employees, benefits, and other direct and indirect costs per detailed instructions in the application package.

E/P encourages cost-sharing, which may be in the form of allowable direct or indirect costs. E/P would be especially interested in proposals which demonstrate a program vision which goes well beyond that which can be supported by the requested USIA grant and which would try to use a USIA grant to leverage additional funding from other sources to support elements of the broader program plan.

Please refer to the Solicitation Package for complete budget guidelines and formatting instructions.

Review Process

USIA will acknowledge receipt of all proposals and will review them for technical eligibility. Proposals will be deemed ineligible if they do not fully adhere to the guidelines stated herein and in the Solicitation Package. Eligible proposals will be forwarded to panels of USIA officers for advisory review. All eligible proposals will be reviewed by the Agency contracts office, as well as the USIA Office of African Affairs and the USIA post overseas, where appropriate. Proposals may also be reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel or by other Agency elements. Funding decisions are at the discretion of the USIA Associate Director for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Final technical authority for grant awards resides with the USIA grants officer.

Review Criteria

Technically eligible applications will be competitively reviewed according to the criteria stated below. These criteria are not rank ordered and all carry equal weight in the proposal evaluation:

1. Institutional Reputation and Ability

Applicant institutions should demonstrate their potential for excellence in program design and implementation and/or provide documentation of successful programs. If an applicant is a previous USIA grant recipient, responsible fiscal management and full compliance with all reporting requirements for past Agency grants as determined by USIA's Office of Contracts will be considered.

Relevant substantive evaluations of previous projects may also be considered in this assessment.

2. Project Personnel

The thematic and logistical expertise of project personnel should be relevant to the proposed program. Resumes or C.V.s should be summaries which are relevant to the specific proposal and no longer than two pages each.

3. Program Planning

A detailed agenda and relevant work plan should demonstrate substantive rigor and logistical capacity.

4. Thematic Expertise

Proposal should demonstrate the organization's expertise in the subject area which promises an effective sharing of information.

5. Support of Diversity

Proposals should demonstrate the recipient's commitment to promoting the awareness and understanding of diversity.

6. Cross-Cultural Sensitivity and Area Expertise

Evidence should be provided of sensitivity to historical, linguistic, religious, and other cross-cultural factors, as well as relevant knowledge of the target geographic area/country.

7. Ability To Achieve Program Objectives

Objectives should be realistic and feasible. The proposal should clearly demonstrate how the grantee institution will meet program objectives.

8. Multiplier Effect

Proposed programs should strengthen long-term mutual understanding and contribute to maximum sharing of information and establishment of longterm institutional and individual ties.

9. Cost-Effectiveness

Overhead and direct administrative costs to USIA should be kept as low as possible. All other items proposed for USIA funding should be necessary and appropriate to achieve the program's objectives.

10. Cost-Sharing

Proposals should maximize costsharing through other private sector support as well as direct funding contributions and/or in-kind support from the prospective grantee institution and its partners.

11. Follow-On Activities

Proposals should provide a plan for continued exchange activity (without USIA support) which ensures that USIA-supported programs are not isolated events.

12. Project Evaluation

Proposals should include a plan to evaluate the activity's success, both as the activities unfold and at the end of the program. USIA recommends that the proposal include a draft survey questionnaire or other technique plus description of a methodology to use to link outcomes to original project objectives. Grantees will be expected to submit intermediate reports after each project component is concluded or quarterly, whichever is less frequent.

Votice

The terms and conditions published in this RFP are binding and may not be modified by an USIA representative. Explanatory information provided by the Agency that contradicts published language will not be binding. issuance of the RFP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the Government. The needs of the program may require the award to be reduced, revised, or increased. Final awards cannot be made until funds have been appropriated by Congress, allocated and committed through internal USIA procedures.

Notification

BILLING CODE 8230-01-M

All applicants will be notified of the results of the review process on or about June 16, 1995. Awards made will be subject to periodic reporting and evaluation requirements.

Dated: January 11, 1995.
Dell Pendergrast,
Deputy Associate Director, Educational and
Cultural Affairs.
[FR Doc. 95–1182 Filed 1–18–95; 8:45 am]