



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

AUDIT OF USAID/IRAQ'S CIVIL SOCIETY ACTIVITIES

AUDIT REPORT NO. E-267-07-001-P
NOVEMBER 5, 2006

BAGHDAD, IRAQ



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Office of Inspector General

November 5, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Acting USAID/Iraq Mission Director, Michael Harvey

FROM: RIG/Baghdad, Nancy J. Lawton /s/

SUBJECT: Audit of USAID/Iraq's Civil Society Activities (Report No. E-267-07-001-P)

This memorandum transmits our final report on the subject audit. This report contains two recommendations with which you concurred in your response to the draft report. Based on the actions you have taken in response to the audit findings, a management decision has been reached and final action has been taken on both recommendations.

I want to express my sincere appreciation for the cooperation and courtesies extended to my staff during this audit.

CONTENTS

Summary of Results	1
Background	2
Audit Objective	3
Audit Findings	4
Performance Monitoring Plan Should Be Complete and Achievable	5
Each Reported Output Should Be Specific, Accurate, and Documented	6
Evaluation of Management Comments	7
Appendix I – Scope and Methodology	8
Appendix II – Management Comments	11
Appendix III – Table of Intended Outputs	13
Appendix IV – Table of Indicators Without Intended Outputs	27

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

USAID/Iraq's civil society activities focused on fostering growth and development of civil society organizations in the areas of civic education, women's advocacy, anti-corruption, and human rights. Training and technical assistance were provided to civil society organizations through civil society resource centers and a small grants program created by the implementing partner, America's Development Foundation (ADF). (See page 2.)

Of the 35 intended outputs included in ADF's Performance Monitoring Plan, the audit found that USAID/Iraq's civil society activities achieved 17 intended outputs while 8 were reported as not met. In addition, 10 were not determinable due to a lack of sufficient documentation and non-specific reported outputs. (See page 4.)

ADF's Performance Monitoring Plan was neither complete nor achievable. The Performance Monitoring Plan did not have intended outputs listed for all indicators, and there were security issues that caused delays in the implementation of the program. To address these problems, we recommended that USAID/Iraq review ADF's Performance Monitoring Plan to require that each indicator has a measurable output and that the intended outputs are achievable. (See page 5.)

In addition, the audit found that some reported outputs were not specific, accurate and documented. To address these issues, we recommended that USAID/Iraq develop procedures to provide reasonable assurance of having specific and accurate reported outputs and sufficient documentation to substantiate the reported outputs. (See page 6.)

Mission management concurred with the recommendations. Based on the actions taken by the Mission, management decisions have been reached and final action has been taken. (See page 7.) Management comments are included in their entirety in Appendix II. (See page 11.)

BACKGROUND

Since liberation, thousands of independent citizen-based organizations have sprung up within Iraq, taking advantage of the open political and social space afforded by the collapse of the Ba'ath regime. These organizations represent the major force for democratic transformation as they are striving to ensure that the gains achieved until now will not be lost and that the new sovereign government is held accountable to its citizens. However, there are a number of possible obstacles in the development of a vibrant, non-sectarian, sustainable Iraqi civil society including a lack of public security; a mixture of fear, cynicism, and suppression of independent thought resulting from the Ba'athist legacy of totalitarianism; and an emerging manifestation of ideological, religious, and political divisions within and across civil society organizations (CSOs).

In support of the U.S. Government's efforts to foster participatory democratic governance in Iraq, USAID/Iraq sought to strengthen civil society's role in the economic and political development of a broad cadre of indigenous CSOs in Iraq. To accomplish this goal, USAID/Iraq awarded a \$43 million contract to America's Development Foundation (ADF), USAID/Iraq's primary implementing partner for civil society activities, effective August 16, 2004. Through modifications, the funding increased to \$59.1 million with an end date of June 30, 2007.

The program funded through the contract focused on fostering the growth and development of CSOs active in areas of civic education, women's advocacy, anti-corruption, and human rights. ADF established four civil society resource centers staffed by Iraqis to serve as regional hubs for the delivery of training and technical assistance to Iraqi CSOs. ADF also implemented a small grants program that reinforced the training and technical assistance activities being provided to the CSOs and their participation in advocacy and policy-making at the national, regional, and local levels. In addition, ADF worked to develop a professional independent media sector in Iraq with the goal of developing outlets throughout the country to provide high quality information via print and broadcast media that respond to the needs of their audiences.

This audit covered the activities implemented by ADF from August 2004 to March 31, 2006. As of March 31, 2006, cumulative obligations and disbursements under the ADF contract were \$42.9 million and \$31.9 million, respectively. Funds were disbursed for program costs (\$5.2 million) and salaries, allowances, fringe benefits, and travel costs (\$6.4 million).¹ In addition, there were expenditures related to contractual obligations such as overhead, general administrative costs and profit (\$5.3 million), security and other support services (\$11.8 million), and other direct costs (\$3.2 million).

