



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EVALUATION

Transparency & Accountability Grant Project Summative Evaluation

Final Report

May 2011

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by the staff of Performance Management Plan for Lebanon (PMPL) project through Social Impact Inc. with Management Systems International.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

TRANSPARENCY & ACCOUNTABILITY GRANT PROJECT SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

May 2011

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by the staff of Performance Management Plan for Lebanon (PMPL) project through Social Impact Inc. with Management Systems International.

TRANSPARENCY & ACCOUNTABILITY GRANT PROJECT

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION FINAL

DISCLAIMER

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

This document was submitted by Social Impact, Inc., with Management Systems International, to the United States Agency for International Development under USAID Contract No. RAN-I-00-09-00019, Task Order 07.

Social Impact, Inc.
2300 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, VA, 22201
Tel: (703) 465-1884
Fax: (703) 465-1888
info@socialimpact.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	ii
ACRONYMS.....	iii
DEFINITIONS.....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Purpose of the Evaluation	1
Conclusions and Supporting Findings	1
Recommendations & Lessons Learned.....	5
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose.....	1
Project Description.....	1
Overview of the Situation in Lebanon between 2000-2011	5
II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.....	7
III. CONCLUSIONS & SUPPORTING FINDINGS	8
Program Relevance	8
Program Effectiveness	9
Program Impact.....	13
Program Sustainability.....	14
Program Gender sensitivity.....	14
Hindrances and Challenges faced by TAG:.....	15
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS LEARNED.....	16
Annex 1: TAG Evaluation Scope of Work.....	20
Annex 2: TAG Grant Criteria & Guidelines.....	26
Annex 3: List of Key Informants Interviewed.....	37
Annex 4: List of Focus Group Discussants	38
Annex 5: List of Documents Reviewed.....	43
Annex 6: Focus Group Discussion Checklist	46
Annex 7: Key Informant Interview Checklist	48
Annex 8: Sample Opinion Survey Questionnaire.....	56

PREFACE

This report is an evaluation of the Transparency and Accountability Grants (TAG) program implemented by AMIDEAST under a Cooperative Agreement with USAID/Lebanon. TAG was operated between 2001 and 2011. Between 2001 and 2003 it was implemented as a one-year activity. And in 2003 the program was modified and began to receive multi-year funding. The evaluation was conducted by the staff of the USAID/Lebanon Performance Management Plan for Lebanon (PMPL) project¹.

The report provides a standalone executive summary summarizing the team's findings, conclusions and recommendations. The main body of the report is structured in four sections. Section I is the Introduction which briefly states the purpose of the evaluation, the project description, and an overview of the situation in Lebanon between 2000 and 2011. Section II discusses the data collection methodology and analysis approach. Section III provides the Team's conclusions and supporting findings. Section IV summarizes the team's recommendations and lessons learned.

The report also includes a set of annexes referenced in the main body of the report.

¹ The project document review was conducted by Christelle Safi, Reem Mikdashi and Hiba Shatila; the sample opinion survey was managed by Rodolph Gebrael with assistance of a short-term local consultant; and the focus group discussion was managed by Najwa Andraos with the assistance of a short-term local consultant. While Ms. Andraos was the point person for organizing this evaluation, the overall process was managed by the PMPL Chief of Party, Samuel Taddesse. The team acknowledges the collaboration and support it received from the AMIDEAST staff.

ACRONYMS

AMIDEAST	America-Mideast Educational and Training Services
AO	Assistance Objective
CPD	Consumer Protection Department
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DR	Desk Review
EAITD	Educational Association for Information Technology Development
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FY	Fiscal Year
GIS	Geographic Information System
GOL	Government of Lebanon
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
IR	Intermediate Result
IT	Information Technology
KII	Key Informant Interview
LAES	Lebanese Association for Education Studies
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MEHE	Ministry of Education and Higher Education
MOET	Ministry of Economy and Trade
MOF	Ministry of Finance
MOH	Ministry of Health
MOI	Ministry of Interior
MOJ	Ministry of Justice
MOL	Ministry of Labor
MOSA	Ministry of Social Affairs
OP	Operation Plan
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PMPL	Performance Management Plan for Lebanon
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
SOS	Sample Opinion Survey
TAG	Transparency and Accountability Grant
UN	United Nations
UNIFIL	United Nations Interim Forces in Lebanon
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
WTO	World Trade Organization
YASA	Youth Association for Social Awareness

DEFINITIONS

Accountability	Accountability is a concept in ethics and governance with several meanings. It encompasses responsibility, answerability, blameworthiness, liability, and other terms associated with the expectation of account-giving. In leadership roles, accountability is the acknowledgment and assumption of responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies including the administration, governance, and implementation within the scope of the role or employment position and encompassing the obligation to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences.
Corruption	Corruption is broadly understood as the abuse of entrusted power for private gain. It is often used interchangeably with bribery which is the offering, giving, receiving or soliciting of any item of value to influence the action of an official or other persons in the discharge of a public or legal duty. Other forms of corruption include embezzlement, fraud, collusion, favoritism and extortion.
Gender	Gender is a social construct that refers to relations between and among the sexes, based on their relative roles. It encompasses the economic, political, and socio-cultural attributes, constraints, and opportunities associated with being male or female. As a social construct, gender varies across cultures, is dynamic and open to change over time. Because of the variation in gender across cultures and over time, gender roles should not be assumed but investigated. Note that “gender” is not interchangeable with “women” or “sex.”
Gender Equality	Gender equality is a broad concept and a goal for development. It is achieved when men and women have equal rights, freedoms, conditions, and opportunities for realizing their full potential and for contributing to and benefiting from economic, social, cultural, and political development. It means society values men and women equally for their similarities and the diverse roles they play. It signifies the outcomes that result from gender equity strategies and processes.
Gender Equity	Gender equity refers to the process of being fair to women and men. To ensure fairness, measures must often be available to compensate for historical and social disadvantages that prevent women and men from otherwise operating on a level playing field. Equity leads to equality.
Gender Mainstreaming	Gender mainstreaming relates to the concept of assessing the different implications for women and men of any planned policy action, including legislation and socio-economic program activities. Mainstreaming essentially offers a pluralistic approach that values diversity among both women and men. It is a strategy for making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programs in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated.
Good Governance	Governance is "the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a

country's economic and social resources for development." Good governance is, among other things, participatory, transparent and accountable, effective and equitable, and it promotes the rule of law. It ensures that political, social and economic priorities are based on broad consensus in society and that the voices of the poorest and the most vulnerable are heard in decision-making over the allocation of development resources.

Transparency

Transparency refers to sharing information and acting in an open manner. It allows stakeholders to gather information that may be critical to uncovering abuses and defending their interests. Transparent systems have clear procedures for public decision-making and open channels of communication between stakeholders and officials, and make a wide range of information accessible. Transparent procedures include open meetings, financial disclosure statements, budgetary review, audits, etc.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Transparency and Accountability Grants (TAG) program was implemented at a time when the Government of Lebanon (GOL) was struggling to combat corruption. TAG was implemented as one of the activities supporting USAID's program strategy designed to promote and foster transparency, accountability and good governance in civil society as well as in central and local governments. TAG was conceived in 1999 and implemented in 2001 under a Cooperative Agreement (CA) between AMIDEAST and USAID/Lebanon. Although TAG was implemented as a one-year program it was extended to 10 years, until February 2011, through a series of consecutive CA modifications. Over the years the cumulative value of TAG grew from \$655,000 in 2001² to \$9,350,900 by February 2011. The program went through 20 CA modifications and amendments. TAG provided small grants (less than USD \$50,000) to a wide range of civil society organizations and individuals that worked to promote and foster transparency, accountability and good governance. Eight organizations, however, were provided grants between \$50,000 and \$100,000³.

Purpose of the Evaluation

As the TAG project was coming to an end, USAID/Lebanon requested the Program Management Plan for Lebanon (PMPL) project to conduct an evaluation which would draw lessons and make recommendations to enhance the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of similar future programs. The evaluation was conducted between March and May 2011. The design of the evaluation and the evaluation questions are contained in the attached TAG Evaluation Scope of Work (see Annex 1). The evaluation assesses the degree to which the project had achieved its purpose as set out in the CA between AMIDEAST and USAID. It also evaluates the impact of the project in terms of raising awareness about the costs of corruption and promoting and fostering transparency, accountability and good governance in Lebanese society.

Conclusions and Supporting Findings

- 1. TAG was relevant to both the Lebanese context and USAID/Lebanon's program strategy.** TAG was implemented at a time when there was strong political will to tackle corruption and address issues of transparency, accountability and good governance by the GOL. TAG was also implemented as an activity that contributed to USAID/Lebanon's program strategy as it was designed to address, promote and foster transparency and accountability, develop anticorruption mechanisms and enhance the role of civil society organizations in creating public awareness and advocacy for transparency and accountability.
- 2. TAG has met or exceeded the targets set in FY 2008 for a number of indicators for the Life of the Project (LOP), at both the Objective and Intermediate Result (IR) levels.** As shown in Table 1, the program has met and exceeded targets for all except two

² According to AMIDEAST, the original award was 655,000, whereas the CA indicates the award was \$500,000 for making small grants to sub-grantees.

³ The organization that receive grant amount above \$50,000 include National Commission of Lebanese Women, Sader Publishers, Leb Youth, Telecommunication Regulatory Authority, InfoPro, INMA-Information International, Sustainable Democracy Center, and Center for Development and Planning.

indicators. The reason given by AMIDEAST for not meeting these two targets was that not enough applications were received with the specific indicator focus.⁴

Table 1: Performance Data Table (Period of Coverage: Oct 2008-Feb 2011)⁵

Objective & Intermediate Results	Performance Indicators	LOP Target	Actual	Target Exceeded, Met, or Not Met
AO: Targeted governing and civil society institutions are more responsive to Lebanese citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of CSOs' programs actively seeking citizen input to shape activities 	10	11	Exceeded
IR 1: Strengthened capacity of targeted CSOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of public civic engagement activities held by USG supported CSOs 	4	6	Exceeded
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of CSOs using USG assistance to improve internal organizational capacity 	12	11	Not Met
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of CSOs linkages created 	18	21	Exceeded
IR 2: Expanded role of civil society advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing efficient and transparent practices in the private sector and civil society 	11	8	Not Met
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased number of government actions based on NGO/ individual initiatives 	11	17	Exceeded
IR 3: Increased agreements/activities related to public awareness on government procedures and citizens' rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of signed agreements with USAID assistance 	12	13	Exceeded

3. According to key informants, focus group discussants and opinion survey respondents, TAG was appreciated as a program that addressed concepts of transparency, accountability and good governance for the first time in Lebanon. Data gathered from the desk review (DR) of project documents, focus group discussions (FGDs), key informant interviews (KIIs) and a sample opinion survey (SOS), indicate that numerous awareness-raising information, education and communication (IEC) materials were produced in both Arabic and English and disseminated to the public. The data also indicates that the dissemination of the IEC material was often followed by public forum meetings and media events and campaigns to raise public awareness. To increase transparency of government procedures a number of websites were developed and established at the partnering government offices. Changes to existing legislation, laws and policies were proposed to address the rights issues of women, youth, the disabled, and to enhance consumer protection, improve traffic laws and discipline drivers.

⁴ The evaluation team could not, however, locate a results framework or a Performance Management Plan for TAG. Furthermore, the evaluation team could not find a Performance Data Table that presents indicator baselines, targets and actual values for the period 2001 to 2008. According to AMIDEAST, USAID itself did not have a PMP when TAG began in 2001 and performance indicators and performance data requirement changed several times over the years as USAID was rearticulating its Country Strategy and performance indicators.

⁵ TAG 2nd Semi-Annual Report 04/01/2010 – 09/30/2010

According to the sample opinion survey respondents,⁶ 52.1% agreed or strongly agreed that the activities in which they have participated promoted and fostered transparency in the government, and 20% noted that these activities could lead to more transparency. Furthermore, 63.5% agreed or strongly agreed that TAG activities promoted and fostered accountability in the public sector. Similarly, when asked about good governance, 45.7% of these survey respondents agreed that TAG activities promoted good governance, and 12.1% responded that these activities could ultimately lead to achieving good governance.⁷

4. **TAG was effective in “enhancing the momentum of a vibrant civil society,” however; it missed the window of opportunity to create a Civil Society Organization (CSO) national or sub-national network.** Over the ten-year period TAG awarded grants to 183 innovative ideas from 129 organizations and individuals. Partly this is a result of (a) flexible application selection criteria and (b) the minimal bureaucratic hindrances which encouraged many CSOs and individuals with a wide range of creative ideas to apply for TAG grants. With regard to networking, TAG did encourage grant applicants to link up with other grantees working in similar areas to avoid duplication. PMPL, however, did not find any evidence that TAG had initiated and facilitated the formation of CSO networks for learning, leveraging CSO knowledge and CSO policies, collaborating on projects, or articulating and coalescing citizen interests and demands for good governance.
5. **TAG has strengthened the advocacy capacity and the internal administrative and management processes of many participating CSOs.** With respect to policy advocacy, for example, some TAG grantees successfully lobbied to allow women the right to open bank accounts for their minor children for the first time in Lebanon. Others successfully raised awareness on (a) counterfeit products and consumer protection, and (b) traffic laws and traffic safety.

With respect to CSOs’ capacity building, there was a strong consensus among focus group discussants that the TAG team helped them learn about proper budgeting and means of developing a comprehensive financial management system that they continue to use. A number of key informants and focus group discussants also indicated that they improved their own organization’s internal operating procedures and structure, as a result of the experience gained through their participation in TAG-supported activities. Some grantees also reported that they became more transparent in their planning and budgeting processes and in the sharing of information with their staff and constituencies.

6. **TAG was effective in leveraging other donors’ funds.** Many key informants and focus group discussants indicated that they were able to obtain additional funding for projects from non-USAID donors as a result of: 1) adapting transparent accounting and financial management systems and improving their skills in proposal writing, and 2) donors wanting to build on the achievements made where Transparency, Accountability and Good Governance initiatives were concerned.

⁶ Around 12 projects out of 179 projects, were selected for a direct opinion survey targeting the end beneficiaries of these projects, taking two criteria into consideration :

- a. Grants implemented after 2008 – so end beneficiaries are available and remember the details of the project
- b. The project itself has a targeted group that could be identified clearly to be surveyed

⁷ As indicated in the main body of the document, the total number of survey participants is 140 men and women.

