

## USAID Montenegro Assessment

### **Economic Impact of Community Revitalization through Democratic Action (CRDA) and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP)**

#### **Statement of Work**

#### **I. PURPOSE OF THE ASSESSMENT**

The primary purpose of this report is to provide USAID/Montenegro with an objective, external, economic impact<sup>1</sup> assessment of two key, but different USAID/Montenegro programs that will be closing, to apply experience to the next generation economic growth programs including Local Economic Development project, as well as to higher level (national) interventions.

Given the broader original conceptual design of the Community Revitalization through Democratic Action (CRDA) program, the secondary purpose of the assessment is to examine efficiency, sustainability and relevance of CRDA as a vehicle for citizen participation and to include specific areas jointly covered with a prematurely closed local government activity (Good Local Government (GLG) Program), which had planned overlap on certain participation functions/outcomes.

In order to achieve the purposes of the assessment, the assessment team will seek to capture effective approaches, analyze utility of performance monitoring efforts and consider respective outcomes and results, and influence of internal and external changes on achievement of results.

The results of this assessment will provide feedback to USAID/Montenegro for any lessons learned that can be incorporated into relevant on-going or new activities. A summary report will be shared with the Government of Montenegro and the donor community. The results will also be used by the Business Growth Initiative (BGI) Project of EGAT/EG (CTO, Steve Silcox) to disseminate lessons learned and best practices in enterprise development

#### **II. BACKGROUND**

Whereas the assessment takes into account two activities, CRDA and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP), it is not envisioned as a formal 'final' assessment of those activities. Instead, the Mission is looking to

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this assessment, economic impact is defined as changes in economic activity within each CRDA Regions and/or Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) sector, resulting from investments and activities under these projects in combination with other major events identified. To the extent possible, USAID is interested in better understanding and quantifying the 'value added' of the two activities to be assessed in terms of their relative merits against opportunities lost and unmet needs.

capture key areas of overlap of importance to the Mission. CRDA is a very broad program with two implementers, each working in a discrete geographic area and using a variety of approaches. However, economic development/revitalization was a connecting theme for a majority of CRDA resources, especially in the second part of its implementation.

At the same time, the Mission wants to capture the impact of CRDA on citizen participation as a secondary theme because it was the original primary purpose in CRDA and it remains an important theme in Montenegro. In the assessment, the Mission is also looking for specific overlaps with GLG that were part of the original CRDA design and that have relevance to the secondary assessment theme of citizen participation.

## **1. Information bases/foundation:**

Given breadth of information to cover – in addition to making choices (and eliminating certain activity areas, to facilitate review, the Mission has:

- 1.1. For CRDA - created matrices to help catalogue/synthesize/inventory numerous activities, and provide easier foundation for understanding/review/identifying data sources;
- 1.2. Detailed project descriptions and performance data are available in CRDA and MCP project databases.
- 1.3. The assessment team will also have access to mid-term evaluation of CRDA as well as implementer reports, studies, assessments and other available materials

## **2. Activity descriptions:**

### **2.1. CRDA Basic Facts:**

- 1,161 projects worth \$50.6 million implemented in 21 municipalities throughout Montenegro from 2002 to 2007.
- Designed as a three year program that was extended for an additional two years.
- Two regions served by a different implementing partner. North by CHF and South by IRD
- Objective: “a community development program aimed at promoting citizen participation in and between communities to identify and address the critical needs of the economic and social revitalization of community life”.
- Communities’ cost share contribution higher than 50%
- Project categories: Social (151 project worth 1.1 million); infrastructure (252 projects worth \$24.7 millions); health (45 projects worth \$1.5 millions); environment (67 projects worth \$2.01 millions); education (149 projects worth \$4.01 millions); additional economics (283 projects worth \$6.2 millions); agriculture (110 projects worth \$6 millions); tourism (104 projects worth \$4.8 millions)

In order to maintain its primary focus on economic impact and the secondary focus on citizen participation, the assessment will not concentrate on successes in environment, social infrastructure, reproductive health etc.

