



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

AUDIT OF USAID/LEBANON'S DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES

AUDIT REPORT NO. 6-268-09-002-P
NOVEMBER 9, 2008

CAIRO, EGYPT



Office of Inspector General

November 9, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: USAID/Lebanon Director, Denise A. Herbol

FROM: Regional Inspector General/Cairo, Lloyd J. Miller /s/

SUBJECT: Audit of USAID/Lebanon's Democracy and Governance Activities
(Report No. 6-268-09-002-P)

This memorandum transmits our final report on the subject audit. This final audit report includes three recommendations to USAID/Lebanon. We have carefully considered your comments on the draft report and have included your response in appendix II.

The report contains three recommendations intended to improve the implementation of USAID/Lebanon's democracy and governance activities. Based on your comments and the documentation provided, we consider that management decisions have been made on all recommendations, and final action has been completed on recommendation no. 2. A determination of final action for recommendations nos. 1 and 3 will be made by the Audit, Performance and Compliance Division (M/CFO/APC) upon completion of the planned actions.

Thank you for the cooperation and courtesy extended to the audit team during this audit. I would like to express my sincere appreciation for the cooperation and courtesy extended to my staff during the audit.

CONTENTS

Summary of Results	1
Background	2
Audit Objective	3
Audit Findings	4
Data Quality Should Be Strengthened	7
Performance Management Plan Indicators Lacked Precise Definitions.....	8
Evaluation of Management Comments	10
Appendix I—Scope and Methodology	11
Appendix II—Management Comments	13
Appendix III—Operational Plan Standard Indicators for Fiscal Year 2007	15
Appendix IV—Performance Management Plan Indicators for Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007	16

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Lebanon is a parliamentary democracy. However, from the mid-1970s until the parliamentary elections in 1992, civil war precluded the effective exercise of political rights. With the withdrawal of Syrian troops in April 2005, Lebanon was no longer under Syrian occupation, but it still lacked elements of sovereignty. In July and August 2006, Lebanon was immersed in a 6-week war between Israel and Hezbollah. According to mission information, the conflict led to \$3.6 billion worth of material damages, a 23.5 percent drop in public revenues, a 7 percent loss of gross domestic product, and an unemployment rate reaching 25 percent. (See page 2.)

USAID/Lebanon implemented its democracy and governance activities through (1) a \$19.5 million agreement with the State University of New York to provide training and technical assistance to the Lebanese Parliament to enhance its legislative capabilities and to strengthen municipalities and increase their effectiveness and (2) a \$6.9 million agreement with America-Mideast Educational and Training Services to manage small grants to improve transparency and accountability. As of September 30, 2007, USAID/Lebanon had obligated \$12.1 million and had expended \$6.7 million for its democracy and governance activities. (See pages 2–3.)

As part of a worldwide audit of democracy and governance activities, the Regional Inspector General/Cairo performed this audit to determine if USAID/Lebanon's democracy and governance activities achieved planned results and what has been the impact. USAID/Lebanon's democracy and governance activities partially achieved their planned results in fiscal years 2006 and 2007, achieving the targets for 17 (63 percent) of 27 performance targets. According to the mission, 10 targets were not achieved because of (1) the 2006 war and its aftermath, (2) the absence of a country president and a functional parliament, (3) and the political situation in the country. Considering the turmoil in the country's political instability and the security situation since 2006, the overall impact of USAID/Lebanon's democracy and governance program has been positive. For example, of the 944 municipalities participating in the municipal governance program, 621 municipalities generated automated financial statements in 2006. By contrast, 561 municipalities were able to generate such financial statements in 2005 and 324 in 2004. (See pages 3–6.)

Even though USAID/Lebanon's democracy and governance activities achieved 63 percent of its targets within difficult constraints, the audit noted that USAID/Lebanon should strengthen its assessments of data quality and clarify definitions for its democracy and governance indicators to be objective. (See pages 7–9.)

