



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

INSIGHTS FROM THE SMALL GRANTS PROGRAM: PHASE II

THE JOHN OGONOWSKI AND DOUG BEREUTER FARMER-
TO-FARMER PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

NOVEMBER 7, 2013

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Weidemann Associates, Inc., A Crown Agents USA Company and David Joslyn.

INSIGHTS FROM THE SMALL GRANTS PROGRAM: PHASE II

The John Ogonowski and Doug Bereuter Farmer-to-Farmer
Program Assessment

AEG-I-00-04-00010-00

Farmer-to-Farmer Special Program Support Project
Weidemann Associates, Inc., A Crown Agents USA Company
and David Joslyn

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

Background	1
Purpose	1
Methodology	1
Findings	2
Recommendations	10
Case Studies	12

TABLES

Table 1: Data for Niche Grant	22
-------------------------------	----

Background

During the present 5-year Farmer-to-Farmer (F2F) cycle, 23 small grants (SG) and three Program Development Projects (PDP) were awarded to test innovative approaches to use U.S. based volunteers overseas in the food and agriculture sector, to draw from non-traditional sources of U.S. volunteers and to allow new U.S. based organizations with minimal experience with F2F Programs to participate in F2F programs. While the SGs were for a 1-year period, the PDPs were contracts with potential F2F implementing partners to implement limited scope multi-year F2F volunteer activities that would serve to strengthen and prepare those institutions to compete for a future core implementer award.

The experience and knowledge generated from the SG and PDP projects is expected to benefit the overall F2F programs by expanding the field of potential implementers, pointing the way towards innovative approaches, and identifying implementation policies and practices that could improve program performance.

Purpose

The purpose of this assessment is to provide guidance for the crafting of future support services solicitations by identifying SG best practices and possible modifications in technical implementation and organizational structure of the SG program in general. It is also to suggest approaches and implementation policies and practices to improve performance of the overall F2F program.

This report builds upon earlier assessments and reviews of the implementation of the SGs, and identifies opportunities to make the program more efficient and effective. This information will help shape future F2F programs. The 2007 and 2012 F2F Program Evaluations for the most part assessed F2F core projects, while the one-year SGs and PDP awards received minimal evaluation. This assessment consolidates learning from SG projects and increases awareness within the F2F community of the contributions, costs and benefits of SGs.

Methodology

The research was conducted in two phases. Phase 1 was a desktop study of grantee reports, data submitted by grantees on target indicators, secondary data about grantee activities, and key informant telephone interviews with grantee personnel, related implementation partners, and other knowledgeable persons familiar with the project, including technical expertise from Wes Weidemann and Arvin Bunker. Phase 2 involved data gathering through field visits.

In phase I, we reviewed the salient features of the approaches and operations of the SG recipients, special features of their programs, and the results achieved. This review captured the information to compare and contrast results among the several SGs, as well as with the core F2F programs. We gathered data and information to determine if: 1) the work of SG recipients resulted in the lower, same or higher level of outputs as core F2F projects, 2) SG recipients have introduced new and more effective recruiting approaches that identified and fielded volunteers able to achieve superior results, and/or 3) operating costs were significantly reduced. Initially,

this assessment focused on three practices that were introduced into the F2F program through some of the SGs:

- Extended length of volunteer service in country
- Universities as implementers
- Fielding volunteers through associations and specialist networks

In phase II we gathered additional data and information in the field, as well as additional information from the grantees to further define information obtained in phase I. Field visits were made in Dominica, Mexico, and Peru. The choice of countries was based on the availability of host organization representatives, technical area the grantee was focused on, the type of organization, and length of volunteer time in country. To provide more detailed information we selected projects that were still ongoing or very recently completed. In the last year of the F2F program many core projects were already closed, making our choices for field visits limited.

The three practices we analyzed initially were important to the SG program because one objective of the program was to allow, in fact encourage, innovation in the program. In the second phase, we intended to analyze one additional practice, Impact Assessment, which we believed could be studied in several SGs. This turned out to be less productive than we thought initially, because there is far less impact assessment of F2F volunteer activity than we thought, but regardless, we do have several recommendations to make on this issue.

Findings

a. **Topic 1. Extended length of volunteer service**

Our conversations with F2F Grants Managers and field personnel support the general idea that for specific types of problems, volunteers achieve a greater impact if they provide sustained service over a period of time longer than the two week normal F2F assignment. Key informants in the field and at the implementing organization headquarters stated that requests are high for longer term volunteers, and many go unfilled, especially in the areas of small business development. Our field visits to Peru to observe SG activity of Thunderbird University and TechnoServe confirmed the effectiveness, validity, and lower cost of longer volunteer stays in-country in comparison to shorter-term, one-time visits for the type of program goals established (see Table 1). In these cases, small business development including training in business practices and assistance in setting up local chamber of commerce support institutions was possible through the continued presence of the volunteer for 6 to 9 months. Of course, the objectives of the program could have been written differently if only short-term volunteers were available, but to accomplish the type of local small business development these two grantees endorse, the longer term assignment clearly worked best. These two grantees validated this approach, but their experience also highlighted important limitations.

For the longer assignment volunteer to take full advantage of the longer stay in country, there are several factors that have to be addressed.

- i. Importance of volunteer assignments with active collaborating partners

Placing the longer term volunteer(s) in an active host agency that employs local staff and has a deep and comprehensive understanding of the issues at hand and the community they are working with leads to a stronger project as a whole and more productive volunteers. In the cases we observed, strong host agencies not only develop relevant and specific scopes of work for the volunteers, but they also provide information and support for the volunteers before they arrive (so they can prepare better for their assignment), while they are in country (to maintain consistency between volunteer activities with the host's objectives, and through continued communications after the volunteers have left. For long-term volunteers, this is especially important since they can rely on the local organization for initial orientation and guidance and technical input throughout their time in the field, so the need for support from the grantee home office and field staff is reduced, lowering total cost per day for the volunteer service. Of course, the level of involvement will vary from volunteer to volunteer and host to host.

For example, in TechnoServe's project in southern Peru (Ilo and Moquegua), the volunteer we observed was very self-sufficient, had weekly interaction with the implementing partner organization via email, but spent most of his time with the host businesses chosen to receive his advisory services. The volunteer was a mid-level professional with an MBA who had already worked abroad for a number of years and spoke Spanish. He was tasked with mentoring local businesses in a community that provides goods and services to a large nearby mining operation. The objective was to work with small businesses to build their capacity to provide goods and services to the mining operation as well as the local community as it grows. TechnoServe's Program Manager in Peru visited the towns the volunteer worked in about one time per month to make sure everything was going smoothly. The volunteer managed his time and decided on what tasks he would assist with based on the business owner's needs. This operating model seems to work well with long-term volunteers in small business development.

