


CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE

"...promoting the transition to and consolidation of democratic regimes throughout the world."

**RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCE REQUEST
FY 2001**



March 1999

**Center for Democracy and Governance
Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support, and Research
U.S. Agency for International Development**

**RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCE REQUEST
FY 2001**

CONTENTS

I.	Overview of Performance and Issues for Consideration	1
A.	Summary of Center Accomplishments	1
B.	Whither G/DG	3
C.	Issues for Senior Management Consideration	3
	1. Setting Priorities	3
	2. Budget Reductions	4
II.	Working Across SSOs: The Center's Sector-Level Accomplishments	5
A.	Strategic Assessments	5
B.	Managing for Results	5
C.	Establishing a DG Technical Cadre	5
D.	Cross-Cutting Linkages	6
E.	Women in Politics	6
F.	Influencing Other Donors and Partners	6
III.	Results Review	7
A.	SSO 1: Legal systems operate more effectively to embody democratic principles and protect human rights	7
	1. Center Involvement in U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities	7
	2. Sharing Technical Expertise and Lessons Learned	8
	3. Field Support	8
	4. Program Management	9
	5. Expected Focus and Results through 2001	10
B.	SSO 2: Political processes, including elections, are competitive and more effectively reflect the will of an informed citizenry	11
	1. Center Involvement in U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities	11
	2. Sharing Technical Expertise and Lessons Learned	12
	3. Field Support	12
	4. Program Management	13
	5. Expected Focus and Results through 2001	14
C.	SSO 3: Informed citizens' groups effectively contribute to more responsive government	15
	1. Center Involvement in U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities	15
	2. Sharing Technical Expertise and Lessons Learned	15
	3. Field Support	16
	4. Program Management	17
	5. Expected Focus and Results through 2001	18

D.	SSO 4: National and local government institutions more openly and effectively perform public responsibilities	20
1.	Center Involvement in U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities	20
2.	Sharing Technical Expertise and Lessons Learned	20
3.	Field Support	21
4.	Program Management	22
5.	Expected Focus and Results through 2001	22
IV.	Resource Request	24
A.	Program Requirements	24
B.	Workforce	25
C.	Operating Expenses	25
D.	Data Tables	26
Annex A	Center for Democracy and Governance Strategic Framework	
Annex B	Democracy Programs in Non-Presence Countries	

I. OVERVIEW OF CENTER PERFORMANCE AND ISSUES FOR SENIOR MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATION

Illustrating once again that political change is rarely a linear process, this year saw both advances and setbacks in democratization around the world. Democratic gains are often fragile and can be reversed, and even in those cases where transitions have occurred, considerable obstacles remain to permanently reforming political institutions and systems. While new opportunities emerged in Indonesia, Nigeria, and Slovakia, disappointing elections occurred in Kazakhstan, and the halting but forward progress that had been made in Congo and Liberia stalled. Democracy proponents have cautioned that democratization is a long-term process: progress will inevitably be uneven as countries grapple with how to transform their political and economic systems.

Within the U.S. government (USG), promoting democracy and governance (DG) continued to be a priority objective. High-level attention was focused on particular countries in the process of transition such as Bosnia, Cambodia, Indonesia, and Nigeria, and also on efforts to raise the profile of rule of law (ROL) and anti-corruption within U.S. foreign policy. In addition, democracy continued to be integrated into USAID's development efforts. Coupled with the demand for democracy funding in post-conflict complex emergencies and in conflict prevention efforts, there were increasing pressures on the scarce program funds and trained human resources available for democracy work. As in previous years, USAID missions worldwide requested more resources for DG programs than were available due to the pressure of directives on USAID's overall budget. The Agency established additional direct-hire democracy officer positions in a number of countries (including Indonesia, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Ukraine), agreed that recruitment of mid- and entry-level officers with democracy technical skills was necessary, and moved forward on the process of selecting and hiring new officers. Training courses in democracy and governance continued to be oversubscribed, as officers sought out opportunities to acquire the skills necessary for USAID to be successful in the rapidly changing world of political transitions, including in post-conflict and crisis countries.

A. Summary of Center Accomplishments

In this rating period, the Center for Democracy and Governance (G/DG or the Center) continued and expanded its role in supporting field mission programs, guiding USAID's DG thinking, and responding to USG policy priorities in democracy and governance. G/DG's established contract and grant mechanisms offered a full array of services and were accessed by missions and, increasingly, other parts of the USG. An impressive cadre of technical experts with both regional and sub-sectoral expertise was assembled within the Center for use by the Agency. Moreover, the Center, as the primary source of new DG officers for the Agency, served as an "incubator" in which new officers were trained for field service. Five years after it was created in 1994, G/DG has solidified its operations and made significant progress towards realizing its mandate of (1) providing strategic support and intellectual leadership to DG programs, and (2) supporting USG foreign policy objectives in DG. The Center successfully applied lessons learned for strategic use of limited resources in the sector and encouraged others in USAID, the State Department (State), and partner organizations to think more globally about how experience in one country relates to programming in other countries.

The Center has made significant headway in implementing its "technical leadership" agenda. Through training programs and targeted TDYs, it has helped to build the DG technical cadre in the Agency and influence programs based on lessons learned. In addition, a number of important publications have been circulated to field missions and the broader community interested in DG. For example, in FY 1998, the Center developed and/or published technical guidance including a strategic assessment framework; a handbook on program level indicators to track results in DG; guidance on approaches to civil-military relations; and handbooks on anti-corruption, legislative strengthening, decentralization, alternative dispute

resolution (ADR), and ROL programming. These program guidance materials were developed to shape the design of DG programs around the world.

The technical guidance produced by the Center is only relevant if it helps to strengthen democracy programs, especially those implemented by USAID field missions, and influences democratic progress. The Center provides field support to USAID missions in two ways. Center staff provide technical assistance, either from Washington or through short- or long-term TDYs to missions. This assistance can be a simple discrete task, a complex analytical project, or assistance with filling temporary personnel gaps. In FY 1998, the Center provided direct assistance across a full spectrum of sectoral and subsectoral assessments, strategy and program development, and performance monitoring and evaluation. Center staff traveled to 36 countries, with significant amounts of direct assistance provided to Egypt, Indonesia, Lebanon, Liberia, Morocco, and Nigeria.

The other common means the Center used to provide field support was its program implementation mechanisms. While these mechanisms are used to directly manage some programs, including non-presence country activities (see Annex B), they are primarily designed for use by the field. The vast majority of the mechanisms were indefinite quality contracts (IQCs), which could be accessed directly by missions. In addition, G/DG put core funding into a number of worldwide grant mechanisms. Last year, the AFL/CIO-affiliated Solidarity Center was G/DG's primary recipient of core funding, receiving almost 50 percent of the Center's annual program budget. Other major recipients and partners were the Consortium for Elections and Political Processes Strengthening [CEPPS—made up of the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI), the International Republican Institute (IRI), and the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), The Asia Foundation, Transparency International (TI), the Department of Justice (DOJ), and the International Development Law Institute (IDLI)]. The funds in these mechanisms provided support for a rapid-response capability as well as activities that were innovative and cross-boundary in nature.

Increasingly, other agencies of the USG have also come to rely on Center-developed expertise and best practices. In the past year, the Administration developed several priority initiatives that placed G/DG in a leadership role for USAID. U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright announced an ROL initiative as one of her 13 priority action agendas for State. G/DG represented USAID in several inter-agency fora to define priorities and approaches in this area. It also sat on the inter-agency oversight committee for police and prosecutorial training. Vice President Al Gore initiated an anti-corruption initiative, culminating in a global conference for senior government officials around the world. G/DG played a significant role in helping to organize this conference, as well as a parallel Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)-sponsored private sector conference to link program options with political will for reform.

State increasingly turned to USAID to design economic support funds (ESF)-funded programs, such as the Great Lakes Justice Initiative and the Near East regional ROL program. A significant role played by G/DG in the foreign policy formulation arena is its active involvement in the annual allocation process for the regional democracy ESF. Last year, using its delegation of authority, G/DG, with regional bureau concurrence, approved certain ESF-funded activities in non-presence countries, managing them through established Center grant mechanisms. Short-term country activities were completed in Algeria, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, Togo, and Venezuela. Activities are ongoing for Algeria, Cote d'Ivoire, Laos, Lesotho, Oman, Swaziland, Thailand, and Yemen and new short-term activities are being prepared for Afghanistan, Angola, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, and Pakistan. (See Annex B for a report on ESF/non-presence country activities.) The lack of an overall strategic approach to allocation by State meant that the process varied greatly among regions, and that a limited amount of funds was spread among the greatest number of countries possible.

The Center also played an active role in inter-agency groups that developed democracy policy toward countries with key foreign policy concerns, including Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DROC), Indonesia, Kosovo, Liberia, Nigeria, Rwanda, West Bank-Gaza, and Zimbabwe in the past year. In many of these countries, G/DG actively collaborated and coordinated with regional bureaus and the Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) to ensure the most effective USAID response. In short, G/DG served as USAID's vanguard in the Administration's policy deliberations regarding DG programming.

B. Whither G/DG?

To guide future directions, the Center is working to actively integrate its technical leadership, field support, and direct program implementation efforts. G/DG has already taken steps to ensure that its technical guidance is based on lessons learned, is pertinent to field needs and applications, and is reinforced through the Center's training efforts. The Center is seeking feedback to ensure that second generation work is directly relevant to Agency priority needs. G/DG is also significantly expanding its use of the G/DG page of the Agency's "intranet" as a communication vehicle to better disseminate technical information to the field. The Center recently launched *Democracy Dispatches*, a new interactive, field-oriented electronic publication intended to facilitate the sharing of valuable DG case studies and lessons learned among field missions. Each issue of *Democracy Dispatches* approaches one salient DG issue (e.g., sustainability of programming, donor coordination, women in politics, etc.).

Most of the Center's implementing mechanisms (IQCs, grants, and cooperative agreements) are being re-bid this year, and G/DG has redesigned these mechanisms based on lessons learned and mission feedback. The new mechanisms, particularly two new innovative ROL cooperative agreements with an explicit human rights approach, will have lower cost structures, increased flexibility, and ease of access to accommodate rapid response capability. The Center expects that, with these new mechanisms, actions should move through the procurement process significantly faster than in the past.

C. Issues for Senior Management Consideration

In looking to the future, the Center needs to hear from those inside (and increasingly outside) the Agency to hear your opinions about where G/DG needs to focus its limited program and staff budget. What are the Agency's priorities for the Center? The Center has identified a couple of key issues for senior management consideration, and hopes that the review of this document helps to stimulate a frank discussion about the Center's future priorities.

1. Setting Priorities: Grappling with the Need to Ensure that USAID Remains Relevant to U.S. Foreign Policy Initiatives in Democracy

Field missions and regional bureaus continue to learn about and draw upon Center expertise and mechanisms. That, combined with the increasing imperative to represent the Agency's DG portfolio with the National Security Council (NSC), State, and NGOs, has already stretched the Center's resources. The Center has demonstrated its flexibility in terms of both its organizational and programmatic structures as it takes on an ever-growing list of demands, resetting priorities on an almost continuous basis. Overall, however, choices will have to be made about which priorities simply cannot be met, especially given that program resources are declining and the Center's previous requests for additional direct-hire staff have not been realized, nor are future increases likely. Examples of current pressing, unanticipated program priorities are anti-corruption, ROL, international crime, conflict prevention and mitigation, and post-conflict reconciliation and democracy-building. Each of these areas is a growing effort for Center staff.

G/DG's increasing role in responding to inter-agency priorities was not anticipated at its inception. USG-wide efforts have continued to create new and significant demands on both staff and program resources.

One of the most significant demands on G/DG's limited resources is its growing involvement in the ESF process. Last year, G/DG and regional bureau staff attended a large number of meetings at the technical and senior levels (both within USAID and between USAID and State) to establish criteria for allocations and clarify the process by which allocations will be made. The negotiations over ESF allocation have contributed more to the G/DG workload than the management and oversight requirements for implementing programs in non-presence countries approved in the allocation process.

As the relationship between USAID and State continues to evolve, there are increasing pressures for G/DG to become the implementing arm for State's democracy agenda. The Center believes that it is critical for USAID to be involved and G/DG can and has made major contributions in terms of providing expertise in terms of what works, and what is realistic to undertake in a particular setting. Implementing programs in Burma, China, and Iraq in technical areas where there are no established grant mechanisms (e.g., civil society) cuts at the core of both the State-USAID relationship and the identity of the Center. Senior Agency officials will need to provide guidance on where they want the Center to go in this regard, and how they see the Center's relationship with State and other USG actors, as well as how seriously they want to try to affect strategic allocations of ESF.