## **2.2. Description of CRDA Approach to Citizen Participation:**

The CRDA “Community” element evolved from 2002-2005, undergoing a number of transitions while retaining a basic modus operandi: communities prioritize projects for implementation using shared resources of CRDA implementers, the community and local government. The implementation started in a post-Milosevic period as the major programmatic element in USAID’s response to a perceived need for quick and tangible improvements that would inspire hope among broad citizen groups and mobilize them for support of a comprehensive reform process in the context of weak institutions, deeply felt mistrust of citizens in institutions, and unrealistic expectations of the population.

Community development was a broad term that was used in the CRDA context to describe a variety of activities at the local level in which communities drive and control the decisions and actions that affect their lives. In other words, community development was seen as a mechanism for active citizen participation and local collaboration in the selection and implementation of activities that have tangible community-level benefits. Through this approach, various sectors of the community were brought into productive partnerships. The scope of such projects within CRDA was very broad and it focused on local infrastructure rehabilitation, job creation, support to micro entrepreneurs, capacity building and networking of cooperatives and associations, reproductive health problem solving, and more generally leveraging of resources through public private partnerships.

Although the building blocks and sequencing varied between implementers, both had community mobilization teams, Community Development Committees (CDCs) or Community Action Committees (CACs). CDC/CAC members were elected in public meetings and were responsible for organizing meetings and spearheading projects. Beginning in 2003, Regional Cluster Committees (RCCs) determined regional priorities while local communities prepared proposals which were evaluated by CRDA implementers. Special Interest Groups, including youth, women, disabled, minorities and environmental groups were encouraged to form so that their special interests could also be addressed

## **2.3. Description of CRDA-Economic Approach**

Shift to CRDA-Economic in 2005 implied changes in the Workplan structure for both implementing partners. At the same time, CRDA was extended until April, 2007. The implementers were focused on agriculture and tourism sector development, SME development, economic environment, trade and promotion and market access, and special initiatives not associated with economic development.

## **2.4. CRDA Key Indicators**

CRDA partners used a standardized set of indicators and report on a CRDA-wide M&E system known as Web-PRS (Project Reporting System) developed and administered by CHF. Generally speaking, the database is capable of effectively capturing and reporting the data; however, data entered into the system were subject to errors in measurement. Key performance data tracked for CRDA include: 1) person months of employment generated; 2) additional income generated; 3) number

economic development activities initiated, other indicators include: 4) total number of CRDA projects; 5) number of direct beneficiary impacts of CRDA projects; 6) number of citizens actively participating in CRDA process; 7) percentage of community contribution for all projects; 8) percentage of minorities or women participating in CRDA process; and 9) Number of civic participation, civil works and environmental projects initiated

### **3.1 Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) Basic Facts**

The Montenegro Competitiveness Project (MCP) provides technical assistance to the Montenegrin private sector in the tourism, agribusiness and wood industries. MCP's mission is increased economic growth resulting in a broader-based prosperity for the people of Montenegro.

#### Results Summary:

MCP activities to date have resulted in

- ▶ Several hundred million US\$ in revenue to the Government of Montenegro through the lease of the iconic hotel island of Sveti Stefan;
- ▶ Over US\$ 4 million in agribusiness exports as a result of MCP support;
- ▶ The creation of the Wood Industry Council of Montenegro, a private sector industry representation;
- ▶ 100% sales increase and 141% export growth in client wood processing companies;
- ▶ Over 30 STTA interventions through workshops and one on one counseling;
- ▶ 51 trainings to approximately 1,400 company representatives (40% women).

### **3.2. Description of Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) Approach**

MCP works at the firm level, helping individual firms find competitive traction and supporting the private sector-led economic growth objectives of Montenegro's Economic Reform Agenda (ERA). MCP provides this assistance on three levels

- Improve and expand organization and industry-wide access to both domestic and foreign export markets through enhancement to operations, manufacturing, and overall product quality. This is achieved through training in market research, marketing, branding, international certification, customer services, quality assurances, and packaging. MCP also helps high potential local firms compete for, and attract, foreign and domestic investment.