While the volunteer advised the local chamber of commerce regarding training and technical support the chamber could eventually provide small businesses, his daily activities with the small businesses chosen to receive assistance from the volunteer were established and arranged for the most part between the volunteer and the business managers themselves. The minimal role and low cost of the F2F funded Program Manager (who lived in the distant capital city of Lima and only worked part time on this F2F activity) on this specific project seemed to work well because: 1) it was a very rural area and the town was small; 2) the volunteer was very self-sufficient; and 3) it was a nine month assignment. For these reasons the Program Manager could provide the initial orientation and training, carry out supervisory visits related to key milestones, and maintain overall programmatic relations between TechnoServe and the local host agencies (two chambers of commerce).

A very different example demonstrating the importance of an active, relevant host agency is Thunderbird's small grant project in Lima, Peru. Thunderbird's project was similar to TechnoServe's because of the focus on small business development and the volunteer term of service of six months or more. However, Thunderbird sent volunteers to an already existing

project in a much larger city, supported by a local and international bank (IDB), and with services from Goldman Sachs. The volunteers were coordinated by the local project staff (non-F2F funded) and worked directly with a number of small businesses selected by the project staff. The longer term of service of the volunteers allowed for an overlap in country of each outgoing volunteer with incoming volunteers to the program, so they could pass along information, lessons learned, and different strategies to improve the businesses of the individual entrepreneurs with whom they were working. The volunteers could also rely on the host organization for technical guidance and support (for most of the project, although this waned at the end due to staffing changes in the Peruvian project staff.). The host organization, with support from Goldman Sachs, also had a strong monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system in place, which was convenient when the volunteers needed to collect data for the F2F M&E portion of the project. A strong and active host agency strengthened this project because: 1) the volunteers were either recent graduates or had little work experience requiring more guidance than a mid to senior level professional; 2) the host worked to identify project beneficiaries and provided in-country support, leaving the Thunderbird Program Manager in Arizona to focus on supporting the volunteers with more of the technical content and recruiting new volunteers for the program; 3) a M&E system was already in place and being used to make programmatic decisions like how much and what type of training should be given to new entrepreneurs; and 4) the project was more sustainable because volunteers were working closely with local staff.

ii. Limited sources of volunteers

Grantees like Thunderbird and TechnoServe, who are able to provide longer term volunteers especially in the business development sector, have a limited pool from which to recruit volunteers. However, Thunderbird University has a built-in component of the international MBA curriculum that involves overseas advising as a requisite for the degree. If the relationship with F2F were more stable, that is, based upon a longer grant period (several years rather than just one), both institutions (and probably others) would be able to create recruiting mechanisms and expand the program to double or triple the present size. Thunderbird could definitely field more volunteers for a 3-month period, since it fits with their academic program and could involve more mid-career professionals who attend Thunderbird for mid-career retooling and are required to do overseas mentoring as part of the requirements for their course. TechnoServe is linked with many private businesses and with a more secure grant or contractual arrangement with the F2F program probably could field more mid-level professionals as volunteers in the future.

iii. Opportunity for deeper impact, institutional development

The longer term assignments fielded by Thunderbird and Technoserve in Peru support the claim that if F2F volunteers are placed for longer periods of time(3 months at least) they can be assigned institution strengthening tasks that shorter term volunteers cannot. The work with small

businesses is important in itself, but the assistance these same volunteers are giving to establish and strengthen the Chambers of Commerce in Ilo and Moquegua is key to the sustainability of their efforts with the individual entrepreneurs. While the volunteers are advising the individual businesses on practices such as marketing, accounting, and sales management they are also encouraging them to join together in their Chambers of Commerce to capture economies of scale and ensure continuity of training services, to lobby for community and regional services that benefit all small businesses in the area, and to support other community development actions that benefit them all.

iv. Creation of deeper, longer lasting relationships

Relationships between volunteers and their host institutions and individual businesses (especially in the case of business development volunteers) are clearly enhanced by the longer term assignment. Volunteers not only become more invested in each of the businesses they advise over the period of the assignment, but also are more apt to become intimately attached personally to local individuals with whom they work and their families. As well, as seen with the TechnoServe volunteers in Lima, several volunteers have remained in Peru to work, or are establishing business ventures or marketing outlets in the US in association with the businesses they advised. This is all due to the longer assignment and the period of time it takes to establish personal relationships in foreign cultures.

However, we must recognize that for the same amount of US taxpayer investment, fielding volunteers for longer periods of time means that there will be fewer Americans involved in the program for the same total program cost. It is a tradeoff between more volunteers with much shorter periods of contact and hence shallower relationships and probably less technical impact, compared to fewer volunteers with deeper relationships and probably more impact on the hosts and their institutions and businesses. If the goal of the F2F program is to maximize the number of Americans providing technical advice overseas, then the longer period of the assignment works against that goal. For example, if Thunderbird had decided to send short-term volunteers instead of long-term volunteers in their SGs, they could have sent around 30 volunteers for a period of about 8 days each.

An alternative to the longer assignment, that attempts to accomplish the same advantages of longer assignments, is the programming of follow-up assignments of volunteers to the same institutions and hosts, over a long period of time. This model was used by the Purdue small grant in Costa Rica, where over a year three or four teams of two to three volunteers worked for an average of two weeks in the same cooperative association ensuring that the work of each team was expanded further by the follow-on volunteers. Iowa State University used a similar model, sending four pairs of two people to work with similar hosts for about two weeks, expanding the assistance during each visit. This model is recommended where only short term volunteers are available, and where the grantee can program and support a series of volunteers or volunteer groups to the same hosts over a long period of time.

b. Topic 2. Universities as implementers

Past reviews of the F2F program suggest that some universities have implemented F2F activities with excellent outcomes, while others with less impressive results. The program provided small grants to universities in the last cycle, and some have been innovative in their use of volunteers and their approaches to the program. Included in the research are four SG recipients: University of Arizona, Iowa State University, Purdue University, and Thunderbird School of Global Management (also included in the extended length of volunteer service section earlier in this report). We are aware that USAID and the US Congress support involvement of US agriculture universities and colleges, where and when appropriate, in programs like F2F. Through this analysis, we have identified several best approaches and effective means to involve these institutions in the program, and the major benefits of their involvement.

The Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco (UJAT) in Tabasco, Mexico, is an excellent example of an active grant program that was visited during Phase II. UJAT was aligned with the University of Arizona, which was working specifically on aquaculture. Volunteers were sent to Mexico for a period of 2-3 weeks at a time, and worked out of the research facility in Tabasco and the University's coastal facility 2 hours away from the main campus. The volunteers were given tours of the facility upon arrival and orientation of the campus, their scopes, and an overview of the agenda. Subsequently, UJAT faculty was there to help as needed but the volunteers were allowed to manage their own time. Feedback provided by the volunteers in the form of trip reports supported the process as a working model. Volunteers stayed in a hotel near the campus and were transported each day to the University campus. During the visits there was a very open and collaborative sharing of ideas and approaches.

- i. Universities can provide volunteers with good skills in extension/training

Generally these institutions recruit volunteers with experience in extension and often with vast experience in education and training techniques. These skills are especially valuable for the kind of short term technical assistance the F2F program provides. One good example is the Purdue University small grant program, through which they provided 18 volunteers over a two-year period to provide technical assistance to an organic coffee cooperative in Cost Rica. Based on hands-on training sessions and on-farm visits the volunteers (most of whom were from the Indiana extension service linked to Purdue University) developed very detailed lesson plans and follow-up activities for the host organization drawing heavily from their experience as educators and extension agents in the US. Purdue has access to a pool of close to 500 extension agents, educators, and trainers with proven experience, as do other land grant universities closely linked with USDA and State extension services, a resource the F2F program could tap to greater advantage.

The Iowa State University (ISU) small grants program presents a similar situation. Their grants were implemented by ISU Global Extension, ISU's Center for Sustainable Rural Livelihoods within their College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and The Volunteer Efforts for Development Concerns, a non-profit based in Uganda. Between these partners, they were able to provide skilled volunteers to improve production and marketing of maize and soybeans and improve business development skills among the women farmers in Kumali.

The volunteers provided by University of Arizona were mostly ex-students or colleagues of the grant manager at the University, and hence all have a high level of academic training including

techniques of providing technical information to field based hosts. This skill ensures a higher level of acceptance and adoption of the technical information being imparted by the volunteers, as well as a certain consistency of approach due to their training and involvement at the same program in Arizona.

The volunteers recruited by Thunderbird, as long as they have spent some time at Thunderbird in training, are all well prepared to provide business development guidance and business planning since it is an integral part of the educational program there. These volunteers hence bring a consistency of approach to the F2F program.

In the case of University of Arizona, the volunteers came mainly from the private sector. Their level of expertise was easy adaptable to the university framework set up by UJAT. The technical expertise provided by the volunteers was also transferable regardless of gender. Gender in volunteers in Mexico at UJAT through the University of Arizona was something that was not an issue during the period of performance of the grants.

In all of these cases, the ability, skills, and experience the volunteers bring with them to the overseas assignment in terms of communication and information exchange most surely increases their chances of making an impact on their hosts during and subsequent to their assignments.

- ii. Universities tend to provide sound technical support during and after assignments

In most of the cases of university implementation of SGs, the volunteers were provided with excellent technical information and ongoing technical support during the assignment. This is because the project managers are themselves in most cases technically qualified in the areas of the project, and take a personal interest in ensuring that the project is technically sound. Another reason is that volunteers who return to the providing institution, like in the case of Purdue and Iowa State, were able to provide orientation and technical support to volunteers about to go overseas or during their assignments. The establishment of institutional websites with volunteer reports also provides an ongoing learning and support mechanism. However, this benefit is not as great as it could be due to the fact that the grants are only for 1 year and therefore the universities do not have the multi-year opportunity to create institutional mechanisms to provide technical support of this kind over a sustained period of time and several cycles of volunteers, as is the case with the core implementers.

- iii. University implementation of F2F grants is inhibited by problematic bureaucracies, at least initially

Under the small grant program, most university grantees had a difficult time establishing the grant management mechanisms required by the USG to ensure proper accountability of the resources made available to them through the program. With the assistance of the support contractor, however, most eventually did align the accounting and reporting systems satisfactorily. For a short grant period of just one year, however, this investment of institutional

effort is of questionable value. Universities with extensive experience in managing short term grants from the USG will always be in a better position to implement the F2F grants, but all expressed the view that they would prefer and benefit from longer grant periods. A small number of Universities were awarded multiple grants, including the University of Arizona. The university under both awards was consistent with its accounting and reporting systems. However, one example where they fell short was in invoicing during their first grant. In one case, a request for payment was sent well after the period of performance had ended. This on the grand scale of things is very minor but is indicative of the challenges the different schools within Universities have to face when invoicing.

Although Program Development Projects (PDPs) were not a focus within our assessment, it is important to note that the one University who implemented a PDP under Weidemann Associates also struggled to provide the resources required to properly manage the field activities, field volunteers in a timely way and submit accurate invoicing. The reasons for this are a combination of shortcomings of the personnel implementing the project as well as the systems under which they operate. The approval processes within the University were lengthy and bureaucratic and it often took a longer time than is normally necessary to accomplish simple administrative tasks.

- iv. University implementers provide valuable public exposure and political support for the F2F program

Involving the leading US agriculture institutions, especially the prestige of US land grant universities, tends to lend credibility in the field and garner political support at home. While the F2F program could make a greater effort to take advantage of these benefits to increase understanding and support for the program in the US congress and in the US public at large (as suggested in the mid-term review of the F2F program), a volunteer with institutional connections to these institutions is generally afforded a high degree of respect by host agencies and individuals.

- c. **Topic 3. Fielding volunteers through associations and specialist networks**

In the past, volunteers from the different technical and professional associations and networks have been recruited by the core implementers of the F2F program, but the SG program in this past cycle provided the opportunity for these organizations to take charge of the full process of recruiting, placing, and supporting volunteers in the field. F2F volunteers recruited through associations and specialist networks demonstrate a unique perspective because they bring current market knowledge and direct business involvement to their hosts. Furthermore, associations and specialist networks often provide technical and organizational cohesion to the volunteers' work and can facilitate moving product from growers in developing economies to buyers in developed markets. SG holders who should be noted in this regard are Cooperative Coffees, Veterinarians without Borders, University of Arizona teamed with Aquaculture without Frontiers, The Florida Association for Volunteer Action in the Caribbean and the Americas (FAVACA), and Mercy Corps teamed with Whole Foods. F2F projects fielded by FAVACA, Cooperative Coffees and University of Arizona/Aquaculture without Frontiers were visited in the field during this assessment.

The assessment team identified the benefits of including these associations within the F2F program. One particular benefit is that many SGs recipients develop the business, technical, and production capacity of local stakeholders and beneficiaries. We found that most of these SG examples have produced and nurtured such linkage opportunities (like FAVACA and University of Arizona).