2. *Budget Reductions: What is the Minimal Amount for G/DG to Function Effectively?*

The Center took a 40 percent cut in discretionary (i.e., non-labor) resources in FY 1999. This cut had serious considerations: priorities were reshuffled, staff functions were dropped, and, in several instances, technical leadership, field support, and program management were combined. The Center has cut back on the more comprehensive technical publications that had been planned for the future. G/DG significantly reduced the grant funding in a number of mechanisms, including civil-military relations. The Center also postponed proceeding with a number of planned efforts—including a new "women in politics" mechanism as well as a global civil society cooperative agreement, which would have allowed USAID to respond to the full range of requests from State for implementation of ESF programs.

If G/DG is asked to continue at the lower operating year budget (OYB) or take on additional cuts in the future, the integrity of the Center's existing mandate will be undermined. While maintaining a large program budget was never a priority, G/DG needs adequate program resources to support a rapid-response capacity, continue certain critical technically innovative programs, and provide additional technically qualified staff to be able to respond to the increasing demands for DG expertise. A continuing low budget may undermine USAID's responsiveness to State. For example, the civil society grant had been a high priority for State, which had planned on this mechanism to support non-presence civil society strengthening. The Center needs to evaluate with senior staff whether the decisions it made not to go forward on certain activities are the right ones.

II. WORKING ACROSS SSOs: THE CENTER'S SECTOR-LEVEL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A results review organized by the Center's four SSOs or DG "subsectors" (rule of law, elections/political processes, civil society, and governance) is provided in Section II. The Center has also made significant cross-cutting achievements at the sector level that go beyond the four SSOs:

A. Strategic Assessments

Given limited resources for DG programming, USAID must make strategic decisions on how and where to invest for greatest impact. The Center's role is to help USAID field missions and other parts of USAID and the USG define a country-appropriate program to assist in the transition to and consolidation of democracy. To this end, the Center has developed a flexible strategic assessment framework designed to analyze country-specific political conditions and craft targeted program interventions.

Utilizing its technical expertise, the Center has been highly involved in the development of strategies for priority countries. Last year, G/DG provided strategic assessment assistance in key countries, including Cambodia, Egypt, Indonesia, Liberia, Morocco, Nigeria, South Africa, and Zimbabwe.

In **Nigeria**, an inter-agency team—led by the Center's senior strategies advisor—developed a comprehensive USAID response to the opportunities for political transition in 1998. In **Indonesia**, G/DG senior staff participated in assessment teams that designed a comprehensive strategy for the country.

Working with OTI and PPC, G/DG adapted the strategic assessment methodology to the unique circumstances faced by post-conflict countries. The Center helped develop strategies in difficult post-conflict environments such as **Liberia**. Though a program of support to civil society and government reformists has stalled due to political circumstances in Liberia, continued Center involvement in inter-agency processes is likely pending new developments on the ground.

The Center also provided training in the use of the assessment methodology. G/DG tracked the use of its approaches and methodologies and is developing second-generation technical leadership agenda items that reflect additional needs.

B. Managing for Results

The Center worked with the Agency's DG partners, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and several other USAID/W offices to develop an acceptable approach to managing for results (MFR) in the DG sector. The measurement of achievement in DG programs is both technically difficult and politically sensitive. The Center championed a review of the MFR system, undertaking consultations with the IG, OMB, and a broader group of NGOs that resulted in agreement on the complexity of measuring results in the DG sector. The Center's *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators* was developed in consultation with USAID partners and is seen as a first step toward ensuring that USAID and its partners start from a similar understanding of what they agree upon as results in the complex effort of measuring democracy. In addition to vetting the handbook with the NGOs and briefing the IG and OMB on the complexities of the new approach, the Center provided training to USAID staff (both in Washington and the field) and G/DG partners on how to manage for results in the DG area.

C. Establishing a DG Technical Cadre

The importance of DG officer recruitment and training of existing staff became increasingly clear in FY 1998. In response to the need to train existing personnel, the Center held regional training sessions in the AFR and LAC regions, specialized training in conjunction with the Partners Conference in December

1998, and additional USAID/W training. Over 110 individuals were trained at the regional workshops and the December training combined. Priority was given to training DG officers in the use of the strategic assessment methodology and approaches to MFR. In addition, the Center trained fellows, Presidential Management Interns (PMIs), GS/FS converts, and crossovers to DG, and began developing model training for new-hire International Development Interns (IDIs) and mid-career hires. The Center also developed plans for future training efforts, including development of distance-learning modules.

G/DG assisted with Agency workforce planning efforts to assess the need for additional recruitment in the DG area, resulting in the decision to hire five mid-level officers and six IDIs. The Center established KSA levels (knowledge, skills, and abilities) for DG officers, developed a process for GS/FS conversions, and worked with M/HR on recruitment and placement of DG officers.

In FY 1998, DG fellows were placed in Eritrea, Indonesia, Kenya, Paraguay, South Africa, PPC, and G/DG. Fellows gained valuable DG experience while helping the Agency promote the development of democratic institutions and practices in developing countries. Center-based fellows made significant contributions in technical leadership (e.g., media assessment) and field support.

The G/DG Information Unit played a critical role in supporting DG professionals by disseminating technical information both inside and outside the Agency. The unit managed the internal and external web sites, and produced the Center's regular publications (*Democracy Dialogue*, *Democracy Exchange*, and *Democracy Dispatches*), as well as the Center's Technical Publication Series. It coordinated training efforts and organized the Tuesday Group, a weekly Agency-wide discussion forum on DG-related issues, sharing summaries Agency-wide via *Democracy Report*, an electronic publication.

D. Cross-Cutting Linkages

In FY 1998, the Center increasingly emphasized the integration of DG with other sectors. The Center worked with CDIE on a cross-sectoral linkages study. With G/EG, G/DG co-sponsored a conference on legal and institutional reform to emphasize DG/EG linkages. The Center also began a study on the role of civil society in economic policy formation and applied some of the initial findings to the Asian Accelerated Economic Recovery in Asia (AERA) Initiative. Finally, regional anti-corruption conferences were designed to include training for both DG and EG field officers.

E. Women in Politics

The Center continued to manage the Global Women in Politics (G/WIP) program in FY 1998. It also funded an evaluation of USAID and other donor-sponsored women's political participation programs. The evaluation found that these programs and approaches did not always produce desired results, and recommended that any future G/WIP-type program focus on fewer countries and combine assistance and evaluation. Given budget cutbacks, G/DG will not proceed with a new cooperative agreement, but will work to integrate WIP activities into other parts of the DG portfolio.

F. Influencing Other Donors and Partners

The Center contributed to efforts to make democracy part of the normal considerations of the G-7 plus Russia (the "G-8"), coordinating with PPC, AFR, and State's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Affairs (DRL). G/DG co-sponsored with the Development Assistance Committee an international participatory development and good governance (PDGG) conference in Mali to energize the PDGG initiative and address relationships among donors, host country governments, and civil society. In addition, over 20 partners participated in the Center's annual Partners Conference. G/DG also undertook targeted dissemination of its technical materials to other donors and implementing partners.

III. RESULTS REVIEW

A. SSO 1: Legal systems operate more effectively to embody democratic principles and protect human rights (*Rule of Law*)

Respect for ROL and development of a well-defined and functioning justice system are essential underpinnings of a democratic society and a modern economy. Effective ROL curbs the abuse of power and authority, provides the means to equitably resolve conflicts, and fosters social interaction in accord with legal norms and widely accepted societal values. ROL consolidates the social contract between the government and the governed, in a form that upholds democratic institutions and provides for their sustained capability to serve and protect citizens. It is in this context that USAID has embraced ROL and human rights as cornerstones of its democracy assistance programs.

Center efforts are designed to improve the quality and effectiveness of USAID ROL programs worldwide. G/DG has identified appropriate legal frameworks, justice sector institutions, access to justice, and human rights as the essential building blocks of ROL programs. Based on experience gathered from field implementation, the Center has begun compiling data relative to lessons learned and best practices, and is sharing this information with interested missions. Increasing numbers of USAID missions are now recognizing the critical importance of ROL in bringing about democratic political reform and developing the political will necessary to effect lasting change.

There has been growing interest outside of USAID in ROL. In addition to the new inter-agency initiatives described below, the General Accounting Office, at the request of 12 members of Congress, initiated a study of administration of justice/ROL programming. The study, due out in the near future, has focused principally on Latin American projects. G/DG has worked with LAC to provide information and to highlight specific accomplishments since 1993.

While the Center has had to make various modifications to its ROL program as discussed below, the results achieved lead to the conclusion that the Center is "on track" with respect to this SSO.

1. Center Involvement in U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities

As ROL has become a central focus of U.S. foreign policy, inter-agency attention to ROL has dramatically increased, with both State and the NSC embarking on initiatives to coordinate and raise the profile of USG activities in this area. G/DG has worked hard with other parts of USAID and other U.S. agencies to emphasize the holistic nature of ROL systems. The Center has been one of the most vocal and persistent proponents of the need to develop an integrated model that incorporates penal, criminal, and civil law dimensions to the more traditional areas of USAID ROL activities.

Several significant developments in the inter-agency context have taken place. Principal among these is the designation of a senior ROL position within State to oversee the coordination of the many ROL programs undertaken by various USG agencies. Center staff helped to define the new coordinator's scope of work and, together with representatives from other USAID bureaus, have begun to work closely with him, placing particular emphasis on promoting a holistic and balanced approach to ROL program planning and implementation.

- In addition, the Center coordinated with the NSC, State, and DOJ on a Presidential Decision Directive on Peacekeeping and Complex Contingencies.

- The Center is represented on the newly created ICITAP/OPDAT Advisory Committee, established to enhance inter-agency communication and coordination in the areas of police and prosecutor training and development.
- Center staff also played a lead role in the President's Great Lakes Justice Initiative, providing assistance to define the initiative and ensure that it was both programmatically and politically sound. The project combined field realities with programmatic goals in a way that encouraged a partnership between government, private sector, and civil society to develop a unified vision of how to achieve justice and reconciliation.
- G/DG also provided technical guidance and expertise to a series of working groups and task forces, such as the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission Justice and Anti-crime Cooperation Committee.

2. Sharing Technical Expertise and Lessons Learned

Recognizing that certain common elements and programmatic approaches have relevance across the gamut of ROL activities in the field, the Center has sought to capture and disseminate lessons learned from the many years of LAC Bureau experience in the field. These data were analyzed and compiled by Center staff into a series of reports and topical summaries for program guidance, including monographs entitled *Code Reform and Law Revision; Institutional Strengthening and Justice Reform; Judicial Training and Justice Reform; Political Will, Constituency Building, and Public Support in Rule of Law Programs; Rule of Law Programs Implemented in Latin America;* and the first chapter in a *Self-Study Guide for USAID Democracy Officers*. These reports have helped inform Center staff about key ingredients for, and impediments to, successful programming. The next step is to publish these findings as part of the Center's Technical Publication Series in order to share these lessons learned and best practices with field missions.

In addition, the Center developed a guide on ADR that has been liberally distributed to missions and partners. According to feedback from the field, including USAID/Madagascar and USAID/El Salvador, the guide has been useful in terms of understanding the basic concepts as well as designing programs addressing this technical area.

In an effort to stimulate interest in ROL programs for Africa, a region that up to the present has had little success in generating the sort of political will or civil society constituencies necessary to effect change, the Center oversaw a survey of ROL trends in Africa. The study, conducted during 1998, identified potential commonalities within the region and cited critical areas in need of improvement and assistance. The findings of this study will be released to the field in the next few weeks. Another key publication, the *Court Case Management Manual*, was completed in 1998 and will be available for dissemination in the near future.

3. Field Support

The Center has established itself as a valuable resource to USAID field missions and Washington bureaus, both through direct TDY technical assistance and guidance and through its implementing mechanisms. Over the past year, Center staff provided direct support to a number of high-priority countries, including Bulgaria, Colombia, Egypt, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, and West Bank-Gaza. It also provided technical review, expertise, and guidance to additional missions, including Cambodia, El Salvador, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mongolia, Paraguay, Rwanda, and Ukraine.

