

APPENDIX A: MANAGEMENT GOAL PERFORMANCE DATA

Management Goal: Achieve USAID's Goals Efficiently and Effectively Table of FY 2001 Performance Data					
Performance Goals & Indicators	FY 2001 Target	FY 2001 Actual	Assessment	Notes	Linkage to President's Management Agenda
Objective #1: Accurate program performance and financial information available for Agency decisions (M/CFO)					
<i>1.1: Core financial management system certified compliant with Federal requirements</i>				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
1.1.1: Integrated, automated financial systems worldwide	Such a system is fully operational in Washington and two overseas Missions.	Washington system fully implemented. System linked to missions through electronic interface. No pilot missions.	Target exceeded Target met Target not met per note:	Overseas deployment of core financial system resequenced to follow acquisition and deployment of a new procurement system and upgraded telecommunication network capabilities.	Improved Financial Performance
1.1.2: A fully operational, secure and compliant core financial system installed with interfaces to major feeder systems	Federal certification of the general control environment and system security of the accounting operations of approximately one-half of the Agency's overseas Missions.	Washington system certified. Mission critical interfaces. System security certification and accreditations were conducted at nine of 38 overseas accounting stations. System security vulnerabilities were identified and corrected. The 10th mission was not certified due to delays associated with September 11. Technical and functional managers designated for five mission critical systems.	Target met Target met Target partially met Target exceeded	Target not fully achieved in order to dedicate budget resources to complete implementation of core financial system in Washington.	Improved Financial Performance
<i>1.2: A system to allocate costs fully to Agency strategic goals installed in Washington and the field</i>				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
1.2.1: Costs attributable to Agency strategic goals	Provide secure, reliable and accurate financial information at the strategic objective level throughout the Agency.	Financial reporting at the strategic objective level in Washington. Mission financial reporting at the strategic objective level on schedule for June 2002.	Target met Target partially met		Budget and Performance Integration

APPENDIX A: MANAGEMENT GOAL PERFORMANCE DATA

Management Goal: Achieve USAID's Goals Efficiently and Effectively Table of FY 2001 Performance Data					
Performance Goals & Indicators	FY 2001 Target	FY 2001 Actual	Assessment	Notes	Linkage to President's Management Agenda
Objective #1: Accurate program performance and financial information available for Agency decisions (M/CFO)					
<i>1.3: Program performance assessment systems and capabilities increased</i>				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
1.3.1: USAID program performance tracked	Target not set for FY 2001.		Not applicable	New indicator for FY 2002 (introduced in FY 2000 POR).	Budget and Performance Integration
<i>1.4: Knowledge to plan and implement USAID's programs acquired and shared effectively</i>				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
1.4.1: Knowledge	Target not set for FY 2001.	Implementation of www.USAIDResults.org as a knowledge management portal for ADS 200 Programming Policies.	Not applicable	New indicator for FY 2002 (introduced in FY 2000 POR).	
<i>1.5: Agency operations guided by effective policies and procedures</i>				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
1.5.1: Assessment and audits validate implementation of policies and procedures	Target not set for FY 2001.	9 OIG Performance Audits Conducted indicating inconsistent adherence to data reliability standards.	Not applicable	New indicator for FY 2002 (introduced in FY 2000 POR).	Budget and Performance Integration; and, Improved Financial Performance
Objective #2: USAID staff skills, Agency goals, core values and organizational structures better aligned to achieve results efficiently (M/HR)					
<i>2.1: Human resource planning capabilities strengthened</i>				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
2.1.1: Recruitment efforts result in rapid deployment of staff in all labor categories and services-Target A	An additional 151 employees (of which 131 will be NEPs) brought on board through March 2002.	Total of 141 employees brought on board. Breakdown: 77 NEPs (Foreign Service entry level employees) entered on duty along with 18 Presidential Management Interns, 46 other career Civil Service (CS) employees entered on duty during FY 2001.	Target not met	NEP Classes are about 10 employees fewer than actual target due to last minute cancellations or lack of necessary medical/security clearances. Next NEP class enters March 2002.	Strategic Management of Human Capital
2.1.1: Recruitment efforts result in rapid deployment of staff in all labor categories and services-Target B	Planned FS staffing level maintained.	Excluding the IG, USAID had 996 FS employees on 9/30/2000; on 9/30/2001, it had 992. FS attrition was 92 of FY 2001. (USAID projects FS attrition to be at least 90 per year through FY 2005 and total FS & CS attrition will be 200, or about 10% per annum.)	Target met	The Agency plans to have 1,000 Foreign Service (FS) on board by 9/30/2002.	Strategic Management of Human Capital

