



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



VEGA 2005 Annual Report

**LEADER WITH ASSOCIATE AGREEMENT (LWA)
EEM-A-00-04-00002-00**

**Prepared for the United States Agency for
International Development (USAID)**

Submitted:

March 10, 2006



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
I. Managing Leader with Associate Cooperative Agreement (LWA)	2
II. Outreach	4
III. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).....	7
IV. Initiation for New Projects	9
V. Project Implementation Support	13
VI. 2005 Budget and Expenditures	14
VII. Consideration for 2006 Work Plan	15
 <u>ATTACHMENTS:</u>	
1. VEGA’s Fast Track Process for Preparing Program Designs	16
2. VEGA Full Process for Preparing Program Designs	18
3. VEGA Evaluation Scorecard	20
4. IEC Contact and Profile	22

VEGA - 2005 Annual Report

This Annual Report focuses on strategic issues encountered and addressed by VEGA during 2005. The Quarterly Reports present and describe the activities that VEGA carried out during the year.

I. Managing Leader with Associate Cooperative Agreement (LWA) Number EEM-A-00-04-00002-00

A. As the Year Began

As the year began, the organizational start-up measures called for in the February 2004 LWA with USAID had been completed, or had been initiated and were in progress.

A progress report on the first two months of calendar year 2005 was provided in VEGA's 2004 Annual Report, because those months constituted the last two months of VEGA's then program year – February 2004 –February 2005. Beginning in 2006, and with this Annual Report, VEGA's program year will be January through December. As a brief summary, January and February 2005 were characterized by: 1) a leadership transition, as Earl Yates succeeded Jim May as Executive Director; 2) on-going support to the implementation of the Private Sector Development Initiative in Iraq; the Bulgaria Trade and Development Project; and the Cyprus Economic Growth Program; 3) on-going Outreach activities, including the development and submission of a concept paper in response to USAID's Regional Development Mission in Thailand, for VEGA's providing technical assistance at the regional and country levels to assist the Asia and Near East Region to address the short-term relief and long-term economic development challenges caused by the December 2004 Tsunami. While no request for VEGA's services resulted from this submitted concept paper, the effort did demonstrate the ability of VEGA and Member Organization staff to do rapid-response program conceptualization and its readiness to deploy technical assistance prepared to design and implement economic growth programs in response to specifically defined client needs.

B. Review and Clarification of Elements of the LWA

Most of the activities specified in the LWA had been initiated in 2004 or would be initiated early in 2005. A few activities, however, as described in the LWA, seemed to be less feasible or less necessary than originally envisioned. The most notable example was that of a proposed knowledge management component that would use computer hardware and software resources to tool a system called Gateway. Also, the Outreach component called for an ambitious and aggressive promotion of VEGA through mainstream media.

For purposes of clarifying the importance that USAID now attached to such activities, in view of operations developments over the course of the first year of the project, the VEGA staff conferred with USAID's Activity Manager for VEGA, Steve Silcox, who has succeeded Cognizant Technical Officer Kristin Lobron, upon her resignation in April 2005. Through these consultations, the Activity Manager reaffirmed that while the fundamental goals, objectives, and implementation targets of the LWA remained unchanged, some of these were being achieved by activities that might differ in name and general description from those specified in the LWA. For example, the communications and knowledge management goals of the Gateway system

were, indeed, being achieved by VEGA's external website and by its evolving intra-net. The Activity Manager also clarified that some activities, such as the noted promotion through the mainstream media was, at minimum, premature for these first two years of the project, or possibly not appropriate for later years of the project, given that the fairly technical and specialized nature of VEGA's work was not likely to rise often to the level of general news interest. These consultations with USAID helped the VEGA staff to concentrate on the still valid goals and objectives of the LWA, but to make adjustments in implemented activities as needed.

C. LWA Staffing Provisions

Section IV, Project Implementation Support and Section V, Initiation of New Projects will report on the development of these two key areas of VEGA's operations over the course of its second year. In this section on Managing the LWA, it must be noted that the workload that resulted from these activities came to demand a level of staff time and effort that could not have been quantified in the early planning of VEGA. The LWA was able to anticipate and make staffing and other budgetary provision for Outreach; Monitoring and Evaluation; Best Practices; a knowledge management system; and general management and administration of VEGA's work.

It was not able to do so, however, for Project Implementation Support and Initiation of New Projects. The LWA provided in Section B.4, Management Plan, sub-section B.4b, Management Team Goals, "VEGA staff will prepare and unknown quantity of programs on demand from USAID missions." Understandably, it could not quantify the workload and staffing demands of these areas of activity. Consequently, their substantial demand for staff time and effort was "out-of-hide" as regards other LWA-specified activities. The Executive Director, Outreach Director, Program, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, and Outreach Intern were compelled to take up increased workload in these areas. The additional workload was spread out over the course of the year, but was especially intense from early April through September, when ten new projects were initiated, and one existing project was significantly expanded. This, of course, required the negotiation and execution of ten new Associate Cooperative Agreements with USAID Missions or offices, and ten new Sub-Agreements with the VEGA implementing organizations.

This development in 2005 made clear that staffing and other budgetary provision for Project Implementation Support and Initiation of New Projects would have to have to be addressed in preparation for the demands of 2006.

D. Recovery of Indirect Costs

The LWA made no provision for VEGA's recovery of indirect costs, the apparent rationale being that the budget provided adequate funding, as direct costs, for all of VEGA's operations for some (unspecified) period of its first year(s) of operation. The Agreement Officer anticipated, however, that VEGA would - at some (unspecified) point seek to negotiate an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA) with USAID. LWA Modification Number 4 to the LWA, directed that VEGA submit its request for a NICRA not later than November 14, 2005. In consultation with the Executive Director, Ms. Liz Staines (FLAG International), who serves as VEGA's Accounting and Finance Officer, prepared and submitted the NICRA request to USAID. In preparing the request, the Executive Director also had the benefit of the advice and counsel of three VEGA Member Organization Finance Officers: Pablo Paz y Muno, Partners of the Americas; Stephen Kroll, International Executive Service Corps; and Lisa McClay, Winrock

International. The negotiations with Ms. Kim Randall, USAID Office of Acquisition and Assistance, Overhead, Special Cost and Closeout Branch took place on December 8, 2005. On December 21, 2005, Agreement Officer Ellen Wills issued Modification No. 4, adding a two-level NICRA – a 1.73% sub-contract administration fee, and a 13.83% overhead on LWA budget direct costs, which would be effective retroactively to January 1, 2005.

The provision for recovery of indirect costs is an extremely meaningful modification to the LWA, and is essential for VEGA’s organizational development.

E. Retention, Addition, or Loss of VEGA Member Organizations

VEGA’s membership did not change during the year. Three organizations began expressing an interest during the Summer, and made formal application during the Fall. Their applications were brought to the attention of the VEGA Board of Directors at its September 9 meeting. Consequently, incoming Board Chair David Norman, appointed an ad hoc subcommittee of two Board Members, Deirdre White, Citizens Development Corps and Robert I. Nooter, Land O’ Lakes, to guide and support the Executive Director in considering these applications and in developing regularized procedures for VEGA to receive and the Board to consider applications for membership. Still, no new members had been added at the end of the year, so the number of number of members remained at seventeen (17) for the year.