¹ ADF classifies a large portion of salary expense as program costs.

AUDIT OBJECTIVE

As part of its fiscal year 2006 annual audit plan, the Regional Inspector General in Baghdad conducted this audit to answer the following question:

- Are USAID/Iraq's civil society activities achieving their intended outputs?

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

AUDIT FINDINGS

The audit found that USAID/Iraq's civil society activities of its primary implementing partner, America's Development Foundation (ADF), met 17 intended outputs while ADF reported not meeting 8 intended outputs. We were unable to determine if ADF achieved the remaining 10 intended outputs. The table below shows the breakdown of the 35 intended outputs.

Progress of Intended Outputs

Output Status	Number of Outputs	Percent of Total Outputs
Intended outputs were met	17	49
Intended outputs were not met	8	23
Not able to determine	10	29
Total	35	101 ²

ADF had sufficient documentation to support the achievement of 17 intended outputs. For example, intended outputs relating to civil society organization assessment indicators were met. ADF assessed over 1,200 civil society organizations, exceeding the intended output of 1,000 civil society organizations to be assessed. Other examples of intended outputs met include developing or adapting 83 capacity-building training modules and establishing four resource libraries.

ADF reported not meeting eight intended outputs including outputs relating to staff trainings on organizational assessments, the establishment of satellite centers, and multiple human rights intended outputs. In addition to the intended outputs not met, we were unable to determine if ADF achieved the intended outputs for 10 intended outputs due to a lack of supporting documentation (8 intended outputs) and because ADF did not provide specific output information (2 intended outputs). For example, no number was reported for the intended output of civil society organizations conducting 18 gender events.

In addition, eight indicators did not have intended outputs listed in ADF's Performance Monitoring Plan³ (PMP), but outputs were reported in the Performance Monitoring Report for six of these indicators (see Appendix IV). Further, ADF did not accurately report its activities. After the debriefing, which discussed the results of the audit fieldwork, ADF revised reported outputs for 20 outputs originally under-reported. Appendix III provides a complete listing of the intended and reported outputs.

Even though many intended outputs were not achieved, during the audit we found that USAID/Iraq and ADF actively monitored the programs and grants awarded. The Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) was well informed of the program activities and met

² The total is greater than 100 percent due to rounding.

³ The performance monitoring plan was prepared by ADF as required by its contract with USAID. It is analogous to the performance management plan cited in USAID's Automated Directives System and is used to provide for periodic evaluation.

regularly with ADF. During interviews with grantees, we found that ADF employees consistently monitored the activities (usually through unannounced visits) and that ADF wrote monitoring reports that were regularly included in the grant files.

Performance Monitoring Plan Should Be Complete and Achievable

ADF's contract required that a PMP be developed to measure progress throughout the program and to provide for periodic evaluation of the impact of the program. The plan was to include methodology on how data would be collected, interim and final targets, and a timeline for collecting data. Data was to be collected for all indicators and provided to the CTO. Pursuant to USAID's Automated Directives System (ADS) 203.3.4.5, each indicator in the PMP should include performance baselines and set intended outputs that are ambitious but achievable given the stated timeframe and the available resources. ADS 203.3.3.1 further states that each indicator in a PMP should have a target value.⁴

Contrary to ADS guidance, ADF's PMP was incomplete. As stated previously, eight indicators did not have intended outputs associated with them (listed in Appendix IV). In addition, the PMP contained intended outputs that were not achievable in the given timeframe, contrary to the ADS. For example, the intended output of establishing 12 satellite support centers by December 2005 was not achievable given the situation in Iraq and the time requirements of establishing a functioning center.

USAID/Iraq and ADF management focused on implementing the program rather than developing an achievable and complete PMP. ADF also experienced significant security issues that affected the implementation of the program. For example, ADF and partner staff were kidnapped; a partner office was bombed; and there was an attempted bombing at the ADF headquarters in Baghdad. Given the security issues, some of the PMP indicators were not achievable. The PMP should have been revised to reflect achievable intended outputs given these problems that arose during implementation. As a result of an incomplete and unachievable PMP, the Mission was not properly using a critical tool for planning and managing the program.

Recommendation No. 1: We recommend that USAID/Iraq review each indicator in the America's Development Foundation Performance Monitoring Plan for its civil society activities to provide reasonable assurance that each indicator has a measurable intended output and that the intended outputs are achievable in the timeframe specified in the plan.

⁴ Because the contract between USAID and ADF did not specify detailed requirements for ADF's PMP, we are using USAID guidance as criteria.