- 7. TAG has enhanced Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) by encouraging grants that were implemented in partnership with government bodies and ministries.** A number of TAG grantees had partnered with GOL ministries such as the Ministry of Economy and Trade (MOET), Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE), Ministry of Interior (MOI), Ministry of Justice (MOJ), Ministry of Labor (MOL), Ministry of Health (MOH), Ministry of Social Affairs (MOSA), and Ministry of Finance (MOF) which contributed to the transparency of these institutions. For instance, in partnership with the MEHE, the Educational Association for Information Technology Development (EAID) developed an automated scheme to facilitate processing of “education equivalence certification” for students studying abroad. In partnership with the Institute of Finance, the Lebanese Association of Societal Synergy produced a series of guides for citizens to better inform the public about procedures for various Ministry of Finance transactions which included: Your Right to Object and Your Duties When Starting Work: A Guide for All Income Tax Payers. In partnership with the Ministry of Economy and Trade, the Brand Protection Group helped in integrating a new GIS system into the consumer protection department (CPD) at the Ministry to upload inspection findings and improve the performance and efficiency of CDP inspectors. This same partnership conducted a series of TV and radio public awareness campaigns to encourage citizens to react to abuse and report to the ministry through a hotline. Desk review of project documents indicates more than 5,000 complaints were recorded and addressed.
- 8. TAG-funded grant activities had a tangible impact in different ways.** For instance, according to key informants and survey respondents TAG has promoted transparency, accountability, and good governance both within the CSOs themselves and their government counterparts and their beneficiaries. A number of TAG grantees have raised awareness of beneficiaries regarding their rights and the rights of marginalized groups such as youth, women, the disabled and the visually impaired. For instance, the Disability Awareness and Enforcement Campaign (AEC) created awareness through promotional material on the ‘rights of disabled in hospital admission’ by producing information and launching a media enforcement campaign about rights of the disabled and the related Ministry of Health regulations. Byblos Ecologia worked with students from fourteen schools in the Batroun and Koura regions on increasing their awareness on themes such as citizenship, transparency, accountability and corruption through competitions, where the winning student received the “Good Citizen Passport.” The Christian Association for the Blind produced a Braille version of a guide to help visually impaired citizens better understand their rights in transactions conducted at local municipalities and distributed copies to municipalities and organizations serving the visually impaired. The Institute of Progressive Women managed to remove a discriminatory clause in the custodial bank accounts law which did not allow women to open bank accounts for their minor children.
- 9. Although TAG was not “gender sensitive” in the sense of “mainstreaming gender across all TAG projects”, it nevertheless succeeded in targeting and addressing specific women’s issues.** TAG projects across the board did not make a specific effort to incorporate gender in their projects per se, as it was not a criterion for TAG and not mentioned in the CA. Furthermore, the concept of “gender” was ambiguous to many TAG grantees. “Gender sensitivity” was confused with “women specific.” As indicated by focus group discussants, gender was perceived as an alternative term to ‘women.’ Some discussants responded that the only measure taken to ensure “gender sensitivity” was through “inviting women to activities/project events to ensure their participation.”

10. Some results produced by TAG grantees are relatively more sustainable than others. A large number of key informants have indicated that TAG-funded projects involving changes in legislative/legal standards, government procedures, and establishment and use of digital systems, websites, web-portals, and reference material, are more sustainable than awareness-raising and advocacy campaigns. The latter require a longer gestation time to produce sustainable results that impact attitudes and behaviors and change old habits and longstanding misconceptions and beliefs. According to many focus group discussants the low grant amount (less than US\$ 50,000) did not allow for the achievement of long-term sustainable activities, which consequently did not allow for higher impact projects.

11. Effectiveness and impact of TAG-supported activities were affected by numerous factors including the following:

- Unstable and insecure political environment which led to program interruptions, a high rate of deadline extensions and delays;
- Short-term nature of the TAG support;
- Lack of clear planning tools, performance monitoring, evaluation and reporting guidelines;
- Weak networking among CSOs and other stakeholders;
- Weak cooperation and cumbersome bureaucracy by some government partners;
- Weak management and operational capacity of some grantees;
- Lack of or weak outreach strategies: Many projects aimed at disseminating awareness and raising IEC material to a wide audience, but had difficulty reaching their target population. The opinion survey showed that only 50% of surveyed respondents received any of these IEC materials; and
- Non-inclusive eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: Grantees felt that excluding certain groups perceived as terrorists by USAID affected their objectivity and image/status as an organization. Also the requirement that participants sign an anti-terrorism pledge letter excluded many potentially strong CSOs.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

1. USAID-approved Performance Management Plans (PMP) should be made a requirement for all Cooperative Agreements. As indicated above, the TAG program has accomplished much in terms of engaging a wide range of civil society actors and in supporting a range of activities that in one way or another raised awareness, increased knowledge and changed transparency, accountability and good governance practices within participating CSOs as well as with the partnering local and central governmental entities. The PMPL team however, believes that the performance of TAG could have been enhanced and better documented and communicated had it developed a coherent PMP with explicit objectives, outcomes and performance indicators, from the inception of the project.⁸ Related to the designing and implementation of a performance management and monitoring plan is the weakness of USAID's performance management process. The lack of a coherent

⁸ According to AMIDEAST, the fact that the TAG project was based on demand by CSOs made it impossible to know beforehand what targets to set under each indicator.

USAID strategy to link implementing partners' activities to the Mission's Country Strategy and the lack of a consistent monitoring and feedback process, combined with the periodic and ad hoc overlaying of Operational Plans (OPs) indicators on implementing partners' performance monitoring and reporting system does not help to reinforce or strengthen implementing partner PMPs.

2. **Activities that are expected to promote and foster transparency, accountability and good governance should have longer project lives to allow for adequate planning (according to a set results framework), capacity building and results achievement.** The fact that TAG was implemented as a single-year project, even after USAID begun obligating multi-year funding in 2003, did not allow for a longer-term strategic vision to generate tangible impact in terms of changed attitudes and practices related to transparency, accountability and good governance. Longer project life will also allow time for building capacities of the CSOs. As noted above, many TAG grantees had weak capacity with regard to proposal writing, project management and financial accounting and performance reporting. The short life of TAG activities coupled with the time spent building capacities of these grantees did not provide sufficient time to translate development of IEC materials into awareness raising, knowledge building and changing practices of transparency, accountability and good governance on the ground.
3. **Project proposals funded by USG should in general include sustainability criteria and an exit strategy.** These sustainability criteria and exit strategies will have identified the critical capacity and budgetary needs of CSOs and address them early at the start of the program. For instance, building fundraising and networking capabilities of TAG grantees would have enhanced the sustainability of the outcomes generated by the program. Fundraising capacity would have generated additional funds for the grantees to implement follow-on activities even after grant monies had run out.
4. **The size of individual grant amounts should be based on (a) the scope of the grant proposal, (b) the implementation capacity of the grantee, and (c) the length of time required for achieving the expected outcomes and results of the proposed project.** Many TAG grantees had indicated that the amount of the TAG grant was small and did not allow them to implement high impact projects or to cover a larger geographic area. The PMPL Team recommends, however, that projects that require larger grant funding and longer time to implement and obtain the expected results should be required to develop a coherent PMP, and be allowed more time to implement and achieve results. The accomplishments and progress of these projects should also be monitored closely and feedback and guidance provided to ensure that the grant money is used properly.
5. **All USG-funded projects/activities shall have a gender component and be required to adopt a consistent gender definition and gender mainstreaming strategy.** A gender component has to be required and incorporated at the design stage of all projects as required by USAID policy not only to addressing specific issues related to women, but to achieve gender equality. As indicated in our conclusion section, the concept of gender is not well understood. USAID should provide a common definition and guidelines for gender mainstreaming.
6. **All projects that work with CSOs and grassroots organizations should be encouraged to facilitate the formation of national and regional networks among**

participating CSOs and grassroots organizations. While the cost of supporting networking among CSOs and other stakeholder is small, the payoff can be large in terms of strengthening capacities of the CSOs, legitimizing CSOs and enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of project activities.

7. **Cost-sharing should be a requirement in a grant-based project such as TAG to ensure seriousness and commitment of the grantees.** According to TAG management, the total average cost-sharing achieved throughout TAG's implementation was 56%. However, key informants and focus group discussants indicated that the criteria for determining the level of cost-sharing and what counts towards the shared cost was not clear to them. Explicit and uniform criteria and formula should be developed and applied uniformly across all grantees. At the same time, the criteria should take into account the size of the organization, and its capital base and capacity to raise funds from different sources.

Transparency and Accountability Grants (TAG) Project Summative Evaluation

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the achievement of the Transparency and Accountability Grants (TAG) program and discern lessons for future USAID/Lebanon programming with respect to promoting and fostering transparency, accountability and good governance. As outlined in the evaluation scope of work (Annex 1), the evaluation specifically aims at assessing if TAG was:

- Effective in promoting transparency, accountability and good governance within Lebanese society;
- Relevant to USG Lebanon country strategy, and to the Lebanon context;
- Efficiently implemented with respect to value for money; and
- Gender sensitive.

The evaluation also aims to assess the extent to which TAG has promoted and fostered transparency, accountability and good governance practices within selected government entities and civil society organizations (CSOs). A related issue assessed is if the activities initiated and the results obtained by the project are sustainable.

Project Description

The TAG program was launched by USAID in March 2001, under a cooperative agreement between USAID and AMIDEAST. It was designed as a one-year small grants project aimed at strengthening efforts of local civic groups, organizations and individuals to effectively increase local and central governments' transparency and accountability. Its ultimate goal was to expand local democratic processes and increase the effectiveness of institutions that support democracy and restore citizens' confidence in their government.

AMIDEAST implemented this small grants project by publicizing the Project's purpose and procedures through mailings, group forums and smaller meetings throughout Lebanon. It also used the media for calls for grant applications, and established Application Review and Grant Approval Criteria (see Annex 2). While these criteria did not target specific governmental entities or civic groups, they were focused on:

- Responding to demand for good governance by providing grants to CSOs and individuals that have identified areas of governance which require improved transparency and accountability;
- Promoting public-private partnerships with specific objective of increasing transparency, accountability and good governance

Although TAG was initiated as a one-year project, the project implementation period was stretched to ten years, from March 2001 to February 2011, through cooperative agreement modifications and extensions. Throughout this period, the project underwent a total of twenty agreement modifications and agreement completion date extensions. USAID funding of this project also increased from \$655,000 in 2001 to a cumulative sum of \$9,350,900 by February FY 2011 (see Table 2).

Table 2: Cooperative Agreement Amendments/ Modification

Mod. No.	Date of Mod.	Purpose & Objective of Amendment	Remarks
1	03-01-2001	The purpose of this modification is to provide incremental funding of \$155,000.00 to the CA	
2	03-21-2001	The purpose of this modification is to correct the completion date of the CA; change Key Personnel; modify the Payment Office and modify the Financial Reporting clause. Estimated CA completion corrected to read "02/08/2002"	
3	02-28-2002	The purpose of the modification is: 1. Extend the completion date of the CA to March 31, 2002 2. Re-align the budget 3. Incorporate the New NICRA rates	
4	03-31-2002	The purpose of this modification is: 1. Extend the completion date of the CA to March 31, 2004 2. Expand the Program Description 3. Increase both the obligated and estimated amount – Obligated amount= \$1,355,000 and total estimated amount = \$2,132,515	Multi-year funding began as of this modification
5	10-31-2002	The purpose of this modification is to provide incremental funding of \$777,514.77 to the CA	
6	06-30-2003	The purpose of this modification is: 1. Extend the estimated completion date of the CA to September 30, 2005 2. Expand the Program Description 3. Increase both the obligated and estimated amounts 4. Incorporate the New NICRA rates	Obligated amount increased to \$2,332,514.79 and the total estimated amount increased to \$4,132,414.00
7	07-31-2003	The purpose of this modification is to provide incremental funding of \$100,000 to the CA.	
8	08-28-2003	The purpose of this modification is to provide incremental funding of \$1,100,000 to the CA	
9	11-13-2003	The purpose of this modification is to add Foreign Tax clause to the CA	
10	07-22-2004	The purpose of this modification to fully fund the CA by providing incremental funding of \$599,899.21 and to revise the Monitoring and Reporting Program Performance, and the publication and media release provision. The modification specifically required AMIDEAST to submit quarterly performance report and a final report. It also required that "USAID shall be prominently acknowledged in all publications, videos or other information/media products funded".	
11	11-11-2004	The purpose of the modifications is to add a standard provision for activities related to human trafficking in compliance with the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2003.	
12	07-26-2005	The purpose of the modification is to: 1. Increase the total estimated costs by \$2,895,933 2. Add appendix to the program description 3. provide incremental funding of \$2,895,933 and 4. Extend the completion date to September 30, 2007	It appears that the project was provided multi-year funding

Mod. No.	Date of Mod.	Purpose & Objective of Amendment	Remarks
		This modification brings the total estimated cost to \$3,954,968	
13	06-27-2006	The purpose of the modification is to incrementally fund the agreement by adding \$500,000.00	
14	04-24-2007	The purpose of the amendment is to fully fund the agreement by adding \$1,318,487	
15	08-05-2007	The purpose of this modification is to extend the completion date of the agreement from September 30, 2007 to September 30, 2008 at no additional cost.	
16	08-26-2008	The purpose of the modification is: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extend the estimated completion date of the agreement from September 30, 2008 to February 28, 2011 2. Increase the total estimate amount by \$2,500,000, from \$6,850,901 to \$9,350,901 3. Incrementally fund the Cooperative Agreement by obligation \$1,000,000, and 4. Revise the Program Description 	The Program description has not changed from what it was. The attachment simply highlighted accomplishments of the program to date.
17		The purpose of the modification is to incrementally fund the CA by obligating \$137,214. Thus the total obligated amount will be changed from \$7,850,901 to a revised amount of \$7,988,115. Funds will be sufficient till September 30, 2009	
18	11-23-2008	The purpose of this modification is to increase the obligated amount by \$536,000 for a revised amount of \$8,524,115	
19	12-16-2009	This is a Blanket modification effective at the signature date to add Provision entitled Participant Training.	This mod is to ensure that required participant training data is entered into the USAID TraiNet system
20	05-16-2010	The purpose of this modification is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the obligated amount by \$826,786 for a revised amount of \$9,350,901, thus fully funding the CA • And revise financial reporting 	

As indicated above, TAG was conceived in 1999 when USAID began implementing initiatives that empower local government, media and CSOs to counter the perceived high corruption level in Lebanon, in support of Government of Lebanon's (GOL's) administrative reforms and rule of law efforts. Components of the USAID/Lebanon program, under which TAG was implemented included:⁹

1. Increased public awareness of the costs of corruption through national media campaigns to spark anti-corruption activities;
2. Strengthened investigative journalism by training journalists in investigative journalism skills to enhance their ability to write articles on anti-corruption issues;

⁹ Randa Antoun, May 2002, Transparency and Accountability Grant (TAG) Evaluation, Final Report

3. Transparency and accountability at the municipal government level fostered by computerizing administrative procedures; and
4. Anticorruption efforts by local groups supported through small grants mechanism.

TAG was directly linked to component four above.

While there was no results framework or performance management plan (PMP) for TAG when it was implemented in 2001, the Project did identify and adopt a set of results and indicators in 2009 as required by USAID. As outlined in the 2009 2nd Quarter Semi-Annual report, the objectives and intermediate results and performance indicators of the project were stated as follows:

Objective: Expanded role of civil society advocacy

Indicator: Number of private sector companies and CBOs/NGOs adopting new measures to enhance transparency and accountability

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capacity of targeted CSOs

Indicator 1.1: Number of public civic engagement activities held by USG-supported CSOs

Indicator 1.2: Number of CSOs using USG assistance to improve internal organizational capacities (F)

Indicator 1.3: Number of CSO linkages created

Intermediate Result 2: Increased agreements/activities related to public awareness on government procedures and citizens' rights

Indicator 2.1: Number of signed agreements with USG assistance

In subsequent semi-annual reports the objective and the intermediate results were adjusted perhaps to coincide with the Mission's 2009-2013 country strategy. In the 2010 semi-annual reporting TAG is linked to USAID/Lebanon's Assistance Objective AO 1: *Responsiveness of targeted governing and civil society institutions increased*. These results and indicators of TAG were adjusted as follows:¹⁰

Objective: Targeted governing and civil society institutions are more responsive to Lebanese citizens.