II. Outreach

A. Mission Trips Strategy

The Outreach component was carried out as envisaged in the LWA, i.e., centered largely in visits to targeted USAID Missions. There were three trips to two USAID Regions, Asia and Near East and Europe and Eurasia, and sixteen countries: Morocco; Jordan, Israel (for West Bank/Gaza program) Egypt; Lebanon; Azerbaijan, Georgia, Serbia/Montenegro, Bosnia; Thailand (Regional Development Mission); Philippines; Indonesia; East Timor; Bangladesh; India. The Outreach Director made the visits to all 16 countries; the Executive Director made the visits to five of the countries; the USAID Activity Manager to four of the countries; one Member Organization Home Office staff member made the visit to Egypt; and one other to Azerbaijan and Georgia. VEGA Board of Directors members did not participate in any of the Mission visits in 2005. While Board Members surely did represent and promote VEGA during travel that they made when representing their individual organizations, VEGA has not to date developed and put in place a means for tracking or assessing such effort.

The purpose of these visits was face-to-face meetings to inform staff, particularly Mission Directors, Economic Growth officers, and Contracts officers about VEGA’s capabilities and the advantages that use of the LWA as an acquisition vehicle offered, and to establish working relationships that would be maintained for the purpose of tracking program development and VEGA business opportunities at those Missions. The trips also included meetings of as many Member Organization field staff in the country as possible. At these meetings, the Outreach Director conducted brown-bag information sessions to inform field staff members about VEGA, enabling them to be more effective VEGA representatives and Outreach resource persons, who would have on-going presence in the country and on-going contact with the Missions. The Outreach Director, with the assistance of the Outreach Intern, planned these visits on the basis of substantial pre-visit business intelligence-gathering, including consultation with USAID Desk

Officers; on-going monitoring of USAID’s Congressional Business Justification; contact (e-mail and telephone) with Mission staff; and a series of meetings with Member Organizations with past or present experience in the targeted countries.

The planning and execution of the Mission trips was very effectively done, and the trips (combined with those made in 2004) contributed directly or indirectly to the new project initiations listed in Section IV below, as follows:

- The 2004 visit to South Africa by the Outreach Director and the Activity Manager did lead directly to VEGA’s current (17 - month, \$1.73 million) small grants program there.
- The 2004 visit by the Outreach Director to the Regional Contracts Office in Kenya, did contribute to VEGA’s eventually securing an Associate Cooperative Agreement for the current 3-year, \$11.0 million Agricultural Markets Enterprise Development (AMED) project in the Sudan, but VEGA’s positioning for that opportunity resulted also from contact and an established relationship by VEGA staff in Washington with the EGAT Economic Growth Officer who became the Sudan Field Office’s Cognizant Officer for AMED.
- The 2005 visit by the Outreach Director to Lebanon resulted in the current (9-month, \$500,000) country program assessment that VEGA recently completed there.

On the other hand, the following Mission trip results must also be considered:

- The February/March 2005 visit to Jordan by the Outreach Director and the Executive Director did inform the appropriate Mission staff about VEGA, but the present Long-Term Business Advisor Project in Jordan, and the five other LTBA projects now being implemented come to as the direct result of EGAT’s termination of the Cooperative Agreement - with the Institute of International Education - through which Missions previously accessed the Emerging Markets Development Assistance program, and the folding of that activity into EGAT’s LWA with VEGA.

Visits during this trip to Israel (for West Bank/Gaza) and to Egypt have lead to no new projects or new project prospects to date.

- The Summer 2005 visits by the Outreach Director to Europe and Eurasia Region missions identified new project prospects in Serbia/Montenegro and Bosnia that may come to fruition this year, but none in Azerbaijan and Georgia.
- The October 2005 Asia & Near East Region visit (three countries by the Executive Director; those three countries plus one other by the USAID Activity Manager; those three countries plus three more by the Outreach Director) led to prospective new business opportunities with USAID/Indonesia; with USAID/Bangladesh; and with the Regional Development Mission (RDM) in Thailand. The Indonesia opportunity did not come to fruition. The Bangladesh opportunity fell through when the long-anticipated RFA was recently cancelled by the Mission. The opportunity for a “regional project” with the RDM remains open, and will require further cultivation.

Recognizing that this is a still relatively recent trip, no new prospects have emerged to date from the Mission visits East Timor and India.

The results overall show that periodic Mission visits by VEGA staff, occasional participation by the Activity Manager, and modest participation by Member Organization staff has led directly or indirectly to some new project initiation and identification of some new prospects that are still outstanding. The results show also, however, that the centrality of Mission trips to the overall Outreach strategy merit on-going monitoring - and modification as necessary - in 2006.

VEGA's Outreach activities to date have made great strides in spreading recognition of VEGA as a "brand name" among USAID officials in a number of overseas Missions and Washington offices. Consequently, Mission visits made to **introduce** VEGA will, arguably, not be as critical in 2006 as in 2004 and 2005. Further, the dramatic growth and refining of the VEGA website and dissemination of its Newsletter provide Outreach resources that are available to USAID staff in Washington and overseas with a couple of computer key strokes. Our challenge this year is to give the appropriate weight and allocate the appropriate resources to Mission trips as one component of a comprehensive Outreach strategy for 2006 and beyond.

B. Success Stories and Best Practices

VEGA action on the LWA's requirement for VEGA's identification and dissemination of Best Practices had been initiated in 2004 with the collection by the original Outreach Officer of twenty-five "Best Practices" submitted by Member Organizations. Still, USAID's expectations for this activity were not entirely clear at the beginning of 2005, but were made more clear during the LWA review and clarification consultations with USAID reported in Section I above. There remained, however, the challenge of achieving consensus – between EGAT, VEGA, and Member Organizations - on the definition of "best practices" and "success stories," and on how the two products may differ from, but closely relate to, each other.

Drawing on the guidance and advice of Activity Manager Steve Silcox, the assistance of Consultant Bill Witting, and the collaboration of Member Organization staff, Outreach Director Todd Kirkbride led the effort to resolve these issues. This resulted in the development of prototypes for "Case Studies in Best Practices," products designed to concisely but effectively showcase VEGA's capabilities and achievements in developing and carrying out economic growth programs at quality and cost effectiveness levels that equal or exceed "industry standards."

There remained at the end of the year the question of how "Case Studies in Best Practices" can be most effectively disseminated and used effectively as Outreach tools in 2006 and beyond.

C. Outreach Through Development and Operation of VEGA's Internet and Intranet Websites

The development and operation of VEGA's Internet and Intranet websites advanced dramatically in 2005. VEGA's website (www.vegaalliance.org) serves as the main depository for all VEGA information and targets USAID/ general public interested in learning about the Alliance. Website content was routinely updated with monthly news and events (which coincided with the

distribution of the monthly VEGA Newsletter), new program descriptions, revised outreach materials and other downloadable documents. Navigability was also enhanced due to VEGA's installation of new web-traffic tracking software. Entirely new server platforms, non-conflicted coding language and security measures were also installed.