USAID/Lebanon agreed with the findings and recommendations in the report, has already implemented corrective actions for one recommendation, and is in the process of completing corrective action for the other two recommendations. Management comments in their entirety are included in appendix II. (See page 13.)

BACKGROUND

Lebanon is a parliamentary democracy in which the people constitutionally have the right to change their government. However, from the mid-1970s until the parliamentary elections in 1992, civil war precluded the effective exercise of political rights. Syria intervened with a strong influence over Lebanese politics that continued until its withdrawal in 2005. With the withdrawal of Syrian troops in April 2005, Lebanon was no longer under Syrian occupation, but it still lacked elements of sovereignty. In July and August 2006, Lebanon was immersed in a 6-week war between Israel and Hezbollah. According to mission information, the conflict led to \$3.6 billion worth of material damages, a 23.5 percent drop in public revenues, a 7 percent loss of gross domestic product (GDP), and an unemployment rate reaching 25 percent.

Map of Lebanon



According to USAID/Lebanon's 2007 Operational Plan, Lebanon lacks strong government institutions to provide economic and social services, and various parties and factions have tried to fill the gap. U.S. Government assistance has tried to consolidate momentum after the end of Syria's control over Lebanon and move Lebanon toward transformation and economic growth. USAID/Lebanon's democracy and governance activities supported the Government of Lebanon to strengthen transparency, good governance, and civil society. The activities were implemented by the following principal partners.

- USAID/Lebanon awarded the State University of New York (SUNY) a \$19.5 million cooperative agreement to provide technical assistance to the Lebanese Parliament to enhance its legislative capabilities and to strengthen municipalities and increase their effectiveness.

- USAID/Lebanon awarded America-Mideast Educational and Training Services (AMIDEAST) a \$6.9 million cooperative agreement to manage small grants to improve transparency and accountability.

As of September 30, 2007, USAID/Lebanon had obligated \$12.1 million and had expended \$6.7 million for its democracy and governance activities.

AUDIT OBJECTIVE

As part of a worldwide audit of democracy and governance activities, the Regional Inspector General/Cairo performed an audit to answer the following question:

- Have USAID/Lebanon's democracy and governance activities achieved planned results and what has been the impact?

Appendix I contains a discussion of the audit's scope and methodology.

AUDIT FINDINGS

USAID/Lebanon’s democracy and governance activities partially achieved their planned results in fiscal years 2006 and 2007 for the standard indicators specified in the operational plan and the mission’s performance management plan. Of the 27 performance targets for both plans, USAID/Lebanon achieved the planned results for 17 (63 percent) performance targets, as seen in table 1. According to the mission, the targets were not achieved because of (1) the 2006 war and its aftermath, (2) the absence of a country president and a functional parliament, (3) and the political situation in the country. Considering the turmoil in the country’s political instability and the security situation since 2006, the overall impact of USAID/Lebanon’s democracy and governance program has been positive.

**Table 1. Democracy and Governance Program Progress
Based on Achievement of Targets for Performance Indicators**

Monitoring	Achieved FY 2006	Not Achieved FY 2006	Achieved FY 2007	Not Achieved FY 2007
Operational Plan ¹	N/A	N/A	5	6
Performance Management Plan ²	5	3	7	1

Of the 11 performance indicators in the fiscal year 2007 operational plan, USAID/Lebanon achieved or exceeded the targets for 5 indicators and did not achieve targets for 6 indicators. (See appendix III.) For example, the democracy and governance program provided training to strengthen local government and decentralization to 2,082 individuals, exceeding a target of 2,000 individuals. In addition, the democracy and governance program provided civic education programs to 25,750 people, exceeding a target of 25,000 people. On the other hand, the democracy and governance program provided assistance to improve organizational capacity to 6 civil society organizations, falling short of a target of 12 organizations. Similarly, the program did not support any independent and democratic trade/labor unions to promote international labor standards, falling short of a target of one trade/labor union.