Each Reported Output Should Be Specific, Accurate, and Documented

ADS 203.3.4.2 states that performance indicators selected for inclusion in the PMP should be useful for the relevant level of decision-making. If reported outputs are not specific, the indicator may not be useful in the decision-making process. In addition, the Government Accountability Office's *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government* states that all transactions and other significant events need to be clearly documented and that the documentation should be readily available for examination.

ADF did not provide specific and accurate output information related to each indicator, nor did it have sufficient documentation to support the reported outputs. ADF did not provide specific reported outputs to measure two indicators; it only reported general, nonspecific outputs for the two indicators. In addition, as a response to the debriefing to discuss the results of the audit fieldwork, ADF revised the information in its Performance Monitoring Report and increased its reported outputs for 20 indicators; all additional information provided was audited.

ADF also did not maintain sufficient documentation to support the reported outputs of eight intended outputs. While ADF did provide some supporting documentation for each intended output, that documentation was not sufficient to verify the reported output. For example, ADF did not maintain a complete listing of its activities. ADF had identified the issue of the complete listing before the audit began and was in the process of developing a database that would include all services provided.

The lack of specific, accurate reported outputs and sufficient documentation was due to oversight by ADF management, which was focused on the actual implementation of the program. In addition, USAID/Iraq had not performed any data quality assessments on the performance data; the Mission was aware that it lacked an assessment, and an assessment encompassing all USAID/Iraq programs was scheduled for October 2006. Without having specific, accurate reported outputs and sufficient documentation, USAID/Iraq cannot be assured that it is making the most appropriate decisions for the program. To address this issue, we are making the following recommendation:

Recommendation No. 2: We recommend that USAID/Iraq develop procedures for its civil society activities to provide reasonable assurance that specific and accurate outputs are reported for each intended output and that adequate supporting documentation is maintained to substantiate the reported outputs.

EVALUATION OF MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

In response to our draft report, USAID/Iraq agreed with the audit recommendations and described actions it was taking to address the recommendations.

In response to Recommendation No. 1, Mission management stated that they had reviewed the indicators and proposed outputs. In addition, a schedule was created for regular reviews of the performance monitoring plan through the end of the contract.

In response to Recommendation No. 2, USAID/Iraq developed a schedule for the review of its performance monitoring reports through the end of the contract.

Based on the above response by the Mission, we consider the recommendations to have received management decisions and final action to have been taken. Management's comments are included in their entirety in Appendix II.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Scope

The Regional Inspector General in Baghdad audited USAID/Iraq's civil society activities in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. The purpose of the audit was to determine whether USAID/Iraq's civil society activities were achieving their intended outputs.

Projects were implemented through America's Development Foundation (ADF), USAID/Iraq's primary implementing partner for civil society activities, under one contract with five modifications. The contract, with a cumulative value of \$59.1 million, was awarded on August 16, 2004, and was effective through June 30, 2007. As of March 31, 2006, combined cumulative obligations and disbursements totaled approximately \$42.9 million and \$31.9 million, respectively.

The audit focused on determining if USAID/Iraq projects implemented by ADF had achieved their intended outputs as of December 31, 2005, the time-frame specified in the Performance Monitoring Plan. Because the audit period was from August 2004 to March 31, 2006, the audit would have also considered reported outputs through March 31, 2006, had ADF provided such information. In July 2006 (after our debriefing to discuss the results of the audit), ADF provided revised reported results and supporting documentation related to activities that took place before December 31, 2005; this information was also audited when answering the audit objective.

The audit also included an examination of management controls relating to the monitoring of activities performed under the contract. Specifically, these controls included:

- Performing periodic field visits by USAID/Iraq and ADF staff to the project sites to observe work achieved.
- Reviewing and approving ADF's financial vouchers.
- Reviewing and approving ADF's periodic performance reports.
- Completing the Mission's Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act reports.

The audit fieldwork was performed from April 6 to July 31, 2006, and consisted of interviews with key technical staff from the Mission and ADF employees; review of relevant performance and financial documents; and site visits to selected grantees in Erbil. Because of security conditions, grantees from the Baghdad area were interviewed at ADF's office, and grantees from Hillah and Basrah were interviewed at the Regional Embassy Offices.

As part of our initial planning work, we examined related audits performed by other U.S. Government agencies, including the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

Methodology

To determine if the grantees met intended outputs, we reviewed reported outputs for all 35 intended outputs. We requested supporting documentation for all indicators that had a specific output. Because ADF did not have a complete listing of activities, we were not able to statistically sample the population for six indicators (indicators 1, 10, 11, 17, 22, and 27 in Appendix III) relating to ADF's training sessions, conferences, and technical assistance sessions. Instead, we selected a one-week period, and then we were given a list of activities for that week. From that list, we were then able to judgmentally select a specific activity and request appropriate supporting documentation. However, because this was a judgmental sample, we could not project these results for the six indicators; therefore, we were unable to determine if they met their intended outputs.