APPENDIX A: MANAGEMENT GOAL PERFORMANCE DATA

Management Goal: Achieve USAID's Goals Efficiently and Effectively Table of FY 2001 Performance Data

Performance Goals & Indicators	FY 2001 Target	FY 2001 Actual	Assessment	Notes	Linkage to President's Management Agenda
Objective #2: USAID staff skills, Agency goals, core values and organizational structures better aligned to achieve results efficiently (M/HR)					
2.2: Skill shortages addressed				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
2.2.1: In-house training on critical operational skills continued-Target A	Leadership training for 100 executive-level (FS-1/GS-15) employees	105 executive-level (FS-1/GS-15) employees trained.	Target Met		Strategic Management of Human Capital
2.2.1: In-house training on critical operational skills continued-Target B	Operations training for 120 midlevel seniors (FS-2/GS-14), senior level FSNs and US PSCs	147 midlevel seniors (FS-2/GS-14), senior level FSNs and US PSCs trained.	Target Met		Strategic Management of Human Capital
2.2.1: In-house training on critical operational skills continued-Target C	Assistance and acquisition training for 425 technical officers	480 employees trained.	Target Met		Strategic Management of Human Capital
2.2.1: In-house training on critical operational skills continued-Target D	Supervisory training for 300 employees at all levels	385 employees trained.	Target Met		Strategic Management of Human Capital
2.2.1: In-house training on critical operational skills continued-Target E	Managing for Results Program made available for computer-based self-instruction.	Program made available and 348 employees trained.	Target Met		Strategic Management of Human Capital
Objective #3: Agency goals and objectives served by well-planned and managed acquisitions and assistance (A&A) (M/OP)					
3.1: A&A planning integrated with program development				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
3.1.1: Procurement priorities established and modified jointly by technical and contract officers	Negotiate 38% of A&A instruments within first three quarters of FY 2001, 20% during July, 21% during August, and 21% in September. Baseline (FY 1999): 32% of A&A instruments awarded were executed during the first three quarters of the year. The remaining 68% of the instruments were executed during the fourth quarter as follows: July - 13%; August - 14%; September - 41%.	Of the A&A awards made in Washington, 40% of awards were made within the first three quarters. 8% were awarded in July; 8% were awarded in August; 44% were awarded in September.	Target exceeded Other targets not met. See note at right	The goal of reducing fourth quarter obligations is partly dependent on when the OYB is made available. In addition, some programs, such as OFDA, must react to immediate needs. (USAID is retaining its targets for FY 2002, but plans further review to determine whether the goals should exclude actions that cannot be planned in advance.)	Competitive Sourcing

APPENDIX A: MANAGEMENT GOAL PERFORMANCE DATA

Management Goal: Achieve USAID's Goals Efficiently and Effectively Table of FY 2001 Performance Data					
Performance Goals & Indicators	FY 2001 Target	FY 2001 Actual	Assessment	Notes	Linkage to President's Management Agenda
Objective #3: Agency goals and objectives served by well-planned and managed acquisitions and assistance (A&A) (M/OP)					
<i>3.2: A&A competencies of technical and contract staff strengthened</i>				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
3.2.1: Percentage of CTOs and COs certified-Target A	Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) certification program approved.	The Administrator approved the CTO certification program.	Target met	Administrator's notice of July 16 indicated his decision to budget resources to complete the CTO certification program in three years.	Improved Financial Performance
3.2.1: Percentage of CTOs and COs certified-Target B	85% of Contract Officers (COs) certified by end of FY 2001.	96% of COs with unlimited warrants are certified. 77% of COs with warrants of \$2.5 million and more are certified.	Target met		Improved Financial Performance
3.2.1: Percentage of CTOs and COs certified-Target C	Productivity of COs enhanced by a fully operational, automated contract-writing system.	New automated contract writing system (ProDoc) is operational in Washington and Missions.	Target met	System is required to be used as of 10/01/01.	Improved Financial Performance
<i>3.3: Partnerships among USAID technical offices, contract offices and contractors and recipients improved</i>				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
3.3.1: Increase in postaward meetings between all parties when substantial new awards are made	Baseline established and 2002 target set.	Baseline established that joint meetings were held for large new contracts approximately 30% of the time.	Target met		Improved Financial Performance
3.3.2: Contract administration is simplified	New indicator-target not set for FY 2001.		Not applicable		Improved Financial Performance
<i>3.4: Consistency in application of A&A policies and procedures</i>				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
3.4.1: Uniform implementation of contracting policies	Uniform implementation of contracting policies	Baseline not established because of end-of-year work requirements.	Target not met	CRB began reviewing contracts exceeding \$10 million in April. Since the majority of the work of the CRB occurred during the last three months of the year--particularly the last month--the board has not yet set down its findings in order to establish a baseline.	Improved Financial Performance