- MCP partners with local organizations and business service providers to provide training, improve understanding and develop specific skills required to thrive in a market-driven economy.

- With vital input from the private sector, MCP works in coordination with other USAID and donor programs to improve and institutionalize reforms already underway. MCP is also working with the Government of Montenegro to remove barriers to conducting business, and achieve harmonization with EU criteria

### **3.3. Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) Key Results**

#### **Tourism**

- Transaction Counsel: At the invitation of the Ministry of Tourism, MCP

has played an instrumental role in the 30-year lease of Sveti Stefan and two adjacent properties, to the renowned Aman Resorts. This transaction will be substantial in scale, with incremental investment of over 40 million Euros, and nominal revenue of over several hundred million Euros during the term of the lease, as well as a significant multiplier effect through new employment and the stimulation of incremental investment and tourism development. This transaction is expected to result in the creation of further resort destinations that will demonstrate the high level of product that can be created and operated in Montenegro, and the type of upscale consumer that can be attracted to Montenegro if the appropriate product and infrastructure is developed. MCP is providing expert advice on the sale/lease of tourism assets on an ongoing basis.

- **MICE Market:** The MICE (Meetings, Incentives, Conventions and Exhibitions) market offers particular promise for Montenegro, given its potential to build incremental revenues for the tourism sector during shoulder and off-peak periods. Working in close partnership with both the public and private sectors, MCP performed a comprehensive market analysis, as well as implementing several initiatives to support the industry in moving towards a viable MICE focused industry marketing and sales effort. As a result, under the umbrella of the Montenegro National Tourism Organization, and support from MCP, six Montenegrin companies, exhibited for the first time at IMEX in Frankfurt, Germany in April '07, the premier trade show for the meetings and incentive travel industry. The National Tourism Organization estimates that the presence at this show will result in Euros 5.6 million (US\$ 7.5 million) in direct revenue to Montenegro. In addition, substantial firm level assistance has been provided, in order to help firms connect with potential buyers of the Montenegrin meetings and convention product.
- **Training/Knowledge Transfer:** MCP has worked extensively with small, medium and larger firms in the tourism sector to provide technical assistance in areas as diverse as tourism management, international electronic distribution and booking systems, internet marketing, basic computer skills, graphic design and brochure production, HACCP certification, food safety, and food and beverage marketing. Our focus has been on practical assistance that allows firms to operate more efficiently, be more effective operators and marketers, and compete more effectively, both within Montenegro and in the international marketplace. In total, over 50 trainings have been provided by MCP in the tourism sector, to over 1,400 participants, 40% of whom were women.

### **Agribusiness**

**Expert Advice:** MCP has been providing expert advice to Montenegrin SMEs in order to improve their business knowledge, market research, branding, packaging, labeling, production processes, etc. For example, MCP has identified an expert for herbs and medicinal plants, a sector which used to be a strong export sector before the war, and has significant potential. The expert, who has now been to Montenegro four times, counsels local firms on harvesting, storing and processing herbs, has established business contacts in the U.S. and is promoting Montenegrin herbs through articles in a number of technical publications in the U.S.

- 19 trainings have been provided to agribusiness firms by MCP to date, with a total of 416 participants, 148 of them women.
- **Trade Show Support:** MCP has been supporting Montenegrin companies' trade show participation by cost-sharing expenditures. The focus has been on fostering business relationships in the region. As an example, in May 2007, MCP

supported the participation of 12 Montenegrin agribusiness companies at the Agriculture Trade Show in Novi Sad, Serbia, by cost-sharing space rental, booth design, and construction. This trade show is the largest in its sector in the former Yugoslavia. The participating companies received over 150 quality awards for their products. Several exhibitors are now in negotiations with prospective clients, primarily from the region.

