

To: Feed the Future Partnering for Innovation Files
From: Person
CC: Person, USAID/BFS
Re: TRAINING SIMULATION - PI-RFA-02 TEC Memo
Date:

A Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) comprised of XXX convened in place on date to review applications received for consideration.

APPLICATIONS DISCUSSED on DATE

PI-RFA-02 COMPANY X

Proposal review:

- Technology:
- ZOI:
- **COMPANY X** is a for-profit company
- Number of smallholder farmers: estimating XXX farmers

Technology Innovation: VG

The Committee determined a rating of Very Good for Technology Innovation, agreeing that the XXX technology is an improvement over current practices. First trialed in 2011, this technology has already been sold on the market. Although there are other competitors in the market, this technology is specifically focused on dairy and addresses a gap in farmer extension. Additional noteworthy strengths in this category included the services the technology covered, and **COMPANY X** ability to work with smallholder farmers as their market demand led them to add three new services to the technology not previously provided. The Committee liked the emphasis on extension and technical assistance, as well as the commitment to farmer data.

For due diligence, the Committee recommends verifying XXX technology data, specifically with regards to the claim that **COMPANY X** has a growing subscription base. According to the proposal, the technology has XXX subscribers, but a database of XXX farmers. Clarification on the difference and function of subscribers vs. database is necessary in order to quantify this data. Further, the Committee would like access to the impact study referenced to better understand the number of farmers **COMPANY X** interviewed while collecting the data.

Market Potential: S

The Committee determined a rating of Satisfactory due to the lack of clarity on XXX technology's market segment and the target number of clients included in the proposal. According to the proposal, XXX technology's USSD platform costs \$xx per SMS; \$xx per week for three Farmer Tips (\$0.03/message). Information on the costs of the veterinary service was not included. **COMPANY X** sited the total country population as the potential market, but the Committee agreed that for the purposes of this project, **COMPANY X** would need to provide a more feasible target to reach during the designated funding period.

The Committee questioned if partnering with one cell phone provider would limit **COMPANY X** reach of the Kenya population. Based on research conducted prior to the TEC, **COMPANY X** cell phone partner, Safaricom, provides services and M-PESA to 64% of the market in Kenya. In terms of their target hold, this could be great for XXX technology's advertisements.

Smallholder Impact: M

With limited quantifiable information, specifically on how **COMPANY X** calculated the smallholder impact numbers included in the proposal, the Committee determined a rating of Marginal for Smallholder Impact. The Committee unanimously agreed that **COMPANY X** provided a weak response to the Smallholder Impact questions. The weak responses led to doubt that sending text messages could accurately be determined as the impetus for farmer change and improved cow health. With this in mind, the Committee found it questionable if this could be effective extension, and felt that **COMPANY X** would have to provide more extension services, including in-person follow up and personal attention, to ensure the highest service quality.

Organizational Capacity/Partnership: M

Based on the Committee's familiarity with cell phone carriers in Kenya, they agreed that Safaricom is the right partner for **COMPANY X** to have as a service provider. **PARTNER X** was a known database service, but the Committee agreed that it was unclear what role **PARTNER X** would play – if they are sourcing the technology platform or they are involved in technical assistance.

While the Committee agreed they have hope in **COMPANY X** as a company, there was significant concern with the clarity and quality of the technical content included in the technology. In conclusion, the Committee agreed the highest rating for this category was Marginal.

Sustainability: M

Given the organizational design detailed in the proposal, the Committee doubted the commercial competence of **COMPANY X**. Without a detailed plan and support from a commercial partners, it will be impossible for **COMPANY X** to effectively scale to three other countries. Due to this lack of commercial partners, the Committee agreed that it is unclear how **XXX technology** will be profitable. If the company plans to use advertisements to make money or generate revenue through SMS messaging, the Committee agreed that **COMPANY X** will need to provide revenue number projections as well as details on who will receive the money from the advertisements. Without this information, there is significant doubt in the sustainability of **COMPANY X** and **XXX technology's** in the Kenya market.