During the reporting period, the Center's ROL IQCs were used to implement activities in a number of USAID missions, including Caucasus, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Paraguay, the Philippines, Rwanda, and West Bank-Gaza. Through an inter-agency agreement with DOJ, the Center was able to support ROL programs in a number of countries, including Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti, Liberia, Rwanda, and West Bank-Gaza. The IDLI grant was used to implement activities in Bulgaria, Chad, Laos, Mongolia, and Oman.

Several specific examples of programmatic support serve to highlight the nature and impact of assistance provided by Center staff and expert consultants. Center staff supported a comprehensive assessment of the problems affecting the performance of **Panama's** justice sector. Although USAID ROL assistance had previously been discontinued as a part of an anticipated mission closure, the study recommended resumption of activities in several key areas. As a result, a ROL assistance project is being re-established.

As part of USAID's effort to bring justice and reconciliation to **Rwanda**, the Center partnered with DOJ and—in less than two weeks—was able to field a team of experts to perform an assessment of the very sensitive Rwandan legal and political situation. Based upon the data generated from the assessment, Center staff assisted in designing a ROL program, and have subsequently provided support to USAID in Rwanda.

In **Liberia**, the Center again assembled an expert assessment team, composed of State, DOJ, and the Federal Judiciary, then provided technical guidance in the overall design of a DG program.

The Center provided technical assistance to USAID/**West Bank-Gaza** to explore ROL programming options and to help focus and shape mission thinking on program design. USAID/West Bank-Gaza reported that, as a direct result of programs conceptualized in a ROL assessment (conducted under an IQC with Chemonics International), a judicial association was formed, the Ministry of Justice undertook the development of administrative law and administrative law courts, and Birzeit University decided to initiate a U.S.-style legal education program.

The **Mongolian** bench book program, designed by IDLI, was deemed a successful and useful document by USAID/Mongolia. The mission reports that 90 percent of judges polled found the bench book relevant to their work. As a result, a large number of judges, advocates, prosecutors, police, prison officials, and media representatives have requested both the bench book and training in its use.

4. Program Management

To supplement technical assistance provided directly by staff, the Center also manages seven ROL implementing mechanisms, including four IQCs, two inter-agency agreements, and a public international organization grant to IDLI. In addition, Center staff and implementing mechanisms provided assistance to several ROL programs in USAID non-presence countries, discussed in detail in Annex B.

Human rights programming has become a higher priority within the ROL sector. That, combined with G/DG's determination to tap the expertise of the NGO community in implementing successful human rights and ROL programs, as well as program ESF funding resulting from renewed State interest, led the Center to compete and award cooperative agreements with two consortia of non-governmental, non-profit organizations in the area of ROL and human rights. These mechanisms are designed so that field missions can easily access them through an innovative "leader-associate" grant arrangement.

5. *Expected Focus and Results through 2001*

The departure of key staff from the ROL team, including the senior ROL advisor and a Democracy Fellow, coupled with the reduction in the FY 2000 budget, have occasioned a re-evaluation of the Center's programmatic focus and the streamlining of activities into the most critical ROL building blocks. For example, separate technical areas such as commercial/economic law and ROL institution-building are being scaled back. Given budget restraints, the Center has also ended its direct support to IDLI and reduced its investments in the inter-agency agreement with the Federal Judiciary.

During FY 1999-2001, the Center anticipates completing negotiations on new IQCs and renewing the Participatory Agency Service Agreement (PASA) with DOJ. The Center will shortly re-bid its general ROL IQCs. In response to feedback from the field, the IQCs will be improved in the following ways: increased ceiling for longer term IQC activities; revised cost structure that is more cost-effective for missions, making it more user-friendly; and simplified labor categories for management purposes. In order to augment its capacity to respond to rapidly emerging opportunities, the Center plans to incorporate a rapid-response component into its new IQCs.

Issues related to inter-agency planning and coordination and the design of an overall strategic framework for ROL have been identified as additional program objectives during the coming year. Given the high level of interest in inter-agency cooperation and coordination, the Center continues to emphasize building close relationships with other entities working in the ROL arena. To this end, two representatives from DOJ have recently joined G/DG.

To better focus Agency activities and efforts in the ROL and human rights areas, G/DG will update *Weighing in on the Scales of Justice* and, drawing on additional technical findings and insights, craft an overall strategic framework for USAID missions (and increasingly other USG agencies) to use when developing ROL programs. The Center will work with other USG agencies to encourage use of the ROL strategic planning framework, using it to define roles and responsibilities and to address sequencing issues. El Salvador will be the first pilot case for effective inter-agency collaboration and coordination. Once the strategic planning framework has been developed and field-tested, the Center will draft a ROL training module for DG field officers planning to implement ROL programs.

The Center anticipates a growing demand from field missions in the areas of assessment, program design, implementation, and performance measurement. In light of recent political developments, it is likely that these Center technical resources will be sought in support of programs for Cambodia, Colombia, the Great Lakes region of Africa, Indonesia, Kosovo, Mongolia, Nigeria, and West Bank-Gaza.

B. SSO 2: Political processes, including elections, are competitive and more effectively reflect the will of an informed citizenry (*Elections and Political Processes*)

Free and fair elections are indispensable to democracy. Although other elements of democracy can develop before competitive elections are held, a country cannot be truly democratic until its citizens have the opportunity to choose their representatives. Elections can be a primary tool to expand political openings and increase citizens' political participation, offering political parties and civic groups an opportunity to mobilize and organize supporters and develop alternative platforms with the public. For an election to be free and fair and a step towards democratization, fundamental civil liberties such as freedom of speech, association, and assembly are required.

The Center supports this objective by providing technical expertise for strategic program design, funding urgent program needs, and offering rapid-response implementing mechanisms to USAID missions, embassies, and DC-based offices. The Center's approach emphasizes elections as part of a longer-term democratization strategy, with the objective of building indigenous capacity to carry out elections, targeting electoral commissions, political parties, civil society, and newly elected leaders. The Center assists missions and embassies in making strategic choices and program design decisions, and provides program management and implementing mechanisms to field missions and in a number of non-presence countries (see Annex B).

During this rating period, Center mechanisms have been tapped and G/DG personnel have been involved with developing and implementing a strategic approach to electoral assistance in a number of critical countries including Cambodia, Indonesia, Kosovo, Nigeria, and South Africa. Based on the impact of this assistance, the Center believes that the overall performance of SSO 2 is exceeding expectations.

1. Center Involvement in U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities

Throughout FY 1998, the Center has consistently demonstrated its capacity to support and influence key foreign policy objectives by quickly designing, funding, and implementing new elections-related programs. Based on their strategic and programmatic expertise, Center personnel have also been increasingly asked by other USG offices to participate in critical foreign policy electoral initiatives.

The Center's senior elections advisor was asked to provide technical input to the elections chapter of the proposed Kosovo peace settlement and to participate in related negotiations in France. This Center input influenced the negotiations by addressing the need to assure sufficient time to hold credible elections and allow for voting by those displaced by the conflict. G/DG simultaneously participated (along with ENI and OTI) on the Washington-based task force that supported the peace efforts. This inter-agency work is anticipated to continue once peace negotiations are re-started.

In Nigeria, the Center led an assessment team that conducted the first evaluation of preparations for Nigeria's transition from military to civilian government, analyzing the organizational abilities of domestic election observers, the capacity of the independent election commission, and the potential role of international observers. Building on this assessment, the team worked closely with its U.S. NGO partners, State, and other Nigeria Task Force members to design and implement an electoral assistance program in less than two months, providing nationwide training for domestic observers and support for improved electoral administration and international observation. Without this assistance, programmatic support could not have been provided prior to the local elections that served to inform and improve the subsequent state, legislative, and presidential elections.

The Center reacted immediately to help USAID/Indonesia take advantage of opportunities provided by the sudden scheduling of the upcoming June 7 elections in Indonesia. Because Indonesia has not held

free and fair elections in more than 40 years, a flawed election could derail this promising political opening. Along with ANE, the Center co-chaired an agency working group to coordinate the initial design and implementation of the democracy portfolio, and participated in inter-agency efforts to design an overall USG strategy. Center staff traveled repeatedly to the country to help develop USAID's overall strategy, supporting elections assistance programming. As part of this effort, the CEPPS mechanism was utilized to support election preparation efforts, complementing a significant OTI program.

2. Sharing Technical Expertise and Lessons Learned

In addition to designing country-based programs, G/DG continued to develop program and policy guidance used by missions and other USG agencies in the area of elections and political processes. The Center also supported the efforts of its U.S. NGO partners to develop and share their lessons learned. For example, the Center's U.S. NGO partners held discussions of best practices and lessons learned in political party assistance in four regions. Support was also provided for regional associations of electoral commissions to develop their professional capacity and establish regional networking capabilities. In support of the Agency's disability policy, commissioners are engaged in discussions to develop proposals to assure access for disabled voters to polling.

The Center is poised to release a handbook, *USAID Political Party Development Assistance*, which includes lessons learned, case studies, and an analysis of program options. This handbook will help missions identify appropriate political party partners and opportunities for political party support. It addresses the issue of inclusiveness of party support activities, arguing that hard and fast rules may be difficult to apply to different country contexts. At the same time, the guidance recognizes USAID's need to remain in compliance with legislative prohibitions on influencing an election outcome.

The Administration and Cost of Elections (ACE) project, which is co-funded with IFES through CEPPS funds, is a unique on-line publication produced in partnership with the UN and the Institute for Democratic and Electoral Assistance. USAID funding contributed to the first global resource providing information on the range of electoral systems and their financial costs, including an analysis of their political costs and benefits. This project is notable in that it allows for greater self-sufficiency, cost-effectiveness, and sustainability in the field by providing all stakeholders in electoral processes (both electoral officials and civil society) equal access to information. It further facilitates long-term planning and thoughtful policy choices far in advance of electoral cycles, rather than shortly before the event. The demand for this resource is reflected in web site use, which rose to a total of more than 27,000 separate visits during the first quarter of FY 1999. USAID funding specifically supported three of nine "modules" in the ACE program including electoral management, voter registration, and voter education, as well as the cost of translation into Russian and French. USAID/Mozambique and USAID/Indonesia both employed this resource during the program design phase of their electoral assistance programs.

G/DG supported the operations of the IFES F. Clifton White Resource Center, which shares comprehensive information on elections and political processes worldwide through a collection of primary documentation. Over 400 individuals visited the resource center in FY 1998, which also responded to nearly 200 requests for election-related information from election practitioners, USG policy makers, and academicians. In order to guarantee that USAID investments to date will result in sustainable services by the resource center in the future, the Center worked with IFES to develop a strategy to diversify its funding that will be implemented in FY 1999.

3. Field Support

Through its mechanisms and directly through staff advice, G/DG provided extensive support to the country programs described in the foreign policy section, as well as any requesting field missions.

Overall, 29 country programs were supported using Center-managed elections mechanisms. While field missions will report on their results directly, the following are a few examples of G/DG field support in the elections and political processes area:

The Center has continued to provide technical assistance to **Bosnia** through its IQC with IFES. As Bosnia continued its biannual municipal and presidential elections, Center and mission efforts focused on nationalizing the electoral administration, which is currently in the hands of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The CEPPS-funded NDI activity supported political parties and domestic monitoring efforts in anticipation of the 1998 presidential election. This was equally important to the nationalization of the electoral process.

CEPPS is also a valuable resource for ESF-funded activities not managed bilaterally through missions. In **Morocco**, the Center managed a political party and legislative capacity building program funded through FY 1998 ESF. This is a case in which the USAID mission has looked to the Center to provide a high level of management assistance due to the need to program funds in support of a State-driven strategy. The program objective is to support a more representative and competitive multi-party system. This program has succeeded in increasing the role and understanding of opposition political parties in promoting accountability and transparency in Morocco's governance. This is a notable achievement in a political environment in which multi-party democracy is a new concept.

At the request of the mission and U.S. Embassy in Kathmandu, the Center took the lead in negotiating and implementing DG programming of ESF funds in **Nepal**. Currently, the Center serves as the nexus among State, the U.S. Embassy in Kathmandu, USAID/Nepal, and its grantees to implement activities to strengthen the legislature and electoral processes in Nepal. Without Center support, these activities would not have been possible, due to an overburdened staff at the USAID mission.

At the request of USAID/Mali, the Center served as the nexus among the AFR Bureau, USAID/Mali, and its grantees to design and implement activities to increase Malian citizens' participation in local governance. Specifically, the program supports women's organizations and female candidates to participate more actively in political party processes and local governance. The Center was instrumental in completing negotiations with U.S. grantees concerning which organizations could best implement the different components of this program and encouraging the mission, within the context of its strategy, to build upon the recommendations of a national forum addressing concerns about Mali's electoral process.