APPENDIX A: MANAGEMENT GOAL PERFORMANCE DATA

Management Goal: Achieve USAID's Goals Efficiently and Effectively Table of FY 2001 Performance Data					
Performance Goals & Indicators	FY 2001 Target	FY 2001 Actual	Assessment	Notes	Linkage to President's Management Agenda
Objective #4: Agency goals and objectives supported by better information management and technology (M/IRM and M/CIO)					
<i>NEW: 4.1: Information technology improves Agency efficiency and effectiveness</i>				<i>Modified in FY 2000 POR</i>	
4.1: Enhanced compliance with Federal requirements and regulations	Continue the process of modernizing Agency systems consistent with the technical architecture adapted in fiscal year 2000.	Evaluation of new desktop operating system/office suite for USAID/W completed. Eight missions completed for network operating system, e-mail upgrades. Telecommunications network equipment upgraded in three missions.	Target met		Expanded Electronic Government

APPENDIX B: USAID OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL STATEMENT CONCERNING USAID'S MOST SERIOUS MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE CHALLENGES

INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

TO: A/AID, Andrew S. Natsios
FROM: IG, Everett L. Mosley 
SUBJECT: USAID's Most Serious Management Challenges

SUMMARY

Attached is a revised copy of my Office's statement of the most serious challenges facing USAID management for inclusion in USAID's fiscal year 2001 Accountability Report. Except as otherwise noted, this summary is as of September 30, 2001.

DISCUSSION

The Report Consolidation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-531) states that an agency Accountability Report "shall include a statement prepared by the agency's inspector general that summarizes what the inspector general considers to be the most serious management and performance challenges facing the agency and briefly assesses the agency's progress in addressing those challenges."

The attached document provides our statement concerning USAID's most serious management and performance challenges for inclusion in USAID's fiscal year 2001 Accountability Report. This memorandum supercedes my same subject memorandum to you dated February 4, 2002 as it contains additional information derived from relevant audit work my Office performed subsequent to the September 30, 2001 reporting period. This additional information is described in the attachment.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss this document, I would be happy to meet with you.

Attachment:

USAID Office of Inspector General Statement Concerning USAID's Most Serious Management and Performance Challenges

APPENDIX B: USAID OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL STATEMENT CONCERNING USAID'S MOST SERIOUS MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE CHALLENGES

This document presents the Office of Inspector General's assessment of the most serious challenges facing USAID management at the close of fiscal year 2001.

In pursuit of its mission, USAID faces a number of serious challenges. This statement describes USAID's continuing efforts to address its major management and performance challenges and OIG efforts to assist in overcoming these challenges.

Information Resource Management

Over the past several years, OIG audits have identified significant weaknesses in USAID's management of information technology resources. Organizational and management deficiencies have slowed USAID's acquisition and implementation of effective information systems. Furthermore, USAID's management practices have kept the Agency from fully complying with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996, which requires executive agencies to implement a process that maximizes the value of information technology investments and assess the risks involved with these investments. As a result, USAID managers have not had access to financial information that is complete, reliable, and timely.

USAID faces three primary information resource management challenges: financial reporting and resource management capabilities, information resource management processes, and computer security.

Improving Financial Reporting and Resource Management Capabilities

The information systems at USAID have not fully supported the Agency's

planning and reporting requirements. Therefore, USAID managers have had difficulty consistently obtaining timely, reliable and complete financial and performance data. Even though USAID managers can mitigate the systemic weaknesses by generating individual reports on an ad hoc basis, the Agency's ability to routinely use financial information for decision-making purposes remains impaired.

To correct this weakness, USAID has deployed Phoenix, the core financial accounting component of a new integrated financial management and accounting system. The Phoenix system replaced key components of USAID's unreliable financial management system, the New Management System. The OIG has closely monitored the implementation of the Phoenix system.