For two civil society organization assessment indicators (indicators 6 and 8 in Appendix III), we randomly selected 81 civil society organizations, assuming an error rate of less than 5 percent. Variations allowed were plus or minus 4 percent, and the confidence level was 95 percent. Based on the results of the sample testing, we projected the results to the population of civil society organization assessments. Of the 81 CSOs selected, ADF provided sufficient documentation, specifically the organization assessment tool, for 77 CSOs (95 percent). Based on these results, we projected that the CSO intended outputs did have proper supporting documentation, and therefore, they met the intended outputs for these two indicators.

For three grant indicators (indicators 20, 25, and 30), we randomly selected 81 grants, assuming an error rate of less than 5 percent. Variations allowed were plus or minus 4 percent, and the confidence level was 95 percent. Of the 81 grants selected for testing, 76 were complete at the time of the audit. For these 76 selected grants, ADF provided sufficient documentation to support intended output results for 75 grants (99 percent). Because the percentage meets our materiality threshold, we projected that the grants did have sufficient supporting documentation, and as such, they met the intended outputs for the three indicators. For each selected grant, we requested documentation for review, including the grant agreement, monitoring reports, close-out reports, participant lists (if appropriate), and other pertinent documents.

For the remaining 24 indicators, we attempted to verify 100 percent of the reported outputs. For example, we requested and reviewed documentation to support the reported number of 83 training modules developed. Of the 24 indicators, we determined that the intended outputs were met for 12 indicators, but the intended outputs were not met for 8 indicators. We were unable to determine if the intended outputs were achieved for four indicators.

In conducting our fieldwork, we interviewed technical staff from the USAID/Iraq Mission, its contractor (ADF), and selected grantees. These interviews were conducted either in person or via e-mail correspondence. In addition, the audit included a financial review; vouchers were judgmentally selected for review based on dollar values.

Site visits were made to 2 of the 81 selected grantees. Because the security situation precluded visits to many areas, additional grants were judgmentally selected for interviews based on funding levels and activities funded. In total, 27 site visits or

interviews of grantees were performed. Because the site visits were not randomly chosen, the results were not projected onto the population.

Our materiality threshold for this audit was established at 10 percent when determining if an intended output was met. For example, if at least 90 percent of the intended output was performed, we concluded that intended output was met. We considered using a materiality threshold when answering the audit objective; however, we found that one was not applicable for this audit.

MANAGEMENT COMMENTS



MEMORANDUM

TO: Nancy Lawton, Regional Inspector General, Iraq

FROM: Hilda Arellano, Mission Director /s/

SUBJECT: Mission Response to RIG/Audit of USAID/Iraq's Civil Society Activities – Report No. E-267-06-00X-P

DATE: October 24, 2006

This memorandum transmits the Mission's response to the Regional Inspector General's draft report on the audit of USAID/Iraq's Civil Society Activities.

The stated objective of the audit was to ascertain whether USAID/Iraq's Civil Society Activities are achieving their intended outputs. The audit found that USAID/Iraq's civil society activities of its primary implementing partner, America's Development Foundation (ADF), met 17 intended outputs while ADF reported not meeting 8 intended outputs. The audit was unable to determine if ADF achieved the remaining 10 intended outputs.

General Comments:

The Mission appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft audit report which made two recommendations. The audit covered the period August, 2004 to March 31, 2006, ADF submitted an initial PMP in late 2005 and subsequently revised it in early 2006. The PMP was prepared in the absence of an overall mission PMP, under uncertainty of funding beyond March 31, 2006 and in a difficult security and implementing environment. The ADS outlines the requirements for PMPs for a normal operating mission which Iraq is not. The very fact that indicators and intended outputs were established under near impossible operating conditions in Iraq is a major accomplishment in itself.

Our comments on the two audit recommendations follow:

Recommendation No 1: We recommend that USAID/Iraq review each indicator in the America's Development Foundation (ADF) Performance Monitoring Plan for its civil society activities to provide reasonable assurance that each indicator has a measurable intended output and that the intended outputs are achievable in the timeframe specified in the plan.

- **Response:** Agree. USAID/Iraq received and reviewed ADF's initial monitoring plan in late 2005 which was subsequently revised in early 2006. The indicators and outputs which were established at the time were deemed to be reasonable and achievable. The constant volatile and unpredictable operating Iraqi environment makes achievement of realistic indicators/outputs a huge challenge; the unpredictability and volatility of the Iraq environment requires constant revisions to indicators/outputs. The ADF PMP was established as a "best guess" at the time of its development given the operating conditions.
- **Final Action:** USAID and ADF met on October 15, 2006 to review the indicators and proposed outputs. As part of the PMP modification ADF will update and re-submit indicators and outputs within an agreed upon schedule. Regular PMP reviews will be undertaken until the end of the contract (June 30, 2007).