Of the eight performance indicators in the fiscal year 2007 performance management plan, USAID/Lebanon achieved or exceeded the targets for seven indicators and did not achieve the target for one indicator. (See appendix IV.) For the same eight indicators in the fiscal year 2006 performance management plan, USAID/Lebanon achieved or exceeded targets for five indicators and did not achieve targets for three indicators. For example, in 2007, the democracy and governance exceeded its target of increased public confidence in municipalities, realizing an 18 percent increase over a target of 10 percent. In addition, the mission reported 6,073 municipality employees trained, exceeding its target of 6,000. On the other hand, the democracy and governance program fell short of its targets in fiscal years 2006 and 2007 for enabling the legal environment to strengthen

¹ The purpose of the operational plan is to provide a comprehensive, interagency picture of how foreign assistance resources received by an operating unit will be used to support the foreign assistance objectives and the transformational diplomacy goal.

² The purpose of the performance management plan is to assess and report progress towards achieving a strategic objective.

the role of local government and municipalities through the passage of laws, decrees, and orders to civil society organizations. For 2006, the mission reported 7 decrees and orders passed, instead of a target of 10. For 2007, the mission reported 11 decrees and orders passed, instead of a target of 15.

Although USAID/Lebanon achieved only 63 percent of the its intended targets in the 2007 operational plan and 2006 and 2007 performance management plans, the overall impact of the program has been positive given the constraints facing the program. The USAID/Lebanon mission director provided several examples of these constraints, including more than 12 political assassinations and attempted assassinations. In addition several other disturbances caused significant delays and interruptions to USAID/Lebanon programs, which included the Cedar Revolution, the departure of the Syrian troops after 30 years of occupation, civil unrest, the 34-day war between Hezbollah and Israel in July 2006, and the evacuation or relocation of implementing partners. Because of these constraints, achievement of program targets, especially at the local government level, has been hindered. Nonetheless, USAID/Lebanon has achieved success in its democracy and governance projects.

Under USAID/Lebanon's transparency and accountability grants program to support civil society organizations, AMIDEAST provided nearly \$4 million in grants to support 131 local nongovernmental organizations and civic initiatives. In addition, this program has had other accomplishments, including a book and a Web site dealing with the legal rights of Muslim women in religious courts on prenuptial agreements. Additionally, the Chamber of Commerce, Industry, and Agriculture of Beirut and Mount Lebanon launched the first issue of the Business Confidence Index. During site visits, the audit team observed six examples of projects implemented by the program as follows:

- The Christian Association for the Blind received a \$24,760 grant to create a guide on human rights in Braille and distribute 800 copies to blind residents in Lebanon to help this group of citizens to understand their rights in society.



**Volunteer at the blind association putting together copies of a Braille manual.
Photo taken by RIG/Cairo auditor in April 2008.**

- SADER Publishers received a \$92,275 grant to develop, in coordination with the Ministry of Justice, a compilation of all international, multilateral, and bilateral treaties approved by the Lebanese Parliament and ratified for use by judges and courts nationwide. According to the grant agreement, this will lead to stronger application of the rule of law, thereby benefiting citizens, professionals, and investors. All judges will receive a copy of the books; however, according to the implementer, the distribution has been delayed because of the political situation and the books are being held in a warehouse.



**Boxes sitting at the grantee's warehouse waiting for distribution.
Photo taken by RIG/Cairo auditor in April 2008.**

Under USAID/Lebanon's municipal governance assistance program, the State University of New York provided management work processes and systems, and professional development and training for government officials and employees. During site visits to municipalities, the audit team observed examples of the effect of the project.

- Of the 944 municipalities participating in the municipal governance program, 621 municipalities generated automated financial statements in 2006. By contrast, 561 municipalities were able to generate such financial statements in 2005 and 324 were able to do so in 2004.
- The implementing partner developed a municipal accounting system that has standardized accounting procedures and made the financial work of local government more transparent. This system also enabled municipalities to electronically manage the business, accounting, and reporting processes related to fixed assets and inventories.



Recordkeeping before (left, manual records) and after (right, computer screen showing computer records) the implementation of the municipal governance program. Photos taken by a RIG/Cairo auditor, April 2008.