- i. Access to producers, buyers, often leading to continued business relationships

Drawing volunteers from these associations ensures a degree of “practitioner” involvement in the F2F program. Grants to Cooperative Coffees, and Aquaculture without Frontiers sent volunteers with ongoing business operations directly to producer groups in the host country who are also involved in production (but usually at a simpler or more rudimentary level). As a result, adoption of recommendations appear to be almost immediate and obvious. In some cases, especially with the Cooperative Coffee volunteers, an expected outcome was a continued business relationship between the host coffee producer and the importing coffee roasters who provided the volunteers. In the case of the aquaculture volunteers, several cases of continued contact for purposes of the exchange of technical information and even provision of laboratory and production equipment and inputs continue beyond the volunteer service period.

In Dominica, a FAVACA volunteer who assisted with the establishment of greenhouse tomato production also continued to stay involved in the project after returning to the US and is providing pest-free root stock to use in new grafting process introduced by the FAVACA volunteers and being ramped up in Dominica.

- ii. Require less in-country support From the US Grantee

For the most part, volunteer programs established by these associations are based on very close working arrangements with local and regional implementing institutions. Research and training institutions like CATIE in Costa Rica (regional scope), CARDI in the Caribbean, and Universities in Mexico provide in-country support for F2F volunteers in the Purdue, FAVACA, and Aquaculture small grant programs. These partner institutions consider it their responsibility to support the F2F volunteers, since they are providing technical assistance to their purchasing activities, which otherwise they would have to procure in some other way. Therefore, the management costs to the grantee are reduced in most cases. Also, these relationships endure over time, and true technical partnerships result, albeit often quite informal in nature.

- iii. Can provide technical support through technically based network

Volunteers provided through technical and professional associations tend to remain linked with each other, and often through the grant manager, as is the case with Aquaculture without Frontiers, Cooperative Coffees, and FAVACA volunteers. Through meetings, personal communication, and technical websites these volunteers tend to stay in touch with each other,

and often with their host institutions. Admittedly, the short term nature of the grant limits this aspect of the program. Links to some of the websites here:

<http://favaca.org/?q=node/89>

<http://t4g.thunderbird.edu/blog-tags/farmer-farmer>

d. Topic 4: Impact assessment

During our assessment, we attempted to determine to what degree the impact of volunteer service was being measured, and what methods might be adopted to improve ex-post impact assessment of F2F volunteer contribution. During discussions around the mid-term assessment of the F2F program, a senior USAID officer suggested that for a program like the F2F program, with such short-term volunteer assignments, impact measurement might be impossible, or at least not worth the cost/effort. Generally, managers and volunteers are of the opinion that the program indicators (# of recommendations, people influenced) the program now uses to record “success” or “progress” are highly subjective and probably misleading as reported in many cases. This is especially true the more a F2F volunteer works in a team setting, and/or provides just one recommended technical or operational input/option to an ongoing complex development process. While it certainly is important to be able to evaluate the F2F program, measuring each volunteer’s contribution beyond anecdotal description, may not be very useful. For reliable ex-post impact measurement the baseline against which measurement is to take place must be determined. The costs of this data measurement prior to a volunteer’s arrival and after their departure is probably unjustified for short term volunteers.

However, in Peru Goldman-Sachs is sponsoring an ex-post evaluation process for the business development program to which Thunderbird University is providing volunteers. The volunteers serve as mentors to individual entrepreneurs who have gone through one or more training programs. When volunteers are attached to a program like this, where the host organization already has a separate M&E system, some determination can be made about the contribution of the F2F volunteers. In this case in Peru, for example, the evaluation process so far has determined that the group training sessions may not by themselves contribute to an increase in sales or profit for the entrepreneurs, but when the training is combined with the F2F mentoring, there is a measurable impact on business. This was the only impact evaluation process we observed during our assessment, and we are inclined to believe that unless this type of program-wide ex-post impact assessment is in place for a program where F2F volunteers are assigned, impact assessment is either too costly or too unreliable.

Recommendations

Based upon our review of several of the Small Grants awarded during the past cycle of F2F program, we conclude that the two main objectives of the SG program were effectively delivered, that is a) examples of innovative approaches to recruitment and placement of volunteers, and b) identification of specific implementing institutions that could continue to

provide higher levels of volunteer programs in the future. For this latter to happen, though, we are recommending that the F2F management team continue the SG program but consider some modifications in the future.

Recommendation #1: Continue the competitive small grant program in the F2F program, but manage the grant process with more targeted objectives and direction. The SGs are ideal for expanding and pinpointing development objectives to complement the larger core program. SGs can be used to ensure broader geographic coverage of the program, by requiring SG proposals to focus on the smaller countries left out of the core awards, such as the smaller Caribbean countries, Central America, parts of Africa, and Asia. The SGs could also be targeted on a technical area USAID believes needs more involvement, such as fisheries, aquaculture, emerging coffee disease, animal health, secondary crop production and other areas where the major Feed-the-Future programs are not involved.

Recommendation #2: The program should find a mechanism that allows for multi-year (1.5 to 4) grants, to be made available (through the competitive process) to grantees that have successfully implemented the one-year SGs in past cycles of the F2F program. The amounts made available for these grants would have to be larger than the \$100,000 amount awarded in the past program; possibly as much as \$3-500,000. Admittedly, these then begin to look like the PDPs of the past cycle, and that may be the way to accomplish the creation of this second tier of award, between the SG level and the core LWA awards.

Recommendation #3: To provide volunteers in small business development, one or more small, medium, or PDP grants could be made available to institutions that can field long-term volunteers (3-9 month assignments).

For reasons mentioned earlier, the recruitment of long-term volunteers is limited, even though implementing partners and hosts in the field would like to receive more of these volunteers. Therefore, we suggest that if a sound program in business development within the F2F program is desired, a special award (PDP possibly) be considered with institutions that have the capacity to recruit and field this type of volunteer. Thunderbird and TechnoServe have proven by successfully implementing their SGs that they can implement this type of program but on a limited basis. If this is done, however, it is imperative to insist on close ties to agriculture sector businesses, since the recent experience revealed a tendency to go too far afield of agriculture with volunteer assignments.

A version of this would be to sponsor a larger program with both long- and short-term volunteers. Teamed with a group or groups of short-term volunteers, some long-term volunteers could provide the required follow-up to what the short term volunteers provided. This will help with project continuity without needing a field staff often required to support short-term volunteers.