Recommendation No 2: *We recommend that USAID/Iraq develop procedures for its civil society activities to provide reasonable assurance that specific and accurate outputs are reported for each intended output and that adequate supporting documentation is maintained to substantiate the reported outputs.*

- **Response:** Agree. At the time of the audit, ADF's database was still under construction. The auditors were informed of this status by ADF. In April, 2006 the database was completed. In May, 2006, USAID/Iraq required ADF to participate in the Mission-sponsored weeklong PMP workshop to provide input in the development of the SO PMP.

ICSP's Monitoring and Evaluation team has since April, 2006 completed the development of a comprehensive data base that charts all key information on ICSP partner CSOs, ICSP grants, CSO activities and scoring of the Organizational Assessment Tool. The database contains an inventory of all ICSP and ICSP support CSO actions. It is subject to rigorous quality control procedures including checks at the regional level and home office by trained database personnel to ensure accuracy, completeness and achievability.

- **Final Action:** USAID and ADF have agreed to the following calendar:

Task	Date to USAID
<i>Updated list of indicators for period October 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007</i>	<i>October 19, 2006</i>
<i>Final PMP for October 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007 with indicators and definitions</i>	<i>October 31, 2006</i>
<i>PMR Report for January 1 – June 30, 2006</i>	<i>October 31, 2006</i>
<i>PMR Report for July 1 – September 30, 2006</i>	<i>November 21, 2006</i>
<i>Quarterly Review of PMP indicators along with PMR</i>	<i>January 31, 2007</i>
<i>Quarterly Review of PMP indicators along with PMR</i>	<i>April 30, 2007</i>
<i>Final PMR</i>	<i>July 31, 2007</i>

Table of Intended Outputs

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
1	Indicator 1.1: Civil Society Resource Centers (CSRCs) are operational and provide safe and secure access for America's Development Foundation (ADF) staff and civil society organization (CSO) clients. CSRCs are established and operating in Baghdad, Basrah, Erbil, and Hilla. Centers provide full service delivery and outreach to CSOs in all governorates.	40,000 beneficiaries attending a total of 1,600 activities by December 2005	All four regional service centers are established, fully staffed, equipped and have delivered 2,813 services to over 37,129 beneficiaries (37 percent of whom are women) representing more than 1,000 CSOs.	40,120 beneficiaries attending a total of 3,228 activities	Unable to determine due to lack of database	Under reported
2	Indicator 2.1 CSRC staff development plans (SDPs) are designed and implemented to develop a cadre of highly qualified and experienced Iraqi trainers and facilitators. SDPs include staff performance standards, evaluation mechanisms and staff training programs that upgrade the professional skills of ADF staff in management, training, service delivery, administration, research, monitoring & evaluation, quality control, public relations, information technology and networking.	All CSRCs have SDPs in place	Not reported in the Performance Monitoring Report	A general SDP has been developed for all national staff	Yes	Under reported

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
3	Indicator 2.1 CSRC SDPs are designed and implemented to develop a cadre of highly qualified and experienced Iraqi trainers and facilitators. SDPs include staff performance standards, evaluation mechanisms and staff training programs that upgrade the professional skills of ADF staff in management, training, service delivery, administration, research, monitoring & evaluation, quality control, public relations, information technology and networking.	32 staff development/ technical training seminars	ADF has delivered nine staff development activities for 127 ADF staff. This number does not capture the ongoing mentoring that takes place on a daily basis between international and local staff.	38 staff development activities took place	Yes	Under reported
4	Indicator 2.2 CSRC training materials and resources are developed, adapted, validated and constantly upgraded. ADF has region-specific approaches to CSO training delivery and tailors services to support democratic changes underway in Iraq.	72 CSO Capacity-building Training Modules	ADF has developed or adapted 22 training modules, while periodically updating the library of resource materials at each center.	83 modules were developed or adapted	Yes	Under reported
5	Indicator 2.2 CSRC training materials and resources are developed, adapted, validated and constantly upgraded. ADF has region-specific approaches to CSO training delivery and tailors services to support democratic changes underway in Iraq.	Four CSRC resource libraries	ADF has developed or adapted 22 training modules, while periodically updating the library of resource materials at each center.	Not revised	Yes	N/A