Indicator 1: # of CSOs' programs actively seeking citizen input to shape activities

IR 1: Strengthened capacity of targeted CSOs

Indicator 1.1: # of public civic engagement activities held by USG supported CSOs

Indicator 1.2: # of CSOs using USG assistance to improve internal organizational capacity

Indicator 1.3: # of CSOs linkages created

IR 2: Expanded role of civil society advocacy

¹⁰ Transparency and Accountability Grant, Cooperative Agreement No. 268-00-01-00204-00, FY 2010, 2nd Semi-Annual Report, April 1, 2010 – September 30, 2010.

Indicator 2.1: Developing efficient and transparent practices in the private sector and civil society

Indicator 2.2: Increase number of government actions based on NGO/individual initiatives

IR 3: Increased agreements/activities related to public awareness on government procedures and citizens' rights.

Indicator 3.1: # of signed agreements with USAID assistance

TAG was implemented in a period where there was a demand for transparency and accountability of government by the Lebanese public. The socio-political setting that anchored the TAG project is discussed below.

Overview of the Situation in Lebanon between 2000-2011¹¹

The Lebanese political and administrative system is based on confessionalism whereby political and institutional power is distributed proportionally among religious communities. This system imposes inequality among citizens, and it also results in the concentration of power and influence in the hands of the key authorities in the relative confessional groups. Public positions are usually reserved for different confessional groups. Appointment decisions to these positions are the prerogatives of the key confessional authorities although the final decision is made by the Council of Ministers. Political appointments are common in democracies; however, in Lebanon the mechanism is confessional in nature and is the basis of inequality and is one of the causes of corruption. Hence, the political structure remains a fertile soil for the practice of widespread corruption.

Confessionalism is perceived as the main cause of corruption in Lebanon because it institutionalizes extraordinary political inequality.

The Lebanese political system is dominated by confessionalism and is characterized by a very delicate formula of power sharing between confessional groups leaving little or no room for democratic succession in office or participation in the decision-making process. In such a context, a group of powerful people dominate the country and control its resources. The circle of decision-making is closed and public elections seldom allow new entries. If public elections took place in a free environment and according to fair electoral laws that encourage public participation, which has not been the case these past 18 years, then there might be hope for change.

Lebanon has numerous political parties but they play a much less significant role in Lebanese politics and in influencing public policy than they do in most parliamentary democracies. Many of the "parties" are simply lists of candidates endorsed by prominent national or local figures. Loose coalitions, usually organized locally, are formed for electoral purposes by negotiations among clan leaders and candidates representing various religious communities. Such coalitions usually exist only for the election, and rarely form a cohesive bloc in the Parliament after the election.

By 2001-2002, Lebanon had made progress in meeting the major economic and political challenges that faced it after the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from South Lebanon. For

¹¹ This section is adopted from a paper by Hassan Krayem, Lebanon: Confessionalism and the Crisis of Democracy: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/17232620/Lebanon-Confessionalism-and-the-C-risis-of-Democracy>

example, the GOL's signing of the long-awaited Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, in tandem with ongoing negotiations on World Trade Organization (WTO) membership, were key steps in Lebanon's bid for an increased share of regional and global trade at that time. A new value-added tax, along with actions favorable to privatization, budget belt-tightening, and administrative streamlining, were perceived to add much-needed efficiencies and revenues to the public sector. Elections in formerly-occupied municipalities not only signaled the government's commitment to extend its sovereignty in the south, but, for the first time in nearly 40 years, formally activated local government and grassroots decision-making nationwide. Safety and security were also enhanced when the Lebanese Army, working closely with troops from the United Nations Interim Forces in Lebanon (UNIFIL), began demining efforts and mine awareness campaigns in the South's most heavily mined areas. After September 11th 2001, the GOL also actively supported U.N.-originated counter-terrorism measures.

Internal political tension, however, continued to simmer and on February 14, 2005 the former Prime Minister Rafik Hariri was assassinated. Lebanon then witnessed a series of assassinations and explosions throughout that year. In the summer of 2006 a furious 34-day war broke out between Israel and Hizbullah, leading to the destruction of the country's infrastructure. Enormous national and international efforts shifted towards relief and reconstruction. Soon after, the political situation started to deteriorate with the resignation of six ministers from the government, the assassination of the Minister of Industry, and a continuous sit-in organized by the opposition which lasted through May 2008.

In January 2008, serious street clashes between Lebanese army troops and protesters left several people dead or wounded. The country was on the verge of a civil war in May 2008, with ten days of bloody fights leaving more than sixty civilians dead and hundreds wounded, and compelling international efforts to bring Lebanese political leaders to reconciliation in May 2008. In June the same year, the parliament was finally able to elect a new president who enjoyed political consensus and public support. A new cabinet was formed whose mission was to prepare for the parliamentary elections in May 2009. That positive development constituted an opportunity for the Lebanese people to move the country towards a better and more stable future. The inauguration speech of the new president outlined the vision that was to govern the country for the next six years which focused on the leading role and involvement of civil society in public affairs. The international community was expected to continue supporting local CSOs and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) willing to work hard and creatively to address corruption and promote good governance in all sectors. At such critical times, the need for engaged CSOs and activities was greater than ever.

CSOs in Lebanon played an important role throughout the Lebanese civil war as they emerged as key players in filling in for the government and its weakening institutions during its sporadic absence, through the delivery of social services, responding to relief needs and mobilizing the local community. In post-war Lebanon the inadequacy of the Lebanese government and negligence of human development needs in favor of reconstruction made CSOs more reliable to the Lebanese people. However, CSOs were faced with a number of challenges to respond to the emerging needs and to shift their focus from conducting relief efforts to being agents of change and development. Development needs varied from sustainability of the environment to human rights and transparency and accountability. Moreover, Lebanese CSOs lacked the capacity and the financial means to adapt to the new role to secure their survival as they were largely reliant on international aid which had declined in the post-war era. Hence, TAG was implemented during a critical period for a society that was struggling with peace, war and unstable and weak governance institutions.

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

In addition to assessing whether or not the project has achieved its stated purpose, objectives and intermediate results based on achievement of indicator targets, this evaluation endeavors to determine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, gender sensitivity, impact, and sustainability of the project. The evaluation team applied a multi-method approach to gather and analyze data. Data was gathered from a desk review (DR) of project documents, focus group discussions (FGD), key informant interviews (KII), and a sample opinion survey (SOS) of project beneficiaries (i.e., targeted citizens from the local community that benefited from the project through activities implemented by the grantees). Key informants included project staff, selected civil society leaders, senior public sector managers, and representatives of government entities both at the central and municipal level that partnered with selected CSOs (see Annex 3). Focus group discussants included CSO representatives and individuals that participated in TAG activities as grantees (see Annex 4). SOS respondents included individuals that participated in grantees' outreach activities. The list of project documents reviewed is provided in Annex 5.

A total of eight (8) FGDs with forty three (43) participants from thirty seven (37) grantees were conducted (see Table 3).

Table 3: Number of Focus Groups & Focus Group Discussants

FGD #	Date	TAG Projects #	Number of Organizations	Number of Participants
I	March 2, 2011	76-95-100-144-145-109-8-32-81-107-141-115-129-106	6	8 participants
II	March 3, 2011	147-165-146-136-14-62-99-124	4	5 participants
III	March 4, 2011	151-175-182-167- 172-142-177-159-50-69-120-162	8	8 participants
IV	March 9, 2011	160-164-176	3	3 participants
V	March 10, 2011	67-98-132-44-148-171	3	5 participants
VI	March 16, 2011	127-134-153-66-85	4	5 participants
VII	March 22, 2011	122-114-137-63-73-74	5	5 participants
VIII	March 24, 2011	19-154-11-102-189-183	4	4 participants

Sixty nine (69) KIIs were held including two (2) AMIDEAST staff members a number of civil society leaders, and partnering private and government entities both at the central and municipal level. The SOS involved one hundred and forty (140) project beneficiaries randomly select from four projects to determine to what extent these grantees had reached out to their target population and created awareness on transparency and accountability. The checklist/questions used in the FGDs and KIIs are included as Annex 6 and 7. The opinion survey questionnaire is attached as Annex 8.

The qualitative and quantitative data gathered from these different sources were then triangulated, cross checked and mapped against the evaluation questions stated in the scope of work.

The evaluation faced a number of limitations, mostly related to the short timeline for the evaluation. AMIDEAST was in the process of closing out the project and packing and shipping all relevant project documents to the United States when the desk review was conducted. In addition, the lead time for identifying key informants and focus group discussants was short. As a consequence there were low participation rates in focus groups as well as in the SOS and KIIs. Furthermore, the long implementation period of TAG and the absence of an alumni follow-up system meant a lack of sufficient contact information and a shortage of referral bodies. It also meant the loss of institutional memory due to the departure of involved personnel and the closure/discontinuity of projects. Other factors included insufficient commitment and availability to provide adequate responses by some SOS target groups and focus group discussants, and preoccupation of senior key informants and their unavailability for interviews.

The evaluation was conducted by the PMPL project staff assisted by two external local consultants. Ms. Nathalie Bavitch helped in facilitating focus group discussions and Ms. Reem Askar assisted in the SOS.

III. CONCLUSIONS & SUPPORTING FINDINGS

Program Relevance

- 1. TAG directly contributed to USAID's country strategy.** TAG was implemented to support USAID's 1999 Country Strategy. As indicated before, one key focus of the 1999 country strategy was to empower local government, media and civil society in their anti-corruption efforts. This included (a) increasing public awareness on the cost of corruption through a national media campaign to spark anti-corruption activities, (b) strengthening investigative journalism by training journalists in investigative journalism skills to enhance their ability to write articles on anti-corruption issues, (c) fostering transparency and accountability at the municipal government level by computerizing administrative procedures; and (d) provision of a small grants mechanism to support anti-corruption efforts by local groups. According to the CA, the TAG project was awarded to AMIDEAST as a one-year small grants project with a total value of \$655,000 as part of component 4 to work with local CSO and civic leaders to implement activities that address corruption and promote transparency and accountability in Lebanon. In addition, according to the CA Modification No. 4, 12 and 16 TAG received multi-year funding and agreement completion date extensions. TAG contributed to the Mission's 2009-2013 Country Strategy through its linkage to the Mission's Assistance Objective 1 (AO 1): "Targeted governing and civil society institutions are more responsive to Lebanese citizens."
- 2. TAG was relevant to Lebanon's socio-political context.** TAG was initiated at a time when there was a political will by the GOL to address issues of transparency, accountability and good governance. This was reflected clearly in the inaugural speech of the then-President Emil Lahoud, indicating that issues of transparency, accountability and good governance were a top priority for Lebanon's government.¹² In 2001 Lebanon still faced many challenges related to recovery from the long period of war and internal insecurity, destruction of its infrastructure, lack of rule of law and widespread corruption. It was not only struggling with the reconstruction and development of its economy and

¹² Randa Antoun, *ibid*

the reconstitution of its civil society but also faced the arduous task of integrating and adjusting to the new trends of globalization while trying to position itself in a region characterized by political turmoil. The empowerment of local civic associations was crucial in order to mobilize citizens and civic groups to play a constructive role in advocating and demanding for greater transparency and accountability from their local and central governments and to positively contribute to the reconstruction and development of the nation's economy.

Program Effectiveness

3. **TAG has met or exceeded a number of performance indicator targets set in the 2008-2009 timeframe. In some cases, however, it did not meet its life of program targets completely.** From 2008 onwards, the project had established performance indicator targets as per Table 4 below. However, prior to 2008 TAG did not have a PMP and thus it cannot be determined whether or not the project achieved stated objectives. It is also difficult to track the exact outputs and results produced by each grantee before 2007 as the project had not provided performance reporting guidelines and templates.

Table 4: Performance Data Table¹³

Objective & Intermediate Results	Performance Indicators	LOP Target	Actual	Target Exceeded, Met, or Not Met
AO: Targeted governing and civil society institutions are more responsive to Lebanese citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of CSOs programs actively seeking citizen input to shape activities 	10	11	Exceeded
IR 1: Strengthened capacity of targeted CSOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of public civic engagement activities held by USG supported CSOs 	4	6	Exceeded
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of CSOs using USG assistance to improve internal organizational capacity 	12	11	Not met completely
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of CSOs linkages created 	18	21	Exceeded
IR 2: Expanded role of civil society advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing efficient and transparent practices in the private sector and civil society 	11	8	Not met completely
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased number of government actions based on NGO/ individual initiatives 	11	17	Exceeded
IR 3: Increased agreements/activities related to public awareness on government procedures and citizens' rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of signed agreements with USAID assistance 	12	13	Exceeded
OP indicators				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of CSOs using USG assistance to promote political participation 	5	4	Not met completely
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of CSOs using USG assistance to improve internal organizational capacity 	10	12	Exceeded
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of CSO advocacy campaigns supported by USG 	13	20	Exceeded
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of independent and democratic trade/labor unions supported by USG to promote international core labor standards 	2	2	Met

¹³ Summarized from TAG 2nd Semi-Annual Report 04/01/2010 - 09/30/2010

Over the ten-year period, the program disseminated 183 grants with an average size of US\$20,000 to US\$50,000 to a wide range of CSOs and individuals. Of these 179 were successfully completed. Four grants did not manage to close before TAG ended. Of the 129 organizations and individuals that received TAG grants, 8 were provided grant amounts above \$50,000 and several had received multiple grants.

The evaluation also came across a number of factors which contributed to achieving the TAG objective. Some of these are related to AMIDEAST's quick response and a spirit of volunteerism that was conducive to involving the local community in projects. Furthermore, some CSOs received multiple grants that enabled them to follow-through and continue to build on previous activities. Another factor was the flexibility in giving grants to non-registered CSOs and individuals and extending deadlines in view of multiple political and security-related hindrances. According to focus group discussants this was very positive as it enabled more CSOs and individuals to participate. Specific evaluation conclusions and supporting findings follow.

Yes TAG did manage to achieve its purpose as far as its purpose is concerned. TAG was meant as a platform for local NGOs/CSOs to address issues of accountability and transparency at a small scale. Even at the level of the government, it didn't reach a wider scope and stayed within the boundaries of each public department rather than have a national level impact. It was like a spark of fire here and there, having small sporadic effects without working towards a common overall vision with specific goals. It was bottom-up rather than top-down, hence it was effective only at that level.

Statement from a Key Informant

- 4. TAG was appreciated as a project that addressed the concepts of Transparency, Accountability and Good Governance for the first time in Lebanon.** This sentiment, expressed by focus group discussants and key informants, indicated that TAG activities increased public awareness and knowledge about financial transparency, consumer protection rights and citizenship rights. TAG grantees produced a wide range of informational, educational and communications material such as flyers, booklets, brochures, guide books and informed different groups in society. Moreover, TAG grantees benefited from high media coverage and therefore succeeded in informing the public about the concepts of transparency and accountability. It was evident from key informant interviews and focus group discussions that AMIDEAST's open door approach with effective support to grantees was valuable in project implementation and capacity building. According to survey respondents who were asked whether they agree that the activities in which they have participated promoted and fostered transparency in the government, 51.1% strongly agreed or agreed and 20% noted that these activities could lead to more transparency. 63.5% strongly agreed or agreed that TAG activities promoted and fostered accountability in the public sector. Similarly, when asked about good governance, 45.7% of respondents agreed, and 12.1% believed that these activities could lead to achieving good governance.¹⁴

¹⁴ Around 12 projects out of 179 projects, were selected for a direct opinion survey targeting the end beneficiaries of these projects, taking two criteria into consideration :

- a. Grants implemented after 2008 – so end beneficiaries are available and remember the details of the project
- b. The project itself have a targeted group that could be identified clearly to be surveyed

Furthermore, as shown in Table 5, 80% of survey respondents rated as good or very good the IEC material they received from the grantee CSOs.