- Food Safety Certifications: The implementation of food safety and quality systems is one of MCP's priorities. MCP supports Montenegrin companies wishing to become HACCP certified. The food safety certification HACCP (Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point) serves as a production quality seal and is a prerequisite for exporting to the EU. Before MCP became active in this area, only one company in Montenegro was HACCP certified. With MCP's help, 20 firms have now acquired or are in the process of acquiring HACCP certification.
- As a result of MCP's support to the agribusiness sector, exports of over Euros 3 million (US\$ 4.1 million) have been generated since project inception.

### **Wood/Furniture**

- Trade Association Building: One of MCP's strategic objectives was to organize the private sector under a formal legal entity to represent the commercial interests of the wood industry and implement strategic initiatives to improve the business environment. MCP helped create the Wood Industry Council of Montenegro (Savjet Drvne Industrije Crne Gore, SDICG), which currently has 21 members.
- Access to New Technology and New Markets: Attendance at international wood processing machines, tools, and furniture trade shows and symposiums expose Montenegrin wood processors to global leaders in technology. Over the past year, MCP assisted Montenegrin firms on a cost-share basis to attend trade shows in Turkey, Italy, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Germany and Russia, and technical symposiums for the forest products industry in Austria and Serbia. In October of 2006, MCP assisted five Montenegrin producers to exhibit at the International Furniture and Interior Decoration Fair in Zagreb, Croatia. The objective was to access potential buyers in the international market for hotel refurbishment and construction, one of MCP's strategy initiatives. MCP also assisted a producer of curly maple and spruce planks used in making high quality string instruments, to exhibit at the 16<sup>th</sup> International Exhibition of Musical Craftsmanship Instruments and Violin Accessories – Mondomusica 2006, in Cremona, Italy. Euros 50,000 in export sales is the preliminary result of MCP companies' participation in the Zagreb and Cremona trade shows alone. MCP also assisted furniture producers to exhibit at a regional trade show in Budva, Montenegro, in March 2007, and in Banja Luka, Bosnia-Herzegovina in June 2007.
- MCP has provided 13 trainings in the wood sector to date, including on new designs, windows and door manufacturing. A total of 272 company representatives attended (62 women).
  - MCP client companies in the wood sector registered 50% employee growth, 100% sales increase and 141% export growth between 2004 and 2006.

### III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Considerations for the assessment team:

#### 1. Economic Impact

- 1.1. Measurements far from perfect and some inconsistent across partners
- 1.2. Results that are difficult to quantify may be still important to 'value' but under-reported (e.g. business enabling environment and regulatory work, training and capacity building of business/ag. associations, etc.)
- 1.3. Because of data availability, there are tradeoffs between efforts in the realm of data collection vs. using available data. Could these tradeoffs lead to skewing the design?
- 1.4. Ambassador focus almost exclusively on 'job creation' may be premature.
- 1.5. Need to examine if distinction between improved livelihood and economic growth is blurred and whether M&E data can be grouped in a way that helps better relate and understand respective impacts.
- 1.6. Need to be mindful of overlaps between CRDA and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) (e.g. tourism sectors, forestry)

#### 2. Citizen Participation

- 2.1. CRDA shift in external direction – from primary focus on participation and secondary on economic development to primary on economic and secondary on participation
- 2.2. Output-based measurements for citizen participation.
- 2.3. Impact of the shift on sustainability of structures and mechanisms created
- 2.4. Difficulties in capturing results in the realm of promoting gender equality (all CRDA implementers) and inter-ethnic cooperation

The assessment team will examine whether the following assumptions that informed activity design can be validated by evidence:

#### Economic Impact

1. A shift in focus from the original CRDA program scope to a more economic growth oriented program is an appropriate response to changes in the operating environment and citizens priorities articulated as jobs and economic growth (CRDA)
2. Economic improvement is a precondition of further democratic development in Montenegro (CRDA).
3. Real engines for economic growth are investments – primarily FDI - at the local level