4. Program Management

Center mechanisms, particularly CEPPS, have been enormously popular and have proved versatile in meeting Agency needs. Last year, requests for assistance through CEPPS increased from \$7 million to \$14 million (100 percent). As the Center anticipates even higher levels of requests this year, it has increased the overall grant ceiling by \$30 million. Given that field missions have the option of providing direct grants or accessing other mechanisms, the decision to utilize Center mechanisms is noteworthy. Part of the reason the CEPPS mechanism has far exceeded the expected level of demand is its capacity to respond immediately as programmatic opportunities emerge. In FY 1998, the team forward-funded over \$2 million of CEPPS activities that could not have been realized otherwise. The most striking example is **Nigeria**. In this case, a nationwide domestic poll watcher training program trained and mobilized more than 15,000 monitors. Overall, neither electoral administration support nor observation would have taken place without the Center's technical advice and use of its flexible implementing mechanism.

By contrast, the level of demand for the elections IQC actually decreased in FY 1998. Missions reported that the key barrier to higher use was the cost structure (a high multiplier). This is currently being addressed in the new RFP/IQC in order to make this mechanism more customer-friendly and less costly.

Center staff and implementing mechanisms provided assistance to several programs in USAID non-presence countries, discussed in detail in Annex B. In addition, G/DG used CEPPS core funding to establish an Asian election monitoring network to monitor political developments in the region, share technical assistance among member organizations, and disseminate information broadly. In FY 1998, the network strengthened its organization through an exchange mission to Cambodia and the creation of a library of resource and materials in Bangkok for its members.

5. Expected Focus and Results through 2001

Over the course of the next year, the Center will continue to work on anticipated key countries, while responding to emerging priorities as necessary. In addition to continued efforts in Indonesia and Kosovo, anticipated priorities are likely to include Bosnia, Haiti, Mexico, Russia, South Africa, and Ukraine. Countries such as the DROC and Liberia may also become priorities depending on events on the ground.

The Center will produce new elections and political processes guidance as well as conceptual papers on electoral administration, political party assistance, local elections assistance, and post-elections assistance. In addition, a series of 10 country case studies highlighting best practices and lessons learned will be produced. These documents will serve DG officers by providing a more comprehensive analysis of USAID electoral assistance efforts, as well as issues relating to MFR.

The Center will continue to support the innovative work undertaken by its U.S. NGO partners. Toward their efforts to establish baseline performance measures, a workshop on lessons learned in electoral assistance will take place next year. A set of baseline development activities for CEPPS is also being refined to ensure it directly supports mission programs. Linking the Center's elections and governance work, proceedings from the legislative development workshop and a guidebook will be published, and their utility to missions evaluated.

Given Center budget constraints and an analysis of activities to date, the Center cut back on a number of NGO proposed election-related technical leadership initiatives. Remaining funds will be targeted towards ensuring the sustainability of effective activities such as ACE and implementing the sustainability plan developed for IFES' resource center. In addition, the Center will be exploring the option of targeting cooperative agreement "core" funds to support key bilateral programs of high foreign policy interest. Also, the Center will support development of a parallel vote tabulation assistance manual and an evaluation of voter education initiatives.

The Center will shortly re-bid its general elections and political processes IQC. In response to feedback to the field, the IQC has been improved in the following ways: increased ceiling for longer term IQC activities; revised cost structure that is more cost-effective for missions, making it more user-friendly; and simplified labor categories for management purposes. In order to augment its capacity to respond to rapidly emerging opportunities, the Center plans to incorporate a rapid-response component into its next electoral support IQC.

The CEPPS cooperative agreement will end during the next reporting period. The mechanism will draw down at the end of calendar year 2000. As part of the design process for a successor mechanism, the Center will conduct a needs assessment to determine how to improve service to the field. There will be a review of country-level impact and the quality of technical leadership, and the Center will review the partnership criteria. As CEPPS is such a crucial part of the G/DG portfolio, it is a Center priority to ensure that its follow-on has the same high level of quality and utility. Sufficient funds must be maintained to preserve the same rapid-response capabilities in the future.

C. SSO 3: Informed citizens' groups effectively contribute to more responsive Government (*Civil Society*)

The hallmark of a democratic society is the freedom of individuals to associate with like-minded individuals, express views publicly, openly debate public policy, petition government, and undertake collaborative action. "Civil society" is the term used to describe organizations (e.g., NGOs, trade unions, business associations, religious institutions, and independent media) that allow for this type of participation. The Center's priorities in the civil society area include developing an enabling environment to allow civil society organizations (CSOs) to operate effectively; enhancing citizen participation in public policy formation and oversight; providing capacity-building assistance to CSOs; increasing the free flow of information through the media; and strengthening democratic political cultures.

While recognizing the broad range of contributions of civil society in a democracy, the activities in this area focus on the political actions of civil society, particularly enhancing advocacy and public debate on political issues. It is through the advocacy efforts of NGOs that people are given a voice in promulgating public policy. Media support is provided to stimulate public awareness as a basis for this advocacy. Labor is also a key component in civil society; the Center supports free and independent trade unions as a major partner seeking basic rights and freedoms. The Center supports civil society programming through field support, technical leadership, and a large labor grant with the American Center for International Labor Solidarity (Solidarity Center).

While the Center did not complete a survey of civil society approaches originally planned for FY 1998, this delay was a result of unanticipated but critical field support in **Indonesia**, as well as major efforts in the areas of labor and media development. The Center believes that this SSO is still "on track."

1. Center Involvement in U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities

The Center continued to be involved in a number of labor issues of foreign policy interest. A revitalized relationship with the Department of Labor (DOL) is being nurtured to fully achieve a coordinated response to these issues. Most recently, a DOL career employee was assigned to G/DG on detail to replace a long-term RSSA assignment. The Center is negotiating a new RSSA as the basis for other DOL staff assignments to the Agency.

Late in 1998, in response to a request from the National Economic Council at the White House, G/DG teamed with G/HCD and LAC/RSD to outline a global program to assist in the elimination of abusive child labor through an education initiative. The proposal was well received and a request for \$10 million is included in the Administration's FY 2000 request to the Congress for funding.

In addition, G/DG is supporting a complementary effort to that of the White House Voluntary Apparel Industry Partnership as it seeks to bring to public attention the working conditions under which many products are made overseas for sale by U.S. companies in U.S. markets. The partnership is targeting the elimination of sweatshops. To encourage corporate-union partnerships outside the apparel industry, the Center is funding (with DRL and LAC Bureau) a small pilot program to develop the capacity of CSOs in two countries to monitor compliance with codes of conduct adopted voluntarily by two U.S. companies. The pilot program will be initiated in FY 1999 with the award of a grant to the International Labor Rights Fund.

2. Sharing Technical Expertise and Lessons Learned

G/DG continues to focus attention on strengthening the role of civil society in pressing for economic reforms. A comparative study of approaches and lessons learned on representing civil society in economic

policy formation is underway. The Center participated in the initial strategy design for the AERA Initiative, focusing on strengthening CSOs to press for reform and oversight of recovery initiatives.

G/DG completed an impact assessment of USAID media investments in Central America, the report of which constituted the basis for a strategic framework for donor media investments. The draft framework was featured in a Center-sponsored workshop on the "Role of Media in Democracy," which included the participation of NGOs and donors supporting media development. G/DG was represented in the founding of the Bellagio media network, which includes the membership of media policy and advocacy institutes worldwide and representatives from Asia, Belarus, China, Russia, and the Latin American and Southern African regions. The network provides technical assistance and support for entities seeking to improve the operation of media laws, regulations, and policies in transition societies.

The Center participated in the founding of the International Working Group on NGO Capacity Building, which features representation of donors and northern and southern NGOs. The network identifies the priority needs of southern NGOs and coordinates assistance strategies to meet these needs.

In FY 1998, G/DG completed an interim report that assesses the impact of USAID in civic education activities in the **Dominican Republic** and **Poland**. The preliminary results should influence this rapidly-growing area of USAID support, since they indicate USAID civic education programs should be coupled with opportunities for participants to actively engage in social and political activities. The Center is studying the impact of civic education in **South Africa** to validate these initial findings.

G/DG staff recently participated in ENI's "Lessons in Transition" study of USAID NGO assistance. Specifically, the Center contributed members to teams sent to Poland, Russia, and Ukraine to assess what types of NGO assistance have been most effective, and where USAID assistance should be targeted in the future. The Center will also assist in the dissemination of a subsequent final report to DG officers worldwide.

3. Field Support

The Center provided intensive assistance to a number of missions in the design of their DG strategies—many of which have a heavy civil society component. In **Indonesia**, for example, the Center assisted in designing a strategy to strengthen the contributions of civil society in the current democratic transition. In particular, the program has been expanded to include support for CSOs engaged in interfaith/interethnic dialogue and reconciliation, support for a newly emerging free and independent labor movement, and assistance in developing a broader coalition of CSOs advocating democratic reforms.

The Center is working closely with the Agency Task Force and the U.S. Embassy to support civil society participation in the **DROC's** political transition process. The USG's overall goal of supporting a peaceful democratic transition in this country has been particularly challenging, as initial diplomatic efforts to engage the government in a participatory transition process produced only limited results. Congressional prohibitions on direct assistance to the government together with political sensitivities have further limited programmatic options. In response to this challenging environment, the Center and its partners established a resource center in Kinshasa, whose performance has exceeded Center expectations. Specifically, the Center provided critical support to CSOs through strategic planning and education workshops and information on the evolving transition process. Its existence has also proven to be a mainstay of U.S.-Congolese relations. For example, when the United States was forced to evacuate its embassy, the resource center remained open, making use of its flexibility as an NGO funded by the USG. This activity (highly praised by the U.S. ambassador, State, and the NSC), analyzes the **DROC's** electoral and transition process.

The Center assisted the USAID mission in **Kenya** in updating its DG strategy, which continues to place primary emphasis on strengthening civil society advocacy for political liberalization and basic constitutional reform. The new strategy seeks to deepen the outreach of civil society to rural areas and cultivate potential reformist pressures emanating within parliament and other institutions of governance.

The Center's civil society IQCs with World Learning and MSI provided rapid-response technical expertise to support civil society programs of missions and regional bureaus. Linkages with the ENI region were strengthened when the Center's IQC on civil society was accessed for technical expertise in evaluating the DemNet project, a major regional civil society program for the East European region. Technical services were provided to Egyptian NGOs to strengthen their volunteer management practices. Long-term resident advisors continued to assist the growth of civil society in Angola and Indonesia. Advocacy training programs were initiated for CSOs in El Salvador and Guinea. A training program on fair election coverage for print and electronic journalists was undertaken in El Salvador.

4. Program Management

A major goal of the Agency is strengthening the capacity and role of labor unions to advocate for political and economic reform. In addition to its civil society IQCs, the Center manages a \$45-million, five-year labor grant to the Solidarity Center, which continues to provide assistance to promote the development of free, democratic, and independent trade unions as a fundamental building block for the rights of freedom of association and free speech. In the past year, the Center introduced a number of improvements to the management of the labor program. The Solidarity Center has adopted the Agency's framework for results management and its annual implementation plan is now reviewed by the Agency in the context of the USAID DG strategy. Beyond this, the four regional labor organizations have now been absorbed into the Solidarity Center, ensuring a global approach and improved management structure. For the first time this year, ENI programs will be incorporated into the global grant.

A concerted effort is being made to assure that USAID-funded Solidarity Center programming becomes more consistent with larger Agency objectives in democracy and economic development. As part of this effort, the Center has sponsored a series of workshops on the role of labor in democratic and economic development. The result of these workshops will be the design of DG strategies that feature greater integration of labor in democracy and economic reform efforts.

The following are some of the Center's important results in the labor area:

In **El Salvador**, a legal assistance project provided high quality legal services to the Center's partner unions. Challenges to basic rights that would have gone unaddressed were pushed toward resolution through enforcement of existing law. This result forms a critical part of USAID's strategy to defend and protect basic human rights in El Salvador.

In **India**, as part of a Center-supported program, the South Asian Coalition Against Child Servitude conducted a "schools campaign" centered in the Delhi administrative unit and the states of Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. Approximately 150 schools and colleges participated in the campaign—a major achievement of which was a reduction of fireworks sales by 40 percent during this season, thus dramatically punishing employers who violate India's child labor laws.