VEGANet is VEGA's members-only knowledge management intranet website. A newly designed four-level security authorization protection system grants limited access to different visitors whether you are a general member organization, committee member, VEGA staff person or Board of Director. VEGANet has been organized into five primary areas to allow VEGA staff to upload specific documents and discussions targeting different audiences: Board of Directors, Outreach Materials, Associate Design Committee, Leader Steering Committee and Knowledge Management. The most actively used area, Outreach Materials, contains any VEGA document or outreach material piece that the general membership may be interested in. In 2006, VEGA plans to further develop the Knowledge Management site which present contains all the intelligence collecting and reports that VEGA generates including Country Profiles and CBJ Regional Analysis reports.

D. Information Technology Infrastructure Development and Management

VEGA primarily outsources its IT needs with Partners International to manage and maintain VEGA's Microsoft Exchange Server and computer systems. All IT operations are overseen by the Outreach Director, while the Administrative Assistant is the primary contact person for technical matters. VEGA has worked with Partners International to establish systems through which Partners can most efficiently respond to VEGA's IT needs. The staff minimizes costly on-site visits by Partners International by troubleshooting IT complications and following up with Partners via telephone or email communications. In order for VEGA staff to manage budgeted and unexpected IT projects, we have developed a project management protocol with Program Expense Justification Forms to approve unbudgeted IT expenses.

The server was brought on location in 2005 to most cost effectively manage our network and website. Monthly check-ups and system-wide updates are performed by Partners to prevent any virus or software conflicts. The system is preserved by a back-up system on site to record daily work saved on the server. In late 2005, the server experienced multiple failures after the Windows 2003 Service Pack 1 was installed due to previous incorrect configurations of web applications. The server crash forced Partners and VEGA's web developer to clean out and upgrade the server, disable and restart IPSec service, and reconfigure the VEGA website. The result of the server crash is an upgraded, more efficient, and more secure Exchange server that should continue to serve VEGA's growing operations at least throughout 2006. Additional workstations have been purchased to support VEGA's expanding staff needs and the server space will be monitored as the files on the network increase and VEGA website and program websites content continues to increase.

III. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

A. Process of Refining the Concept of a VEGA M&E System

The LWA required the establishment of a VEGA Monitoring and Evaluation system designed to collect common data on the use of volunteers for economic growth technical assistance activities

and impact data on the beneficiary firms receiving VEGA assistance across regions and sectors. The original stated deliverable appeared to anticipate a relatively ambitious and complex M&E system that would be applied to VEGA projects, either in addition to, or in place of, long-established M&E methodologies utilized by the Member Organizations. Further, this LWA deliverable did not give attention to the critical question of how the VEGA M&E system would replace or be reconciled with individual USAID Mission M&E requirements specified in Associate Cooperative Agreements. Answering these questions, and finding a system that could be viewed as complementary and not overly burdensome or repetitious by VEGA's member organizations and project field offices involved a series of discussions and consultations. At the same time, the system needed to meet USAID's needs. Answering that question involved consultations with VEGA's Activity Manager at USAID, Stephen Silcox, and the Farmer-to-Farmer M&E Specialist, Eric Benschotter, to identify exactly what kind of data would be useful to USAID.

B. Consultations with Member Organization Staff and with the USAID Activity Manager

As guided by the LWA, VEGA Program, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer Renee Gifford tried to identify and secure the assistance of Member Organization staff members who had relevant expertise and experience in development and utilization of M&E of economic growth projects. While no individual Member Organization M&E expert was found to be readily available to invest the time needed to advise VEGA on the development of the system, members of the Leader Steering Committee (LSC) and a periodic M&E Committee contributed substantial time and effort to brainstorming on the concept and design of a VEGA M&E system. While the LSC consultations enabled the VEGA staff to move forward, they also raised a series of questions on the feasibility and the added-value of a VEGA system that differed from pre-existing M&E systems.

Consequently, as part of the consultations noted in Item I.B. above, the VEGA Staff and the USAID Activity Manager reached consensus on the nature and scale of a VEGA M&E system that would serve the purpose specified in the LWA, as well as complement existing M&E systems in use by Member Organizations. The VEGA M&E "system" would essentially be a carefully designed set of metrics and indicators that were adaptable to all current and anticipated projects. Instead of investing a large amount of funds to building a database before the system was tested, a series of Microsoft Excel templates were designed for members to fill in data and send to VEGA. VEGA will then consolidate the data for reporting to USAID. After the first year of using these templates, VEGA will consult with USAID and its members to determine if building an electronic or web-based database will be worthwhile.

C. Consultant Services

Guided by these consultations and consensus, the VEGA staff was able to take initial steps in development of the M&E templates. Still, the level of effort and experiential background that was needed to move forward more aggressively required VEGA to supplement its staff with the services of a consultant. Former VEGA Board member and LSC member Bill Witting was contracted to assist with this effort. Renee and Bill, working in on-going consultation with Steve Silcox and with a number of Member Organization staff members, defined the list of critical indicators and developed the set of M&E templates. At the end of the year, these templates had been completed, and development of an Instructions Manual was near completion. The final

steps and distribution of the new templates and instruction guide to all VEGA members was planned for early in 2006.

D. M&E Data Collection in 2006

The next step towards VEGA's M&E reporting is to collect project data. This will entail field testing by VEGA project staff, followed by refinement as needed after the first year. The data collected will be a valuable input to the design and performance monitoring of future economic growth projects, and into the development of VEGA's "Case Studies in Best Practices."

IV. Initiation of New Projects

A. List of New Projects

Following is the list of VEGA projects initiated in 2005:

- Bulgaria (VEGA/Business and Trade Development)
 - Duration: 9/05 - 5/07
 - Amount: \$1,200,000 (increases obligation to \$4,425,848)
 - Implementing Organizations: Citizens Development Corps (CDC), International Executive Service Corps (IESC), Financial Services Volunteer Corps (FSVC)
- Ethiopia (VEGA/African Growth and Opportunities Act)
 - Duration: 6/05 – 6/07
 - Amount: \$299,268
 - Implementing Organization: International Executive Service Corps (IESC)
- Lebanon (VEGA/Lebanon Assessment for Growth and Opportunity)
 - Duration: 9/05 – 1/06
 - Amount: \$249,737
 - Implementing Organizations: Citizens Development Corps (CDC), Partners of the Americas
- Morocco/Bahrain (VEGA/Export Trade Training)
 - Duration: 9/05-9/06
 - Amount: \$700,910
 - Implementing Organizations: International Executive Service Corps (IESC), Institute of International Education (IIE)
- South Africa (VEGA/SAAGA)
 - Duration: 9/05 - 2/07
 - Amount: \$1,731,542
 - Implementing Organization: International Executive Service Corps (IESC)
- Sudan (VEGA/Agriculture Market and Enterprise Development)
 - Duration: 7/05 - 9/08
 - Amount: \$10,999,650
 - Implementing Organizations: Winrock International, ACDI/VOCA, Citizens Development Corps (CDC), Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs (CNFA), International Executive Service Corps (IESC)

Long-Term Business Adviser Programs (VEGA/LTBAS)

- Armenia
 - Duration: 9/05 - 2/07
 - Amount: \$239,211
 - Implementing Organizations: Institute of International Education (IIE)

- Indonesia
 - Duration: 8/05 - 8/06
 - Amount: \$121,736
 - Implementing Organizations: Institute of International Education (IIE)

- Jordan
 - Duration: 7/05 – 3/07
 - Amount: \$361,193
 - Implementing Organizations: Institute of International Education (IIE)

- Mexico
 - Duration: 9/05 - 2/07
 - Amount: \$56,692
 - Implementing Organizations: Institute of International Education (IIE)

- Microenterprise Development (in Ecuador, Guyana, Sierra Leone, Pakistan, Philippines, Zambia)
 - Duration: 9/05 - 2/07
 - Amount: \$387,108
 - Implementing Organizations: Institute of International Education (IIE)

B. Project Acquisition Process

The project acquisition process that led to VEGA’s execution of Associate Cooperative Agreements with the USAID Missions and Washington offices in question was envisaged by the LWA in its provision for the Associate Design Committee (ADC), the operations of which are noted below. The level of effort and intensity of the workload required to enable the ADC to function and to carry out the overall project acquisition process was a first-time effort for the VEGA staff that could not have been anticipated in advance of this year’s experience and which, therefore, had to be developed and refined as this project acquisition cycle played out from early April to early October. While a detailed description of the 2005 experience is not in order here, it is important to highlight here those aspects of the process that must be considered in preparing for new project acquisition in 2006.