Recommendation #4: Provide specific opportunities for increased involvement of universities in F2F. There are several ways this could be accomplished. The most direct would be to create a “next level” mechanism (as described above in #2) for universities that carry out successful small grants; this would apply at present to Purdue, Arizona State, and Iowa State. Another could be to encourage universities to form a consortium to apply for a core LWA award. The idea along these lines designed and put forward recently by Purdue appears interesting. A third, less interesting but feasible way to increase involvement of universities in the F2F program is to require core implementers to have sub-awards with universities for a specific number of volunteers. For this to be meaningful, though, the core awardees would have to be willing to assign a specific number of volunteers to the university sub-awardees, pass the corresponding F2F resources on to the universities for them to manage, and but still provide overall coordination to ensure program integrity of the award.

Recommendation #5: Continue to encourage the involvement of technical associations in the small grant program, possibly for a period of up to two years, to continue to bring new groups of agriculture sector professionals and practitioners into the program. The inclusion of these types of groups enriches the program and expands the profile of the F2F universe.

Recommendation #6: Related to #5, we recommend the preparation of a report on all business linkages created in the last cycle of F2F, including small grants and core implementers, to reveal the depth and breadth of business partnering and linkages between the US and host countries via the F2F program. Our view is that the report would be impressive.

Case Studies

Thunderbird University

Thunderbird received two grants. The first grant was for \$100,000, for which they fielded four volunteers for six months each, total of 721 volunteer days. The second was for \$100,000, for which they fielded four volunteers. The average cost per volunteer assignment in grant one was \$25,000, per volunteer day was \$138.70 (\$25,000/180.25 work days in six months). For grant two, the average cost per volunteer assignment was \$25,000, and cost per volunteer assignment day was \$138.70. There were no repeat assignments within either grant.

The objective of the program was to improve business management skills of managers of women-run enterprises while providing advice on access to market for their products. The volunteers were mainly experienced in business, entrepreneurship, marketing and social media, usually students associated with the MBA program. Their assignments were in the areas of market research and analysis, improvement of business marketing and development. They worked with 10 hosts (average). The hosts were generally women entrepreneurs. The recommendations made by the volunteers were generally in marketing, market linkages, business skills and public outreach.

The director of this grant believes strongly that to develop access to market advice for small and medium size businesses requires a longer term volunteer assignment than the normal two-week F2F term. However, the program at Thunderbird has mentoring programs all over the world, through which they provide advice for shorter periods, such as 1, 3, and 6 weeks, and they are actively testing new models. One such pilot program is for late career professional MBA students who are studying mostly on weekends while continuing to work, with one week in the field working with small businesses. This pilot is being observed now, and could be of interest to the F2F program. They are associated with a Goldman Saks M&E program in Peru that measures impact of volunteer mentoring on business performance and are interested in developing a metric to measure the impact on farmers as a result of increased sales. Impact assessment of this type would be a healthy addition to the F2F approach generally.

One volunteer for the Thunderbird for Good Women's Entrepreneurship F2F program in Peru worked with 15 women in the textile industry, linking the women to new providers for six months. By the end of her time volunteering, 60% of the women had a new client and the remaining 40% were in negotiations with new clients. She believes she could not have accomplished what she did in less time because it took a few months to develop a relationship with the women and to gain knowledge about the local markets. The first two to three months are essential to developing strong relationships and knowledge of the area, businesses and markets. The volunteer lived in her own apartment and subsequently stayed in Peru to work on a different program. She was able to spend this length of time abroad because she took a sabbatical from work to spend a few years abroad. She noted that a longer period spent abroad for F2F was very beneficial for projects focusing on business development. The Thunderbird Program Director visited two times and had bi-weekly phone calls with the staff in the field.

Program Successes/Partnerships: By the end of the project, the SMEs began to make notable changes in their marketing practices: 38% updated their business cards and revised their business logos; 36% developed new corporate brochures; 51% got new company websites or updated the existing ones; and nearly half (49%) revamped or started new Facebook business pages. F2F volunteers used their business management and analytical experience to mentor the entrepreneurs and help improve competitiveness, open new product lines, and access new markets. Their support also contributed to the overall strengthening of the businesses' respective value chains. In total, the program fostered the growth of nearly 50 local organizations including 11 women-owned businesses.

TechnoServe

TechnoServe received three grants. The first grant was for \$100,000, for which they fielded two volunteers for assignments of four to five months, for a total of 552 volunteer days (276 volunteer days average). The second was for \$100,000, for which they fielded 3 volunteers for a total of 430 volunteer days (143.3 volunteer days on average). The average cost per volunteer assignment in grant one was \$50,000, per volunteer day was $\$50,000/276=\181.16 . For grant two, the average cost per volunteer assignment was \$33,333.33, and per volunteer assignment

day was $\$33,333.33/143.3 = \232.61 . The third grant, which began on October 1, 2012, was for \$100,000. They fielded four volunteers. The average cost per volunteer was \$25,000, per volunteer day was around \$174.82. There were no repeat volunteers within any of the grants. The volunteers were mainly experienced in sales strategies, developing local commercial opportunities and general business skills. Their assignments were in the areas of financial linkages, market linkages and communication, and they worked with 17 hosts (average). The hosts were generally entrepreneurs. The recommendations made by the volunteers were generally in business skills.

The director of this grant noted that TechnoServe doesn't send short-term volunteers because TechnoServe already has a number of short-term consultants already living in Latin America and able to assist with short-term needs. They designed this program specifically to work with businesses for a longer period of time with the hopes of achieving a greater impact.

The interview process to screen candidates is a bit lengthier than it would be for short-term volunteers or consultants due to the length of time the volunteers spend in country. Usually the Program Director and Assistant Director will participate in the interviews. They have a strong database and recruitment network, so finding a volunteer to stay in the field for a longer period of time usually isn't a challenge. They also send volunteers to areas where TechnoServe already has a field presence, so there is an ample amount of supervision and structure for the F2F volunteers. Most of the F2F volunteers for their program have their MBA's and business experience.

Because the first and second F2F programs were implemented in conjunction with another TechnoServe programs, they may be able to provide impact and outcome data.

Program Successes/Partnerships: After the end of the first volunteer's visit, 19 different host organizations received assistance in the search for financing. The volunteers worked with the hosts on finding alternative financing options through micro-finance, private equity, business plan competitions and government grants. Another volunteer assisted 12 small businesses to receive local market assistance and 10 businesses to receive foreign market assistance. Beyond the life of the first F2F small grant, TechnoServe incorporated best practices and lessons learned through the project into their BPC programs in Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, Bolivia and Venezuela. Volunteers also connected host organizations to one another (fertilizer producers, fruit producers, snack food distributors) that created a sustainable and lasting impact.