Solidarity Center support for the efforts of **Indonesian** unions to push for the ratification of ILO Convention 87 was instrumental in bringing about a presidential decree of accession as one of the first acts of the new Habibie government. This was fundamental in changing the environment for independent, representative trade unions to function, and supporting freedom of association more generally. Under the new guidelines, independent unions now exist outside of a government-controlled monopoly union. In

addition, USAID's labor support in Indonesia brought sufficient visibility that the second political prisoner freed by Habibie was a local partner of the Solidarity Center.

G/DG labor activities in **Nigeria** played a significant role in the democratic transition there. Under a waiver of legal restrictions, Center-supported labor programs were pre-positioned and acted quickly in conjunction with other cooperating partners as voter registrars, election monitors, and observers to permit the conduct of statewide local and national elections.

In **Sri Lanka**, the Center supported the establishment of a trade union women's forum, comprised of female leaders from 17 unions. The forum is the first vehicle established in Sri Lanka through which working class women have been able to address gender equity and parity issues.

In 1998, due to a series of comprehensive capacity-building programs sponsored by the Center, the **Bangladesh** Independent Garment Workers Union Federation increased its affiliated factory-level unions from 15 to 24. Membership increased by 7,600 (4,489 women) to a total of 23,687 (14,729 women) in 1998, a 47 percent increase over 1997. This reaffirmed that, even in an industrial setting, an organization run by women could achieve great gains for its members. Unions also gained the right to sue their employers, resulting in successful attempts by women to receive previously withheld back wages.

5. Expected Focus and Results through 2001

The Center will shortly re-bid its general civil society IQCs. In response to feedback from the field, the IQCs will be improved in the following ways: increased ceiling for longer term IQC activities; revised cost structure that is more cost-effective for missions, making it more user-friendly; and simplified labor categories for management purposes. In order to augment its capacity to respond to rapidly emerging opportunities, the Center plans to incorporate a rapid-response component into its new IQCs. Due to reduced budget outlay, G/DG abandoned a planned global civil society cooperative agreement that would have tapped into the expertise of the NGO community, and allowed USAID to respond to the full range of requests from State for implementation of ESF programs.

Given extensive field support and the management demands of labor, as well as the departure of the Center's labor officer and an experienced RSSA employee, work on a broad framework for the development of civil society strategies was not completed last year. This work will be taken on in earnest in FY 1999.

In addition, as part of a G8 initiative in DG, the Center will soon award a grant to analyze the minimum legal standards for supporting a free and independent media. Results of the analysis, to be completed in 1999, will be translated into Spanish, Russian, and French for worldwide distribution through the Bellagio network. Until the recent budget cutbacks, the Center had contemplated joint donor funding for the network to undertake programs in advocating and providing assistance to countries intent on strengthening laws supportive of a free media.

G/DG will continue to enhance the contributions of its labor program toward broader political and economic development. As part of this effort the Center will sponsor additional workshops in the LAC and ANE regions on the role of labor in development. The workshops will feature the participation of the Solidarity Center, academics, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the World Bank, the ILO, and the Center for International Private Enterprise, among others. The result of these workshops will be the design of DG strategies that feature greater integration of labor in democracy and economic reform efforts.

The Center will complete its analysis of lessons learned about civil society participation in economic reform. G/DG guidance from this analysis will be helpful to missions and other donors seeking to design strategies and forums to encourage constructive dialogue among civil society, the private sector, and government on reform issues.

G/DG will also undertake an additional country study of civic education, focusing on innovative programs, such as the Soros Step-by-Step program, in elementary schools. This Soros activity seems to have successfully instilled democratic values and behaviors in children at an early age. If this is the case, the Center may want to work to incorporate elements of this program into new and existing USAID civic education activities.

Anticipated priority countries for civil society technical analysis and field support have been selected to include both those which have had successful USAID civil society programs and those with the most critical civil society challenges faced by USAID, particularly in countries that are high U.S. foreign policy priorities. Selected countries include Guatemala, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, South Africa, and the Ukraine.

D. SSO 4: National and local government institutions more openly and effectively perform public responsibilities (*Governance*)

A primary challenge in building democracy within developing countries is to increase the effectiveness of government institutions in ways that go beyond mere efficiency. Sustainable democratic governance must encompass various aspects of transparency and accountability, such as responsiveness, accessibility, and citizen involvement. The Center supports the goal of transparent and accountable governance through five themes: encouraging government practices and procedures that oppose and combat government corruption; encouraging central governments to devolve genuine authority for decision-making to local governments; improving the representative, lawmaking, and oversight functions of legislatures; promoting civil-military relations that are supportive of democracy; and assisting partners to implement policy change in a strategic and democratic manner.

The Center's work in the governance area is carried out through the design and implementation of new implementing mechanisms, the development of new technical leadership materials, assistance to missions in carrying out DG assessments and designing programming strategies, and providing other field support. The results of the past year demonstrate that the Center is "on-track" in the pursuit of these goals.

1. Center Involvement in U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities

As corruption has become an increasing foreign policy concern of the United States, G/DG has been placed at the forefront of a variety of inter-agency tasks, ensuring that USAID's anti-corruption experience is both recognized and applied. The Center worked in an inter-agency group headed by the NSC to help design and roll out the Transparency Initiative of the President's Trip to Africa. The Center also helped design Vice President Al Gore's conference on corruption and provided extensive logistical support for that event and another conference co-sponsored with CIPE and the OECD on the private sector role in fighting corruption. The Center is continuing to work in an inter-agency working group on follow-up activities to the Gore conference. The Center also worked closely with the ANE Bureau to develop a response to the Asian financial crisis, the AERA Initiative. G/DG led a team to Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand to assess opportunities and recommend USAID programming for promoting transparency and accountability in government. Lastly, the Center worked with OTI and LAC to explore new approaches to reduce corruption in Hurricane Mitch-related relief efforts.

The Center has developed a pilot program to improve civilian oversight of the military. Working with the Department of Defense (DOD), G/DG developed a program that focuses on civilian audiences. This program will promote approaches to military accountability and civil society advocacy for military transparency and accountability. This complements DOD's Expanded International Military Education and Training program, which focuses primarily on military audiences.

2. Sharing Technical Expertise and Lessons Learned

The Center has, in the past year, completed two governance handbooks and is nearing completion of a third. The handbooks provide technical programming guidance, help missions strategize, and evaluate programming training modules. Inter-bureau coordination and the application of lessons learned have been enhanced as staff from other Agency bureaus took part in handbook guidance reviews.

Providing a conceptual framework for anti-corruption work and examples of the range of interventions possible, *A Handbook on Fighting Corruption* was produced and has helped facilitate dialogue within and outside the Agency on approaches to fighting corruption. The handbook was presented at a heavily attended workshop at the USAID Mission Directors' conference (1998) and distributed at the Gore conference. The Center also used the handbook to train AFR DG officers. Missions in Morocco,

Paraguay, and Philippines have asked the Center for further guidance in anti-corruption programming. Evidenced by high demand, a wide variety of audiences have found the handbook useful, including inquiries and positive feedback from the Czech and Romanian embassies, Radio Free Asia, UNDP, The Asia Foundation, TI, and the World Bank.

This year the Center completed the first draft of a handbook on decentralization programming. In an effort to ensure its practical application and to incorporate case studies into the guidance, the approach was piloted in Bangladesh, Benin, Paraguay, and Senegal. The pilots allowed the Center to improve decentralization programming—to evaluate activities, develop a local government training plan, and help missions strategize. The Center also used the handbook to train DG officers at a LAC regional workshop.

The Center has made significant refinements to the *Handbook on Legislative Strengthening*. A version of this handbook will be distributed in advance of a conference planned for August/September 1999. It will be the first publicly available, widely distributed guidance that begins to define the state-of-the-art in assistance to legislatures in democratizing countries. It will provide an assessment framework for determining the most important areas for investment and identify specific programming alternatives to address the specified areas. The draft handbook was used for training at an AFR regional workshop and a DC-based DG officers' workshop, both in 1998.

The Implementing Policy Change (IPC) contract has made significant advances toward understanding and improving the policy reform and implementation process. Through the contract, a methodology has been developed that promotes the democratic principles of accountability, transparency, and participation; recognizes that the reform process is not linear but multidirectional, calling for action at various, identifiable points along the way; and takes account of the technical, political, and institutional dimensions of reform.

The Center published *Civil-Military Relations: USAID's Role*, a technical publication that reviews past civil-military activities implemented with donor assistance and identifies salient issues in this area.

3. *Field Support*

The Center brought lessons learned and knowledge from aggregated experience to bear on missions' programs and strategies through TDYs and review and comment on SOWs, R4s, and strategy documents. Regarding anti-corruption, the Center provided comments on ENI and ANE regional initiatives, the LAC results package, the Regional Financial Management project, and an unsolicited proposal from the Carter Center. G/DG staff traveled to **Benin, Indonesia, and Philippines** to conduct anti-corruption assessments.

Center staff traveled to **Tanzania** to assist with design and implementation issues for mission strategy promoting partnership between government and civil society.

G/DG staff visited **Ukraine** to provide a legislative strengthening assessment and **Guatemala** to review legislative strengthening best practices based on a legislative intern program.

Center staff went on TDY to **Bangladesh, Benin, Senegal, and Uganda** to provide advice on democratic local government programs.

This year witnessed increased mission utilization of governance IQCs, affirming both the Center's role in providing expertise and in facilitating mission programming in governance. The IQC mechanisms continued to provide key support for mission governance activities, with 31 active this reporting period and approximately \$9 million in FY 1998 buy-ins. As evidence of the results achieved through

governance mechanisms, the Center can point to the development of **Bulgaria's** national strategy for small and medium enterprise development—described by the chairman of their Parliamentary Economic Committee as the “most democratically developed policy in Bulgaria’s history.” In **Ukraine**, IPC has played a critical role in building coalitions of civil-society, business, and government officials at the *Oblast* (district) level to combat corruption.

4. Program Management

Entering the second year of a four-year, \$2 million grant, TI has helped fund a national integrity workshop in Ghana and an awareness-raising program in Benin. In addition, there is a productive dialogue among local TI chapters, USAID missions, TI headquarters, and the Center on anti-corruption programs in Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mozambique, the Philippines, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, and Ukraine. For example, USAID/El Salvador funded an exploratory mission of TI-Berlin to El Salvador in October 1998 to assess the interest and commitment of civil society in forming a local chapter and to help kick off a coalition-building process in anti-corruption.

Center staff and the IPC contractors provided valuable technical assistance and field support throughout FY 1998. The Center funded IPC efforts to apply knowledge regarding building constituencies for reform to mobilize support for the implementation of policies to bring Honduras into compliance with its obligations as a member of the World Trade Organization.

With the AFR Bureau, the Center also supported the planning of a regional networking conference, “Effective Policymaking and Good Governance in Africa: The Role of the Executive Office.” Representatives from offices of the president, prime minister, and/or cabinet of nine African countries met in Uganda in March 1999 to exchange experiences and ideas about effective executive office management and the critical policy issues facing them, including decentralization and anti-corruption. By the end of the meeting, delegates had agreed on the importance of an ongoing African Executive Office Network and agreed on a structure to initiate it.

In July 1998, the Center awarded a \$3.8 million, three-year cooperative agreement to NDI to support an experimental program in global civil-military relations. Focusing on civil society actors, the program will support civilian oversight of the military by making the military and defense policymaking more accountable to the citizenry. G/DG’s groundbreaking work in civil-military relations helped lay the foundation for USAID field missions and OTI to launch civil-military interventions in Indonesia and Nigeria. The Center’s civil-military relations program will create a governance and security clearinghouse of information resources, develop civil-military relations resource publications (more than 20 practical country case studies and a book of best practices and lessons learned), and increase in-country programming. Indonesia and Nigeria will be focus countries for civil-military relations in FY 2000.

5. Expected Focus and Results through 2001

The Center will be re-bidding its IQCs in decentralization, legislative strengthening, policy development/regulatory reform, and competing a new IQC in anti-corruption. In response to feedback from the field, the IQCs will be improved in the following ways: increased ceiling for longer term IQC activities; revised cost structure that is more cost-effective for missions, making it more user-friendly; and simplified labor categories for management purposes. In order to augment its capacity to respond to rapidly emerging opportunities, the Center plans to incorporate a rapid-response component into its new IQCs.

