFAR anticipates staggered start and completion dates across the four evaluations to allow for adequate scoping, data collection and synthesis while balancing internal review capacity.

Each evaluation will run up to 7–12 months from contract execution to the delivery of final reports.

Specific start and end dates will be finalized in consultation with selected evaluators.

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Anticipated Contract Execution</b>	<b>Preliminary Findings Due</b>	<b>Final Deliverables Due</b>
Veterinary Fellows	Q2—2026	October 2026	December 2026
New Innovators	Q2—2026	December 2026	March 2027
Open Market Consortium	Q3—2026	February 2027	May 2027

Each evaluation will follow a similar sequence of milestones. These timelines may be adjusted for particularly straightforward or complex evaluations:

- Kickoff meeting and definition of criteria/standards of success: within 4 weeks of contract execution
- Desk review, data collection, and analysis: months 2–8
- Presentation of preliminary findings: approximately month 9 or 10
- Submission of draft final report: month 11
- Submission of final report and all deliverables: month 12

Applicants proposing to conduct multiple evaluations should clearly describe:

- How projects will be sequenced or overlapped within their proposed schedule;
- How team structure and resourcing ensure quality and timely delivery across evaluations; and
- Any cost efficiencies or methodological synergies achieved through shared frameworks, tools, or analytic approaches.

## Proposal Guidelines

All proposals are to be submitted by Wednesday April, 8 2026 at 8pm Eastern deadline. Proposals should be submitted as a Portable Document Format (PDF) via email to [cgambino@foundationfar.org](mailto:cgambino@foundationfar.org) with the subject line “FFAR 2026 Evaluations\_[Program Name]\_[Evaluator Name]”. If multiple programs, insert “multiple” in place of program name.

### *Proposal Process Timeline*

- Submission deadline: Wednesday April, 8 2026 at 8pm Eastern
- Finalist presentations and panel discussions: April 27, 2026 to May 6, 2026

- Client reference checks: April 27, 2026 to May 6, 2026

### *Proposals Should Contain the Following Sections*

1. Applicant background/overview (1 page maximum), including an indication of relevant expertise
2. Previous experience(s) of research program evaluation work with a similar or related scope (2 pages maximum)
3. Description approach and evaluation plan (5 pages maximum)
  - Including relevant, illustrative measures you plan collect that assess the proposed evaluation questions. Make it clear which potential measures apply to which evaluation if submitting a multi-evaluation proposal.
4. Project budget and budget justification (this evaluation does not require matching funds)
  - Make it clear how costs are being used across evaluations if submitting a multi-evaluation proposal. Additionally, clearly identify any shared costs or efficiencies if submitting a multi-evaluation proposal.
  - Within each program proposal, the evaluator must provide:
    - A core evaluation budget (no exemplars included), and
    - A single unit cost to develop one exemplar case study, using methods appropriate to the evaluation type.
      - During early data collection, FFAR and the evaluator will jointly determine how many exemplars (up to four) are feasible.
    - The core budget + four exemplars should not exceed the maximum cost listed for each program.
5. Evaluation timeline
6. Project key personnel including roles and responsibilities
7. Team members' CVs
8. Links to deliverables from past evaluation projects of a similar scope
9. Client references

### *Finalist Presentation Preparation*

FFAR will hold a 60-minute meeting (20-minutes presentation and 40-minute panel interview) with finalists via video conference. The presentation should highlight the applicant's approach, including the criteria and standards they envision being used to measure the success of projects and programs as a whole. Additionally, the presentation



should include a brief explanation of methods, followed by a showcase of how collected data may be visualized.

The panel discussion may be used to clarify the methods used for collection and analysis of data. Additionally, the panel may inquire about past projects and previous client relations to ensure the applicant and FFAR are a good fit.

## Submission Notes

- Contractors may bid on any combination of the evaluations listed.
- Proposals must clearly indicate which evaluation(s) are included.
- FFAR reserves the right to award contracts separately or jointly.
- FFAR may select one contractor to complete all evaluations if capacity, expertise and value are demonstrated.