Table 5: Rating of IEC Material by Survey Respondents¹⁵

Rating Criterion	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
Clarity of the Language used	39.0%	45.7%	4.3%	10.9%	0.0%
Clarity of the Message	43.7%	41.3%	4.3%	10.7%	0.0%
Accuracy of the Message with respect to what you already know	41.3%	41.3%	6.5%	10.9%	0.0%
Applicability of the Message to your needs	39.1%	43.7%	6.5%	10.9%	0.0%
Overall Rating	41.0%	43.0%	5.4%	10.8%	0.0%

5. **TAG was effective in building the financial accounting and management capacities of grantees.** This is evident from the desk review of project documents and testimonies of focus group discussants. There was a strong consensus by focus group discussants that the TAG team helped them learn about proper budgeting and means of developing a comprehensive financial management system that they continue to use. According to focus group discussants, the TAG team was always available to support grantees, answer their questions and be flexible in case some changes were necessary in the grant agreement document. Moreover, grants were disbursed based on producing a progress report that highlighted that the agreed activities are met and completed in a timely manner. Key informants and focus group discussants also indicated benefitting from their experience with TAG with respect to improving their own internal operating procedures and management structure. Some grantees also reported that they became more transparent in the budgeting process and the sharing of information with their staff and constituencies.
6. **TAG was effective in leveraging other donors' funds.** Key informants and focus group discussants indicated that they were able to obtain additional funding for projects from non-USAID donors as a result of adopting transparent accounting and financial management systems on one hand, and on the other, because those donors wanted to build on the achievements made where Transparency, Accountability and Good Governance initiatives were concerned.
7. **TAG was effective in a number of ways in enhancing the momentum of the vibrant civil society.** It responded to 183 innovative ideas from 174 organizations and individuals as a result of the flexible application selection criteria it used with minimal bureaucratic hindrances which encouraged many CSOs and individuals with a wide range of good ideas to apply for TAG grants. For instance:

¹⁵ It should be noted that only 32% (n=46) of the surveyed respondents (N=140 of which 45% are female) received IEC material from grantees. The percentage of females who received IEC material was more prevalent than males, 45 and 27%, respectively.

- TAG grantees successfully lobbied to allow women to have the right to open bank accounts for their minor children for the first time in Lebanon.
- The Brand Protection Group launched a media campaign in collaboration with the Ministry of Economy and Trade to raise awareness on counterfeit products and to empower consumers.
- TAG helped in raising citizens' awareness about traffic laws and regulations. The Youth Association for Social Awareness (YASA) developed a comprehensive traffic legislation, a draft of which was presented and registered in the Parliament by a Member of Parliament Mohammad Kabbani on June 2, 2005. In order to ensure the passage of this law and the mobilization of public support for it, YASA launched a lobbying campaign to promote the new traffic legislation.

8. TAG promoted Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) by encouraging grants that were implemented in partnership with local and central governmental departments. According to our desk review, FGDs and KIIs, many grantees had partnered with some ministries such as the Ministry of Economy and Trade (MOET), Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) and Ministry of Finance (MOF) which increased the transparency and accountability of these institutions. Some examples include the following:

- In partnership with the MEHE, the Lebanese Association for Education Studies (LAES) worked on drafting a law for the establishment of a National Quality Assurance body for Higher Education in Lebanon in support of the ministerial declaration of the government in 2009 to address the quality of higher education and its regulation.
- In partnership with the MEHE, the Educational Association for Information Technology Development (EAITD) developed an automated scheme to facilitate processing of 'education equivalence certification' for students studying abroad.
- In partnership with the Institute of Finance, the Lebanese Association of Societal Synergy produced a series of guidebooks for citizens to better inform the public about procedures for various Ministry of Finance transactions which included: "Your Right to Object," and "Your Duties When Starting Work: A Guide for All Income Tax Payers."
- In coordination with the Qa'im-Maqam of Mount Lebanon, the Green Hand Organization worked on empowering youth in the Aley region and strengthening the relationship between youth and their municipalities in ten villages. Youth were trained in lobbying skills, accountability, good governance, and the role of municipalities which also included municipal council members and municipality employees.
- In partnership with the MOET, the Brand Protection Group helped in integrating a new Geographic Information System (GIS) system into the consumer protection department (CPD) at the ministry to upload inspection findings and improve performance and efficiency of CDP inspectors. This same partnership also resulted in TV and radio public awareness campaigns to encourage citizens to react to abuse and report to the ministry through a hotline.

9. TAG missed the window of opportunity to facilitate the establishment of CSO national or regional networks for learning, experience sharing and mutual support.

There is a strong consensus among focus group discussants that TAG did not create a forum for promoting linkages and networks among CSOs. Focus group discussants indicated that no networking or partnership was promoted by TAG among the CSOs, which contributed to the duplication of some projects. According to the prominent opinion of focus group discussants. The establishment of networking among the grantee CSOs would have allowed the sharing of resources and expertise, an increase in impact, and less duplication. PMPL was, however, told by AMIDEAST and some key informants that some CSOs were linked with other CSOs working on similar projects so as not reinvent the wheel or duplicate efforts.

Program Impact

10. Many TAG-funded projects had tangible impact. Key informants and surveyed respondents indicated that TAG-funded projects have promoted transparency, accountability, and good governance within both the CSOs themselves and their government counterparts and their beneficiaries. For instance:

- Focus Group discussants indicated increased understanding about transparency and accountability concepts, although the level of understanding varied among discussants. For a substantial number of discussants, these TAG-funded projects were the only experience that participants had in understanding and applying practices of transparency, accountability, and good governance.
- Newly-established CSOs were most positively impacted by TAG's transparency, accountability and good governance activities. Respondents from these newly-established CSOs stated that the projects helped build their capacity in terms of applying accountability and transparency procedures from the start. Other CSOs also reported that their "already-existing" practices were positively influenced and reinforced. This influence pertained to a change in the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of their leadership and staff. In fact, focus group discussants believe that TAG activities helped reinforce favorable attitudes such as sense of responsibility towards beneficiaries. Other grantees reported having adopted procedures that promote transparency, accountability and good governance such as setting terms of reference and job descriptions, involving employees and board members in decision-making, improving documentation and financial reporting, and making the financial reports accessible to all staff as well as to other stakeholders. Focus group discussants and key informants also indicated having promoted transparency and good governance through their projects for raising awareness of beneficiaries regarding their rights and the rights of marginalized groups such as youth, women, the disabled and the visually impaired. Examples include:
 - The Awareness and Enforcement Campaign created awareness through promotional material on the 'rights of the disabled in hospital admission' by producing information and launching a media enforcement campaign about the rights of the disabled and related Ministry of Health regulations.
 - Byblos Ecologia worked with students from fourteen schools in the Batroun and Koura regions to increase their awareness on themes such as citizenship, transparency, accountability and corruption. Students received a "Good Citizen's Passport" upon completion of the program.

- The Christian Association for the Blind produced a Braille version of a guide to help visually impaired citizens better understand their rights in transactions conducted at local municipalities and distributed copies to municipalities and organizations serving the visually impaired.
- Institute of Progressive Women managed to remove a discriminatory clause in the custodial bank accounts law which did not allow women to open bank accounts for their children. Now mothers can open bank accounts for their minor children.

Program Sustainability

11. Some results produced by TAG grantees are relatively more sustainable than others.

A majority of key informants have indicated that TAG-funded projects involving clarification of legislative/legal standards and government procedures and the establishment and use of digital systems, websites, web-portals, and reference material are more sustainable than awareness-raising and advocacy campaigns. These campaigns require repetitive action and longer duration to generate results that impact attitudes and behaviors and that change old habits and long-standing misconceptions and beliefs. Furthermore, although several grant activities continue to run after the grant has expired, they have limited long-term sustainability due to a shortage of financial resources. According to the consensus of focus group discussants, the low grant amount (less than US\$ 50,000) did not allow achievement of long-term sustainable activity and also did not allow for higher impact projects.

Due to a lack of fundraising skills within CSOs, a large number of key informants doubted the ability of grantees to continue their activities on the same scale without continued external funding. All interviewed grantees, on the other hand, expressed their hope to receive future funding to progress to the next stages of their projects.

It should be noted that many key informants and focus group discussants also expressed that the limited time allocated for TAG-funded projects only allowed for small scale interventions which did not necessarily have a long-term impact. The large majority of focus group discussants agreed that the projects need to be followed up in a second and third phase in order to ensure sustainable impact. For example, an awareness-raising campaign can produce and disseminate IEC material but this will require more time and resources to reinforce the messages and follow-up and evaluate impact to ensure changed practices. As such, the initial setting up of a system funded by TAG, including the running costs of hosting, maintenance, upgrading etc., required continuous funding which TAG did not provide. Many CSOs therefore had to secure funding through different means, mostly through other donors

Program Gender sensitivity

12. Although TAG was not “gender sensitive” in the true sense of the term, it nevertheless did target and address specific women issues. TAG projects across the board did not make a specific effort to incorporate gender across all projects per se, as it was not a criterion for

Gender wasn't a requirement, but efforts were made to include women. Many projects did focus on women's rights and achieved their objectives and managed to change some laws that discriminate against women. Women CSOs were funded to lobby and advocate for gender equality. No there was no gender component in Cooperative Agreement, but a recommendation could be made to make Gender an integral component of future TAG programming.

Statement from a Key informant

TAG, was not mentioned in the CA and because the concept of gender was ambiguous to many TAG grantees. Gender sensitivity was confused with “women specific” as almost all focus group discussants did not seem to distinguish “gender” from “women.” Some focus group discussants responded that the only measure taken to ensure gender sensitivity was through “inviting women to activities/project events to ensure their participation.” There were also certain projects that addressed the specific needs of women such as addressing the custodial bank law which had prevented women from opening bank accounts for their minor children.

Hindrances and Challenges faced by TAG:

13. The performance of TAG was also hindered by a number of factors including:

- **Unstable and insecure political environment which led to high rate of deadline extensions and delays.** During the ten years in which TAG was implemented, Lebanon faced a series of destabilizing events including political assassinations, political stalemate and an Israeli war in 2006. Such events made the implementation of activities difficult at times and caused recurrent interruptions and delays.
- **Lack of clear M&E framework and performance reporting guidelines¹⁶.** The project did not have a coherent PMP to track progress in different areas until 2008. Between 2001 and 2008 the program only tracked the number of grants disbursed and general outputs and therefore gives a limited view of what TAG really achieved. For example, it was difficult to determine the overall level of outreach of TAG as the number of outputs disseminated by each CSO and the related number of beneficiaries was not tracked. By the same token there was no systematic assessment of impact of TAG activities on grantees and their beneficiaries. Reporting on progress of activities from grantees was very brief and general. The majority of reviewed grantee progress reports were one-page reports which gave a summary that lacked details on achievements. Therefore, it was difficult to determine achievements of grantees from reviewing such reports.
- **Weak networking among CSOs and other stakeholders.** As noted by key informants and focus group discussants, although TAG management had linked some CSOs with others working in related areas, the project failed to establish a system to promote networking among grantees (i.e., holding coordination meetings, common planning meetings, information exchange workshops, etc.) at the national or sub-national level. It was determined from focus group discussions that CSOs were not aware of other organizations’ activities and expressed their desire to learn more about other projects and to make use of available sources and share knowledge and experiences.
- **Undefined cost sharing formula.** According to key informants and focus group discussants this issue presented a challenge to many grantees since they couldn’t account their real cost as far as cost-share was concerned. Some grantees believe cost sharing should be 10% to 25% of the value of a project, while others believe it should be voluntary based on each CSO’s ability.

¹⁶ According to AMIDEAST, grants were tracked based upon the existing USAID objectives or indicators in specific years but USAID changed its system several times during the TAG implementation period.

- **Low Grant ceiling:** While the low grant ceiling amount allowed more CSOs to participate in TAG activities, it did not allow for implementation of long-term impact activities or wide geographical coverage.

- **Weak cooperation and cumbersome bureaucracy by some government partners.**

One of the findings from the KIIs and FGDs is that grantees that worked on drafting new laws or lobbied to change some existing laws faced great difficulty given the existing bureaucratic structure of Ministries and the lack of continuity from one Minister to another. Such grants were faced with a number of delays. One key informant stated that “projects that aimed at reforming policies

Major challenges were related to good governance, due to the polarization of the Lebanese society and the government paralysis which affected and delayed the endorsement of many drafted legislation and laws. During the non-operational parliament periods, grantees were given no-cost extension, and many projects were delayed and had to be amended multiple times because of this. The flexibility of TAG allowed such delays as TAG was keen on not compromising results for deadlines..

Statement from a Key informant

faced a key challenge in terms of willingness of government officials to engage in such endeavors and their resistance to become open and transparent.”

- **Weak management and operational capacity of grantees.** A key issue highlighted by key informants was that grantees lacked the capacity to draft work plans, write proposals and present comprehensive budgets to AMIDEAST. Despite the considerable technical assistance provided by TAG project staff to grantees, there still was a pressing need for capacity building for grantees on proposal writing and budget drafting to make sure they met USAID requirements.
- **Lack of outreach strategies:** Many projects aimed at disseminating awareness and raising IEC material to a wide audience, but had difficulty defining and reaching their target population. The opinion survey showed that only 50% of surveyed respondents received any of these IEC materials.
- **Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:** Grantees felt that excluding certain groups perceived as terrorists by USAID affected their objectivity and image/status as an organization. There was a strong statement by focus group discussants and a number of key informants that an important hindrance is related to USAID’s visibility through its branding policy and conditions like the visibility of its logo and the Anti-terrorism Act. Some CSOs who had to make sure the USAID logo was visible encountered resistance in areas that were not very USA friendly, consequently limiting the effectiveness of their activities. In addition, a number of credible CSOs who would have been good potential grantees refused to sign the Anti-Terrorism Act and excluded themselves from participating in TAG.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS LEARNED

1. **USAID-approved PMPs should be required of all Cooperative Agreements.** As indicated above the TAG program has accomplished much in terms of engaging a wide range of civil society actors and in supporting a range of activities that in one way or another raised awareness, increased knowledge and changed transparency, accountability and good governance practices within participating CSOs and to a limited extent within

the partnering local and central governmental entities. The PMPL team, however, believes that the performance of TAG could have been enhanced and better documented and communicated if the project had developed a coherent performance management plan from the its inception with explicit objectives, outcomes and performance indicators. Related to the design and implementation of a performance management and monitoring plan is the weakness in USAID's performance management. Lack of a coherent strategy to link implementing partners' activities and periodic and ad hoc overlaying of Operational Plan (OP) indicators on implementing partners' performance monitoring and reporting system, while burdensome, did not reinforce or strengthen implementing partners' Performance Management Plans and performance reporting.