Improving Information Resource Management Processes

Over the past years, the OIG has reported that USAID's processes for procuring and managing information resource technology have not followed the guidelines established by the Clinger-Cohen Act. USAID management has acknowledged the weaknesses of its information resource management processes, and the Agency has made efforts to improve them. For example, USAID is incorporating performance measurements to enhance program management capabilities for monitoring and tracking information management projects. Also, the Agency is developing plans to seek independent certification that its practices meet commonly accepted government and industry standards. USAID efforts to comply with industry

standards for complex information technology projects, such as the wide area renovation projects to deploy telecommunication services overseas, should result in faster, more efficient project implementation.

USAID's management and procurement of information technology resources will considerably improve with these actions. The OIG will continue to track and report on USAID's efforts to fully comply with requirements of the Clinger-Cohen Act.

Improving Computer Security

Recent OIG audits have confirmed that USAID does not yet have adequate computer security controls in place to mitigate the risks to critical information systems. These audits, however, have also identified substantial computer security improvements. For example, USAID's computer security framework includes updated security policies, a security valuation process requiring certification by management, improved security training, and a risk assessment process. The Chief Information Officers Council and the General Services Administration recognized USAID's security program as an innovative and comprehensive approach that could benefit the entire Federal government.

Despite these efforts, more work is needed to ensure that sensitive data is not exposed to unacceptable risks of loss or destruction. As of July 2001, USAID had assessed the computer security risks at only 20 percent of missions, and agency-wide computer security had not yet been fully addressed. Also, during fiscal year 2001, USAID conducted assessments at nine overseas Mission Accounting

APPENDIX B: USAID OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL STATEMENT CONCERNING USAID'S MOST SERIOUS MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE CHALLENGES

and Control Systems (MACS) accounting stations and found that three MACS systems had not been finalized according to certification and accreditation requirements. Furthermore, USAID could better protect Agency information systems by developing capabilities to prevent, detect, respond to, and report efforts to obtain unauthorized access.

The OIG, through continuing audits and by monitoring USAID's Information Systems Security Working Group, will continue to work with USAID management to improve computer security.

Financial Management

Over the past several years, USAID has made progress toward resolving problems with its financial management system, and the Agency has committed significant resources for additional improvements. Despite these efforts, USAID's outstanding financial management system deficiencies remain a significant management challenge, and the solutions to several long-standing problems have been delayed.

Implementing an Integrated Financial Management System

OIG audits showed that USAID's financial management systems did not comply with Federal Financial Management Improvement Act (FFMIA) requirements and were unable to provide complete, reliable, timely, and consistent information about Agency operations.

To correct this situation, USAID plans to implement an integrated financial management system using a combination of commercial off-the-

shelf software products and third party financial service providers.

Phoenix, the core financial accounting component, operates in Washington, D.C. and receives financial information electronically from the 38 overseas accounting stations. While Phoenix has been deployed in Washington, the deployment of Phoenix to overseas accounting stations has been delayed. Pilot implementation of the system at two missions, scheduled to take place during April 2001, had not occurred by the close of fiscal year 2001, and estimates for the system's full deployment were changed from fiscal year 2003 to fiscal year 2007.

According to USAID management, a major reason for delaying the worldwide Phoenix deployment was the cost. As a result, USAID revised its strategy on how the Agency could become compliant with FFMIA requirements. Initially, USAID developed an interim effort that automated the interface between data extracted from the Agency mission systems and Phoenix. USAID officials believed, at that time, that implementing the automated interface would make the system compliant. However, subsequent to the September 30, 2001 reporting period, we found, based on our discussions with Office of Management and Budget officials and our own audit work, that the interface did not make the system compliant with FFMIA requirements. Again USAID was faced with a need to revise its strategy on how it would become compliant with FFMIA. USAID is currently conducting a study to determine when and how best to deploy the system overseas and become compliant with FFMIA.

The OIG will continue to monitor the deployment of USAID's integrated financial management systems and review USAID's efforts to comply with FFMIA requirements.

Correcting Outstanding Financial Management System Planning Deficiencies

Recent OIG audits reported that USAID had made significant improvements to its financial management system planning. Those improvements included developing and implementing an agency-wide information technology architecture, financial management system portfolio, acquisition strategy, financial management system remediation plan, and a program management office to oversee the development of an integrated financial management system.