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
6	Indicator 3.1: The ADF Civil Society Organizational Assessment Tool (OAT) is developed and implemented in every CSRC.	All CSRCs implementing the ADF OAT	For the April to December 2005 period, ADF assessed 1,209 CSOs. Also during this period, the use of the tool was evaluated, and it was decided that the tool should be revised in light of knowledge gained during its application. The revised version reached near-final state in December. CSOs assessed by region: Central: 218 South Central: 194 North: 431 South: 366	Not revised	Yes	N/A
7	Indicator 3.2: CSRC staff is trained in assessing CSOs using the OAT.	36 staff development training activities on organizational assessment	For the period in question, the ADF Capacity-building team delivered five staff development sessions to 85 ADF staff members.	ADF delivered 11 trainings	No	Under reported
8	Indicator 3.3: CSOs are assessed prior to receiving any ADF services and re-assessment conducted four to six months after receiving services. The assessment provides necessary baseline data to track the CSO capacity development and measure the ADF impact.	1,000 CSOs assessed/re-assessed by December 2005	CSOs are assessed prior to receiving any ADF services, though in many cases ADF priorities overtake this prerequisite. In these cases, partner CSOs who have received an ADF service without undergoing an assessment are asked to do so. (As indicated previously, 1,209 CSOs were assessed.)	Not revised	Yes	N/A

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
9	Indicator 3.4: Key CSOs are trained and provide services to CSOs in all regions. Key CSOs and CSRCs organize and conduct conferences, workshops and public forums that foster participation of citizens and constructive activities by public interest groups that engage elected representatives and government officials and are directly related to the development of the new constitution and the decentralization of governance. The basic criteria of selection of “key CSOs” include track record of achievement, governance and capacity, and CSO mission and goals in keeping with ADF’s. Key CSOs receive extensive technical assistance to sharpen their skills in focus areas and/or as local providers of training and technical assistance to client nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and groups on aspects of civil society development.	48 key CSOs trained and providing services in all regions	ADF core partner CSOs are working with ADF on a daily basis and executing the ADF agenda in all its priority areas.	146 key CSOs trained and providing services in all regions	Unable to determine due to lack of supporting documentation	Under reported

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
10	Indicator 3.4: Key CSOs are trained and provide services to CSOs in all regions. Key CSOs and CSRCs organize and conduct conferences, workshops and public forums that foster participation of citizens and constructive activities by public interest groups that engage elected representatives and government officials and are directly related to the development of the new constitution and the decentralization of governance. The basic criteria of selection of “key CSOs” include track record of achievement, governance and capacity, and CSO mission and goals in keeping with ADF’s. Key CSOs receive extensive technical assistance to sharpen their skills in focus areas and/or as local providers of training and technical assistance to client NGOs and groups on aspects of civil society development.	550 assessments, training and technical assistance interventions to local CSOs	ADF core partner CSOs are working with ADF on a daily basis and executing the ADF agenda in all its priority areas.	2,741 assessments, training and technical assistance interventions to local CSOs	Unable to determine due to lack of database	Under reported

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
11	Indicator 3.4: Key CSOs are trained and provide services to CSOs in all regions. Key CSOs and CSRCs organize and conduct conferences, workshops and public forums that foster participation of citizens and constructive activities by public interest groups that engage elected representatives and government officials and are directly related to the development of the new constitution and the decentralization of governance. The basic criteria of selection of "key CSOs" include track record of achievement, governance and capacity, and CSO mission and goals in keeping with ADF's. Key CSOs receive extensive technical assistance to sharpen their skills in focus areas and/or as local providers of training and technical assistance to client NGOs and groups on aspects of civil society development.	72 events including conferences, workshops and public forums	ADF core partner CSOs are working with ADF on a daily basis and executing the ADF agenda in all its priority areas.	226 events including conferences and public forums	Unable to determine due to lack of database	Under reported
12	Indicator 3.5: Foster and support the development of CSRC satellite support centers owned and operated by qualified key CSOs.	12 Satellite Support Centers. Three per region by December 2005	This concept was developed and vetted within ADF for the period in question, and will be reported on for the next reporting period.	Not revised	No	N/A
13	Indicator 4.1: CSRC business plans are in place.	All CSRCs have business plans in place	Each center has in place and is implementing a business plan.	Not revised	Yes	N/A

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
14	Indicator 4.2: CSRC advisory boards are in place to guide development of sustainability plans and actions.	All CSRCs have chosen lists of candidates for advisory board members	Each center has an advisory board in place.	Not revised	Yes	N/A
15	Indicator 4.3: CSRC sustainability plans are developed and initiated.	CSRC sustainability plans initiated in each center	A sustainability plan for each center was submitted in September 2005.	Not revised	Yes	N/A
16	Indicator 5.1: ADF training staff and key CSOs are trained to deliver quality training services in civic education advocacy areas.	36 training activities	One civic education staff development activity took place for the period reported.	143 civic education staff development activities took place for the period	Yes	Under reported
17	Indicator 5.3: ADF engages, assesses and builds the capacity of CSOs, in particular key partner CSOs, in civic education advocacy.	220 activities with 5400 participants	For the period in question, the ADF Civic Education team delivered 559 services (workshops, technical assistance, forums, and conferences) to 14,796 CSO members – 36% of whom are women – to enable partner CSOs to conduct awareness-raising and advocacy activities.	628 activities with 15,609 participants	Unable to determine due to lack of database	Under reported