Cooperative Coffees

Cooperative Coffees received two grants. The first grant was for \$99,800, for which they fielded 33 volunteers on assignments of 7-14 days, for a total of 254 volunteer days (7.7 days average). Six volunteers repeated twice and two volunteers repeated three times during the first round. The second was for \$98,000, for which they fielded 30 volunteers (In some cases, more than one volunteer worked on a single assignment) for a total of 254 volunteer days completed (8.5 days

on average). The average cost per volunteer in grant one was \$3,024.24, per volunteer day was \$392.76. For grant 2, the average cost per volunteer was \$3,266.67, and per volunteer day was \$384.31. There was one volunteer who repeated 5 times, one which repeated four times, and two which repeated two times during the second grant.

The volunteers were mainly experienced in coffee roasting and quality evaluation, risk management and risk evaluation, Fair Trade diagnostics, communications and marketing. Their assignments were in the areas of coffee production, financial management of coffee farms, and coffee market diagnostics, and they worked with 1 host (average). The hosts were generally groups of coffee growers. The recommendations made by the volunteers were generally in quality control, marketing in the US market and assistance with locating local coffee markets.

As a result of the volunteer's work, Cooperative Coffees linked small, developing country coffee growers with US processors who advise growers on ways to improve product quality and shipping for U.S. buyers . Building such linkages and partnerships creates the potential for long-term sustainability of project supported activities well after the end of the F2F project.

Cooperative Coffees is essentially a F2F volunteer recruiter with insider access to a special group of skilled professionals with knowledge that is valuable for small coffee producers in developing countries where they may not have access to the type of technical and market advice available to the larger producers. They can easily match a volunteer with the right skill with a host producer because the Association has existing connections with both a large group of hosts, and a wide community of potential volunteers. In other words, they are “in the business and know the others who are also in the business.” Even though they feel they are agile and able to satisfy the requirements of the F2F small grant program (most of their volunteers are mid-career professionals), their request for a third grant was denied because, according to the manager of the grant at Cooperative Coffees, “They were pulling from too limited a grid of volunteers”.

Cooperative Coffees often went to the field in 2-3 person teams, with about 40% being repeat volunteers. They admit that the impact of their volunteers would be increased if they had a source of funding for basic infrastructure (especially drying equipment) they could help install and train for during their assignments. They feel that if USAID asked small grantees to provide matching funds for the USG F2F grant, they would quite easily do it, and provide those funds for the basic infrastructure required. The shortness of the grant, however, inhibits this type of forward planning and fundraising, as well as the scheduling of follow-up visits to ensure that their recommendations are followed and therefore produce the expected level of impact.

Program Successes/Partnerships: Coffee farmers gained access to new U.S. coffee buyers. U.S. coffee roasters/buyers are more aware of challenges facing coffee farmers. Both developed contacts with which to exchange information about the supply and demand of coffee for seasons to come. In Mexico, volunteers assisted local cooperatives Maya Vinic and MICHIZA gain a greater understanding of the changing context of Fair Trade and organic markets. In Ecuador, volunteers supported the marketing team of the local cooperative, RioIntag, by explaining pricing mechanisms and contract negotiation norms. In Uganda, volunteers visited farmers'

union facilities to conduct an analysis and more completely understand the operations and production challenges. After pinpointing the issues, the volunteers were able to troubleshoot some of the quality control problems that the cooperative had experienced.

Veterinarians without Borders

Veterinarians without Borders received three grants; the first grant for \$77,062, for which they fielded two volunteers for two assignments each in Liberia for 18-20 volunteer days, the second for \$100,000, for which they fielded four volunteers for two assignments each, and the third grant (awarded September 1, 2012) for \$100,000, for which they aim to field four volunteers for two trip assignments each. The cost per assignment of grant one was \$19,265.50, per volunteer day was $\$19,265.50/19=\$1,013.97$. For grant two, cost per volunteer assignment was \$25,000, per volunteer day was $\$25,000/19=\$1,315.80$. For grant three, cost per volunteer assignment is \$12,500, per volunteer day is $\$12,500/19=\657.89 .

The volunteers were experienced in animal husbandry and veterinary practices. Their assignments were in the areas of veterinary diagnostic and training and they worked with 2 hosts (average). The hosts were farm families, learner participants from animal health non-profits and members of the Liberian and Malian governments. The recommendations made by the volunteers were generally in animal care and husbandry.

Program Successes/Partnerships: It was noted in their Final Report that Thomas Graham, the Program Director, was also a volunteer for two of assignments. He certainly remains in contact with the hosts due to his position and the amount of times he has visited them. During the first grant round Dr. Graham was assigned to appraise the needs for the Liberian Central Veterinary Laboratory and laboratory diagnostic capacity needs for Fendel and Liberia as a whole. This was done before his arrival in Bamako for a regional laboratory and food security discussion held by FAO/USDA/APHIS as well as USAID and European partners. VWB sought to integrate themselves into a 5-10 year plan for Liberian redevelopment plans for veterinary and medical economic development. They have worked with the Government as well as with non-profits to reevaluate the current system and take steps toward changes across the national Veterinary Health and Regulatory Services, and Livestock Production. This systemic change will have an impact long after the program is finished.

The Florida Association for Volunteer Action in the Caribbean and the Americas (FAVACA)

FAVACA received two grants; the first grant for \$100,000 for which they fielded sixteen volunteers in the Caribbean for 5-10 volunteer days, the second for \$99,264 for which they fielded sixteen volunteers for a projected average of 8 days. The cost per assignment of grant one was \$6,250, per volunteer day was $\$6,250/8.1=\771.60 . For grant two, cost per volunteer assignment was \$6,250, per volunteer day was $\$6,250/8.1=\771.60 .

The volunteers were experienced in a wide array of food security skills, such as pest management, post-harvest handling for fruits and vegetables, farm equipment safety and green house development and extension systems. Their assignments were in the areas of food security for Caribbean fruits and vegetables and they worked with two hosts (average). The hosts were organizations such as the Caribbean Agriculture and Development Institute (CARDI) and the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), as well as the Grenada Ministry of Agriculture and the Dominica Department of Agriculture. The recommendations made by the volunteers were generally related to food security.