Despite these improvements, the OIG concluded that additional efforts are needed to fully correct identified financial management system planning deficiencies. For example, USAID needs to improve its process so that information technology investments are prioritized and selected in accordance with OMB guidelines. Furthermore, the Agency needs to strengthen the authorities to ensure to manage financial management system projects effective day-to-day oversight of USAID's financial system modernization efforts. Finally, although USAID's current remediation plan has been updated to include remedies, resources, and intermediate target dates, the Agency has yet to meet those dates. The OIG will continue to monitor the Agency's progress in correcting these remaining financial management system planning deficiencies.

APPENDIX B: USAID OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL STATEMENT CONCERNING USAID'S MOST SERIOUS MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE CHALLENGES

Reconciling Financial Data

During past audits, the OIG found that USAID's grant financial management system did not provide effective control and accountability over many of the Agency's advances. The OIG recommended that USAID reconcile the unliquidated obligation amount for each grant transferred from its old legacy system to the Department of Health and Human Services Payment Management System. USAID is in the process of performing this reconciliation and has contracted with a private accounting firm to provide additional assistance in this area. According to USAID, this effort has improved the reliability of the advance balances that will be reported in the Agency's fiscal year 2001 financial statements. As part of the current Government Management Reform Act (GMRA) audit, the OIG is assessing whether this action led to improvements in the information reported in the Agency's financial accounting system.

Accurately Reporting Accounts Receivable

The OIG first noted in a 1997 audit report that USAID could not adequately track and report its accounts receivable. To address this problem, USAID's new integrated accounting system will have the capacity to establish and report accounts receivable. When this system is fully implemented in Washington and at the missions, the OIG will review the resulting data to determine whether USAID managers are receiving reliable and timely accounts receivable data.

As an interim measure, USAID records accounts receivable as an adjusting entry to its year-end financial statements. As part of the current GMRA audit, the OIG is evaluating these efforts to ensure that they provide adequate information about the Agency's accounts receivable.

Human Capital Management

As a result of downsizing initiatives, USAID has experienced a 30 percent reduction in U.S. direct hire staff since fiscal year 1995. USAID's remaining workforce—the Agency's human capital—must be properly managed to ensure USAID's ability to fulfill its mission.

In January 2001, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) reported that since the early 1990s, USAID has made limited progress in addressing human capital reforms related to personnel administration, career management, training, and Foreign Service assignments. According to the GAO, USAID's human capital problems can be seen as part of a broader pattern of human capital shortcomings that have eroded mission capabilities across the federal government. USAID's specific human capital challenges include:

- a projected 57 percent of U.S. direct hire Foreign Service staff that will be eligible for voluntary retirement by the end of fiscal year 2005;
- a projected 32 percent of U.S. direct hire Civil Service staff that will be eligible for retirement by the end of fiscal year 2005; and
- attrition rates estimated to be about 7 percent for Foreign Service staff

and 10 percent for the Civil Service through fiscal year 2006.

USAID faces a steady decline in the number of experienced Foreign Service officers and employees who have specialized technical expertise. As a result, there are less-experienced personnel managing increasingly complex overseas development programs.

Although these challenges are daunting, they also provide an opportunity for USAID to develop a workforce with the necessary skills for the future. To address these challenges, USAID is planning to (1) hire 80 to 85 entry-level Foreign Service candidates per year through fiscal year 2005, (2) increase external training for upper-level managers through such programs as the Federal Executive Institute and the Foreign Affairs Leadership Seminar, and (3) recruit employees with critical skills in the areas of information technology, financial management, legal, and contracting.

Because human capital management is designated as a major challenge, the OIG is committed to continued audit work in this area. The OIG is currently evaluating USAID's (1) management staff training, (2) management of the Agency's procurement workforce, and (3) human capital baseline data.

Procurement

USAID relies on its procurement workforce to award and administer the contracts and assistance instruments required to accomplish program objectives. A major challenge for USAID is to develop and implement a system to effectively manage the Agency's procurement resources. Specifically, USAID must address the following issues.

APPENDIX B: USAID OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL STATEMENT CONCERNING USAID'S MOST SERIOUS MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE CHALLENGES

Ensuring Adequate Procurement Office Staffing

USAID's Office of Procurement is losing experienced contracting officers to retirement, other federal agencies, the private sector, and transfers to non-contracting jobs within other USAID offices. According to USAID officials, the number of contracting staff as of the second quarter fiscal year 2001 decreased by 20 percent from the onboard levels at the beginning of fiscal year 2000.