1.) Receiving Requests for Services

Requests for VEGA’s services came from USAID Missions or Washington offices in the form of relative formal Requests for Program Description or Requests for Application, as in the case of the Sudan Agricultural Markets and Enterprise Development Project, or in the form of a simple concept paper, as in the case of the Lebanon Assessment for Growth and Opportunity Project. In the latter case, the concept paper was issued with a request that VEGA prepare a response that fleshed out the idea, and proposed the services need to carry out the resulting activity.

Action on these requests for services sometimes began well in advance of receipt of the request itself. Such action included corresponding, sometimes at length, with the Mission or Washington

office to provide it the information needed to access VEGA's services. (Based on this year's experience, the VEGA staff has developed, with the assistance of its EGAT Activity Manager, and distributed to USAID Missions and Washington offices concise but clear instructions on the requirements and the procedures for requesting VEGA's services.)

Once the request for services was received by VEGA, it required a review – done by the Executive Director and the Outreach Director – to determine whether it had sufficient content and clarity for the Member Organizations to prepare comprehensive and fully responsive proposals for consideration by the Associate Design Committee. Further, the Outreach Director then requested from Member Organizations any requests for clarification that they had. Often, on the basis of the VEGA staff review of the Mission's Request, the Outreach Director had to engage in one or more rounds of e-mail or telephone exchange to get clarifications or additional information that VEGA needed to issue the most complete and clearest possible request for proposals to the Member Organizations, and for the Member Organizations to prepare and submit the most responsive proposals.

2.) Proposal Review and Selection of Implementing Organizations

Operations of the Associate Design Committee (ADC)

Established for the purpose of reviewing and scoring proposals submitted by the Member Organizations, then selecting the implementing organization to be proposed to USAID, the Associate Design Committee had procedures that had worked well for those projects initiated in 2004. In 2005, however, the quantity and variety of proposals reviewed, and the workload generated by the review of more than one proposal simultaneously, necessitated refinement of the ADC's procedures. As led and coordinated by the Outreach Director, the ADC successfully modified or re-created procedures as needed, and re-designed evaluation forms, scoring criteria and quality control mechanisms to ensure that USAID Missions would receive the best possible proposal from VEGA. The ADC's procedures – with timelines for Fast-Track and Full Review and the evaluation scorecard are shown in Attachments 1,2,3, respectively.

Overall, the ADC's work was excellent; the Committee reviewed and scored 16 proposals between mid-April and mid-September, showing outstanding commitment by the Committee members themselves, and generous contribution of staff level-of-effort by the participating Member Organizations.

The 2005 experience demonstrated, however, that there was need for improvement of VEGA's procedures – and resources - for review of requests for services, and selection of implementing organizations. The key issues were the following:

- Because no ADC member can participate in the review of proposals submitted in response to an implementation opportunity for which his/her employer is competing, the make-up of the ADC varied – sometimes dramatically – from one set of proposals to another.
- Constituting a committee for review of proposals from which the appointed ADC members had to reclude themselves sometimes resulted in a committee that did not offer as much professional experience and relevant expertise as the recused ADC members for whom the alternate committee members were substituting.

- While, as noted above, the results of the ADC’s were excellent overall, the Committee’s effective operation was sometimes impeded by the inability of some members to meet the review and scoring deadlines of the process, especially in those cases in which two sets of proposals were being reviewed simultaneously.
- There arose some perception, which was intense in some cases, that the fairness of proposal review and scoring was being compromised by inter-organizational competition and “unholy alliances” between some ADC members.

The management of the proposal review and selection process and the on-going refinement of the ADC’s operations required intense level-of-effort by the Outreach Director and the Outreach Intern, and the Executive Director. In addition to management and coordination of the operations of the ADC, some special measures were needed to minimize any real or perceived compromise of the fairness of the process. For example, requests received by VEGA had to be reviewed and modified as needed to eliminate any language that inadvertently suggested a preference - on the part of the requesting USAID Mission or Washington office – for a particular VEGA Member as the implementing organization.

Establishment of the Independent Evaluators Council (IEC)

The experience of the April-September operations of the ADC underscored the merit of an approach that was adopted by Member Organizations at the 2005 Annual Members meeting in April, i.e., the selection and utilization by VEGA of “independent evaluators,” professionals not employed by or having organizational loyalty to any Member Organization. VEGA therefore formed an Independent Evaluators Council (IEC), a committee of established development professional, not tied to any particular Member Organization committed to serving – **as volunteers** – on VEGA proposal review and scoring panels. The list of professionals who have committed to serving on the IEC is shown in Attachment 4. It should be noted that this list includes senior-level professionals with notable standing in the development community, and who bring to the process a level of expertise and credibility with USAID Mission and Washington offices that is not offered by middle-level employees of VEGA Member Organizations.

The IEC is in place and ready to participate in the proposal review and scoring process. Its use in selecting the implementing organization(s) for the next request for services that VEGA receives will be on a trial basis, in anticipation of the IEC’s becoming the sole or principle means by which all VEGA proposals are reviewed and scored, and of the ADC’s continuing to play and advisory and supportive role for VEGA in the overall acquisition process.

Submission of Proposals and Receipt, Negotiation and Execution of Associate Cooperative Agreements.

Once the winning proposal was selected by the ADC, it was submitted by VEGA to the requesting USAID Mission or Washington office. This entailed review and revision as needed, then packaging of the technical and cost proposals as VEGA submissions. The requesting Mission/Washington office’s receipt, consideration of and response to the submitted proposal had to be tracked by VEGA, with follow-up action as needed when action and response was not forthcoming within a reasonable period. This sometimes included a “best and final” process that required VEGA staff to oversee and coordinate the implementing organization(s) preparation of the “best and final” offer. This submission was often followed, in turn, by a series of phone and e-mail exchanges that eventually resulted in VEGA’s receipt of an Associate Cooperative

Agreement. This agreement had to be reviewed by VEGA staff and the implementing organization to ensure that its provisions were consistent with the submitted proposal. The finalized Associate Cooperative was executed by signature of the USAID Agreement Officer, and signature/acknowledgement by the VEGA Executive Director.

This part of the process required some additional effort by the Outreach Director, the full engagement of the Executive Director, with an intense level of effort by Liz Staines, FLAG International, who functions as VEGA's full-time Budget and Finance Officer.