- Most cases of the misuse of funds are being identified during the preparation of the annual financial statements, which is now automated in approximately 65 percent of the municipalities. Ongoing investigations continue in a number of municipalities that have recovered funds. As a result, approximately 5 percent of the annual budget in several municipalities has been recovered.
- Local government revenues have increased significantly as a result of the ability to efficiently, effectively, and legally collect municipal taxes. Based on the implementer's 2007 annual report, 570 municipalities collected increased revenue of approximately 29 percent between 2003 and 2006.

Even though USAID/Lebanon's democracy and governance activities achieved 63 percent of its targets within difficult constraints, as discussed in the following report section, USAID/Lebanon should strengthen its assessments of data quality and clarify definitions to ensure that its democracy and governance indicators are objective.

Data Quality Should Be Strengthened

Summary: Automated Directives System 203.3.5.2 states that operating units should be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of its data and to what extent the data can be trusted for management decisions. USAID/Lebanon has not performed data quality assessments for its performance indicators. According to mission officials, they did not conduct periodic testing and/or verification of data quality because they relied on contractors to report data and ensure data quality, and they were not aware of the requirement. However, data from one implementer revealed some errors in reported results. Data quality assessments with periodic verification of reported results can ensure consistent and reliable data. Without such assurances, decisionmakers may not have the best data to make management decisions regarding performance and budget.

Automated Directives System 203.3.5.2 states that the operating unit should be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of its data and to what extent the data can be trusted to

influence management decisions. Additionally, the Automated Directives System states that data reported to USAID/Washington for Government Performance and Results Act reporting purposes or for reporting externally on Agency performance must have had a data quality assessment at some time within the three years before submission. Also, USAID's *Performance Management Toolkit* supplementary guidance document states that the goal of assessing data from implementing partners and secondary sources is to be aware of data strengths and weaknesses and the extent to which data can be trusted when making management decisions and reporting. It also states that a practical approach to planning data quality assessments includes an initial data quality assessment and periodic quality reviews for completeness, accuracy, and consistency.

USAID/Lebanon has not performed data quality assessments because, according to mission officials, they did not know that it was required. USAID/Lebanon should periodically validate the integrity of the data collected on the reported indicators through spot checks to ensure that the numbers reported are accurate and can be supported. However, mission officials did not conduct periodic testing and verification of the quality of the data provided and, therefore, relied too heavily on the results reported by the implementing partners. In general, mission staff relied on contractors to report data and ensure data quality. For example, source data from an implementing partner revealed an error in reporting data in the wrong fiscal year because of a data entry error that occurred for one of eight indicators in the implementing partner's internal reports. This data entry error was, in turn, used by the mission to report results in its performance management plan.

Data quality assessments and periodic verification of reported results to supporting documentation ensure consistent and reliable data is being collected for management decisionmaking purposes as well as for reporting purposes. Without such assurances, decisionmakers may not have the best available data by which to make management decisions regarding performance and budgetary requirements. Consequently, the audit team is making the following recommendations.

Recommendation No. 1: We recommend that USAID/Lebanon institute procedures to perform data quality assessments as required by Automated Directives System 203.3.5.2.

Recommendation No. 2: We recommend that USAID/Lebanon develop a schedule to periodically sample and review its implementing partners' data for completeness, accuracy, and consistency.

Performance Management Plan Indicators Lacked Precise Definitions

Automated Directives System 203.3.4.2 defines the characteristics of good performance indicators as direct, objective, useful for management, practical, attributable to USAID efforts, timely, and adequate. According to the Automated Directives System, performance indicators should be unambiguous about what is being measured. Performance indicators should also be precisely defined in the performance management plan. To ensure that indicators are comparable over time, operating units should clearly define and document the indicators to permit regular, systemic, and relative objective judgment regarding their change in value or status.

Of the eight indicators in the USAID/Lebanon's performance management plan, seven were ambiguous or lacked clear definitions of what was being measured, and thus were not objective.³ For example, some of the indicators' definitions had different descriptions than the indicator titles, or the unit of measure was not consistent with the indicator title.