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
18	Indicator 5.4: Key CSOs organize advocacy and awareness campaigns on civic education targeting CSOs and the public, specifying actions that public can take to be participatory.	144 civic education activities per region	ADF “core” or “key” partner CSOs evolve out of ADF’s continued inputs and subsequent monitoring of the effect on CSO outputs. Those CSOs most prolific, efficient, and effective in carrying out awareness raising and advocacy are considered core partners, some of whom evolve further to serve as ADF satellite centers.	70 civic education activities	No	Under reported
19	Indicator 5.4: Key CSOs organize advocacy and awareness campaigns on civic education targeting CSOs and the public specifying actions that public can take to be participatory.	18 civic education conferences and public forums conducted by key CSOs	ADF “core” or “key” partner CSOs evolve out of ADF’s continued inputs and subsequent monitoring of the effect on CSO outputs. Those CSOs most prolific, efficient, and effective in carrying out awareness raising and advocacy are considered core partners, some of whom evolve further to serve as ADF satellite centers.	63 civic education activities took place	Yes	Under reported

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
20	Indicator 5.6: Small grants awarded to CSOs engaged in civic education activities.	65 small grants awarded to CSOs engaged in civic education depending on the amount of each grant, the total amount of grants for civic education sector is \$1,200,000	For the period in question, ADF invested \$539,184 across 66 grants for partner CSOs to engage in Civic Education awareness raising and advocacy.	Not revised	Yes	N/A
21	Indicator 6.1: ADF training staff and key CSOs are trained to deliver quality training services in gender advocacy.	36 training activities including four training of trainers activities	ADF conducted one staff development session for the period in question, training eight women's advocacy team members.	52 staff development activities took place	Unable to determine due to lack of supporting documentation	Under reported
22	Indicator 6.3: ADF builds the capacity of CSOs, in particular key partner CSOs, in gender advocacy.	180 activities with 4,400 participants	For the period in question, the ADF women's advocacy team delivered 398 services (workshops, technical assistance, forums, and conferences) to 4,987 CSO members – 69 percent of whom are women – to enable partner CSOs to conduct awareness-raising and advocacy activities.	445 activities with 5,537 participants	Unable to determine due to lack of database	Under reported

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
23	Indicator 6.4: Key CSOs organize advocacy and awareness campaigns on gender targeting CSOs and the public, specifying actions that public can take to be participatory.	144 gender activities per region	ADF “core” or “key” partner CSOs evolve out of ADF’s continued inputs and subsequent monitoring of the effect on CSO outputs. Those CSOs most prolific, efficient, and effective in carrying out awareness raising and advocacy are considered core partners, some of whom evolve further to serve as ADF satellite centers.	Seven gender activities	No	Under reported
24	Indicator 6.4: Key CSOs organize advocacy and awareness campaigns on gender targeting CSOs and the public, specifying actions that public can take to be participatory.	18 gender events (conferences and public forums) conducted by key CSOs	ADF “core” or “key” partner CSOs evolve out of ADF’s continued inputs and subsequent monitoring of the effect on CSO outputs. Those CSOs most prolific, efficient, and effective in carrying out awareness raising and advocacy are considered core partners, some of whom evolve further to serve as ADF satellite centers.	Not revised	Unable to determine based on reported result.	N/A

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
25	Indicator 6.6: Small grants awarded to CSOs engaged in gender advocacy.	60 small grants awarded to CSOs engaged in civic education depending on the amount of each grant, the total amount of grants for civic education sector is \$1,200,000	For the period in question, ADF invested \$524,364 across 63 grants for partner CSOs to engage in women's advocacy awareness raising and advocacy.	Not revised	Yes	N/A
26	Indicator 7.1: ADF training staff and key CSOs are trained to deliver quality training services in anticorruption advocacy.	36 training activities	ADF conducted two staff development sessions for the period in question, training 27 anticorruption team members.	110 anticorruption activities took place	Yes	Under reported
27	Indicator 7.3: ADF builds the capacity of CSOs, in particular key partner CSOs, in anticorruption advocacy.	180 activities with 4,400 participants	For the period in question, the ADF Anti-Corruption team delivered 648 services (workshops, technical assistance, forums, and conferences) to 2,662 CSO members – 69 percent of whom are women – to enable partner CSOs to conduct awareness-raising and advocacy activities.	731 activities with 3,624 participants	Unable to determine due to lack of database	Under reported