#### Citizen Participation

1. Tangible improvements in target communities lead to greater popular support for national reforms (CRDA)

2. Practice of democracy relies more on local governments than on the national government (GLG)

#### **IV. OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED**

##### **1. Objectives**

The primary objective of this activity is to conduct an *ex post* economic impact assessment of two USAID Montenegro activities – CRDA and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP). A secondary objective is to assess impact of citizen participation efforts in CRDA and the discrete overlap between CRDA and GLG activities. A third objective is to assess the approaches and interventions used to develop enterprises in both projects and to draw lessons learned in regard to best practices in enterprise development. In order to achieve the objectives of the assessment, the assessment team will seek to capture effective approaches, analyze utility of performance monitoring efforts and consider respective outcomes and results, and deliberate influence of internal and external changes on achievement of results.

The assessment team will examine project-level and broader contextual data, fill in the important data gaps and relate project approaches, outcomes and results to similar experiences in other countries in the region and more broadly, if relevant.

The team will:

For Economic Impact:

- Ascertain status of performance data and attribution models and practices and verify input-output multipliers in CRDA and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP)
- To the extent possible, establish backward linkages for CRDA and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) results
- Examine differences in CRDA implementer approaches
- Capture results in leveraging local resources and donor cooperation
- Fill in data gaps for economic impact assessment (e.g. beneficiary/firm-level interviews, representatives of relevant local/national institutions and other stakeholder interviews)
- Identify effective models and best practices that can be replicated
- Indicate whether any clear and important opportunities for economic development and/or citizen participation were missed based on the approaches utilized.
- Draw conclusions regarding implementer-specific and aggregate economic impact of CRDA and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) projects
- Determine if particular enterprise development interventions were more successful than others and why



For Citizen Participation:

- Verify citizen participation data and results in CRDA and GLG respectively, and establish appropriate cross-references and overlaps between the two activities
- Examine differences in CRDA implementer approaches
- Fill in data gaps for citizen participation (interviews and/or focus groups with CDC members, youth, women, minorities and key stakeholders)
- Identify effective models and best practices that can be replicated
- Draw conclusions regarding activity-specific and aggregate impacts of CRDA/GLG on citizen participation

## 2. Illustrative Assessment Questions

### 2.1. Economic Impact:

2.1.1. What do performance data and fieldwork say regarding the circumstances under which local economic and/or sectoral development projects are likely to be most effective in achieving economic impact?

The assessment should identify where and why different approaches and combinations of approaches have been successful/unsuccessful. The fieldwork shall help determine those differences in the context of regional/sectoral differences. The fieldwork should assess how the results of specific implementation activities vary (and are explained) by a host of variables, including the following:

- Area of Responsibility (sub-national economic indicators, evolution of local government efforts to support businesses, level of economic development, ethnic composition, number and type of private sector companies; key sectors and role of agriculture and tourism) for CRDA
- Community/municipality (infrastructure, economic activity, level of development, character of associations, quality of local governance);
- Sector selection, strategies and steps taken for penetration into local and international markets;
- Objectives pursued (type of economic infrastructure rehabilitation, local/sectoral economic development, income generation, job creation);
- How an approach was implemented (case selection, comparison with any control cases, role of private and public sector institutions, size of project, type of project, case studies/success stories);
- Roles of associations and clusters;
- Enterprise development approaches and interventions utilized;
- Are additional efforts needed to consolidate the work on completing the sector-level and regulatory development work? If so, what kinds of efforts might be needed in terms of highest/quickest return on investment? Why?
- Can any specific models be drawn to inform economic growth activities focusing on high potential sectors and municipalities vs. focus on economic security?

2.1.2. What are the main breakthroughs and dead ends, based on project performance data and fieldwork?

- Where have CRDA and/or Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) projects most successfully contributed to economic development/competitiveness? What evidence was gathered to show how we know the projects/approaches were successful?
- Why were these projects or approaches successful? What conditions were present that contributed to the success? What evidence was gathered to show how that we can credit these projects?
- What approaches do not work? Why?
- Which approaches have given the largest return on investment? What are the common denominators for those projects that have been most successful at generating sustained economic impact?