For the indicator *Increase in the number of municipalities issuing standardized financial statements*, the indicator title implies an increase (i.e., change), whereas the unit of measure is the actual number of municipalities issuing standardized financial statements. Furthermore, the figures reported for target and actual data for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 reflect the cumulative number of municipalities since program inception. A reader evaluating data from the performance data table could interpret the 2007 actual data as an additional 621 municipalities issued standardized financial statements in the current year, rather than since the program began in 2005. Since the actual data report for fiscal year 2006 was 561 municipalities, the increase for fiscal year 2007 was 60 municipalities.

For the indicator *Private sector companies and nongovernmental organizations develop efficient and transparent practices*, according to its definition, the indicator measures new measures adopted. In contrast, according to the indicator unit of measure, the indicator measures the number of private sector companies and non-governmental organizations adopting new measures.

The mission's cognizant technical officer was not aware that the performance indicators were ambiguous. Moreover, the cognizant technical officer disagreed that the performance indicators were not clearly defined. However, USAID/Lebanon plans to hire a consultant firm to conduct a data quality assessment that will, among other things, review the indicators. The mission expects this review to allow any necessary revisions. If performance data indicators are not clearly and consistently defined, the data collected are unlikely to permit a useful assessment of progress toward the relevant result over time.

Recommendation No. 3: We recommend that USAID/Lebanon update its performance management plan to clarify definitions for its democracy and governance indicators to be objective in accordance with Automated Directives System 203.3.4.2(b).

³ All of the indicators presented in appendix IV, except for indicator number 7, were not clearly defined.

EVALUATION OF MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

In its response to the draft report, USAID/Lebanon agreed with the three recommendations and developed specific plans to implement each of the recommendations.

In response to recommendation no. 1, USAID/Lebanon contracted a firm to conduct performance management work, including data quality assessments; that will be performed in January 2009. In addition, USAID/Lebanon's mission director sent detailed guidance to cognizant technical officers on the issues identified during the audit and the mission's expectations on program data. As a result of these planned actions, we consider that a management decision has been reached for this recommendation. Documentation supporting the completed actions should be sent to M/CFO/APC for final action.

In response to recommendation no. 2, USAID/Lebanon issued a memo to cognizant technical officers outlining detailed guidance on the issues identified during the audit and the mission's expectations on validating implementing partner's data. As a result of these actions, we consider that both a management decision and final action has been reached for this recommendation.

In response to recommendation no. 3, USAID/Lebanon stated that it contracted a firm to conduct performance management work; including a data quality assessment that will be performed in January 2009. USAID/Lebanon will immediately thereafter implement recommendations. As a result of these planned actions, we consider that a management decision has been reached for this recommendation. Documentation supporting the completed actions should be sent to M/CFO/APC for final action.

As a result of the mission's actions to implement these recommendations, management decisions and final action have been completed for recommendation no. 2. Determination for final action for recommendations no. 1 and 3 will be made by the Audit, Performance and Compliance Division (M/CFO/APC) upon completion of the actions planned by the mission. Mission comments in their entirety are included in appendix II.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Scope

RIG/Cairo conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards to determine if USAID/Lebanon's democracy and governance activities are achieving their intended results and what the impact of its program has been. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective.

We reviewed all 11 democracy and governance program indicators included in the fiscal year 2007 operational plan and all 8 indicators included on the performance management plans for fiscal 2006 and 2007. The main implementers were the State University of New York (SUNY) and America-Mideast Educational and Training Services (AMIDEAST). The audit covered the 2-year period from October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2007. As of September 30, 2007, USAID/Lebanon had obligated \$12.1 million and expended \$6.7 million for its democracy and governance activities.