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
28	Indicator 7.4: Key CSOs organize advocacy and awareness campaigns on anticorruption targeting CSOs and the public, specifying actions that public can take to be participatory.	144 anticorruption advocacy activities per region	ADF “core” or “key” partner CSOs evolve out of ADF’s continued inputs and subsequent monitoring of the effect on CSO outputs. Those CSOs most prolific, efficient, and effective in carrying out awareness raising and advocacy are considered core partners, some of whom evolve further to serve as ADF satellite centers.	Not revised	Unable to determine based on reported result	N/A
29	Indicator 7.4: Key CSOs organize advocacy and awareness campaigns on anticorruption targeting CSOs and the public, specifying actions that public can take to be participatory.	18 anticorruption advocacy events (conferences and public forums) conducted by key CSOs	ADF “core” or “key” partner CSOs evolve out of ADF’s continued inputs and subsequent monitoring of the effect on CSO outputs. Those CSOs most prolific, efficient, and effective in carrying out awareness raising and advocacy are considered core partners, some of whom evolve further to serve as ADF satellite centers.	33 anticorruption events took place conducted by key CSOs	Yes	Under reported

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
30	Indicator 7.6: Small grants awarded to CSOs engaged in anti-corruption activities.	75 small grants awarded to CSOs engaged in anticorruption depending on the amount of each grant, the total amount of grants for anticorruption sector is \$2,150,000	For the period in question, ADF invested \$611,490 across 76 grants for partner CSOs to engage in anticorruption awareness raising and advocacy.	Not revised	Yes	N/A
31	Indicator 8.1: ADF training staff and key CSOs are trained to deliver quality training services in human rights advocacy.	36 training activities, including four training of trainers activities	Not reported in the Performance Monitoring Report	26 activities took place	No	Under reported
32	Indicator 8.3: ADF builds the capacity of CSOs, in particular key partner CSOs, in human rights advocacy.	180 activities with 4,400 participants	Not reported in the Performance Monitoring Report	Not revised	No	N/A
33	Indicator 8.4: Key CSOs organize advocacy and awareness campaigns on human rights targeting CSOs and the public, specifying actions that public can take to be participatory.	144 human rights advocacy activities per region	Not reported in the Performance Monitoring Report	Not revised	No	N/A
34	Indicator 8.4: Key CSOs organize advocacy and awareness campaigns on human rights targeting CSOs and the public, specifying actions that public can take to be participatory.	18 human rights advocacy events (conferences and public forums) conducted by key CSOs	Not reported in the Performance Monitoring Report	31 activities took place conducted by key CSOs	Yes	Under reported

APPENDIX III

	Indicator	Intended Output	Original Reported Output	Revised Reported Output	Intended output met?	Under or over reported originally?
35	Indicator 8.6: Small grants awarded to CSOs.	65 small grants awarded to CSOs engaged in human rights depending on the amount of each grant, the total amount of grants for the human rights sector is \$600,000	Not reported in the Performance Monitoring Report	Not revised	No	N/A

Table of Indicators Without Intended Outputs

	Indicator	Reported Output
1	Indicator 5.2: America's Development Foundation (ADF) staff adapt, develop and validate civic education training modules and other materials and resources.	No civic education training modules were adapted for the period reported.
2	Indicator 5.5: The impact of the ADF and key civil society organization (CSO) civic education activities in raising awareness of civic education issues among the Iraqi public as featured in the media.	For the period in question, ADF documented 51 instances of media coverage of ADF or partner CSO activities.
3	Indicator 6.2: ADF staff adapt, develop, and validate gender training modules and other materials and resources.	ADF adapted four women's advocacy training modules for the period in question.
4	Indicator 6.5: The impact of the ADF and key CSO gender advocacy activities in raising awareness of gender advocacy issues among the Iraqi public, as featured in the media.	The ADF women's advocacy team documented 29 instances of newspaper, radio, and television coverage of ADF or ADF partner CSO awareness-raising and advocacy efforts.
5	Indicator 7.2: ADF staff adapt, develop and validate anticorruption advocacy training modules and other materials and resources.	ADF adapted four anticorruption training modules for the period in question.
6	Indicator 7.5: The impact of the ADF and key CSO anticorruption activities in raising awareness of anticorruption issues among the Iraqi public as featured in the media and through specialized and periodic public opinion surveys.	The ADF Anti-Corruption team documented 72 instances of newspaper, radio, and television coverage of ADF or ADF partner CSO awareness-raising and advocacy efforts.
7	Indicator 8.2: ADF staff adapt, develop and validate human rights training modules and other materials and resources.	Not reported in ADF's Performance Monitoring Report
8	Indicator 8.5: The impact of the ADF and key CSO human rights activities in raising awareness of human rights issues among the Iraqi public as portrayed in the media.	Not reported in ADF's Performance Monitoring Report

USAID/IRAQ/RIG
APO, AE 09316
Tel: (202) 216-6276, extension 1036
Fax: (202) 216-6276
www.usaid.gov