Preparation, Negotiation and Execution of Sub-Agreements with the Implementing Organizations

This set of labor-intensive tasks essentially constituted a Program Officer function that fell largely on the plate of the Executive Director, a "Contracts Officer" function that fell largely on the plate of the Budget and Finance Officer. Staff responsibility for these tasks must be reviewed and re-allocated, in 2006.

V. Project Implementation Support

A. Supporting Projects in the Field

VEGA's project portfolio increased from three projects at the start of 2005 to twelve by September 30. Again, this rapid and sizeable increase could not have been anticipated by the Member Organizations when preparing the proposal that was submitted to USAID in September 2003, or by EGAT in preparing the Leader with Associates Cooperative Agreement (LWA) that was executed in February 2004. The proposal and the resulting LWA were clear in their staffing and other provisions for the VEGA staff's principal workload areas, i.e., organizational start-up, management and administration; Outreach; Monitoring & Evaluation; Best Practices/Success Stories; liaison with Member Organizations, liaison with EGAT. There was little provision, however, for initiation of new projects, as discussed in Section IV, and for on-going support for the initiation of these projects. Executive Director Jim May did define the position of Program, Monitoring & Evaluation Officer to include project support as half of the workload of that position, and indeed, it was surely anticipated that the Executive Director position would include responsibility for project implementation support, but surely not the level required by the Iraq Private Sector Development Initiative, which was additional to the more moderate workload demands of implementation support for the Bulgaria Trade and Development Project or the Cyprus Program for Economic Growth.

The reality of VEGA's operations in 2005 was that the staff's overall workload was very heavily weighted toward Section IV's project initiation demands and on-going project implementation support. This support includes as the broad task areas: liaison with Agreement Officers and Cognizant Technical Officers; oversight and coordination of the work of the implementing organizations; preparation and management of Associate Cooperative Agreements; review and submission of the quarterly performance reports (prepared by the implementing organizations); preparation and submission of quarterly financial reports; and liaison with Chiefs of Party, the official representatives of VEGA, the Recipient of all Associated Cooperative Agreements.

B. Changing Structure of Project Implementation Teams

By resolution of the Board of Directors at its September 9, 2005 meeting, VEGA implementing organization teams will henceforth be made up of a prime implementing organization; and associate implementing organizations. To define and secure the services needed, to provide financial the resources, and to pass on obligations that it assumes through Associate Cooperative Agreements, VEGA will execute a Sub-Agreement with the Prime. The Prime, in turn, will enter into sub-agreements or sub-contracts with associate implementing organizations. The Prime will be accountable to VEGA for delivery of all the services and products specified in the Sub-Agreement and for the performance of the entire implementing organization team.

This implementation team structure was adopted to address the operational challenges experienced with teams on which all implementing organizations operated under Sub-Agreements with VEGA, and under which the so called “Lead Organization” did not assume a clear leadership role or responsibilities, and was not fully empowered to direct the operations of the team. The challenge for 2006 and beyond will be to learn from and refine as needed VEGA’s use of the Prime and Associates implementing team structure.

VI. 2005 Budget and Expenditures

The costs incurred by VEGA to implement the LWA for two years have been under the original budget projections.

During the first program year, (Feb 04 – Feb 05), VEGA expended less than budgeted in most areas, carrying over of its Year 1 funding into Year 2. Because of budget adjustments needed to provide increased level-of effort to managing Associate Cooperative Agreements, and to the Mission trips made under the Outreach component, expenditures in Year 2 will bring expenditures closer to the levels projected for VEGA’s first two years of operation.

The recently acquired NICRA will allow VEGA to request Associate Cooperative Agreement modifications to recover indirect costs. This funding will allow VEGA to restore the LWA budget and move forward with added financial resources for on-going operations and organizational development measures.

Implementing organizations’ expenditures on behalf VEGA under their respective Sub-Agreements, made pursuant to VEGA’s Associate Cooperative Agreements with USAID, are not included in the LWA accounting above. All Financial Status reports for the implementing organizations’ programs are prepared on the basis of data submitted by members involved. All

reports are submitted with the Executive Directors signature and are available to VEGA member organizations or USAID offices upon request.

VII. Considerations for 2006 Work Plan

A. Staffing

VEGA's staff will need to be increased, and re-aligned as necessary, to ensure that the workload demands of new project initiation and project implementation support can be assigned the appropriate level of effort, at the same time that appropriate level of effort is committed to the activities (Outreach, M&E; Best Practices/Success Stories; general management and administration) for which the LWA specifically provides.

B. Office Space

VEGA's present office served it well in 2004, but came to be less than completely adequate in 2005, because of increasing staff size, along with the need to present VEGA more as a fully professional non-profit corporation than as a project office. VEGA plans to identify and move to more appropriate office space as early in the year as practicable..

C. Outreach

VEGA's Outreach strategy will have to be reviewed and re-considered in light of the success that the Outreach effort has had to date in establishing VEGA as a far more readily and widely recognized "brand name" among USAID staff and entities in the field and in Washington, and the recognition (favorable or not) that VEGA has gained from its implementation of projects. As the Outreach needs for 2006 and beyond will differ from those of 2004 and 2005, the results and cost effectiveness of Mission visits by Washington-based staff will need to be re-considered and modified as needed to make it just one element of a more comprehensive outreach strategy. One other issue that must be squarely addressed in a new Outreach strategy is the need for substantially increased and more sustained VEGA Outreach effort by the Member Organizations – particularly by their staffs in the field, and their senior officials who routinely make representations to USAID.

D. Monitoring & Evaluation

Utilization of the now completed and disseminated M&E templates by the individual projects will have to be monitored for effectiveness and value – in achieving the stated objectives of the LWA, and any specified M&E objectives of the Associate Cooperative Agreements in question.

E. Project Implementation Teams

The newly adopted model of Prime-led implementation teams will need to be monitored to ensure that it is, in fact, addressing the weaknesses of the structure that it replaced, and that it strengthens VEGA's overall project performance and fulfillment of its commitments to cooperative agreement partners.

Attachment 1:



VEGA Fast Track Process for Preparing Program Designs
10 business days/ 2 weeks

Timing (business days)	Task
Action Prior to VEGA’s Distribution of Requests to Members <i>- VEGA emails members SOW</i> <i>- Member email questions back to VEGA</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USAID Mission/Bureau Program Development Requests are first approved by the USAID CTO for the Leader Agreement and then forwarded to VEGA by the Contracts Officer for the particular Mission interested in entering into an Associate Agreement with VEGA. 2. VEGA will review request to confirm it does not mention any VEGA members’ specific services and then circulate the SOW via email to all the member organizations, so that they are informed of this business opportunity at the same time. 3. Members have 24 hours to review the SOW and email back any questions or clarifications they feel are necessary to prepare the best program design for USAID. 4. VEGA communicates with Mission to receive clarification on any outstanding matters.
Day 0 <i>VEGA Request for Services sent to all members</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. VEGA emails official Program Description Request to all member organizations’ assigned VEGA contacts including updated timeline and clarification points sent from Mission.
Day 2 <i>Members self-nominate</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. All members notify VEGA via email of their interest in participating in the program design.
Day 6 <i>Proposals Due</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Interested organizations submit proposal (<u>maximum 11 pages</u>, min 11pt font, standard 1”margin) in the following format (a maximum of two documents will be accepted from each organization, one in Word or equivalent and one in spreadsheet format-preferably Excel): ** <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Organization’s approach, concept (max 6 pages)-(should include timeline as an appendix) b. Core Capacities of lead and collaborating organizations (2 pages) c. Staff and Volunteers (max 3 pages)-(must include full CV’s of key personnel as an appendix) d. Budget Appendix –summary, detailed and full budget narrative (include as an appendix: refer to VEGA budget guidelines) 8. VEGA collects and reviews proposals to make sure that they contain all required sections and do not exceed 11 pages. 9. VEGA forwards the proposals that met criteria to all ADC members who are not submitting proposals. Organizations involved in the proposals, as either leads or collaborators, cannot participate in the selection process.