We conducted our audit at USAID/Lebanon in Beirut from February 28, 2008, through June 24, 2008. We visited the Beirut offices of the two implementing partners, State University of New York and AMIDEAST. In addition, the audit team made site visits to 10 municipalities under the local governance and decentralization program managed by SUNY. The municipalities were Bourj Hammoud, Batroun Union, Tripoli, Mejdlaya, Hazmieh, Aaraya, Aabadieh, Daroun-Harissa, Jounieh, and Beit Merry. The audit team also made site visits to seven recipients under the transparency and accountability grants program managed by AMIDEAST. The recipients were the International Management and Training Institute, Telecommunications Regulatory Authority, Lebanon Iqra' Association, Christian Association for the Blind, SADER Publishers, Daily Star, and Nahwa Al-Muwatiniya.

In planning and performing the audit, we assessed significant management controls related to the achievement of planned results. Specifically, we obtained an understanding and evaluated the controls relating to (1) the fiscal year 2007 operational plan (new requirement for fiscal year 2007), (2) the fiscal year 2007 performance monitoring plan, (3) the mission's Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982 assessment, (4) the oversight performed by cognizant technical officers, (5) performance measures, and (6) data quality assessments. We also conducted interviews with key USAID/Lebanon personnel, implementing partners, Lebanese government officials, and beneficiaries. There were no prior audits relevant to this review.

Methodology

To answer the audit objective, we reviewed the fiscal year 2006 and 2007 performance management plan and the fiscal year 2007 operational plan planned and actual results. At USAID/Lebanon, the democracy and governance program reported results for 11

standard indicators for the 2007 operational plan and 8 standard indicators for the 2006 and 2007 performance management plans. We validated performance results and compared reported information to documented results from implementer progress reports for these indicators in order to verify the mission's determination of the project's performance. If the mission met 80 percent of the target for an indicator, we concluded that the mission achieved the target for that one indicator.

We selected the two main agreements that were active during our audit period and for those agreements, we reviewed the implementing partners' agreement documents, progress reports, and mid-term evaluations.

We also reviewed applicable policies and procedures for USAID/Lebanon's democracy and governance activities. These included the mission's Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982 assessment; the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Section 116 (e); USAID's Automated Directives System chapters 201, 203, 253, 324, 350 and 621; and Executive Order 13224, Prohibition on Terrorism Financing.

MANAGEMENT COMMENTS



USAID | **LEBANON**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

September 26, 2008

MEMORANDUM

To: Regional Inspector General/Cairo, Lloyd J. Miller

From: USAID/Lebanon Mission Director, Thomas Staal

Subject: Audit of USAID/Lebanon's Democracy and Governance Activities
(Report No. 6-268-08-00X-P)

USAID/Lebanon agrees with the findings and each of the three recommendations. Below please find our plan of action to correct the issues noted:

Recommendation No. 1 states "We recommend that USAID/Lebanon institute procedures to perform data quality assessments as required by the Automated Directives System 203.3.5.2."

Mission Response: USAID/ Washington OAA was requested to incrementally fund the Integrated Managing for Results (IMR2) contract (RAN-M-00-04-00049) contract with Management Systems International in the amount of U.S. \$123,000 to conduct performance management work including a data quality assessment for USAID/Lebanon in compliance with the requirement of ADS 203.

Recommendation No. 2 states "We recommend that USAID/Lebanon develop a schedule to periodically sample and review its implementing partners' data for completeness, accuracy and consistency."

Mission Response: In the last month of every quarter USAID/Lebanon CTOs will visit their implementing partners to sample and review their data for completeness, accuracy and consistency.

Recommendation No. 3 states "We recommend that USAID/Lebanon update its performance management plan to clarify definitions for its democracy and governance indicators to be objective in accordance with Automated Directives System 203.3.4.2(b)."

Mission Response: USAID/ Washington OAA was requested to incrementally fund the Integrated Managing for Results (IMR2 (RAN-M-00-04-00049) contract with Management Systems International in the amount of U.S. \$123,000 to conduct performance management work including a data quality assessment for USAID/Lebanon in compliance with the requirement of ADS 203.