Given that IPC funding will be reduced due to budget cutbacks, IPC will change emphasis from applied research to dissemination in order to share significant knowledge developed over the past eight years of the project. IPC will meet with regional bureaus and field SO teams in priority countries to discuss applications of program findings to meet pressing program needs.

Given budget cutbacks, G/DG has reduced its expected contribution to the civil-military relations grant. It has entered into a co-sponsorship and co-management arrangement with OTI.

Sharing of lessons learned will be a focus for the Center's governance work in the coming year. The first of four regional lessons learned conferences will be held in the ENI region in conjunction with TI. These conferences will include training of both DG and EG field officers in anti-corruption as well as strategies to improve DG/EG cross-sectoral approaches to the issue. Case studies based on lessons learned will be produced for each conference. The Center will take an active role in the planning and development of the 9th International Anti-Corruption Conference to be held in Durban, South Africa, in October 1999. Follow-up on initiatives launched at the Gore conference will also be a Center priority. The Center will sponsor a second international legislative strengthening conference for DG officers, implementing partners, and legislative members and staff that focuses on program development, the needs of legislatures in young democracies, and measurement of progress in assistance for legislatures.

The Center will move from aggregating and consolidating information from field experience and the literature to promoting use of the information by DG field officers. Center staff will assist missions, drawing on lessons in anti-corruption, decentralization, and legislative strengthening; guidance handbooks in these areas will be distributed.

Anticipated governance focus countries differ according to the governance priority areas of governmental integrity, democratic decentralization, legislative strengthening, civil-military relations, and policy implementation. However, some clear priority countries are evident. These include Bolivia, Bulgaria, Indonesia, Nigeria, Uganda, and West Bank-Gaza.

IV. RESOURCE REQUEST

A. Program Requirements

G/DG experienced an abrupt decline in program funding levels in FY 1999. The OYB declined 30 percent from the FY 1998 level of \$12.6 million to the current year level of \$8.941 million. The labor program has never constituted more than 50 percent of the Center's budget. For the first time in the Center's history, it now constitutes over 60 percent of the budget. Discounting the directed amount of \$3 million in the FY 1998 and 1999 budgets for the labor program, discretionary funding to the Center decreased by more than 38 percent. A sustained decrease of such magnitude cannot be absorbed without significant cutback to the scope and/or depth of the Center's program. However, adequate FY 1998 carry-over funding is available to the Center, and approved planning levels for FY 2000 and 2001 bring G/DG back to historical funding levels. G/DG is accordingly requesting an allocation of \$12.455 million in FY 2001 development assistance funds.

This request is based on the understanding that \$3 million of the G/DG program funding level will again be directed to funding of the global labor program. It is expected that other sources within the Agency will, as in past years, contribute the \$6 million balance needed for agreed annual funding of the ACILS grant. The current agreement with the Solidarity Center extends through FY 2001 and calls for annual DA-directed funding of \$9 million.

Program supported assistance to NGO partners represents the most significant portion of the G/DG budget. Besides funding efforts to improve state-of-the-art programming in DG, the Center provides these organizations the funding needed to respond quickly to developments with on-the-ground assessments, strategies, program design, or mobilization of resources for activity start-ups. As such, these assistance agreements are critical to the Agency's effectiveness in many matters of foreign policy significance.

After the Solidarity Center, the NGOs currently receiving the most significant amounts of core funding from G/DG are the following:

- CEPPS (NDI, IRI, and IFES).
- The RIGHTS Consortium (Freedom House, ABA/CEELI, and NDI) for work in rule of law
- IFES and the Human Rights Law Group for work in the rule of law
- TI for work on anti-corruption
- NDI and the Monterey School for work on civil-military affairs
- World Learning for the Democracy Fellows Program

Funding of 632 (b) PASAs with DOJ and the Federal Judiciary will continue through the planning period.

G/DG also maintains a complete portfolio of IQCs that span the full spectrum of DG work. G/DG issues task orders for specific research and analysis requirements, but also funds task orders to keep private firms on call for work under conditions of short notice. This contingency planning provides an added measure of flexibility and maneuverability for the Center and Agency to keep on top of developments anywhere in the world and be responsive to most circumstances.

Another major element of G/DG's program budget is technical expertise staffing. Given the shortage of U.S. direct hires and the Center's overwhelming workload, the cost of G/DG program-funded personnel providing fundamental support functions is now \$2 million annually. Responsibilities of the program-funded staff are identified in the workforce tables that follow.

A sizable complement of non-direct hire personnel will continue to be necessary for effective fulfillment of G/DG's mandate. Non-direct hire staff currently employed or under recruitment (and likely to be retained through the planning period) include experts from the DOJ and DOL on detail to G/DG, one OTI PSC seconded to G/DG, one DOJ PASA employee, one DOL RSSA employee, two USDA RSSA employees, and two IPAs. The employment within the Center of eight fellows is expected to increase to 10. Retention of five contract employees (reduced from six) to staff the G/DG Information Unit will continue through the CDIE R&RS contract or some follow-on mechanism. G/DG strongly supports the Agency's plans to secure PSC authority for technical staff.

B. Workforce

In addition, the current OE-funded direct hire workforce ceiling for G/DG is 24. An increase to 27 is requested. Heavy and growing workload attributable particularly to foreign policy initiatives and a continued shortage of trained personnel in the field requires increased direct hire staff attention.

C. Operating Expenses

An OE budget is needed for direct hire travel purposes. A 30 percent increase over the FY 1999 amount of \$123,000 is requested for FY 2000 to accommodate heavy demand for extended TDY assistance, especially travel to post-conflict and crisis situations (including Indonesia, Kosovo, and Nigeria) and to non-presence countries.

An "off-budget" OE allocation of about \$120,000 will be needed in FY 2000 and again in FY 2001 to continue DG cadre building efforts. The Washington-based training being planned is more efficient and effective relative to that of delivering training in locations outside the United States.



FY 1999 Budget Request by Program/Country

24-Mar-99

12:42 PM

Program/Country: G/DG
 Approp Acct: DA/CSD
 Scenario: Base

. #, Title	FY 1999 Request														Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY 99
	Bilateral/Field Spt	Total	Micro-Enterprise	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Other Health	Environ	D/G		
SS 1: Rule of Law: Legal systems operate more effectively to embody democratic principles, dispense justice, and protect human rights.																
Bilateral	2,600,000													2,600,000	800,000	2,400,000
Field Spt	0													0	0	0
	2,600,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,600,000	800,000	2,400,000
SS 2: Elections and Political Processes: Political processes, including elections, are competitive and reflect the will of an informed citizenry.																
Bilateral	300,000													300,000	2,500,000	2,000,000
Field Spt	0													0	0	0
	300,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300,000	2,500,000	2,000,000
SS 3: Civil Society: Informed citizens' groups effectively contribute to more responsive government.																
Bilateral	3,441,000													3,441,000	3,200,000	2,500,000
Field Spt	0													0	0	0
	3,441,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,441,000	3,200,000	2,500,000
SS 4: Governance National and local government institutions more openly and effectively perform their public responsibilities.																
Bilateral	2,600,000													2,600,000	3,400,000	3,000,000
Field Spt	0													0	0	0
	2,600,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,600,000	3,400,000	3,000,000
SO 5:																
Bilateral	0													0	0	0
Field Spt	0													0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:																
Bilateral	0													0	0	0
Field Spt	0													0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:																
Bilateral	0													0	0	0
Field Spt	0													0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:																
Bilateral	0													0	0	0
Field Spt	0													0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	8,941,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,941,000	9,900,000	9,900,000
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	8,941,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,941,000	9,900,000	9,900,000

FY 99 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	8,941,000
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 99 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	8,941,000
Dev. Assist ICASS	0
Dev. Assist Total:	8,941,000
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	0
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account

FY 2000 Budget Request by Program/Country

24-Mar-99
12:42 PM

Program/Country: G/DG
Approp Acct: DA/CSD
Scenario: Base

. #, Title	FY 2000 Request														Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY 00	
	Bilateral/Field Spt	Total	Micro-Enterprise	Agriculture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Other Health	Environ	D/G			
SS 1: Rule of Law: Legal systems operate more effectively to embody democratic principles, dispense justice, and protect human rights.																Year of Final Oblig:2007	
Bilateral	3,000,000													3,000,000	2,200,000	3,200,000	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	
	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000,000	2,200,000	3,200,000	
SS 2: Elections and Political Processes: Political processes, including elections, are competitive and reflect the will of an informed citizenry.																Year of Final Oblig:2007	
Bilateral	3,000,000													3,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	
	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	
SS 3: Civil Society: Informed citizens' groups effectively contribute to more responsive government.																Year of Final Oblig:2007	
Bilateral	3,455,000													3,455,000	3,500,000	2,455,000	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	
	3,455,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,455,000	3,500,000	2,455,000	
SS 4: Governance National and local government institutions more openly and effectively perform their public responsibilities.																Year of Final Oblig:2007	
Bilateral	3,000,000													3,000,000	3,200,000	2,800,000	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	
	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000,000	3,200,000	2,800,000	
SO 5:																Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral	0													0	0	0	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 6:																Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral	0													0	0	0	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 7:																Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral	0													0	0	0	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 8:																Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral	0													0	0	0	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Bilateral	12,455,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,455,000	11,400,000	10,955,000	
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL PROGRAM	12,455,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,455,000	11,400,000	10,955,000	

FY 00 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	12,455,000
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 00 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	12,455,000
Dev. Assist ICASS	0
Dev. Assist Total:	12,455,000
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	0
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation account
Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account

FY 2001 Budget Request by Program/Country

24-Mar-99

12:42 PM

Program/Country: G/DG
 Approp Acct: DA/CSD
 Scenario: Base

. # , Title	FY 20001 Request														Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY 01	Future Cost (POST-2001)	
	Bilateral/Field Spt	Total	Micro-Enterprise	Agriculture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Other Health	Environ	D/G				
SS 1: Rule of Law: Legal systems operate more effectively to embody democratic principles, dispense justice, and protect human rights.																Year of Final Oblig:2007		
Bilateral	3,000,000													3,000,000	3,000,000	3,200,000	15,000,000	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	0	
	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,200,000	15,000,000	
SS 2: Elections and Political Processes: Political processes, including elections, are competitive and reflect the will of an informed citizenry.																Year of Final Oblig:2007		
Bilateral	3,000,000													3,000,000	3,000,000	2,500,000	15,000,000	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	0	
	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000,000	3,000,000	2,500,000	15,000,000	
SS 3: Civil Society: Informed citizens' groups effectively contribute to more responsive government.																Year of Final Oblig:2007		
Bilateral	3,455,000													3,455,000	3,500,000	2,410,000	20,000,000	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	0	
	3,455,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,455,000	3,500,000	2,410,000	20,000,000	
SS 4: Governance National and local government institutions more openly and effectively perform their public responsibilities.																Year of Final Oblig:2007		
Bilateral	3,000,000													3,000,000	3,200,000	2,600,000	15,000,000	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	0	
	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000,000	3,200,000	2,600,000	15,000,000	
SO 5:																Year of Final Oblig:		
Bilateral	0													0	0	0	0	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 6:																Year of Final Oblig:		
Bilateral	0													0	0	0	0	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 7:																Year of Final Oblig:		
Bilateral	0													0	0	0	0	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 8:																Year of Final Oblig:		
Bilateral	0													0	0	0	0	
Field Spt	0													0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Bilateral	12,455,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,455,000	12,700,000	10,710,000	65,000,000	
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL PROGRAM	12,455,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,455,000	12,700,000	10,710,000	65,000,000	

FY 01 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	12,455,000
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 01 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	12,455,000
Dev. Assist ICASS	0
Dev. Assist Total:	12,455,000
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	0
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account