<p>Day 8 <i>ADC submits votes to VEGA/ Implementing organizations selected</i></p>	<p>10. ADC members submit comments and score proposals to VEGA according to following weights (unless one or more voting members requests a meeting to discuss the proposals, Members submit comments and scores to VEGA via email by COB):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Organization’s approach 45 % b. Core capacities 20% c. Staffing & Volunteers 25% d. Budget 10% <p>11. ADC and VEGA deliberate scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any winning proposal must meet a minimum overall threshold score of above 70%. • If the scoring for two or more proposals is within a 3% spread, the ADC will submit further questions to each competing organizations and will then cast a secret ballot to determine the lead implementer. • ADC may interview submitting organizations for clarifications on proposal (questions will be emailed to organizations prior to conference call). • ADC may conference call to discuss questions or issues (initiated by VEGA or at the request of an ADC member).
<p>Day 9 <i>Winners notified</i></p>	<p>12. The ED notifies the Lead Implementing Organization and the ADC of the results of the selection process.</p> <p>13. The ED notifies all member organizations of the ADC’s selection decision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Any VEGA member may appeal the ADC decision to the ED of VEGA within one business day. The appeal must be in writing, and should be stated in the form of a concise and clear argument. Should the ED find the organization’s arguments to be valid, the Board of Directors will be called upon to vote within 2 business days to either uphold the ADC’s decision or to request the ADC to reconsider its decision explaining why it has done so.
<p>Day 10 <i>VEGA proposal sent to Mission</i></p>	<p>14. Once the ADC has chosen the best implementation plan, the ED will convey VEGA’s Program Description (which now includes the Program Design and the Implementation Plan) to USAID.</p> <p>15. The ED serves as the official negotiator for VEGA, but he will consult as needed with the Lead Implementing Organization on matters affecting the award. If the Mission requests that VEGA travel to the country to negotiate the Associate Award, and if VEGA agrees to do so, the Lead Implementing Organization will likely need to send a representative for these negotiations.</p>

**** NEW Proposal Writing Suggestions:**

- Proposal writing may be done from the perspective of the submitting member organization. However, do not over-brand document with individual member organizations since it will be VEGAized before final submission.
- **Please use block formatting and center justified text.**
- Customize capabilities statement for each proposal based on relevant regional and technical experience for that particular proposal.

Attachment 2:



VEGA Full Review Process for Preparing Program Designs
20 business days/4 weeks

Timing	Task
Action Prior to VEGA's Distribution of Requests to Members <i>- VEGA emails members SOW</i> <i>- Member email questions back to VEGA</i>	16. USAID Mission/Bureau Program Development Requests are first approved by the USAID CTO for the Leader Agreement and then forwarded to VEGA by the Contracts Officer for the particular Mission interested in entering into an Associate Agreement with VEGA. 17. VEGA will review request to confirm it does not mention any VEGA members' specific services and then circulate the SOW via email to all the member organizations, so that they are informed of this business opportunity at the same time. 18. Members have 24 hours to review the SOW and email back any questions or clarifications they feel are necessary to prepare the best program design for USAID. 19. VEGA communicates with Mission to receive clarification on any outstanding matters.
Day 0 <i>VEGA request for services sent to all members</i>	20. VEGA emails official Program Description Request to all member organizations' assigned VEGA contacts including updated timeline and clarification points sent from Mission.
Day 7 <i>Members self-nominate</i>	21. All members notify VEGA via email of their interest in participating in the program design.
Day 14 <i>Proposals Due</i>	22. Interested organizations submit proposal (maximum 16 pages; min 11pt font, standard 1"margin) in the following format (a maximum of two documents will be accepted from each organization, one in Word or equivalent and one in spreadsheet format-preferably Excel)**: a. Organization's approach, concept (maximum 8 pages) -(should include timeline as an appendix) b. Core Capacities of lead and collaborating organizations (4 pages) c. Management Plan and Personnel: Staff and Volunteers (4 pages)-(must include full CV's of key personnel as an appendix) d. Budget Appendix –summary, detailed and full budget narrative (include as an appendix: refer to VEGA budget guidelines) 23. VEGA collects and reviews proposals to make sure that they contain all required sections and do not exceed 16 pages. 24. VEGA forwards the proposals that met criteria to all ADC members who are not submitting proposals . Organizations involved in the proposals, as either leads or collaborators, cannot participate in the selection process.
Day 17 <i>ADC submits votes to VEGA</i>	25. ADC members submit comments and score proposals to VEGA according to following weights (unless one or more voting members requests a meeting to discuss the proposals, Members submit comments and scores to the ED via email by COB): a. Organization's approach 45 %

	<p>b. Core capacities 20%</p> <p>c. Staffing & Volunteers 25%</p> <p>d. Budget 10%</p>
<p>Day 18 <i>Implementing organizations selected</i></p>	<p>26. ADC and VEGA deliberate scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any winning proposal must meet a minimum overall threshold score of above 70%. • If the scoring for two or more proposals is within a 3% spread, the ADC will submit further questions to each competing organizations and will then cast a secret ballot to determine the lead implementer. • ADC may interview submitting organizations for clarifications on proposal (questions will be emailed to organizations prior to conference call). • ADC may conference call to discuss questions or issues (initiated by VEGA or at the request of an ADC member).
<p>Day 19 <i>Winners notified</i></p>	<p>27. The ED notifies the Lead Implementing Organization and the ADC of the results of the selection process.</p> <p>28. The ED notifies all member organizations of the ADC’s selection decision.</p> <p>a. Any VEGA member may appeal the ADC decision to the ED of VEGA within one business day. The appeal must be in writing, and should be stated in the form of a concise and clear argument. Should the ED find the organization’s arguments to be valid, the Board of Directors will be called upon to vote within 2 business days to either uphold the ADC’s decision or to request the ADC to reconsider its decision explaining why it has done so.</p>
<p>Day 20 <i>VEGA proposal sent to Mission</i></p>	<p>29. Once the ADC has chosen the best implementation plan, the ED will convey VEGA’s Program Description (which now includes the Program Design and the Implementation Plan) to USAID.</p> <p>30. The ED serves as the official negotiator for VEGA, but he will consult as needed with the Lead Implementing Organization on matters affecting the award. If the Mission requests that VEGA travel to the country to negotiate the Associate Award, and if VEGA agrees to do so, the Lead Implementing Organization will likely need to send a representative for these negotiations.</p>

**** NEW Proposal Writing Suggestions:**

- Proposal writing may be done from the perspective of the submitting member organization. However, do not over-brand document with individual member organizations since it will be VEGAized before final submission.
- **Please use block formatting and center justified text.**
- Customize capabilities statement for each proposal based on relevant regional and technical experience for that particular proposal.