Program Successes/Partnerships: Due to FAVACA's relationships with the CARDI, FAVACA Farmer-to-Farmer volunteers were able to give targeted advice to organizations who requested assistance from CARDI. In St. Kitts and Nevis, the IICA, on behalf of the St. Kitts and Nevis Agricultural Youth Forum and CARDI, requested the assistance of FAVACA to provide trainings to further knowledge of shade house and protective agricultural technology for extension officers, farmers and students. A Farmer-to-Farmer volunteer who was a Professor and Extension Specialist for Crop Ecology at the Department of Plant Sciences at the University of California Davis was able to provide the requested training. In Barbados, CARDI requested training on the demonstration and practice of virus extract collection for the use of screening hot pepper seedlings for virus resistance. The Farmer-to-Farmer volunteer, a Professor Emeritus of Plant Pathology at Virginia Tech University, was able to train a total of eight CARDI staff and Ministry of Agriculture staff. The technical training and demonstration produced competence in the empirical screening of plants to identify resistance to virus and then rating expressed symptoms after a fixed period of time. Due to the training by this particular volunteer, the participants were able to train the Ministry of Agriculture extension agents on virus screening thereby reducing the amount of crops the farmers lose to disease. Overall, FAVACA has been able to produce strong relationships with partners in the Caribbean and has yielded positive results in a number of different areas relating to food security.

University of Arizona/Aquaculture without Borders (AWOF)

University of Arizona /Aquaculture without Frontiers received two grants; the first for \$97,528, for which they fielded 23 volunteers on assignments of 9-11 days for a total of 244 volunteer days (10.6 volunteer days average). One volunteer repeated six times, one repeated three times, and two repeated two times each during the first grant. The second was for \$90,214, to field 18 volunteers, which was awarded in September 2012 and will end August 31, 2013. Cost per volunteer in grant one was \$4,240.35, per volunteer day \$400.03. For grant two, cost per volunteer assignment will be \$9,021.40, per volunteer assignment day will be \$9,021.40/10=\$902.14.

The volunteers were experienced in aquaculture, management practices and integrated fish and vegetable production. Their assignments were in the areas of sustainable aquaculture practices and certifications, tilapia and vegetable production and monitoring and evaluation of aquaculture

systems. They worked with 1-2 hosts (average). The hosts were generally small, private aquaculture producers. The recommendations made by the volunteers were generally in quality control, including where appropriate production and handling to meet standards required for sale in the US market.

One example of the work done by F2F aquaculture volunteers is the development of integrated aquaculture agriculture systems in an indigenous Chol community at Caridad Guerrero, Tacotalpa county in Tabasco, and at a Chontal indigenous community in Oxiacaque, Nacajuca county, Mexico.

A total of 80 participants attended the integrated aquaculture agriculture workshops. Participants were local farmers, professors, students, and extension government agents. The Farmer to Farmer volunteers conducted workshops at the partner university, Universidad Juarez Autonoma de Tabasco (UJAT) and then went to work in the Caridad Guerrero community. The partner hosts are sharing these results with other mountain communities and encouraging others to adopt the fish and vegetable growing system, and there are plans to publish these results in a peer reviewed science article once the trial is completed in the Oxiacaque village and supported with additional data collection of soil quality and nutrient levels. The Volunteer trip reports are posted at the Aquaculture without Frontiers website.

There were management difficulties with the first University of Arizona grant. For example, a volunteer who spent about a week in South Africa had to set up all of his reservations in country as well as his flight himself (he was reimbursed by the University). The University did put him in contact with three people in country, but before he went to South Africa he didn't know who he was presenting to or what kind of background his audience would have information that clearly would have been helpful in preparing for his trip. He also would have liked more feedback on the work he did in country from the partners and the Program Manager of the University of Arizona's program.

The grant manager recognizes that the startup period was rocky for them; they were on a steep learning curve and matching the University administrative mechanisms with USG mechanisms took some time to get sorted out. These administrative issues probably resulted in their not submitting for a follow-on grant within the right timeframe, and had to wait for the next grant cycle to submit, which they did, successfully. In the second grant, USAID asked the grantee to focus on Mexico and Kenya, instead of the global reach of the first grant. This seems to hold promise since the University is better organized, more familiar with the F2F program guidance and procedures, and should be more efficient in their management of the volunteers.

For this grant, the University of Arizona relies mostly on the AWOF member database, which now contains over 300 practicing fish farmers and related professionals. The present grant that plans for 20 volunteers in 2 countries is manageable under the present arrangement. However, they receive from their contacts in the field between 40 and 50 requests for short term TA, so

with beefed up administrative support, believe they could field a larger program in the future. They are even receiving expressions of interest from other parts of the University to expand into areas other than aquaculture, and even to bid for a LWA core implementer award in the future.

One interesting coincidence is that the USAID supported CRSP in aquaculture seems to be about to be ended. Whatever the reason, it makes a good argument that since fish protein is the protein source growing fastest, and is so crucial to diets of the poorest populations in many countries and throughout the world, an expanded F2F effort to move from the research phase of USAID involvement in aquaculture to a hands on TA program through F2F might be well received. The linkage of F2F volunteers with the Kenyan aquaculture initiative as defined in the new grant to University of Arizona/AWOF is an interesting case to study the potential impact of F2F volunteers working in a concerted way within a national development program.

Program Successes/Partnerships: Volunteers visited Tabasco Mexico to work with the village farmers to identify locally available materials that could be utilized to rebuilt the soil and trap the nutrients from the fish effluent. The last volunteer was invited and stayed with a host family during her visit. The result was an integrated aquaculture agriculture system which was developed by the volunteers for the indigenous community in Tacotalpa. The partner hosts at the University Juarez Autonoma de Tabasco have been sharing the results with other mountain communities and encouraging others to adopt the fish and vegetable growing system.

Purdue University

Purdue University's International Programs in Agriculture (IPIA) and Purdue Cooperative Extension Service (CES), in collaboration with the Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE), based in Turrialba, Costa Rica, received two small grants. The first was for \$98,064, for which they fielded nine volunteers for 9-10 days for a total of 90 volunteer days, the second for \$99,635 for which they fielded nine volunteers for 9-10 days each. The average cost per volunteer assignment in grant one was \$10,896, and per volunteer day was \$1,089.60. For grant two, the average cost per volunteer assignment was \$11,070.55; per volunteer day was \$1,107.06. There are no repeat volunteers within the two grants, although there are volunteers who volunteered for a second time in grant two.

The F2F volunteers worked with the Asociación de Productores Orgánicos de Turrialba (APOT), also located in the Turrialba Valley in Costa Rica, to improve APOT's organizational management, increase product development, and help the producers market their products more effectively in Costa Rica and abroad. The hosts were generally local farming associations. The recommendations made by the volunteers were generally in improving agribusinesses and the cooperative as a whole. The APOT member families were to become familiar with product development and market techniques using models developed by Purdue and CATIE, in association with APOT, leading to improved farmer livelihoods.

The volunteers were mainly experienced in business planning/management at the community level, product development and promotion and extension techniques and training methods, and marketing for agricultural products. Their assignments were in the areas of value chain market development, business planning and marketing, and they generally worked with one collaborating partner.