OC	Resource Category Title	FY 1999 Estimate	FY 2000 Target	FY 2000 Request	FY 2001 Target	FY 2001 Request
11.8	Special personal services payments IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Subtotal OC 11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12.1	Personnel Benefits IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Subtotal OC 12.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Training Travel	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Operational Travel	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel	120,000.0	120,000.0	157,000.0	120,000.0	166,000.0
	Site Visits - Mission Personnel					
	Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats	3,000.0	3,000.0	3,000.0	3,000.0	3,000.0
	Assessment Travel					
	Impact Evaluation Travel					
	Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)					
	Recruitment Travel					
	Other Operational Travel					
	Subtotal OC 21.0	123,000.0	123,000.0	160,000.0	123,000.0	169,000.0
23.3	Communications, Utilities, and Miscellaneous Ch Commercial Time Sharing	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Subtotal OC 23.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
24.0	Printing & Reproduction Subscriptions & Publications	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Subtotal OC 24.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.1	Advisory and assistance services Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Management & Professional Support Services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Engineering & Technical Services					
	Subtotal OC 25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.2	Other services Non-Federal Audits	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Grievances/Investigations					
	Manpower Contracts					
	Other Miscellaneous Services					
	Staff training contracts					
	Subtotal OC 25.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.3	Purchase of goods and services from Government accounts DCAA Audits	Do not enter data on this line.				
	HHS Audits					
	All Other Federal Audits					
	Reimbursements to Other USAID Accounts					
	All Other Services from other Gov't. Agencies					
	Subtotal OC 25.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.7	Operation & Maintenance of Equipment & Storage	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Subtotal OC 25.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.8	Subsistence and support of persons (contract or Gov't)	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Subtotal OC 25.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26.0	Supplies and Materials	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Subtotal OC 26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
31.0	Equipment ADP Software Purchases	Do not enter data on this line.				
	ADP Hardware Purchases					
	Subtotal OC 31.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL BUDGET	123,000.0	123,000.0	160,000.0	123,000.0	169,000.0

WORKFORCE TABLES

Org__G/DG__ End of year On-Board							Org.	Fin.	Admin.	Con-	All		Total	Total
FY 1999 Estimate	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	Over- Arching	Total SO/SpO	Mgmt.	Mgmt	Mgmt	tract	Legal	Other	Mgmt.	Staff
OE Funded: 1/														
U.S. Direct Hire	3	4	3	3	5	18	3					3	6	24
Other U.S. Citizens						0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire						0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN						0							0	0
Subtotal	3	4	3	3	5	18	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	24
Program Funded 1/														
U.S. Citizens	1		2	2		5							0	5
FSNs/TCNs						0							0	0
Subtotal	1	0	2	2		5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total Direct Workforce	4	4	5	5	5	23	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	29
TAACS						0							0	0
Fellows	2	2	2	2	2	10							0	10
IDIs	1	1	1	1	2	6							0	6
Subtotal	3	3	3	3	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
TOTAL WORKFORCE	7	7	8	8	9	39	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	45

Note: Program funded personnel include one DOJ PASA, one IPA, one DOL RSSA and two USDA RSSAs.

Not included are one DOJ detailee, one DOL detailee, and one OTI PSC seconded to G/DG.

1/ Excludes TAACS, Fellows, and IDIs

	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	Over- Arching	Total SO/SpO	Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con- tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Total Staff
FY 2000 Target														
OE Funded: 1/														
U.S. Direct Hire	3	4	3	3	5	18	3					3	6	24
Other U.S. Citizens						0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire						0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN						0							0	0
Subtotal	3	4	3	3	5	18	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	24
Program Funded 1/														
U.S. Citizens	1		2	2		5							0	5
FSNs/TCNs						0							0	0
Subtotal	1	0	2	2		5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total Direct Workforce	4	4	5	5	5	23	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	29
TAACS						0							0	0
Fellows	2	2	2	2	2	10							0	10
IDIs	1	1	1	1	2	6							0	6
Subtotal	3	3	3	3	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
TOTAL WORKFORCE	7	7	8	8	9	39	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	45

FY 2000 Request														
OE Funded: 1/														
U.S. Direct Hire	4	4	4	4	5	21	3					3	6	27
Other U.S. Citizens						0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire						0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN						0							0	0
Subtotal	4	4	4	4	5	21	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	27
Program Funded 1/														
U.S. Citizens	1		2	2		5							0	5
FSNs/TCNs						0							0	0
Subtotal	1	0	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total Direct Workforce	5	4	6	6	5	26	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	32
TAACS						0							0	0
Fellows	2	2	2	2	2	10							0	10
IDIs	1	1	1	1	2	6							0	6
Subtotal	3	3	3	3	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
TOTAL WORKFORCE	8	7	9	9	9	42	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	48

1/ Excludes TAACS, Fellows, and IDIs

FY 2001 Target	Over- Total						Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con-tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	Arching	SO/SpO								
OE Funded: 1/														
U.S. Direct Hire	3	4	3	3	5	18	3					3	6	24
Other U.S. Citizens						0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire						0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN						0							0	0
Subtotal	3	4	3	3	5	18	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	24
Program Funded 1/														
U.S. Citizens	1		2	2		5							0	5
FSNs/TCNs						0							0	0
Subtotal	1	0	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total Direct Workforce	4	4	5	5	5	23	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	29
TAACS						0							0	0
Fellows	2	2	2	2	2	10							0	10
IDIs	1	1	1	1	2	6							0	6
Subtotal	3	3	3	3	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
TOTAL WORKFORCE	7	7	8	8	9	39	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	45

FY 2001 Request														
OE Funded: 1/														
U.S. Direct Hire	4	4	4	4	5	21	3					3	6	27
Other U.S. Citizens						0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire						0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN						0							0	0
Subtotal	4	4	4	4	5	21	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	27
Program Funded 1/														
U.S. Citizens	1		2	2		5							0	5
FSNs/TCNs						0							0	0
Subtotal	1	0	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total Direct Workforce	5	4	6	6	5	26	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	32
TAACS						0							0	0
Fellows	2	2	2	2	2	10							0	10
IDIs	1	1	1	1	2	6							0	6
Subtotal	3	3	3	3	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
TOTAL WORKFORCE	8	7	9	9	9	42	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	48

1/ Excludes TAACS, Fellows, and IDIs

G/DG CENTER
Staff Profile

OFFICE/POSITION	INCUMBENT	INCUMBENT TYPE/GRADE	POSITION NUMBER	POSITION TYPE/GRADE	RESPONSIBILITIES
EXECUTIVE					
Center Director	Jennifer Windsor	USDH/AD-18	169400004	C/PF/AD-18 (SMG)	Represents the Agency on technical issues and responsible for overseeing the technical quality of staff and programs.
Deputy Center Director	Jim Vermilion	USDH/FS-01	169400009	C/PF/FS-01 (SMG)	Represents the Agency on technical issues and responsible for overseeing the technical quality of staff and programs.
Secretary	Sheron Moore	USDH/GS-8	169400020	C/PF/GS-08	Provides administrative support services to the Center Director and Deputy, and other management.
PROGRAM/INFORMATION					
Program Officer	John Webley	USDH/FS-01	169400025	C/PF/FS-01	Responsible for program strategy, planning, monitoring and reporting, and budgeting.
Information Officer	Francis Luzzatto	USDH/AD-15	169400032	C/PF/AD-15	Responsible for center outreach, reference and referral services.
Program Analyst	Patricia Allen	USDH/GS-12	169400029	C/PF/GS-12	Responsible for program budget preparation and program procurement coordination.
STRATEGIC PLANNING AND FIELD SUPPORT					
Senior Advisor/Team Leader	Gerald Hyman	USDH/GS-15	169400041	C/PF/GS-15	Responsible for global liaison services, technical assistance and technical leadership.
Democracy Specialist	Steffi Meyer	USDH/FS-01	169400048	C/PF/FS-01	Provides liaison services, and technical assistance in DG program design and evaluation, to LAC.
Democracy Specialist	Susan Jay	USDH/GS-11	169400052	C/PF/GS-11	Provides liaison services, and technical assistance in DG program design and evaluation, to AFR.
Democracy Specialist	vacant	PMI		C/PF/GS-09	Provides liaison services, and technical assistance in DG program design and evaluation, to ENI.
Democracy Specialist	Tallal Hattar	USDH/GS-09	169400054	C/PF/GS-09	Provides liaison services, and technical assistance in DG program design and evaluation, to ANE.
Democracy Fellow	vacant	WL CoAg		GS-13 Equiv.	Conducts research to develop or test new programmatic approaches.
Democracy Fellow	vacant	WL CoAg		GS-13 Equiv.	Conducts research to develop or test new programmatic approaches.
RULE OF LAW					
Senior Advisor/Team Leader	vacant (Gail Lecce)	USDH/GS-15	169400064	C/PF/GS-15	Responsible for technical leadership in ROL programming, and achievement of G/DG Center SSO 1.
Democracy Specialist	Michael Miklaude	USDH/GS-13	169400065	C/PF/GS-13	Manages mechanisms and provides technical guidance and support to USAID in the ROL area. (IDLI, NCSC, DOJ PASA, AMEX)
Democracy Specialist	Aleksandra Braghieri	USDH/GS-03	169400073	C/PF/GS-13	Manages mechanisms and provides technical guidance and support to USAID in the ROL area. (ADR, EG/DG, Chemonics, COAgs, Federal Judiciary)
ROL Specialist	Jan Stromsem	DOJ detail		DOJ/SES	Provides technical guidance and support to USAID in ROL area.
ROL Specialist	Michele Crawford	DOJ PASA		DOJ/GS-12	Serves as liaison with DOJ and provides support in ROL area.
AAAS Fellow	Jay Wright	AAAS Program		GS-13 Equiv.	Conducts research to develop or test new programmatic approaches.
Democracy Fellow	vacant	WL CoAg		GS-13 Equiv.	Conducts research to develop or test new programmatic approaches.
ELECTIONS AND POLITICAL PROCESSES					
Senior Advisor/Team Leader	Mark Feierstein	USDH/AD-15	169400064	C/PF/AD-15	Responsible for technical leadership in Electoral and Political Processes programming, and achievement of G/DG Center SSO 2.
Democracy Specialist	Katherine Nichols	USDH/GS-13	169400085	C/PF/GS-13	Manages mechanisms and provides technical guidance and field support to USAID in elections and political processes.
Democracy Specialist	Dana Peterson	PMI	169400087	C/PF/GS-11	Manages mechanisms and provides technical guidance and field support to USAID in elections and political processes. (CEPPS)
Democracy Specialist	Kare McDonald	PMI	169400088	C/PF/GS-9	Manages mechanisms and provides technical guidance and field support to USAID in elections and political processes.
Democracy Fellow	Ronald Shalko	WL CoAg		GS-13 Equiv.	Conducts research to develop or test new programmatic approaches. (Political Parties)
Democracy Fellow	vacant	WL CoAg		GS-13 Equiv.	Conducts research to develop or test new programmatic approaches.
CIVIL SOCIETY					
Senior Advisor/Team Leader	Gary Hansen	USDH/GS-15	169400076	C/PF/GS-15	Responsible for technical leadership in Civil Society programming, and achievement of G/DG Center SSO 3.
Democracy Specialist	Robert Hansen	USDH/FS-02	169400053	C/PF/FS-02	Manages mechanisms and provides technical guidance and support to USAID for the labor program.
Senior Labor Advisor	Mikaela Meehan	DOL detail		DOL GS-13	Responsible for technical leadership in the development of the Labor program.
Social Scientist	Harry Blair	IPA	169400090	GS-15 Equiv.	Provides technical leadership, guidance, and support to USAID in civil society.
Democracy Specialist	vacant	PMI		C/PF/GS-09	Manages mechanisms and provides technical guidance and support to USAID for the civil society program.
Democracy Fellow	Liz Hart	WL CoAg		GS-13 Equiv.	Conducts research to develop or test new programmatic approaches. (EG/DG)
Democracy Fellow	vacant	WL CoAg		GS-13 Equiv.	Conducts research to develop or test new programmatic approaches. (Media)
Labor Advisor	vacant	RSSA/GS-12		DOL GS-12	Responsible for technical leadership in the development of the Labor program, with emphasis on women initiatives.
GOVERNANCE					
Senior Advisor/Team Leader	Diana Swain	USDH/FS-01	169400056	C/PF/FS-01	Responsible for technical leadership in Governance programming, and achievement of G/DG Center SSO 4.
Strategic Management Spec.	Pat Isman-Fr'Piere	RSSA/GS-14		USDA GS-14	Provides technical guidance in policy change and DG linkages across sectors; supports the governance program.
Strategic Management Spec.	Sandy Callier	RSSA/GS-14		USDA GS-14	Provides technical guidance in policy change; supports the governance program and cross-cutting center themes.
Democracy Specialist	Hugh Smith	USDH/FE-OC	169400061	FS-01	Manages the civil military component of the governance program.
Democracy Specialist	Phyllis Dinklo	USDH - PT	169400082	GS-13	Manages the anti-corruption component of the governance program.
Democracy Specialist	Eric Kile	USDH/GS-09	169400059	C/PF/GS-09	Manages mechanisms and provides technical guidance and support to USAID for the governance program, with emphasis on anti-corruption.
Democracy Specialist	vacant	OTIPSC		GS-13	Provides technical leadership, guidance, and support to USAID in civil military relations and anti-corruption.
Democracy Fellow	Gary Bland	WL CoAg		GS-13 Equiv.	Conducts research to develop or test new programmatic approaches. (decentralization)
Democracy Fellow	Stephen Brager	WL CoAg		GS-13 Equiv.	Conducts research to develop or test new programmatic approaches. (legislative strengthening and civil military relations)