Attachment 3:



Date: 00/00/00

Evaluation Prepared By: *Put your name here*

Proposal Name: *Put proposal name here*

Organization Submitting: *Name of org you are evaluating*

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORECARD				
	Max Weight	Score	% Score (out of 100)	Total
1. Organizational Approach (45 points)				
a) Does the proposal clearly describe the organization's approach and does the proposal include specific, measurable objectives?	9	0	0%	0
b) Does the proposal address the needs of the Mission and deliver the desired results?	12	0	0%	0
c) Is the work plan and methodology coherent, feasible and flexible for achieving the stated objectives? If a consortium, is it clear how members will interact and decisions will be taken in management of project?	14	0	0%	0
d) Does the proposal adequately use local partners and resources?	7	0	0%	0
e) Is there an adequate timeline indicating activities?	3	0	0%	0
Total Weighted Score			0%	0

Organizational Approach Comments:

please put all your comments in this one box.

	Max Weight	Score	% Score (out of 100)	Total
2. Core Capabilities (20 points)				
a) Does the lead organization demonstrate all the necessary capabilities or have they partnered with appropriate other organizations to deliver on the objectives?	11	0	0%	0
b) Does the organization have a successful past experience in that sectors?	9	0	0%	0
Total Weighted Score			0%	0

Core Capabilities Comments:

please put all your comments in this one box.

	Max Weight	Score	% Score (out of 100)	Total
3. Staffing & Volunteers (25 points)				
a) Are the roles and responsibilities of staff and volunteers clearly stated?	7	0	0%	0
b) Does the proposal integrate the use of volunteers where ever would be most beneficial to the program?	6	0	0%	0
c) Are the capabilities of key personal appropriate for the implementation and management of this program?	9	0	0%	0
d) Does the proposal suggest an appropriate management structure for volunteers (including recruiting, SOW's, logistics etc.)	3	0	0%	0

Total Weighted Score	0%	0
----------------------	----	---

Staffing and Volunteer Comments:

please put all your comments in this one box.

	Max Weight	Score	% Score (out of 100)	Total
4. Budget (10 points)				
a) Is the budget reasonable and justifies costs in relation to objectives and activities?	6	0	0%	0
b) Does the organization(s) appropriately plan for resource and personnel utilization to achieve the project objectives?	4	0	0%	0
Total Weighted Score			0%	0

Budget Comments:

please put all your comments in this one box.

GRAND TOTAL	0%	0
--------------------	-----------	----------

Overall Proposal Comments (and specific suggestions if score less than 70%):

please put all your comments in this one box.

Attachment 4:

IEC Master Contact and Profile List

Jeanne Bartholomew

7657 Township Road 234

Logan, OH 43128

Tel: 740-385-8363

Key Qualifications:

Sustainable rural economic development; community development; agribusiness and marketing; women in economic development; international project development and grant writing; project start-up; project management; monitoring and evaluation; technical assistance and small grant projects; NGO capacity building; national rural development strategy facilitation; written and oral presentations; networking and coalition building; experience working with U.S. federal agencies, World Bank, UNDP; country experience includes China, Mongolia, Republic of Georgia, Moldova and Ecuador

Bradley J. Beeler

160 Covell Road

Pomfret Center, CT 06259

Tel: 860-974-2824

Email: bradleybeeler@sbcglobal.net or bbeeler@beelerconsultingllc.com

Key Qualifications: Educator and consultant with more than thirty years of professional experience in business development in both domestic and international settings. Premier communication and presentation ability coupled with a vast knowledge of strategic, business, and financial planning. A strong creative leader that can assimilate technical and cultural information and develop effective business and educational projects. A demonstrated record of team building through training and motivation. Particular characteristics and areas of expertise include: international project management; teaching, research, writing and analytical skills; survey research, design and analysis; written and oral presentations; networking and coalition building; experience working with U.S. federal agencies, foreign government agencies, and NGO/PVOs.

James Bell

6203 Dunrobbin Dr.

Bethesda, MD 20816

Tel: 301-263-9894

Cell: 240-481-8378

Email: kellybell21@comcast.net

Key Qualifications: Rural economic development; agribusiness and marketing; project management (participatory needs assessments and RRAs, project design, development, and implementation, and M & E); community participation (local leadership, CSOs, and CBOs); small grant projects; capacity building and training for--community members and village leadership, NGOs, national, regional and local Govt. staff; and humanitarian relief and disaster assistance.

Ernest Bethe III

2417 Chilcombe Avenue

St. Paul, MN 55108

Tel: 651-917-7670

Cell: 651-260-201

Email: ernest_bethe@iname.com

Key Qualifications: International agribusiness operations; international economic development; project assessment and monitoring; international project start-up; project/program development; negotiation and alliances; financial acumen; USAID/other donors experience; food aid and rural credit experience; Africa, Asia, Middle East, FSU work.

Ronald R. Bielen

202 Pinecrest Avenue
Wausau, WI 54401
Tel: 715-849-8862
Email: bielens@ol.com

Key Qualifications: Development finance specialist with over 25 years of experience in microfinance, small enterprise finance and rural finance. Experience includes policy analysis, lending, financial services, management, project implementation, evaluations/assessments and advising. Experienced in the institutional strengthening of commercial banks in the areas of micro and small enterprise finance. Resident advisor to commercial banks on USAID and World Bank/IFC funded microenterprise credit projects which demonstrated that lending to microenterprises could be profitable. Experienced in assisting non-bank financial institutions and NGOs.

Philip L. Brown

1959 Lake Blvd., #134
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: 916-756-9310
Email: phil@csdc.org

Key Qualifications: 25 years of experience in economic development and business assistance programs, international and domestic, with emphasis in designing and implementing microenterprise/small business/farm/cooperative credit programs and delivery of training/technical assistance to business owners and cooperative leaders/management.

Christine Weiss Daugherty

4902 Park Blvd.
Oakland, CA 94611
Tel: 510-482-9956
Email: cweissd@att.net

Key Qualifications: Ms Weiss Daugherty has expertise in program development, gender specialization, proposal writing, technical assistance and education, management, writing and publication, evaluation, and organizational development. She previously worked as a Country Representative and Senior Program Advisor to the Rural Community Capacity Building Program in Banska Bystrica, Slovak Republic, and currently owns her own consultant firm specializing in rural economic development and women and community economic development in national and international settings.

Sally W. Everett

790 Stephanie Circle
Great Falls, VA 22066
Tel: 571-235-5377
Email: SEverett717@aol.com

Key Qualifications: Ms. Everett has over 20 years of experience as a manager and leader in the public and private sector, internationally and domestically. As a Principal with Booz Allen Hamilton, she has served on multiple corporate governance committees in the areas of strategy, administration, finance, and people development. In her other capacities as a management consultant, she has developed, implemented, and evaluated major programs and policies for multiple clients. Ms Everett recently served as the Booz Allen senior manager for the US international programs for multiple clients including USAID, United States Trade Development Agency, Millennium Challenge Corporation, as well as World Bank and the other multilateral development banks. She has served as program manager for large Indefinite Quality Contracts including GWACs. Her areas of expertise include economic reform, public and private sector development, infrastructure, healthcare, environmental consulting, and employment and training.