There was a kind of a PMP to a certain extent. It was very flexible with minimum criteria in order to respond to as many requests as possible by CSOs. Its objectives were those of USAID's overall objectives. Since TAG took off from OTI's immediate service delivery project, and was itself grants based and ideas driven, it didn't have specific expected results other than enhancing transparency, accountability and good governance in all sectors of the society. This flexibility also allowed it to take risks and not request guaranteed results. The PMP there was more of a framework for work rather than a concrete plan of action with a clear vision and logframe. Monitoring got better with time.

Statement from a Key Informant

2. **Activities that are expected to promote and foster transparency, accountability and good governance should be synchronized towards achieving common objectives, and should have a longer project life to allow for adequate planning, implementation and achievement of long-term impact and results.** The fact that TAG was implemented as a single-year project did not allow for longer-term strategic vision to generate tangible impact in terms of changed attitude and practices related to transparency, accountability and good governance. Longer project life allows time for building capacities of the civil society organizations. As noted above, many TAG grantees had weak capacity with regard to proposal writing, project management, financial accounting and performance reporting. The short life of TAG activities coupled with the time spent building capacities of these grantees did not provide sufficient time to translate the development of IEC materials into awareness-raising, knowledge building and changing practices of transparency, accountability and good governance.
3. **Project proposals funded by USG should in general have sustainability and exit strategies.** These sustainability and exit strategies will have identified the critical capacity needs of CSOs and addressed them at the start of the program. For instance, building fundraising and networking capabilities of TAG grantees would have enhanced the sustainability of the outcomes generated by the program. Fundraising capacity would have generated additional funds for the grantees to implement follow-on activities even after grant monies had run out.
4. **The size of individual grant amounts should be based on (a) the scope of the grant proposal, (b) the implementation capacity of the grantee, and (c) the length of time required for achieving the expected outcomes and results expressed in the project proposal.** Many TAG grantees indicated that the amount of the TAG grant was small and did not allow them to implement high impact projects or to cover larger geographic areas. The PMPL Team, however, recommends that projects that require larger grant funding and a longer time to implement and obtain the expected results should be required to develop a coherent performance management plan. The accomplishments and progress of

these projects should also be monitored closely to ensure that the grant money is used properly.

5. **All USG-funded projects/activities shall have a gender component and be required to adopt a consistent gender definition and gender mainstreaming strategy.** A gender component must be required and incorporated at the design stage of all projects as required by USAID policy on gender equality (ADS 201.3.9.3). As indicated in our conclusion section, the concept of gender is not well understood. USAID should provide a common definition and guidance on what constitutes a “gender issue” within the context of Lebanon.
6. **All projects that work with CSOs and grassroots organizations should be encouraged to facilitate the formation of networks among participating CSOs and grassroots organizations.** While the cost of supporting networking among CSOs is small, the payoff can be large in terms of strengthening capacities of the CSOs.

Why establish and strengthen CSO Networks

Effective civil society organizations make vital contributions to citizens’ democratic rights and wellbeing by giving voice to citizen interests and providing services where they are needed. Civil society organizations are recognized globally for their success in shaping public policy, keeping government transparent and accountable, defending human rights and ensuring that citizens have access to basic services.

Networks of civil society organizations, when successful, enable citizens to *amplify their voices* and achieve greater influence and impacts in policy, democratic governance and social change. Civil society networks can provide:

- Forums for people to share experiences, express identities, discuss and debate needed changes and craft strategies for action;
- Legitimacy with policy makers and other institutional leaders in democratic contexts, due to the numbers and social identities of those seeking change.
- Linkages to facilitate communication and learning among groups and organizations with similar programs;
- Platforms to coordinate programs, activities and resources of multiple groups and organizations to achieve shared policy or program goals for greater and broader impact;
- Mechanisms for managing coordinated program implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

PMPL, May 2011

7. Cost-sharing should be required in a grant-based project such as TAG to ensure seriousness and commitment of the grantees.

According to TAG management, the average cost-share was about 56%. However the criteria for determining the level of cost sharing and what counts towards the shared cost is not clear. Explicit and uniform criteria and formula should be developed and applied

uniformly across all grantees. However, the criteria should take into account the size, capital base and capacity of the grantees in terms of fundraising.

Although cost-sharing was not a requirement, it was encouraged and highly desirable for ownership purposes and many grantees shared costs even when not required to. The value of cost share in TAG throughout the 10 years was around 56% which is very good. However, since the estimated 56% was at variable rates among the 183 projects, it should not be made a requirement as it could form an obstacle for smaller CSOs who don't have the capacity for cost sharing to benefit from TAG. Furthermore, there are no financial documents to support this figure, since cost share was NOT a requirement, and since much of that amount would be for services and manpower and other hidden expenses reported by the Grantee but not necessarily substantiated or validated. VAT was not covered by TAG and had to be part of the cost share.

Statement from a Key Informant

Annex 1: TAG Evaluation Scope of Work

Background

The Transparency & Accountability Grant (TAG) Project was conceived in 1999 when USAID began implementing initiatives to empower local government, media and civil society organizations to counter the perceived high corruption level in Lebanon, in support of Government of Lebanon's (GOL's) administrative reforms and rule of law efforts.

Components of the USAID/Lebanon program, under which TAG was implemented included:

1. Increased public awareness of the costs of corruption through national media campaigns to spark anti-corruption activities;
2. Strengthened investigative journalism by training journalists in investigative journalism skills to enhance their ability to write articles on anti-corruption issues;
3. Transparency and accountability at the municipal government level fostered by computerizing administrative procedures; and
4. Anticorruption efforts by local groups supported through a small grants mechanism.

The TAG project is directly related to component 4 above and was launched in March 2001, during a time when Lebanon was faced with a complex sociopolitical environment. In 2001 Lebanon still faced many challenges related to recovery from the long period of war and internal insecurity, destruction of its infrastructure, lack of rule of law and corruption at all levels of government. It was not only struggling with the reconstruction and development of its economy and the reconstitution of its civil society, but was also facing the arduous task of integrating and adjusting to the new trends of globalization while trying to position itself in a region characterized by political turmoil.

The empowerment of local civic associations was crucial in order to mobilize ordinary citizens and civic groups to play a constructive role in advocating for and demanding greater transparency and accountability from their local and central governments. This constituted a big challenge for the Lebanese civil society, considering the environment at that time.

Project Description

The TAG project was launched by USAID in March 2001, under a cooperative agreement with AMIDEAST. It was designed as a small grants project aimed at strengthening efforts of local civic groups, organizations and individuals to effectively increase local and central governments' transparency and accountability. Its ultimate goal was to expand local democratic processes and increase the effectiveness of institutions that support democracy and restore citizens' confidence in their government.

AMIDEAST implemented this small grants project by publicizing the project purpose and procedures through mailings, group forums and smaller meetings throughout Lebanon. It also used the media for calls for grant applications, and established Application Review and Grant Approval Criteria. While these criteria did not target specific sectors, they were focused on:

- Responding to demand for good governance by providing grants to CSOs and individuals that have identified areas of governance which require improved transparency and accountability;
- Promoting public-private partnerships with the specific objective of increasing transparency, accountability and good governance.

The TAG project was implemented as a one-year project. However, through cooperative agreement amendments and extensions, the project implementation period was stretched to ten years, from March 2001 to February 2011. Throughout this period, the Project underwent a total of twenty amendments and project extensions to adjust to arising needs and a changing environment on the ground. USAID funding also increased from \$500,000 in 2001 to a cumulative sum of \$9,350,900 through February FY 2011.

The objectives and intermediate results and performance indicators of the project as they evolved over time are stated as follows:

Objective: Expanded role of civil society advocacy

Indicator: Number of private sector companies and CSOs/NGOs adopting new measures to enhance transparency and accountability

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capacity of targeted CSOs

Indicator 1.1: Number of public civic engagement activities held by USG-supported CSOs

Indicator 1.2: Number of CSOs using USG assistance to improve internal organizational capacities (F)

Indicator 1.3: Number of CSO linkages created

Intermediate Result 2: Increased agreements/activities related to public awareness on government procedures and citizens' rights

Indicator 2.1: Number of signed agreements with USG assistance

The TAG project contributed to USG's foreign policy interests in Lebanon and the region by promoting and fostering transparency, accountability and good governance. It was directly linked to USAID/Lebanon's assistance objective *AO 1: Responsiveness of targeted governing and civil society institutions increased.*

Evaluation Purposes and Objectives

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the degree to which the project has achieved its purpose and objective as set out in the Cooperative Agreement between AMIDEAST and USAID. The evaluation will also assess the impact of the project in terms of promoting and fostering transparency, accountability and good governance among the Lebanese citizens, and if and how it has addressed the different needs of men, women and youth. USAID/Lebanon is also interested in knowing, through this evaluation, if the results achieved by the project are sustainable and if they will continue after the project funding ends on February 28, 2011. USAID is also interested in knowing if similar follow-on projects would be relevant, given Lebanon's present sociopolitical and economic environment and given the situation of Lebanon's existing democratic institutions.

In doing so, the evaluation team will ensure that the evaluation is fully compliant with the Terms for Project Evaluations contained in the USAID Automated Directives System (ADS) Series 203 and other relevant regulatory requirements, as may be determined by USAID.

Additionally the Team will understand and fully utilize Social Impact, Inc's "Evaluation/ Special Study Quality Management Guide" which will be presented to the Team members.

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will answer a set of questions designed to address specific characteristics of the project, such as effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, gender sensitivity, impact, and sustainability.

Effectiveness

- Did the project achieve the intended objective of creating awareness, promoting and fostering transparency, accountability and good governance?
- How effective were the project activities in achieving the objectives of the award and subsequent modifications?
- How appropriate and effective were the criteria used for selecting grant applications with respect to promoting transparency and accountability?
- Was the project gender sensitive? And how?

Relevance

- What is the relevance of the project to USAID Lebanon's Country Strategy and USG foreign policy priorities for the region?
- Were the technical areas and project approaches appropriate for USAID/ Lebanon's future project expansion? How should any future USAID investment in this sector be implemented / refocused?
- What recommendations are there for moving forward if the project is to be replicated?

Efficiency

- How was the project's performance in terms of results achieved, efficiency and value for money? Were there better ways to improve efficiency and invest the limited resources of USG in this sector?

Gender Sensitivity

- To what extent did the project address the different needs and constraints faced by men and women?
- To what extent did the project enhance women's understanding of their rights to demand transparency and accountability from their government?
- To what extent did the activities of the project address problems and challenges faced by the youth of Lebanon?

Impact

- To what extent did the project influence the grantees' internal governance, transparency and accountability?
- To what degree did the project influence GOL's policies, regulation and procedures to be more transparent and accountable to citizens?

- Did the project manage to enhance Lebanese citizens’ awareness and understanding of transparency, accountability and good governance? And how?
- What were the best practices, success stories, testimonials – and important lessons learnt? Is there a story which can best demonstrate to the U.S. Congress the lasting impact of the project?

Sustainability

- What strategy and efforts, if any, did the project apply to ensure sustainability of project results?

Research Methodology

The Project Team will apply different data collection methodologies and analytical approaches to answer the above questions. Data will be gathered from project documents through a desk review, and from focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and an opinion survey of project beneficiaries (i.e., citizens that benefited from the project through activities of the grantees).

Based on the list of grantees and key informants provided by AMIDEAST, the evaluation team will organize focus group discussions with grantees, and one-on-one interviews with key informants based on a checklist prepared for this purpose. The key informants may include project staff, selected civil society leaders, and representatives of partnering government entities both at the central and municipal level.

A sample opinion survey with project beneficiaries will be used to determine to what extent grantees have reached out to the general population and created awareness on transparency and accountability. Review of the project documents will determine whether or not targeted citizens groups have received information that affects their lives. The evaluation will capture -to the extent possible- what information citizens have received and how that information has influenced or affected their opinions, attitudes and political practices.

The qualitative and quantitative data gathered from the different sources will be triangulated to answer the evaluation questions posed above.

Required Tasks and Work Plan

Tasks	Time (work days)	Timeline for completion
<p>Initial Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review background documents • Finalize the evaluation questions • Develop and vet with USAID the evaluation scope of work 		2/8/11 – 2/21/11

Field Work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct key informant interviews • Conduct focus group discussions • Conduct stratified random sample opinion survey 		2/22/11 – 3/20/11
Data Compilation and Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compile and analyze data • Summarize findings & conclusions • Review findings and conclusions with USAID • Draft report incorporating USAID's feedback 		3/21/11 – 3/25/11
Final Report Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise draft report incorporating collective USAID/Lebanon and IP feedback • Mark and brand report and submit to USAID 		Within 5 work days after receiving USAID's comments
Total LOE for Local Consultants (2 consultants to facilitate focus group discussions)	12x2days	
Total LOE for 2 consultants to conduct sample opinion survey	8x2 days	
Total LOE for PMPL staff involved in the evaluation (COP, Sr. M&E Officer, Sr. Information Officer, SI HQ support staff)	30 days	

Team Composition, Activities, Logistics and Timing

Because of the tight schedule for this evaluation, the bulk of the data analysis will be conducted by the PMPL staff. PMPL will use two (2) local consultants to organize and facilitate focus group discussions. These consultants will record their findings from each focus group and compile the findings and review with the PMPL staff. PMPL will also use its local partner Information International (II) to conduct the sample opinion survey. II will conduct the survey, analyze the survey data and review the results with the PMPL staff.

Report Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Three copies of the draft report (*even if not entirely complete*) on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Evaluation Team will be presented to USAID/Lebanon AOTR soon after the field work is concluded and the data is compiled and analyzed, in order to

provide progress report and solicit feedback from USAID. The draft report may be presented to the AOTR in the form of a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation. PMPL will then finalize the Evaluation Report and submit to USAID both in hardcopy and Microsoft Word. The final report will include:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction/Background
- Methodology
- Findings/Lessons Learnt (with respect to, *inter alia*, the key questions identified above)
- Conclusions
- Recommendations (with respect, *inter alia*, follow-up activities, expansion, alternative models for scaling up, orderly close out, etc.)
- Annexes: This section should include, *inter alia*, the Team's SOW and a listing of Useful Tools and Products that should be repackaged and produced for wider distribution to other USAID-funded implementing partners in Lebanon.

Annex 2: TAG Grant Criteria & Guidelines

TAG Grant Criteria

The Transparency and Accountability Grants (TAG) Project was launched in March 2001 by AMIDEAST-Lebanon with funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). TAG will support local initiatives and activities which increase good governance, transparency, and accountability within Lebanon.

- All proposed activities must increase transparency, accountability, and/or good governance.
- Applicants for TAG grants may be local organizations, companies or individuals. International organizations are ineligible for grants.
- Activities that partner local citizens or organizations with government agencies or offices in a public-private partnership are strongly encouraged.
- No grants will be made for research studies. However, grants can be made for activities that include research as a part of the project activity, if it is clear that the planned research is an important part of achieving the action part of the activity.
- Proposed activities can not duplicate previously implemented projects in Lebanon.
- Capacity-building for local civil society organizations is eligible if it helps develop their infrastructure and capacity to play a stronger role in promoting transparency, accountability and good governance.
- Activities that enhance participation, democratic practices, rule of law, lobbying for legislative and policy reform, and better implementation of government policies and plans.
- There is no minimum amount for a TAG grant. The maximum amount of a grant is \$50,000. (Note: A few very select grants can be considered for larger amounts subject to additional approval processes beyond the existing TAG application review system.)
- Cost-sharing by the applicant is strongly preferred and encouraged. Such cost-sharing may be cash or in-kind contributions.
- Project timeframes can vary from one week to 18 months but all project activities must be concluded before December 31, 2010. Short-term, focused projects are encouraged.
- For those activities that can offer ongoing benefits beyond the project's implementation, a plan for the project's sustainability is highly preferred.
- Applicants can apply for more than one grant simultaneously. Multiple grants are allowed, but submission of a new application prior to completion of an existing TAG-funded project will require pre-qualification from AMIDEAST before the application will be considered.
- Any organization undertaking activities that violate applicable US laws, directly or indirectly, is ineligible for TAG funding.