2.1.3. Which of the grant disbursement approaches lend themselves to employment generation with reliable attribution?

- What evidence is there that grants are an effective tool for employment generation? What specific pre-requisites and/or criteria help amplify that impact?
- Other approaches beyond grants? Are there important tradeoffs between them?
- What does local and international evidence say about when and under what circumstances grants are an effective tool for income vs. employment generation? How? To what degree? Are there particular elements of CRDA and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) projects that are more/less related to employment generation?

2.2. Citizen Participation:

2.2.1. To what extent has CRDA contributed to community revitalization in Montenegro?

- To what extent was CRDA, successful in mobilizing citizens, increasing and sustaining their participation in community development activities and municipal affairs? Are structures and mechanisms for community participation that were introduced and/or used by CRDA sustainable?
- Are conditions for sustainability met with regards to citizen participation in municipal affairs?
- Are additional efforts needed to consolidate the work on developing bottom up democratic systems and structures? If so, what kinds of efforts might be needed? Are there some areas of the country where such an effort is particularly needed and why?
- To what extent was monitoring, results measurement and performance management of CRDA adequate and able to capture intended results, including major mid-course changes?

## V. ASSESSMENT TEAM TASKS AND DURATION OF TASKS

The assessment team will review relevant documents. Based on the secondary research, the team will develop a methodology to collect additional quantitative and qualitative information on the USAID projects to be assessed.

### 1. Phase 1: Review of Secondary Data and Fieldwork Planning (3 days)

As a first step in the assessment process, the Assessment Team shall review USAID project documents and summaries of relevant country-level strategic objectives and program summaries, as well as contractor/grantee databases, reports and documents on CRDA/GLG and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) programs.

The Assessment Team will use this secondary data review to set forth the proposed methodologies to help identify major data gaps and data collection methodologies, and to structure fieldwork. USAID will review and approve the methodology and plan prior to the Assessment Team undertaking the fieldwork.

### 2. Phase 2: Conducting Fieldwork (15 days in Montenegro – from August 1 to August 15, 2007)

The Assessment Team will be responsible for refining the data collection and stakeholder consultations plan that discusses the objectives, the sampling and data collection methodology to be employed, and the most salient issues and aspects that will be examined based on USAID's feedback on the initial draft. The Assessment Team will be responsible for providing a debriefing following the fieldwork.

During the fieldwork, the assessment team will collect additional data including but not limited to:

- Views of key stakeholders, including project participants, beneficiaries, relevant local and national government officials and donors regarding the impact of CRDA and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) on economic growth and, in the case of CRDA, citizen participation.

- Field verification of and follow up on performance data, including status of businesses supported through CRDA and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) and developments in the enabling environment

- Other investments contributing to continued impact of CRDA and Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP) and sustainability of project efforts

- Differences in actual AoR-level impacts due to specific approaches taken by the CRDA implementers and/or AoR contextual differences

Montenegro Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project (MCP)  
sector-specific impacts

Examples of best practice and success stories

3. Phase 3: Final Assessment Report – Conclusions (30 days)

The final phase of this assessment will require that the Assessment Team carry out data analysis and submit a draft and a final assessment report for USAID Mission comment and review. USAID will provide written comments on that draft report within 15 days of receiving it from the Assessment Team. The Assessment Team, in turn, shall revise the draft report to reflect USAID's comments and suggestions within 15 days of receiving USAID's written comments. Following official acceptance of the report by USAID (CTO), the Assessment Team will then provide USAID with an electronic copy and (2) bound copies of the final report.

## **VI. METHODOLOGY**

The Assessment Team will 1) carry out comprehensive desk research described above; 2) identify data gaps and prepare data collection tools and field work plan; 3) conduct field research in Montenegro; 4) provide a verbal debriefing at the end of the field work to Mission management and technical teams; 5) analyze data and compile key findings; 6) produce draft assessment report and submit to USAID for comments, and 7) revise the draft report as necessary and submit a final report to USAID/Montenegro for acceptance.