Flemming Heegaard

88 Rockledge Ct.
Front Royal, VA 22630
Tel: 540-635-7003
Fax: 540-635-2006
Email: fheeg@shentel.net

Key Qualifications: Mr. Heegaard is a highly experienced Social/Institutional/HRD Development expert specializing in community-based evaluation, program design and training. Educated in Europe and the United States in Psychology, International Affairs, Economics and Political Science and Public Administration, he has 14 years of residential, long term development management experience in Nepal, Afghanistan, Egypt, Kenya, and Ukraine. He has also implemented numerous short-term consultancies and evaluation on participatory project design, evaluation and training in more than 30 countries, most of these as Chief of Party. He is currently teaching Grants management on contract to USAID mission, most recently in Ethiopia, Tanzania, Albania, and Ukraine.

Kenneth A. Lanza

Managing Director, Emerging Markets
BearingPoint, Inc.
1676 International Drive
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703-747-3000
Fax: 703-342-1028
Email: kenneth.lanza@bearingpoint.com

Key Qualifications: Mr. Kenneth A. Lanza is a BearingPoint Managing Director overseeing its global Private Sector Development practice in *Competitiveness and Enterprise Development* from corporate headquarters in McLean, Virginia. Prior to joining BearingPoint, Mr. Lanza served as *Senior Foreign Affairs Advisor to the Assistant to the President* in the White House from 2003-2004. As a US Foreign Service Officer, Mr. Lanza held a senior management position in the US Agency for International Development (USAID) based in Washington, D.C. He joined the US Government in 1984 and oversaw the development and implementation of the Agency's \$2.3 billion Economic Growth programs in Europe and Eurasia as the Director of Economic Growth.

Paul A. Lundberg

36 Newton St
Portland, ME 04103
Email: paulalundberg@yahoo.com

Key Qualifications: I am a specialist in democratic local governance. I have 23 years of on-the-ground experience strengthening the planning and management capabilities of newly emerging democratic local governance institutions in Egypt, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Indonesia, Philippines, Cambodia, Thailand, Myanmar, Vietnam, and Mongolia. I am experienced in the programming systems of UNDP, USAID, and UNICEF. I bring professional level knowledge of democratic institutional analysis, human rights assessment, project/program design, management and evaluation; participatory workshop methods, NRM research and spatial analysis.

Jon C. Richards

2293 McPherson
North Bend, OR 97459
Tel: 541-756-6445 (work)
Fax: 541-756-5735
Email: jrichards@socc.edu

Key Qualifications: Mr. Richards' main qualifications are in projects and activities of small business development, entrepreneurship, rural development, as well as export development.

Albert Schlachtmeyer

International Executive Service Corps
Suite 1010
901 15th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202 326 0280
Direct: 202 589 2626
Fax: 202 326 0289

Email: aschlachtmeyer@iesc.org

Key Qualifications: Mr. Schlachtmeyer is a former key executive of Hewitt Associates and served as the firm's Global Practice Leader for communication, education, and training services. With more than 30 years of experience in the human resources communication field, Al has been involved with many innovative, award-winning initiatives for a wide spectrum of organizations. At Hewitt, he also served as a senior communication strategy resource for organizational change and global equity initiatives. He has relevant experience with small and medium-sized overseas enterprises, governmental entities and NGO's. Relevant country experience: Ukraine.

K.C. Soares, Ph.D

170 Stuart Pointe Lane, Suite 103
Herndon, VA 20170
Tel: 703-464-9778

Email: kcesoares@erols.com

Key Qualifications: Development and implementation of creative approaches to effective social change in public and private, formal and informal sectors; executive development and coaching; negotiations and third party facilitation; leadership development, strategic planning and management; strategic alliance facilitation; organization development and institution building; policy formulation and implementation; total quality programs; development, implementation, management and evaluation of programs; human resource development; entrepreneurial and problem solving skills; critical and analytical reasoning skills; training and teaching; researching and writing. Over 30 years working in multicultural, multilingual environments.

Patricia Lynn Walker, Ph.D

1300 E. 47th Street
Chicago, IL 60653
Tel: 773-285-3331

Email: plwalker@casid.org

Key Qualifications: International Economic Development Analyst and Evaluator with expertise designing projects, surveys and monitoring systems, and conducting research and analysis, interviews, social-economic impact assessments, and evaluations. Skilled in microenterprise development, gender, agricultural credit and informal financial markets. Experience acquired through field assignments in Africa with the Ford Foundation, agencies implementing projects for USAID and at the Harvard Institute for International Development and Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.

Abraham Woldeghebriel

1404 Canton Dr.
Columbia, MO 65302
Tel: 573-234-1373
Email: canton4@hotmail.com

Key Qualifications: More than 15 years of teaching, research, and outreach activities in animal agriculture in the United States, and over 10 years of participatory development in agriculture, child nutrition and health, food security, and sustainable rural development in Malawi and Ethiopia. Has developed strong skills in identifying, writing, directing/managing research and development programs/projects and has been in business for more than 20 years. Very familiar with the rules and regulations governing funding agencies like USDA, USAID, UNDP/FAO. Served as the principal investigator of USAID funded child nutrition and health project in Malawi (2000-2003) and as a volunteer consultant to the ACDI/VOCA sponsored rural development enterprise unit in Eritrea. Extensively traveled and worked in several African countries, many countries in Europe, Canada, and India as a consultant or attending conferences. Currently, self-employed managing a consulting firm.

Paul Wong

1245 13th St, NW, Apt. 901
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-390-4062
Email: pwong@umich.edu

Key Qualifications: Mr. Paul Wong specializes in banking and capital markets development. His prior work in international development has centered on structuring, analyzing, and evaluating credit guarantee programs for the USAID Development Credit Authority. Past projects include: power project finance in Asia, small business development in Eastern Europe, rural finance in Africa. His work in development finance builds upon his project finance experience at the at the Export-Import Bank and management consultant experience at Mercer and KPMG. He has a Master of Business Administration and a Master of Public Policy from the University of Michigan, and a Bachelor of Arts from Swarthmore College.

J. W. Wright, Jr., Ph.D

Business Development Manager
US Agency for International Development Account
IBM Global Services
1301 K St. NW
Washington DC 20005
Tel: 571-238-0607
Fax: 301-803-1181
Email: j.w.wright@us.ibm.com

Key Qualifications: Dr. J.W. Wright is the Business Development Executive for the International Financing Institutions Account, USAID/International Practice, at International Business Machines - Business Consulting Services (IBM/BSC). IBM/BSC was created by the acquisition of PricewaterhouseCoopers Consulting by IBM in 2002. In this position Wright has primary responsibility for field marketing and business development activities for the consulting group that provides services to USAID on a global basis. The Account also works with the World Bank and other donors, as well as the US Department of State. Wright specializes in raising significant project funds and designing strategies for major contracts. In that past two years, key wins for the USAID Practice have include a \$1 billion Financial Services blanket purchase agreement award, and a \$2.4 billion Macroeconomic Policy indefinite quantity contract award, as well as field projects.