Transparency and Accountability Grants (TAG)

Application for Grant

1. Applicant's name: _____

___ Applicant is an Organization ___ Applicant is an Individual

2. Address: _____

3. Telephone: _____ Fax: _____ Email: _____

4. Key contact and title: _____

5. Estimated Start Date: _____

6. Estimated Project Duration: _____

7. Total Amount of Grant Requested: \$ _____

___ Program Description Enclosed (See Attached Instructions)

___ Budget Enclosed (See Attached Instructions)

___ Documents Showing Experience Enclosed (See Attached Instructions)

___ Baseline Questions Enclosed (See Attached Instructions)

Submitted By:

On behalf of the applicant listed above in this Grant Application, I certify that the information within this application and all supporting documents is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge:

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

TAG Use Only

Date Received: _____ Reference Number: _____

I certify that the applicant has received an official receipt for a Grant Application and that a file has been opened.

Program Assistant: _____

Guidelines For Proposals for TAG Funding

Please submit a typed proposal in English explaining each of the following items.
(Proposals may be between 3 and 10 pages maximum, excluding attachments)

Section I - Program Description

1. Title: State the activity title.
2. Background: Provide background information on the situation or context of the activity.
3. Objective: State directly the specific purpose or objective of the activity.
4. Focus: Elaborate how, and why the activity will increase transparency, accountability, and/or good governance.
5. Plan: Describe and list all of the tasks that will be conducted in order to achieve the stated objective of the activity
6. Timeframe: Submit a timeframe and schedule for conducting all mentioned tasks.
7. Output: Identify the tangible output(s) of the activity. (Examples of previous outputs include pamphlets, new law, poster, lobbying campaign, conference, hotline, training seminar, etc.) If the output needs distribution, provide a preliminary distribution plan.
8. Location: Identify the location of the proposed activity.
9. Sector: Which sector(s) will the activity target? (e.g. NGO, private sector, government policies and procedures, youth, legal rights, women, environment, education, etc.)
10. Beneficiaries: Who will benefit from the activity? How many beneficiaries are expected? In what region(s) of Lebanon do beneficiaries reside? What is the benefit?
11. Impact: What is the impact of the project? Is there a verifiable way to measure impact?
12. Sustainability: Is there any plan by the applicant to continue the activity beyond the submitted timeframe and ensure its sustainability? If yes, please describe future plans.
13. Media: Describe and explain plans for generating media coverage for the activity.
14. Cooperation: List any individuals, organizations, or government agencies that will be involved with the applicant in conducting this activity.
15. Proof of Support: If the project requires the support or cooperation of a governmental office, include a letter from the appropriate government official indicating his/her support.

Section II - Budget

All applications for TAG grants must be accompanied by a detailed budget, including:

1. Amount and explanation for all budgeted costs
2. List of other donor contributions to proposed activity (if any)
3. Applicant's cost-share or contribution to proposed activity

(Indicate whether applicant is contributing cash or in-kind contributions, and

provide a dollar value and explanation for each item.)

4. Total amount in \$US of grant requested

See “Guidelines for Budget Preparation” section of the TAG application for all details.

Section III - Experience/Capacity

If an organization or business is applying for the TAG Grant, please provide the following background information with the TAG Application:

- Copy of registration with Government of Lebanon
- List of board members (for NGOs and companies)
- Information about mission statement, offices, and staffing
- Information about other activities and previous experience with donor agencies

If an individual is applying for the TAG Grant, please provide a current CV and three professional letters of recommendation with the TAG application.

Transparency and Accountability Grants

Baseline Questions

These questions are to be addressed along with the grant application form.

1. Has your group previously conducted any activities focused on transparency, accountability, anti-corruption, or good governance? Please describe previous activities.

2. Has your group done any advocacy or lobbying work in the past? Please describe previous activities and partners.

3. Has your group used the media in their activities before? Please describe.

4. Has your group contacted member(s) of the local or national government before? For what purpose? How many times? What was the result?

Transparency and Accountability Grants (TAG)

Guidelines for Budget Preparation

Only properly prepared, clear budgets that have reasonable and allowable cost items will be approved. Here are a few tips on budgeting for TAG activities:

1. All costs must be reasonable.
2. All goods and services included in the budget must be necessary to carry out the activities described in the proposal.
3. Only include costs directly related to carrying out the activity. Any support or administrative costs must be kept to a minimum.
4. Only that labor which is required specifically for the project will be considered, and compensation must be based upon the person's compensation for other projects during the last two years. If labor is approved in the grant, formalized timesheets will have to be completed throughout the project duration.
5. No operating costs (such as utilities, rent, maintenance, overhead, etc.) can be charged to the grant. Such expenses should be excluded from the TAG share of the budget, but may be included as part of the applicant's cost-share.
6. No taxes, including Value Added Tax (VAT) or other taxes, can be charged to the grant.
7. All prices must be at current market prices.
8. Be specific when describing the assumptions you are making as you calculate the cost. Indicate unit cost, quantity, total cost, and cost-share for each line item.
9. If equipment is required for the activity, consider if rental of the equipment is possible and practical. If equipment must be purchased, describe the equipment as clearly and completely as possible, providing the comparable rental cost for the same equipment and timeframe.

Cost-Share and Matching Grants

Cost-sharing refers to your organization's contribution to the project activity. Generally speaking organizations that demonstrate the ability to contribute to the success of the project (with cash or in-kind contributions) will receive a more favorable review. If your organization is unable to provide cost-share towards the project activity please explain fully. Cost-share may be in the form of funds (from your organization or another donor - excluding US government funds), or in-kind, as described below. Successful applicants will be required to report on cost-share contributions as part of their regular financial reporting to AMIDEAST, so budgeting for these funds should be done with care.

Funds from your organization or another donor: Please identify funds that will be contributed by your organization or another donor to facilitate the success of the project activity. These costs must be necessary and reasonable for the success of the project activity. If funds are from another donor please mention the donor. Also mention the degree of certainty of receiving these funds: Are the funds assured (signed agreement), probable, or possible (application has been submitted)?

In-kind: In-kind contribution represents time, resources, commodities, or services received or provided by the organization towards the success of the project activity. As mentioned above these contributions must be necessary and reasonable. Examples of in-kind contributions would include:

- Volunteer's time or staff time used towards project aims but not charged to the AMIDEAST portion of the budget. Calculate the value by estimating the hours to be used times a value per hour that is similar to the market value for these services if these services were paid.
- Resources or commodities may include office space used, equipment used, vehicles, office supplies, computer supplies, etc. Estimate the value by establishing a rate for that particular resource or commodity and multiplying by the quantity to be used.
- Services may include donated professional services such as legal, accounting, media and advertising, consultant's fees, etc. These amounts should be estimated based upon equivalent market value.

Please show all assumptions and calculations used in determining cost share amounts.

SAMPLE BUDGET FORMAT FOR TAG APPLICATIONS*

Anticipated Expenditures	Per Unit Cost	Quantity	Total Amount	TAG Share	Cost-Share
Project Labor (if any)					
1	Project Director				
2	Expert Consultant				
3	Project Assistant				
4					
5					
6					
7					
Project Costs					
1	Printing				
2	Graphic Design				
3	Meetings & Conferences				
4	Honoraria				
5	Equipment Rental				
6	Distribution				
7	Website Development & Hosting				
8	Supplies				
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
Indirect Costs					
	Office Rent				
	Supplies				
	Telephone/ Communication				
	Insurance				
	Utilities / Electricity				
	Taxes				
	TOTALS				

*Line items listed are illustrative only and each project budget should list its specific requirements.

Transparency and Accountability Grants Project Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

1. Who is AMIDEAST?
2. Who is funding the TAG project?
3. What are the eligibility criteria for TAG funding?
4. How do I apply for TAG funding?
5. Does TAG fund research activities?
6. What if I cannot complete my activity as agreed in the grant contract?
7. If I receive a grant from TAG, will I have to undergo a financial audit?
8. What are examples of what I can and cannot ask for in the budget?
9. Can I purchase things myself and then charge AMIDEAST afterward?
10. Can I sell things that were funded by TAG, such as books, pamphlets, stickers and T-shirts?
11. Can I receive other donor funding for my proposed activity?
12. Who is eligible for TAG funding - individuals, companies, or NGO's?
13. Is cost-sharing by the applicant required?

1. Who is AMIDEAST?

America-Mideast Educational and Training Services (AMIDEAST) has over 50 years of experience in implementing and managing education and development programs throughout the Middle East and North Africa. AMIDEAST has been implementing programs encouraging overall democracy and governance objectives, especially in the legal, judicial, and civil society sectors. The Lebanon office has been in operation since 1967, and is registered with the Government of Lebanon. The current Country Director is Mrs. Barbara Shahin Batlouni.

2. Who is funding the TAG project?

The Transparency and Accountability Grants Project is funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in Lebanon. A total of nearly \$7,000,000 in grant funds will be distributed by TAG in the period from March 2001 through July 2010.

3. What are the eligibility criteria for TAG funding?

Projects should reflect new, innovative ideas that do not duplicate previously implemented projects in Lebanon. In addition, these projects should be innovative initiatives that aim at increasing transparency, accountability, and/or good governance within Lebanon. Applicants for TAG may be local organization or individuals.

Full details about criteria can be found in the handout titled “Transparency and Accountability Grants: Grant Criteria” and on our website: www.amideast.org/lebanon/TAG

4. How do I apply for TAG funding?

Contact the TAG office at AMIDEAST:

AMIDEAST
Bazerkan Building, first floor
Nijmeh Square
Beirut Central District
P.O. Box 11-2190
Riad El Solh, Beirut 1107 2100
Lebanon

Phone: (961) (1) 989901, ext. 131
Fax: (961) (1) 989901, ext. 100
Web Site: <http://www.amideast.org/lebanon>
Email: Lebanon@amideast.org

5. Does TAG fund research activities?

The TAG activity does not fund short-term or long-term research projects. However, grants can be made to activities that include research as part of the activity, if that research is an important step to achieve the action part of the activity.

6. What if I cannot complete my activity as agreed in the grant contract?

If the Grantee does not fulfill the conditions outlined in the grant, AMIDEAST reserves the right to confiscate equipment or terminate the grant agreement after prior discussion with the Grantee. In extraordinary circumstances, and with strong justification from the Grantee, AMIDEAST may elect to extend the period of time for an activity and a modification to the agreement will be signed by AMIDEAST and the grantee.

7. If I receive a grant from TAG, will I have to undergo a financial audit?

Financial reports and expenditures for TAG-funded projects will be reviewed regularly by AMIDEAST to ensure compliance with the financial regulations that govern US government funding. In addition, grantees agree to maintain their records for possible audit for a period of up to three years. As a matter of policy, AMIDEAST encourages annual external financial audits. In case a Grantee undergoes an external audit that includes a review of TAG funding, a copy of the final audit report should be forwarded to AMIDEAST.

8. What are examples of what I can and cannot ask for in the budget?

An organization’s proposal should include only those items in the budget that are needed specifically to conduct the TAG-funded activity (and not other routine activities of the applicant).

AMIDEAST is not able to provide any funding to active duty members of the military or

police (this includes salaries, honorariums, transportation, lodging, funds for security service from the police, etc.).

AMIDEAST can pay honoraria or consulting fees for academics or professionals providing “intellectual products,” such as expertise or acting as a facilitator or lecturer. However, we cannot provide any funding for salaries or honoraria for Lebanese government officials.

AMIDEAST cannot pay for an organization’s routine operating costs, such as rent, electricity, overhead, telephone bills, etc. AMIDEAST will only fund tasks and items associated with the particular TAG activity being carried out.

AMIDEAST cannot pay for any form of tax or value added tax, to an organization’s activities associated with the particular TAG activity being carried out.

AMIDEAST will not provide funding for construction costs.

Funding for staff salaries of an organization will be considered only for that portion of a staff person’s time that is devoted exclusively to the TAG-funded activity. The portion of each person’s time listed in the budget must be specified (e.g. full-time, 20% of time, etc.)

9. Can I purchase things myself and then charge AMIDEAST afterward?

All expenditures must be allowable as per the specific terms of your grant agreement, which is signed before the activity commences and before TAG funds are given to an applicant. Provided the grant agreement is signed and the items are accounted for in the budget proposal, items may be purchased prior to disbursement of funds.

10. Can I sell things that were funded by TAG, such as books, pamphlets, stickers and T-shirts? Sale of program output and the receipt of the resulting program income is allowed, provided the funds are used to promote the objectives and tasks of the grant activity.

11. Can I receive other donor funding for my proposed activity?

If other donor funding is agreed upon prior to the signing of the Grant Agreement, then details of the funds should be included in the proposal and financial statements. If, however, donor funding is to come after the signing of the Grant Agreement, then:

- a. All details must be discussed with TAG administrators in advance, AND
- b. May be allowed if an increase in activity output is expected and reasonable.

12. Who is eligible for TAG funding - individuals, companies, or NGO’s?

Applicants for TAG grants may be local organizations, companies or individuals. International or American organizations are ineligible for grants, except for established American educational institutions within Lebanon. NGOs and companies should submit a copy of their registration.

13. Is cost-sharing by the applicant required?

Cost-sharing by the applicant is strongly preferred and encouraged. Such cost-sharing may be cash or in-kind contributions.