The F2F Evaluation carried out in 2011/12 identified several advantages of the approach tested in the Purdue grant, including:

- a) Linking a US educational institution (in this case a Land-Grant University) with a Central American educational institution (CATIE) with a regional reach, opens a multiplicity of programming options for the F2F program;

- b) Recruits come from one population of expertise (extension agents working in Indiana). Indiana has about 270 extension agents in the field and 190 extension agent/educators on campus from whom Purdue can recruit for the F2F program. The advantages of this “captive” group of 460 candidates is that they all have a certain degree of similar formation and approach to their work, they are all “agents of change”, educators or trainers with experience providing technical assistance and advice. They are linked to each other through social network systems through which their experience in the F2F program is shared, increasing the general level of familiarity with the F2F program and the Costa Rica project specifically;

- c) The focus is on building one host institution (APOT). Purdue University and APOT are developing a form of institutional linkage that should result in continued influence in support of APOT’s future and continuing development. The Purdue F2F participants are developing training and technical assistance materials specifically for the APOT member needs, so there is institutional growth through the frequent updates of these materials and the continued contact the Purdue volunteer extension agents maintain with their hosts in Costa Rica. The full case study of the Purdue F2F small grant program, prepared for the 2011/12 Evaluation, is included in Annex B of this report.

One volunteer who participated in the Purdue University Farmer-to-Farmer program in Costa Rica, a trainer, believes the University did a good job of handling the volunteers and thinks the program accomplished what it set out to do. She didn’t notice any challenges within the University in terms of processing documents or preparing her for the two trips she took to Costa Rica. She gave several presentations when she returned to the US on lessons learned and her F2F experience and received some feedback on the reports she submitted to the Program Manager at Purdue.

Currently Purdue University has identified a purchaser in southern Indiana that ships, packages and brands the coffee product produced by the members of the host institutions in Costa Rica working in collaboration with Purdue University on their SG.

Iowa State University

Iowa State University received two grants. The first grant was for \$100,000, for which they fielded 10 volunteers for assignments from 10-12 days, for a total of 90 days (9 volunteer days on average). The second grant, which ended at the end of January 2013, was for \$100,000 and 8 volunteers. The average cost per volunteer assignment in grant one was \$10,000, and per volunteer day was \$1,111.11. For grant two, the average cost per volunteer assignment was \$12,500, and per volunteer day was \$1,388.89, with an average of nine days. There weren't any repeat volunteers within grants one or two.

The volunteers were mainly experienced in maize farming, post-harvest handling, and marketing. Their assignments were in the areas of crop and livestock needs assessments, discovery of alternative market venues, work with production, harvest and post-harvest issues, and they generally worked with one host. The host, a Ugandan NGO that works in seven districts in Uganda with thousands of farmers and farmers groups (60% women). The recommendations made by the volunteers were generally in market access, soil management, harvest, drying and threshing techniques, and seed quality education.

Program Successes/Partnerships: The project focused on building both crop management and marketing skills with 80 Ugandan women farmers. They eventually improved post-harvest management and made positive changes in maize/grain quality.

Table 1: Data for Niche Grant

Data for Niche Grants											
	Grant Award Amount	Number of Volunteers	Total Number of Volunteer Days Completed	Length of Volunteer Assignment (average)	Cost per Volunteer Assignment (average)	Cost per Volunteer Day (average)	Repeat Volunteers within Grant Period	Hosts Assisted	People Trained	People Directly Assisted	Recommendations
<u>Cooperative Coffees</u>											
Grant #1	\$99,800	33	254	7.7	\$3,024.24	\$392.76	8	19	357	396	252
Grant #2	\$98,000	30	254	8.5	\$3,266.67	\$384.31	4	14	289	289	175
<u>Veterinarians without Borders</u>											
Grant #1	\$77,062	10	190	19	\$77,062.20	\$405.59	1	11	94	102	65
Grant #2	\$100,000	8 (4 volunteers)	142	19	\$25,000.00	\$703.23	2	6	16	23	75
Grant #3 (projected)	\$100,000	8 (4 volunteers)	not available	19	\$12,500	\$791.14	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available
<u>University of Arizona/Aquaculture without Frontiers</u>											
Grant #1	\$97,528	23	244	10.6	\$4,240.35	\$400.03	4	17	1,244	1,494	256
Grant #2 (projected)	\$90,214	18	not available	not available	\$9,021.40	\$902.14	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available
<u>Thunderbird</u>											
Grant #1	\$100,000	4	721	180.25	\$25,000	\$138.70	none	54	26	41	37
Grant #2	\$100,000	4	not available	180 (projected)	\$25,000	\$138.70 (projected)	none	not available	not available	not available	not available
<u>TechnoServe</u>											
Grant #1	\$100,000	2	552	276	\$50,000	\$181.16	none	24	30	69	216
Grant #2	\$100,000	3	430	143.3	\$33,333.33	\$232.61	none	25	53	56	50
Grant #3 (projected)	\$100,000	4	not available	143 (projected)	\$25,000	\$174.82	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available
<u>Purdue</u>											
Grant #1	\$98,064	9	90	10	\$10,896	\$1,089.60	none	1	42	46	118
Grant #2	\$99,635	9	90	10	\$11,070.55	\$1,107.06	none	1	80	87	105
<u>Iowa State</u>											
Grant #1	\$100,000	10	90	9	\$10,000	\$1,111.11	none	1	38	330	46
Grant #2 (projected)	\$100,000	8	not available	9 (projected)	\$12,500	\$1,388.89	none	not available	not available	not available	not available
<u>FAVACA</u>											
Grant #1	\$100,000	16	130	8.1	\$6,250.00	\$771.60	2	5	745	745	90
Grant #2 (projected)	\$99,264	16	not available	8.1 (projected)	\$6,250	\$771.60 (projected)	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available
<u>Other Small Grants*:</u>											
<u>IESC</u>											
Grant #1	\$99,990.78	5	92	18.4	\$3,998.16	\$217.29	none	36	32	120	155
<u>Mercy Corps</u>											
Grant #1	\$99,994	6	126	21	\$16,665.67	\$793.60	none	12	56	53	91
<u>League of Hope</u>											
Grant #1 (projected)	\$99,965	17	not available	10 (projected)	\$5,889.29	\$588.03	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available
<u>VEGA</u>											
Grant #1 (projected)	\$93,980	8	not available	15 (projected)	\$15,663.33	\$1,044.22	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available
<u>NPCA</u>											
Grant #1 (projected)	\$100,000	8	not available	42 (projected)	\$12,500	\$297.61	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available

*Other small grants Weidemann has managed or is managing, but are not being researched closely for this analysis.