Attachments: a/s

From: Herbol, Denise

Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2008 8:24 AM

To: Miller, Lloyd (Cairo/RIG)

Lloyd,

As a follow up to the Mission's response to the draft "Audit of USAID/Lebanon's Democracy and Governance Activities", below are specifics as how the Mission will address the recommendations:

Regarding Recommendations No. 1 "We recommend that USAID/Lebanon institute procedures to perform data quality assessments as required by the Automated Directives System 203.3.5.2." and No. 3 "We recommend that USAID/Lebanon update its performance management plan to clarify definitions for its democracy and governance indicators to be objective in accordance with Automated Directives System 203.3.4.2(b)" in FY 08 USAID/Lebanon contracted Management Systems International to conduct performance management work including a data quality assessment for USAID/Lebanon in compliance with the requirement of ADS 203. USAID/Lebanon will comply and immediately implement all recommendations that will result from the data quality assessment to be performed in January 2009.

As for Recommendation No. 2 "We recommend that USAID/Lebanon develop a schedule to periodically sample and review its implementing partners' data for completeness, accuracy and consistency", I signed the attached MEMO regarding the CTOs visits to implementing partners, frequency of visits, and sampling and reviewing their data for completeness, accuracy and consistency.

Denise A. Herbol, Mission Director USAID/Lebanon

Operational Plan Standard Indicators for Fiscal Year 2007

Performance Indicator	Target FY 2007	Actual FY 2007	Achieved ⁴
1. Number of national legislators and national legislative staff attending US government sponsored training or educational events	50	70	Yes
2. Number of draft laws subject to final vote in new or transitional legislatures receiving US government assistance	1	0	No
3. Number of subnational governments receiving US governmental assistance to increase their annual own-source revenues	250	342	Yes
4. Number of individuals who received US government assisted training, including management skills and fiscal management, to strengthen local government and/or decentralization	2,000	2,082	Yes
5. Number of local mechanisms supported with US government assistance for citizens to engage their subnational government	5	2	No
6. Number of civil society organizations using US government assistance to promote political participation	5	1	No
7. Number of civil society organizations using US government assistance to improve internal organization capacity	12	6	No
8. Number of civil society organizations' advocacy campaigns supported by US government	11	9	Yes
9. Number of positive modifications to enabling legislation/regulation for civil society accomplished with US government assistance	1	0	No
10. Number of people who have completed US government assisted civic education programs	25,000	25,750	Yes
11. Number of independent and democratic trade/labor unions supported by US government to promote international core labor standards	1	0	No

⁴ We concluded that the mission achieved its results if it met or exceeded at least 80 percent of performance indicator targets.

**USAID/Lebanon Performance Management Plan Indicators for
Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007**

Performance Indicator	Target FY 2006	Actual FY 2006	Achieved	Target FY 2007	Actual FY 2007	Achieved⁵
1. Increased public confidence in municipalities	10%	22%	Yes	10%	18%	Yes
2. Enabling legal environment that strengthen the role of local government and municipalities	10	7	No	15	11	No
3. Increased resources identified resulting from implementing existing laws	20%	31%	Yes	30%	29%	Yes
4. Increase in the number of municipalities issuing standardized annual financial statement ⁶	500	561	Yes	700	621	Yes
5. Increased number of municipality employees that are being trained	5,000	3,236	No	6,000	6,073	Yes
6. Private sector and non-governmental organizations develop efficient & transparent practices	7	7	Yes	3	5	Yes
7. Increased number of government actions based on NGO/individual initiatives	4	6	Yes	1	4	Yes
8. Number of signed agreements with USAID assistance	14	11	No	8	7	Yes

⁵ We concluded that the mission achieved its results if it met or exceeded at least 80 percent of performance indicator targets.

⁶ Information reported for this performance indicator was incorrectly reported for both years due to data misreported by both the implementer and the mission. Actual results for fiscal year 2006 are 2007 data. Actual results for 2007 were not available until the end of June 2008.

U.S. Agency for International Development
Office of Inspector General
1300 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20523
Tel: (202) 712-1150
Fax: (202) 216-3047
www.usaid.gov/oig