Annex 3: List of Key Informants Interviewed

TAG #	Office	Title	Name	Contact Info
22, 31, 41, 60, 78, 87, 174	Institute of Finance	Director	Lamia Moubayed / Rania Abu Habib	(01) 425149 l.moubayed@if.org.lb
135, 103, 167	Ministry of Economy	Acting Director General	Representative of Fouad Flayfel	(01) 982298 ffleifel@economy.gov.lb
164, 166	Ministry of Education	Director General	Fady Yarak	01-789905-906 fyarak@mehe.gov.lb
100, 145, 165	State Council	Head of State Council	Judge Shukri Sader	01-427844 (Ms. Viviane)/Assistant
	Independent Consultant	Independent Consultant	Khalil Jabbara	(03) 417642 khalil.gebara@gmail.com
96, 131	WIT		Ms. Salam Yamout	(01) 983022 ext 146 syamout@pcm.gov.lb
	Independent Consultant	Professor	Dr. Randa Antoun	03686868 Person knowledgeable about TAG
	AMIDEAST	Former AMIDEAST Staff Member	Myna Shidrawi	03 364651 Former TAG Staff Member
23	TA	Chairman	Gina Shammar,	01 70190
	Independent Consultant	President	Khatoun Haidar	01747347 Person Knowledgeable about TAG
133	LACPA	Former Naqib	Hikmat Sleem	01 35061
130	AMCHAM	Chairman	Salim Zeeni	01 985330
92	LHCMA	Chairman	Dr. Nabil Kronfol	01 374337
69, 120	CFWI		Abla Kaddi	03 269 041
125	CCIA		Fady Saab	

Annex 4: List of Focus Group Discussants

Focus Group I : Wednesday 2 March, 2011

76, 95, 100, 144, 145	SADER Publishers	Maitre Rany Sader	Beirut	
		(01) 88775/6 - (03)733224		
		rany@sadereditors.com		
109	Justice without Frontiers (JWF)	Maitre Brigitte Chelebian	Beirut	
		(01) 890877 - (03) 702113	Jdeideh	
		jwf@jwf.org.lb		
8, 32, 81, 107, 141	International Management and Training Institute (IMTI)	Jean Dib Hajj	Beirut	
		03 395806 -- 01 487811	Dora Square	
		jdibhajj@gmail.com		
115	Nahwa al-Muwatiniya (Towards Citizenship)	Gilbert Doumit	Beirut	
		(01) 565808 - (03) 227673	Ashrafieh	
		gilbert@beyondct.com		
129	Telecom Regulatory Authority (TRA)	Mahasen Ajam X	Beirut	Attended
		03 - 882992	Marfaa	Natalie Bustani
		m.ajam@tra.gov.lb		Corine Feghali
106	YMCA	Joe Awad	Beirut	Attended
		(01) 490640 (03)302096	Sin El Fil	Lady Manoukian
		admin@imtimed.com		

Focus Group II: Thursday 3 March, 2011

TAG #	Name of Organization	Contacts	E-mail	Other contacts
147 – 165	Lebanese Association for philosophy of law (ALIPHID)	Dr. George Saad	gsaadro@hotmail.com	03-488014
146	Green Hand Organization (GHO)	Zaher Radwan	zredwan@greenland.org.lb info@greenland.org.lb	03-760854
136	Lebanon Iqra' Association	Mariam Moubassaly Rima Musallam	Iqra_association@yahoo.com	01-365149
14 – 62 – 99 – 124	YASA	Ziad Akl	ziad@yasa.org	03-601972

Focus Group III: Friday 4 March, 2011

TAG #	Name of Organization	Contacts	E-mail	Other contacts
151 – 175	Kunhadi	Ms. Mirna Mneimne	Mirna.mneimneh@gmail.com	03-600988
182	Beeatoona	Mrs. Patricia Khoury	Patricia.khoury@beeatoona.org	03-120638
167 – 172	Brand Protection Group	Mrs. Kawkab Sinno	Kawkab.sinno@transmed.com	03-309223
142 – 177	Lebanese Center for Civic Education	Mrs. Roula Mikhael	roulamikhael@hotmail.com	03-612413
159	Sesobel	Ms. Julia Issa	project@sosobel.org	03-899411
166	Lebanese Association for Education Studies	Dr. Norma Ghemrawi	Dr.norma_ghamrawi@hotmail.com	03-975137
50	Information International	Miss Ghida Margi	quality@information-international.com	03-006854
69 – 120	CFUWI	Mrs. Abla Kadi	ablakadi@hotmail.com	03-269041
162	Common Effort	Mr. Hadi Jaafar	Hadi.j@common-effort.org	70-020180

Focus Group IV: Wednesday 9 March, 2011

TAG #	Name of Organization	Contacts	E-mail	Other contacts
160	IDRAAC	Ms. Lynn Farah	indraac@indraac.org lynnf@indraac.org	01-583583 03-784912
164	EAID	Mr. Abdou Yammine	abdonada@schoolnet.edu.lb	03-309703
176	Excellence in Leadership and learning Foundation	Mr. Taan Chaib	taanchaib@gmail.com	03-441991 70-044566

Focus Group V: Thursday 10 March, 2011

TAG #	Name of Organization	Contacts	E-mail	Other contacts
67-98-132	Christian Association for Blind	Mr. Michel Harika Mr. Hassan Mollouhi	cadblind@terra.net.lb	70-873240 01-686039
44-148	Contact and Resource Center	Ms. Rita Maalouf Ms. Sabah Mrad	Crc.go@hotmail.com	03-686377 01-510261
171	The Lebanese Physical Handicapped Union	Ms. Dima Wehbe	Sabah_mrad@hotmail.com	

Focus Group VI: Wednesday 16 March, 2011

TAG #	Organization	Contact Name	Email	Tel	Website
127	Youth Without Frontiers	Lara Chlela (on behalf of Dany Daou)	lara.chlela@gmail.com dany.j.daou@gmail.com	03-631379	www.jsf.org.lb

134	Youth Economic Forum (YEF)	YahyaMawloud Cedric Choukeir	ymawloud@gmail.com cedricchoukeir@hotmail.com	03-090045 71-276740	www.yef-lb.org
153	The Institute of Progressive Women (IPW)	Samar Hamdan	wafaabed@yahoo.com samar.hamdan@gmail.com	03-600588 03-771533	
66-85	Center for Middle Eastern Strategic Studies (CESMO)	Ms. Nada Moutragi	Nada.moutragi@cesmo.org	06-429990 03-650791	www.cesmo.org

Focus Group Meeting VII: Tuesday 22 March, 2011

TAG #	Organization	Contact Name	Email	Tel	Website
122-114	Rawdat Al-Fayhaa Alumni Association / The Bar Association in Tripoli	Fehmi Karami	fkarami@dm.net.lb	06-434300 03-826602	http://www.rawda.org/aboutus.html http://www.nlbar.org.lb/english/index.aspx
137	Lebanese Council of Women	FaikaTurkiyeh	faikaaturkieh@gmail.com	03-960419	
63	Environment and Development Magazine	Boghos Ghougassian	boghos@mectat.com.lb	01 321800	
73	The Committee for Women Political Empowerment	Hayat Arslan	aarslan@cyberia.net.lb	05 555711	
74	Lebanese Foundation for Permanent Civil Peace	Rabih Kays	rabihhaysyaho.com	03-883118	

Focus Group Meeting VIII: Thursday 24 March, 2011

TAG #	Organization	Contact Name	Email	Tel
19 154	T & E Solutions	Mr Fadi Hajjar	Elhajjar.fadi@gmail.com	03- 765846 or 01/755939
11, 102	Byblos Ecologia	Dr. Fifi Kallab	becologia@hotmail.com	03/44 44 01
189	Partnership Center for Development & Democracy	Mr Wafic Hawari	Welhawari@hotmail.com	03-843616
183	Injaz	Mr Jad Tamer	Jad@injaz-lebanon.org	03-038661

Annex 5: List of Documents Reviewed¹⁷

TAG #	Grantee/Organization	Project
17	NARD	Training on Transparency & Accountability for NGO's and media
32	International Management and Training Institute (IMTI)	NGO Finance Manual
33	Hariri Foundation	Students' Manual on Rights + Responsibilities in Schools
40	Association for the Defense of Rights and Liberties (ADDL)	Human rights: Freedom to Publish; Freedom of Assembly
42	ASSABIL Association	Human, Women, Children rights resource
44	Contact and Resource Center	Rights of Disabled
50	Information International	Corruption Perception Index
54	LAPNAC (Moukhtara)	Town Hall and Public Forums
62	Youth Association for Social Awareness (YASA)	New Traffic Law
67	Children Association for the Blind	“Know your rights: Law 220” Guide in Braille
69	Non-Governmental Committee for the Follow-up on Women’s issues	Act to Abolish Discrimination Against Women In Lebanese Law
79	Partners for Development	Professional Ethics in Community Work
96	Women in Information Technology (WIT)	WIT Website and Portal
100	SADER Publishers	International Treaties Compendium
102	Byblos Ecologia	Good Citizen’s Passport
103	Brand Protection Group	Counterfeit Hotline

¹⁷ For each project the documents reviewed include (a) Progress Reports; (b) Grant Application Form; (c) Grant Agreement and Modifications; (d) Close-out Summary; (e) Press Clippings; (f) Project Outputs (i.e., brochures, posters, studies); (g) Application Review Form; (h) Impact Assessment (where available); and (i) Correspondence between Grantee and AMIDEAST

106	Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA)	Principles of Good Governance for Cooperatives
109	Justice without frontiers	Capacity building for NGO on Legal issues: Justice without frontiers
115	Nahwa al-Muwatiniya (Towards Citizenship)	Towards Accountability: Citizen's Parliament Monitor
117	Center for Economic Information (InfoPro)	Government Relief and Reconstruction Websites
120	Non-Governmental Committee for the Follow-up on Women's issues	Act to Abolish Discrimination Against Women In Lebanese Law
128	AUBMC Nursing services	Accountability in the Nursing Profession
129	Telecommunication Regulatory Authority	TRA Website and Information Database
134	Youth Economic Forum (YEF)	Youth for Social and Economic Reform
136	Lebanon Iqra' Association	Transparency and Accountability for the Youth Generations
139	American University of Beirut	Bicharaf in High Schools
140	Lebanese Board on Books for Young People	Educating Young Adults in Citizenship
142	Lebanese Center for Civic Education (LCCE)	Investigative Journalism: A Tool for fighting corruption
146	Green Hand Organization	Youth and Municipalities: New participatory governance
149	American University of Beirut, Faculty of Public Health	Safe Work in Lebanese Bakeries: From Policy to Practice
150	Daily Star	Access to Information: Cornerstone of Transparency and accountability
151	KunHadi	A culture of road safety
152	MAJAL, ALBA	Promoting Public Consultation in Urban Policy
153	Institute of Progressive Women	Custodial Bank Accounts – End Gender Discrimination
154	Transformative and Empowering Solutions	Disability ID Awareness and Enforcement Campaign
157	Center for Economic information (InfoPro)	Public Procurement Transparency
158	National Commission for Lebanese Women	Empowering Lebanese Women: E-Center for Lebanese Women

159	Social Service for the Welfare of Children in Lebanon (SESOBEL)	Children advocating children rights
162	Common Effort	Shadow Youth Municipal Councils
165	Lebanese Association for Philosophy of Law ALIPHID	Justice delayed is justice denied
166	Lebanese Association for Education Studies (LAES)	National Quality Assurance Body for Higher Education in Lebanon
168	Justicia Foundation for Development and Human Rights	Equal under the Law: Know your rights 2
170	Lebanese syndicate of craftsmen	Capacity Building of Craftsmen Syndicate
171	Lebanese Physical Handicapped Union	Model Cabinet of Ministers – Public budget
173	Lebanese Economic Association	Increasing Accountability of Government Spending
174	Lebanese Association of Societal Synergy	Citizen Information Pamphlets – Ministry of Finance
178	Lebanon Green Building Council	Energy Efficiency Standards
180	Beyond Organization	Women’s rights monitor
181	Vision Association for Development Rehabilitation and Care	Modern Public Healthcare Regulation
182	Beeatouna Organization	E-waste Management
183	Injaz Lebanon	Business Ethics Program in High Schools

Annex 6: Focus Group Discussion Checklist

Date and Time			
Place			
Objective			
Facilitator		Topic	Transparency/ Accountability/Good Governance
Minutes takers		Target Groups	Grantees (CSOs)
Schedule			
Introduction / Message for the Grantees			
<p>My name is _____ and my colleague's name is _____. We are from the USAID/Lebanon Performance Management Plan for Lebanon (PMPL) Project team. We are evaluating the AMIDEAST implemented Transparency & Accountability Grant Project to determine what was achieved, the challenges, successes and lessons and recommendations for future projects. Thus we would like you to share with us your experiences and opinions based on a few questions. We are interested in your feedback about the project.</p> <p>Please be informed that your identity will not be revealed with your answers, so feel free to say whatever you want. Also please be assured that any answer you provide will not affect in any way your relationship with AMIDEAST or its partners.</p> <p>We have around two hours, and we will use the recorder to facilitate note taking. Answers have to be clear and concise and within the time limit for each question. (State some ground/ engagement rules) Thanks again for your participation. Here we start.</p>			
Ice Breaker			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you know about the Transparency and Accountability Grants project? 10 min 			
Main Focus			
<u>A. Effectiveness related questions: 15 min</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the major results you stated to achieve in the grant agreement; and did you achieve them in a timely manner? 2. What are the major Challenges that you faced throughout the process? 3. What are the major factors that helped you to achieve the results in a timely manner? 4. What is your opinion on the “cost sharing” and “grant ceiling” issues, and what is the ideal formula/ ceiling for effective implementation of a project like this? 			
<u>B. Gender Sensitivity related questions: 20 min</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did your project address the different needs faced by men and women? If yes how, and if no, why not? 			
<u>C. Impact related questions: 30 min</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the AMIDEAST grant influence transparency, accountability or governance practices in your organization? If yes, how, and if no, why not? 2. To what extent did your projects promote (<u>Transparency/ Accountability/Good Governance</u>) within the targeted population / beneficiaries groups? 3. Please share with the group lessons you learned / success stories during the implementation of the grant funded activities? 			
<u>D. Sustainability related question: 20 min</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did your activity continue after the end of the funding? If yes how, and if no why not? 			

E. Ending Questions: 20 min

1. Anyone would like to share any other opinion/ recommendation on the above points?

**Thank you for your time
The Evaluation team**

Notes for the FGD Facilitator:

1. Share with team the definition of the FGD topic, taking into consideration the following :
 - a. **Accountability** means that decision-makers in the private sector, the central and municipal government offices are legally responsible for their actions, decisions and policies produced within the scope of their position and are obliged to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences to citizens like you.
 - b. **Transparency** refers to the processes, institutions and information that decision-makers and the offices they manage use to provide clear and easily understandable information to their members and citizens so that both the members and the citizens can use the information to access services provided and also can understand the decisions made and why and can hold the decision-makers accountable.
 - c. **Good governance** relates to those actions and decision-making processes and procedures used by a governing body in the private sector (e.g., the Board of Directors), or the public sector (Minister or the Head of the Municipality and their close associates and advisors etc), and that these decisions are taken in a participatory and consultative manner, with the concerned citizens. It also relates to the degree that these actions and decisions are respectful of the country's constitutions, rules and regulations, and ensure that decisions taken are transparent, effective, efficient and equitable.
2. If any of the CBOs shared a valuable success story, please ask him to write it down or make sure that he will be sending the story by email. Please take his contact addresses to be able to follow up with him/her on the matter.

Annex 7: Key Informant Interview Checklist

A. Key- Informant Interview with Civil Society & Private Sector

Date and Time			
Place			
Objective			
Facilitator		Topic	Transparency/ Accountability/Good Governance
Minutes takers		Informant Name and Position	Civil Society/Private Sector
Schedule			
Introduction / Message for the Grantees			
<p>My name is _____ and my colleague's name is _____. We are from Social Impact, Inc. Under contract with USAID, Social Impact is currently implementing Performance Management Plan for Lebanon Project (PMPL). The PMPL project was requested by USAID to evaluate the AMIDEAST implemented Transparency & Accountability Grant Project to determine what was achieved, the challenges, successes and lessons and recommendations for future projects. Thus we would like you to share with us your experiences and opinions based on a few questions. We are interested in your feedback about the project.</p> <p>Please be informed that your identity will not be revealed with your responses, so feel free to say whatever you want. Also please be assured that any response you provide will not affect in any way your relationship with AMIDEAST or its partners. We also ask your permission to record this interview to facilitate our note taking. Thanks for taking time out to meet and talk with us. Here we start.</p>			
Before we begin			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please share with us the nature of your involvement in the Transparency and Accountability Grants project implemented by AMIDEAST? 			
Main Focus			
<u>A. Project Effectiveness</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In your opinion what are the major achievements of the project? 2. In your opinion what were the major challenges the project faced with regard to promoting transparency and accountability or good governance? 3. Did project output impact or influence decisions or procedure at the level of your organization? If yes, in what way? 			
<u>B. Gender Sensitivity</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. In your opinion did these USG funded activities address gender issues? If yes, how? 			
<u>C. Project Impact</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. In your opinion, did the project promote transparency, accountability or good governance practices? If yes, did your organization adopt / benefit from some of these practices? Please give us some examples. 			
<u>D. Sustainability</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. In your opinion, do you believe that achievements and initiatives started by the TAG project 			

will continue after the project funding is discontinued? If yes how, and if no why not?