## **VII. USAID'S ROLE IN THE ASSESSMENT**

The USAID Mission in Montenegro will:

- organize a small USAID advisory group for implementation of this scope of work;
- provide programmatic and budgetary information to the team;
- provide project documents and evaluations to the team;
- facilitate additional information-gathering;
- facilitate obtaining USAID/Mission input;
- arrange USAID/Montenegro meetings.

In some instances (although the Assessment Team should not depend on this), an additional USAID staff person may join the team during the field visits/stakeholder interviews in Montenegro. USAID Mission staff and/or the USAID team members will be available to assist the Assessment Team to provide in-depth knowledge of the various projects and activities that are being evaluated.

## **VIII. USAID/MONTENEGRO CONTROL OFFICER**

The USAID Montenegro officer, Vladan Raznatovic, will serve as the Control Officer for this task and must approve all experts and workplans for this assessment.

## **IX. DELIVERABLES**

The Assessment Team's deliverables shall include:

- Conducting a comprehensive review of performance reports and other materials;
- A written methodology plan (research design and operational work plan);
- Refining key research questions and identification of key informants/stakeholders and/or samples;
- Developing appropriate research instruments for field work;
- Debriefing before departing Montenegro;
- Analyzing data and identifying and summarizing key findings;
- Submitting a draft report (electronic and hard copy) to USAID in Montenegro within 15 days after completing the fieldwork for comments of USAID. USAID will be responsible for compiling Mission comments for inclusion and submission to the Assessment Team. USAID/Montenegro will provide the assessment team with a summary of such written comments within fifteen days of having received the draft report. The Assessment Team will submit a final report to USAID/Montenegro within fifteen days after USAID's comments are provided to the Assessment Team.

## **X. TEAM COMPOSITION**

The team for this assessment will consist of Stephen Silcox, Senior Enterprise Development Advisor of EGAT/EG, who will serve as Team Leader, and a Local Government Development Specialist provided by the Business Growth Initiative (BGI) Project, (CTO – Steve Silcox) of the EGAT/EG Office.

Local experts and support staff:

USAID/Montenegro will provide the following local staff and logistical support for the assessment:

1. Private sector development expert – 1 position for 15 days of fieldwork and five days of desk research. Strong research skills and conceptual understanding and experience in analyzing enterprise development and local economic development are required.
2. Municipal government development expert – 1 position for 15 days of fieldwork and five days of desk research. Strong research skills and conceptual understanding and experience with public participation and local government are required.
3. Interpreters/Admin Assistants – 2 positions for 15 days of field work
4. Drivers – 2 positions for 15 days of field work

## **XI. LOGISTICAL SUPPORT**

USAID Montenegro will be responsible for all in-country logistical support. This includes responsibility for scheduling, hotel accommodations, arranging for all in-

country transportation (including vehicle rental and drivers), arranging for interpreters/translation services, and attending to all other administrative issues.

## **XII. ILLUSTRATIVE SCHEDULE**

It is anticipated that fieldwork on the assessment will begin on August 1, 2007 and be completed on August 15, 2007 and that the final report will be submitted by no later than September 15, 2007.

## **XIII. RESPONSIBILITY FOR ASSESSMENT TEAM COSTS**

EGAT/EG will cover the costs of the salary and related items for Stephen Silcox and the BGI Project will cover the cost of the salary and related items for the Local Government Development Specialist under the BGI project. USAID/Montenegro will pay the costs for travel from the USA to Montenegro and the return to the USA of the two expatriate team members, per diem while on travel status and in Montenegro, local travel and other logistical costs during fieldwork in Montenegro.

USAID/Montenegro will contract directly with local staff to assist the Assessment Team as described in Section X above and pay for those costs.

DRAFT