According to USAID's fiscal year 1999 and 2000 budgets, USAID's procurement staff administered approximately 50 percent of the Agency's foreign assistance budget through assistance and acquisition instruments. In the Office of Procurement's fiscal year 2000 Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act submission, the Director reported that as a result of workforce attrition, coupled with the inability to quickly fill vacant procurement professional positions, the Office of Procurement has not been operating at adequate staffing levels. A major challenge for USAID will be to retain enough procurement professionals and to ensure the integrity and efficiency of the Agency's acquisition and assistance functions.

Ensuring Effective Contract Administration

USAID requires its procurement workforce to manage a variety of contract award and administration activities. The staffing challenges USAID faces make it difficult for the procurement workforce to maintain the appropriate levels of contract

administration to ensure continuation of sound business practices. As a result, USAID could be vulnerable to higher contract costs, delays in contract awards, an increased number of bid protests, as well as costly contract modifications and revisions. For fiscal year 2002, USAID's goal is to use performance-based contracting techniques to award at least 20 percent of the Agency's eligible contracts over \$25,000. To achieve this goal, procurement specialists will be expected to have much greater knowledge of market conditions, industry trends and technical details of the commodities and services procured.

To help ensure the effectiveness of USAID's procurement operations, the OIG plans to evaluate various aspects of the procurement function. The OIG currently has underway audits of USAID's staffing of procurement officers and use of non-U.S. direct hire personnel to perform procurement functions. The OIG recently completed an audit of the independence of procurement officers overseas.

Performance Measurement and Reporting

The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Results Act) requires agencies to set program goals, measure program performance against those goals, and report on their progress. As the OIG stated in a December 2000 letter to the U.S. Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, USAID continues to have problems developing performance measurement and reporting systems that meet internal and external

reporting requirements, including the requirements of the Results Act.

The OIG is continuing to monitor and recommend improvements to USAID's performance measurement and reporting systems. For example, in collaboration with USAID management, the OIG conducted a series of audits to test compliance with the Agency's performance monitoring guidance. These audits reviewed indicators appearing in USAID's annual internal Results Review and Resource Request (R4) reports and determined that the audited operating units needed to:

- improve their respective performance monitoring plans;
- perform and document data quality assessments on indicators used for program management and reported in R4 reports; and
- disclose any known data quality limitations in the R4 reports.

The OIG is currently conducting a series of similar audits focused on indicators related to USAID's HIV/AIDS activities. Further, in response to the OIG's audit reports, USAID has revised directives for performance monitoring, and has initiated Agency-wide training to improve performance measurement and monitoring.

The OIG is continuing to monitor and recommend improvements to USAID's performance measurement and reporting systems.

APPENDIX C: LIST OF ACRONYMS

A&A	Acquisition and Assistance	GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act
ACS	Accounting Classification Structure	IFMS	Integrated Financial Management System
ADS	Automated Directives System	IG	Inspector General
AICPA	American Institute of Certified Public Accountants	IMSP	Information Management Strategic Plan
APP	Annual Performance Plan	IT	Information Technology
AWACS	A.I.D. Worldwide Accounting and Control System	JFMIP	Joint Financial Management Improvement Program
C&A	Certification and Accreditation	LOC	Letter of Credit
CFO	Chief Financial Officer	MACS	Mission Accounting and Control System
CIO	Chief Information Officer	MACSTRAX	MACS Voucher Tracking System
CMM	Capability Maturity Model	MAL	MACS Auxiliary Ledger
CO	Contracting Officer	MCA	Managerial Cost Accounting
CONOPS	Concept of Operations	MPICS	Mission Procurement Information Collection System
COTS	Commercial Off-the-Shelf	NEP	New Entry Professional
CRB	Contract Review Board	NFC	National Finance Center
CS	Civil Service	NMS	New Management System
CTO	Cognizant Technical Officer	NXP	Non-Expendable Property
DHHS	Department of Health and Human Services	OIG	Office of the Inspector General
E-GOV	Electronic Government	OMB	Office of Management and Budget
ESIL	Enterprise Solution Integration Laboratory	PMI	Presidential Management Intern
FFMIA	Federal Financial Management Improvement Act	PMS	Payment Management System
FMC	Financial Management Center	PSC	Personal Services Contractor
FMFIA	Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act	QCR	Quality Control Review
FMIP	Financial Management Improvement Program	SGL	Standard General Ledger
FS	Foreign Service	TEIA	Target Enterprise Information Architecture
FSI	Financial Systems Integration	USAID	United States Agency for International Development
FSN	Foreign Service National	USDH	United States Direct Hire
GMRA	Government Management Reform Act		
GPEA	Government Paperwork Elimination Act		