E. Concluding Remarks

7. Please share with us any other point related to the TAG project.

**Thank you for your time
The Evaluation team**

Notes for the KII Facilitator:

1. Please define and discuss the following terms and concepts before starting the interview.
 - a. **Accountability** means that decision-makers in the private sector, the central and municipal government offices are legally responsible for their actions, decisions and policies produced within the scope of their position and are obliged to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences to citizens like you.
 - b. **Transparency** refers to the processes, institutions and information that decision-makers and the offices they manage use to provide clear and easily understandable information to their members and citizens so that both the members and the citizens can use the information to access services provided and also can understand the decisions made and why and can hold the decision-makers accountable.
 - c. **Good governance** relates to those actions and decision-making processes and procedures used by a governing body in the private sector (e.g., the Board of Directors), or the public sector (Minister or the Head of the Municipality and their close associates and advisors etc), and that these decisions are taken in a participatory and consultative manner, with the concerned citizens. It also relates to the degree that these actions and decisions are respectful of the country's constitutions, rules and regulations, and ensure that decisions taken are transparent, effective, efficient and equitable.
2. If the KI shared a valuable success story, please ask the interviewee to write it down or make sure that he will be sending the story by email. Please take his contact addresses to be able to follow up with him/her on the matter.

B. Key- Informant Interview with AMIDEAST

Date and Time			
Place			
Objective			
Facilitator		Topic	TAG Project
Minutes takers		Informant Name and Position	AMIDEAST
Schedule			
Introduction / Message for the Grantees			
<p>As you know, USAID has asked us to evaluate the Transparency & Accountability Grant Project implemented by your organization to determine what was achieved, the challenges, successes and lessons and recommendations for future projects. Thus we would like you to share with us your experiences and opinions based on a few questions.</p> <p>Thanks again for your cooperation. Here we start.</p>			
Main Focus			
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>A. Relevance of the Project:</u></p> <p>1. In your opinion, was the project relevant to the USG’s country strategy?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>B. Effectiveness of the Project</u></p> <p>2. Did the project have a Performance Management Plan (PMP) that spelled-out the objective and the expected results of the project? If yes, please give us a copy of the project PMP.</p> <p>3. In your opinion, did the project achieve the PMP results and purpose of promoting and fostering transparency and accountability within the Lebanese government and society? If yes please give us concrete examples.</p> <p>4. What were the major challenges or factors that hindered or helped you to achieve the results and report to USAID on a timely manner?</p> <p>5. What is your opinion on the “cost sharing” and “grant ceiling” issues, and from your experience what is the ideal formula/ceiling for effective implementation of a grant project such as this one.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>C. Gender Sensitivity</u></p> <p>6. What instruction was given to Grantees to incorporate gender sensitivity in their activities? Was gender sensitivity a requirement of the Cooperative Agreement? If yes, please explain.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>D. Sustainability Project Output and Results</u></p> <p>7. Was sustainability a factor in the management of grant funded activities? In your opinion, which outputs and results seem to be sustainable and will continue after the TAG project is closed-out on February 28, 2011?</p>			

Thank you for your time
The Evaluation team

Notes for the KII Facilitator:

1. Please review these definitions and concepts with the Key Informant
 - a. **Accountability** means that decision-makers in the private sector, the central and municipal government offices are legally responsible for their actions, decisions and policies produced within the scope of their position and are obliged to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences to citizens like you.
 - b. **Transparency** refers to the processes, institutions and information that decision-makers and the offices they manage use to provide clear and easily understandable information to their members and citizens so that both the members and the citizens can use the information to access services provided and also can understand the decisions made and why and can hold the decision-makers accountable.
 - c. **Good governance** relates to those actions and decision-making processes and procedures used by a governing body in the private sector (e.g., the Board of Directors), or the public sector (Minister or the Head of the Municipality and their close associates and advisors etc), and that these decisions are taken in a participatory and consultative manner, with the concerned citizens. It also relates to the degree that these actions and decisions are respectful of the country's constitutions, rules and regulations, and ensure that decisions taken are transparent, effective, efficient and equitable.

C. Key- Informant Interview with Government Counterparts

Date and Time			
Place			
Objective			
Facilitator		Topic	Transparency/ Accountability/Good Governance
Minutes takers		Informant Name and Position	Government Counterpart
Schedule			
Introduction / Message for the Grantees			
<p>My name is _____ and my colleague's name is _____. We are from Social Impact, Inc. Under contract with USAID, Social Impact is currently implementing Performance Management Plan for Lebanon Project (PMPL). The PMPL project was requested by USAID to evaluate the AMIDEAST implemented Transparency & Accountability Grant Project to determine what was achieved, the challenges, successes and lessons and recommendations for future projects. Thus we would like you to share with us your experiences and opinions based on a few questions. We are interested in your feedback about the project.</p> <p>Please be informed that your identity will not be revealed with your responses, so feel free to express your views regarding the project performance, management and impact. Also please be assured that any response you provide will not affect in any way your relationship with AMIDEAST or its partners. We also ask your permission to record this interview to facilitate our note taking. Thanks for taking time out to meet and talk with us. Here we start.</p>			
Before we begin			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please share with us the nature of your involvement in the Transparency and Accountability Grants project implemented by AMIDEAST? 			
Main Focus			
<u>A. Project Effectiveness</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In your opinion what are the major achievements of the project? 2. In your opinion what were the major challenges the project faced with regard to promoting transparency and accountability or good governance? 3. Did project output impact or influence decisions or procedures in your organization (ministry/municipality)? 			
<u>B. Gender Sensitivity</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. In your opinion did these USG funded activities address gender issues? If yes, how? 			
<u>C. Project Impact</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. In your opinion, did the project promoted transparency, accountability or good governance practices? If yes, did your organization adopt some of these practices? If yes, please give us some examples. 			
<u>D. Sustainability</u>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. In your opinion, do you believe that achievements and initiative started by the TAG project will continue after the project is discontinued? If yes how, and if no why not? 			
<u>E. Concluding Remarks</u>			

7. Please share with us any other point related to the TAG project.

Thank you for your time

Notes for the KII Facilitator:

1. Please define and discuss the following terms and concepts before starting the interview.
 - a. **Accountability** means that decision-makers in the private sector, the central and municipal government offices are legally responsible for their actions, decisions and policies produced within the scope of their position and are obliged to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences to citizens like you.
 - b. **Transparency** refers to the processes, institutions and information that decision-makers and the offices they manage use to provide clear and easily understandable information to their members and citizens so that both the members and the citizens can use the information to access services provided and also can understand the decisions made and why and can hold the decision-makers accountable.
 - c. **Good governance** relates to those actions and decision-making processes and procedures used by a governing body in the private sector (e.g., the Board of Directors), or the public sector (Minister or the Head of the Municipality and their close associates and advisors etc), and that these decisions are taken in a participatory and consultative manner, with the concerned citizens. It also relates to the degree that these actions and decisions are respectful of the country's constitutions, rules and regulations, and ensure that decisions taken are transparent, effective, efficient and equitable.
2. If the KI shared a valuable success story, please ask the interviewee to write it down or make sure that he will be sending the story by email. Please take his contact addresses to be able to follow up with him/her on the matter.

D. Key Informant Interview with USAID

Date and Time			
Place			
Objective			
Facilitator		Topic	TAG Project
Minutes takers		Informant Name and Position	USAID
Schedule			
Introduction / Message for the Grantees			
<p>My name is _____ and my colleague's name is _____. We are from the USAID Performance Management Plan for Lebanon Project (PMPL) team. Upon USAID's request, we are evaluating the AMIDEAST implemented Transparency & Accountability Grant Project to determine what was achieved, the challenges, successes and lessons and recommendations for future projects. Thus we would like you to share with us your experiences and opinions based on a few questions. We are interested in your feedback about the project.</p> <p>Thanks for making the time to talk to us. Here we start.</p>			
<u>A. Relevance of the TAG Project to USG Strategy for Lebanon/Region</u>			
1. In your opinion was the project relevant to USAID's country strategy?			
<u>B. Effectiveness of the Project with Respect to Achieving the Intended Outcomes</u>			
2. In your opinion, did AMIDEAST achieve the project purpose of promoting and fostering accountability and transparency within the local and central government institutions and the private sector including civil society organizations?			
3. What were the challenges you faced with AMIDEAST and the TAG project as AOTR? Did AMIDEAST comply with the Cooperative Agreement requirements as amended?			
<u>C. Gender Sensitivity</u>			
4. Was gender sensitivity an integral component of the Cooperative Agreement?			
<u>D. Sustainability</u>			
5. Was sustainability of activities supported by this small grants project (TAG) factored into the Cooperative Agreement as amended?			
Thank you for your time The Evaluation team			

Notes for the KII Facilitator:

1. Define and explain the following terms and concepts before you begin the interview :
 - a. **Accountability** means that decision-makers in the private sector, the central and municipal government offices are legally responsible for their actions, decisions and policies produced within the scope of their position and are obliged to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences to citizens like you.
 - b. **Transparency** refers to the processes, institutions and information that decision-makers and the offices they manage use to provide clear and easily understandable information to their members and citizens so that both the members and the citizens can use the information to access services provided and also can understand the decisions made and why and can hold the decision-makers accountable.
 - c. **Good governance** relates to those actions and decision-making processes and procedures used by a governing body in the private sector (e.g., the Board of Directors), or the public sector (Minister or the Head of the Municipality and their close associates and advisors etc), and that these decisions are taken in a participatory and consultative manner, with the concerned citizens. It also relates to the degree that these actions and decisions are respectful of the country's constitutions, rules and regulations, and ensure that decisions taken are transparent, effective, efficient and equitable.

Annex 8: Sample Opinion Survey Questionnaire

My name is _____. I am from the USAID Performance Management Plan for Lebanon Project Team. We are currently evaluating The AMIDEAST implemented Transparency & Accountability Grants project. As a beneficiary in one of the activities supported by this project we would like to ask you a few questions. Please fill free to respond to our questions openly. Your name and the information you give us will be kept confidential and it will not affect your relationship with the people you work with. However, the information you give us will help the United States Government to provide more projects to benefit the Lebanese people.

Let me define a few terms for you so that you can frame your response to my questions more accurately. In the project implemented by AMIDEAST the following definitions were used:

- **Accountability** means that decision-makers in the private sector, the central and municipal government offices are legally responsible for their actions, decisions and policies produced within the scope of their position and are obliged to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences to citizens like you.
- **Transparency** refers to the processes, institutions and information that decision-makers and the offices they manage use to provide clear and easily understandable information to their members and citizens so that both the members and the citizens can use the information to access services provided and also can understand the decisions made and why and can hold the decision-makers accountable.
- **Good governance** relates to those actions and decision-making processes and procedures used by a governing body in the private sector (e.g., the Board of Directors), or the public sector (Minister or the Head of the Municipality and their close associates and advisors etc), and that these decisions are taken in a participatory and consultative manner, with the concerned citizens. It also relates to the degree that these actions and decisions are respectful of the country's constitutions, rules and regulations, and ensure that decisions taken are transparent, effective, efficient and equitable.

Do you have any questions for me? If not, let us start the question and answer process.

General Information

Governorate: _____

City: _____

Municipality: _____

Place of Meeting with Respondent: _____

Grantee (CSO name): _____

The TAG-supported Grant Activity Title:

Name of the Enumerator: _____

Date: _____

Name of Respondent (Optional):

Respondent's Profile

1. Respondents Sex: Male ___ Female ____
2. What is your marital status?
 - a. Married
 - b. Widow
 - c. Separated
 - d. Single
3. To which age group you belong?
 - a. Under 20
 - b. 21 to 30
 - c. 31 to 40
 - d. 41 to 50
 - e. Over 50
4. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
 - a. Primary School
 - b. High School
 - c. Bachelor degree
 - d. Higher education degree: Masters -- PHD

Project Related Questions

5. Did you participate in supported activities?
 - a. Yes ___ (if the answer is yes Go to question 6)
 - b. No _ (if the answer is No, end the survey)
6. In which specific activity/ies did you participate?, Please choose one activity of the below mentioned.
 - a. Civic education (including training on citizen rights & responsibilities, human rights, women's rights, children rights, etc)
 - b. How to access government service (i.e., information on government procedures, etc.)
 - c. Rule of Law
 - d. Ethics
 - e. Consumer protection

- f. Public Expenditures
 - g. Income tax declaration & tax payment
 - h. Other; please specify _____
7. In what capacity did you participate?
- a. As trainee
 - b. As focus group discussant
 - c. Participant in public gathering
 - d. Recipient of leaflets and booklets
 - e. Other; please specify _____
8. In what ways did your participation in the supported activities benefit you? It provided: (you can choose more than one answer)
- a. Information to know where I can get basic public services
 - b. Information on my citizenship rights to public services
 - c. Information on how to file for income tax and avoid penalty
 - d. Receiving public service without paying bribes
 - e. Other; please specify _____
9. How did you first hear about the Supported Activities? Please choose one of the answers below
- a. Friends/Family
 - b. Internet
 - c. School
 - d. Newspaper/magazines
 - e. Brochures/pamphlets
 - f. Other, please specify _____
10. Did you receive any information, education and communication material from activities (written brochures, videos/films, internet sites, CDs, pamphlets etc)
- a. Yes (if yes go to question 11)
 - b. No (if no go to question 12)
11. Please rate the quality of the material you received from the activities/organization.

Criteria	Very Good 5	Good 4	Fair 3	Poor 2	Very Poor 1
Clarity of the language used					
Clarity of the message communicated					
Accuracy of the message with respect to what you already know					
Applicability of the message to your needs					

12. Do you agree that these supported activities are valuable to the Lebanese society?
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Maybe
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
 - No comment
13. Do you agree that these kinds of activities promote and foster transparency in government? (i.e. processes and information are directly accessible to you)
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Maybe
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
 - No comment
14. Do you agree that these kinds of activities promote and foster accountability in the public sector (i.e. the government is legally responsible for his actions and decisions and is obliged to be answerable for the actions taken and the results to citizens)
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Maybe
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
 - No comment
15. Do you agree that these kinds of activities promote & foster good governance in the public sector? (i.e. processes and structures of governmental decisions are promoting rule of law and are participatory, effective, equitable, transparent and accountable)
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Maybe
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
 - No comment
16. Should such types of activities continue in the future?
- Definitely Yes
 - Yes
 - Maybe
 - No
 - Definitely No
 - I don't know

17. Do you have any opinion you want top share with us?

Thank you for your participation