ANNEX A

**CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE
STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK**

Center For Democracy and Governance - Strategic Framework

SSO 1 Rule of Law	SSO 2 Elections and Political Processes	SSO 3 Civil Society	SSO 4 Governance
<p>Legal systems operate more effectively to embody democratic principles and protect human rights</p>	<p>Political processes, including elections, are competitive and reflect the will of an informed citizenry</p>	<p>Informed citizens' groups effectively contribute to more responsive government</p>	<p>National and local government institutions more openly and effectively perform their public responsibilities</p>
Indicators	Indicators	Indicators	Indicators
<p>1.1 Countries implementing legal systems reform programs. <i>(Legal Reform/Codification of Human Rights)</i></p> <p>1.2 Countries implementing court administration programs. <i>(Administration of Justice)</i></p> <p>1.3 Countries introducing mechanisms to expand access of women and poor and other marginalized populations to legal systems. <i>(Access to Justice)</i></p>	<p>2.1 Countries with fully codified electoral laws and regulations that conform with international standards. <i>(Impartial Electoral Framework)</i></p> <p>2.2 Countries with independent electoral commissions operating effectively. <i>(Credible Electoral Administration)</i></p> <p>2.3 Countries reporting effective oversight of elections through domestic and/or international monitoring and independent media coverage. <i>(Effective Oversight of Electoral Processes)</i></p> <p>2.4 Countries meeting targeted increases in citizen participation in elections through voter education and mobilization efforts. <i>(Informed and Active Citizenry)</i></p> <p>2.5 Countries with political parties organized to represent a broad constituency through internal democratic processes. <i>(Representative and Competitive Multiparty System)</i></p> <p>2.6 Countries meeting targeted increases in political participation by women and disadvantaged groups. <i>(Inclusion of Women and Disadvantaged Groups)</i></p> <p>2.7 Countries in which political power is peacefully transferred following elections through established transition processes. <i>(Well-Established Procedures for Transfers of Power)</i></p>	<p>3.1 A legal framework to protect and promote civil society ensured. <i>(Enabling Environment)</i></p> <p>3.2 Increased citizen participation in the policy process and oversight of public institutions. <i>(Advocacy)</i></p> <p>3.3 Increased institutional and financial viability of civil society organizations. <i>(Sustainability)</i></p> <p>3.4 Enhanced free flow of information. <i>(Media)</i></p> <p>3.5 Strengthened democratic political culture. <i>(Civic Education)</i></p>	<p>4.1. Governments articulate and sponsor anti-corruption measures. <i>(Governmental Integrity)</i></p> <p>4.2. Local-level governments improve democratic processes. <i>(Democratic Decentralization)</i></p> <p>4.3. Legislative bodies improve their effectiveness and accountability. <i>(Legislative Strengthening)</i></p> <p>4.4. Countries progress toward effective civilian control over the national military. <i>(Civil -Military)</i></p> <p>4.5. Countries effectively manage policy implementation. <i>(Policy Implementation)</i></p>

Rule of Law	Elections and Political Processes	Civil Society	Governance
<p align="center">Intermediate Results</p> <p>1.1 Legal reform methodologies developed and applied.</p> <p>1.2 Development of improved AOJ models.</p> <p>1.3 Development of models for increased access to legal systems.</p>	<p align="center">Intermediate Results</p> <p>2.1 USAID methodology (revised manual) for providing assistance in elections administration, local elections, and post-election training developed and applied.</p> <p>2.2 Revised manual with new section and supporting field documents on assistance to strengthen political parties developed and utilized.</p> <p>2.3 Center assistance mechanism for promoting inclusion of women and disadvantaged groups in electoral and political processes is utilized.</p> <p>2.4 Center assistance mechanisms for strengthening elections and political processes in countries are used.</p>	<p align="center">Intermediate Results</p> <p>3.1 Civil society enabling environment guidance developed and applied.</p> <p>3.2 Selected unions strengthened.</p> <p>3.3 Civil society organization's ability to participate in policy advocacy and oversight strengthened</p> <p>3.4 Civil society financial management, administrative, and organizational capabilities are strengthened.</p> <p>3.5 Independent sources of citizen information are increased, media reporting is improved and media management is strengthened.</p> <p>3.6 Civic education is expanded and the quality is improved.</p>	<p align="center">Intermediate Results</p> <p>4.1. Anti-corruption models developed and applied.</p> <p>4.2. Prototype strategies for effecting democratic decentralization developed and applied.</p> <p>4.3. Legislative strengthening models and guidelines developed and applied.</p> <p>4.4 Model methodologies for promoting civil-military relations at different stages of political transition developed and applied.</p> <p>4.5 Model methodologies for anticipating and managing change affecting governance developed and applied.</p>
<p align="center">Indicators</p> <p>1.1 Missions using code reform manual.</p> <p>1.2 Missions use case management methodology.</p> <p>1.3 Missions utilizing alternative dispute resolution models.</p>	<p align="center">Indicators</p> <p>2.1. Missions using USAID methodology for providing assistance in elections administration, local elections, or post elections training.</p> <p>2.2 Missions using guidance on assistance to strengthen political parties.</p> <p>2.3 Missions/embassies using the Center's mechanism to promote increased political participation of women and disadvantaged groups.</p> <p>2.4 Missions using Center assistance mechanisms for strengthening of elections and political processes.</p>	<p align="center">Indicators</p> <p>3.1 Enabling environment program guidelines being used.</p> <p>3.2 Countries with unions better organized.</p> <p>3.3 Advocacy program guidelines being used.</p> <p>3.4 Sustainability program guidelines being used.</p> <p>3.5 Media program guidelines being used.</p> <p>3.6 Civic education program guidelines being used.</p>	<p align="center">Indicators</p> <p>4.1 Missions using approaches for anti-corruption objective.</p> <p>4.2 Missions using democratic decentralization prototypes.</p> <p>4.3 Missions using legislative strengthening models and guidelines.</p> <p>4.4 Missions using policy change models.</p> <p>4.5 Missions using model methodologies for promoting civil-military relations.</p>

ANNEX B

DEMOCRACY PROGRAMS IN NON-PRESENCE COUNTRIES

ANNEX B-1

REVIEW OF NEW PROCEDURES FOR ESF-FUNDED DEMOCRACY PROGRAMS IN NON-PRESENCE COUNTRIES

BACKGROUND

In February 1997, the Administrator authorized a new procedure for approving ESF-funded DG programs in non-presence countries. Prior to that decision, any programs in non-presence countries (whether ESF or DA) required the approval of four assistant administrators: the AA for the relevant regional bureau, AA/G, AA/PPC, and AA/M. Under the new procedure, A/AID delegated the authority to approve exceptions to the non-presence policy for ESF-funded DG activities to the DAA/G/DG (Director of the Center for Democracy and Governance) for implementation by Center grantees.

Under the new procedures, G/DG was tasked to collaborate closely with USAID and State regional bureaus and State/DRL to ensure that a proposed program is technically sound and addresses a clear foreign policy priority. Criteria for exceptions are relevance, results, capacity, cost-effectiveness, accountability, and foreign policy considerations. Clearances are required from USAID regional bureaus. The assistant administrator for the Global Bureau and, "as necessary," PPC and M bureaus, would be consulted in making decisions with significant policy and management ramifications.

At the time the Administrator approved the delegation of authority, he asked for a review of the new procedure. Specifically, he asked that the review "examine the OE costs, whether the new procedure reduces time and staff work, whether the regional bureaus are satisfied they are not left out, whether results are being recorded, and whether the system has an impact on State's intention to program DG through DRL." While there are a number of other reviews of non-presence country activity going on elsewhere in the Agency, the Center has prepared this annex to its FY 2001 R4 to provide additional information on the experience thus far with the delegation of authority.

SUMMARY

While the Center has only had a couple of years of experience with the new procedures, already G/DG has seen dramatic changes in both the way the process has been handled and the building of constructive working relationships with other agencies, particularly State. G/DG believes that there were some significant outcomes of the new procedures that the Center would like to highlight.

(1) State Department reaction: Before this procedure was implemented, State was extremely unhappy with the USAID process. It claimed that the additional layer of clearances in the Agency above the significant negotiations that had occurred with USAID regional bureaus and G/DG was unnecessary and meant lengthy delays in approval. There were several high-level, contentious meetings that the Administrator had to conduct to deal with both the process of ESF allocations and the details of country-specific programs. This was a poor use of the time of the Agency's most senior officer and at least two Assistant Secretaries of State, AAs, DAAs, and staff in preparing for these meetings. While there was never any final disapproval of any activities, most issues had to be brought up to A/AID, and every single non-presence allocation resulted in lengthy debate within USAID and between USAID and State.

We are happy to report that, while there are still serious technical level meetings among USAID regional bureaus, G/DG, and our State counterparts on the allocation of ESF resources to non-presence countries, the process of developing and approving an ESF-funded democracy program in a non-presence country is now more streamlined. State regularly indicates its satisfaction with the more timely approval process.

The new waiver procedure is helpful to USAID because it speeds up response time by streamlining the clearance process. In fact, all three of the DRL staff interviewed by PPC thought that the previous process was "slow and cumbersome, but now it is faster and easier which makes it more attractive for State to use." State/DRL has indicated that it would like for all of its DG assistance to be channeled through G/DG.

That is not to say that USAID is fully satisfied with the ESF allocation process, which still is not guided by sound criteria accepted by USAID and State. It is important to recall that State had become the unilateral decision-maker for allocation of ESF resources and USAID is still struggling to influence allocations to ensure that funds are effectively utilized.

(2) Duplication of mechanisms and oversight: One major concern behind the delegation of authority was to assure that there would not be parallel and duplicative mechanisms across the Administration to carry out the same types of programs with the same partners. Since the new procedure has been put into place, the Center has found that State/DRL has not attempted to further increase its grant management to carry out programs; rather, it is using USAID mechanisms. The new procedure has greatly mitigated the incentives that initially drove DRL to seek its own implementing mechanisms. DRL staff have now acknowledged the advantages and convenience of utilizing existing G/DG assistance mechanisms, and the Assistant Secretary for DRL has indicated that he has no desire to make DRL a direct implementing entity. The new waiver process has led to more productive relations with DRL, and appears to have quieted the separate capacity proposal.

(3) Program design: With the new procedure, we are able to engage our implementing partners to look at program proposals and to provide a "test" of the realism of proposals. This helps to articulate what might be accomplished and also assures that, if ESF allocations are approved, then real and meaningful programs can be developed and applied. G/DG works closely with its partners as they develop proposals to assure that the foreign policy imperatives that brought the country to the priority list are addressed while, at the same time, the program is reasonable and has realistic goals. Although USAID does not usually require formal strategic objectives, intermediate results, and indicators for non-presence countries, activity "results" leading to strengthened democracies can nevertheless be measured according to the everyday meaning of the word. (See Annex B-3.)

It should be noted that State is involved in program design issues and at times even chooses between one program and another. So, while USAID may work on program design, it does not matter how well developed the design is if the initial allocation was directed by State for a country and program that does not reflect strategic priorities. If the initial allocation was not based on the likelihood of some impact, then the program will not deliver programmatic results.

(4) OE costs: The procedure is still relatively new and the Center has not yet had an opportunity to fully assess the OE implications for program monitoring. Considerable staff time was spent in negotiating allocations with State. However, this time is necessary, unless USAID decides to allow State to make all decisions without strong USAID efforts to influence them. The Center is working to convince State to agree to approved criteria for making ESF allocation decisions. To this end, G/DG had limited success in FY 1998 and FY 1999, but hopes to make more significant progress in FY 2000. DRL is amenable. However, the State regional bureaus are reluctant to give up having some funding for each Ambassador. A set of established criteria would not only save staff time in determining allocations, but also improve the likelihood that more strategic, result-oriented choices are made. In addition, as with any add-on to G/DG cooperative agreements, staff time is required to review the proposal technically, to manage the procurement action, and to monitor the results. For example, of 29 add-ons to G/DG elections and political processes mechanisms, over half were funded through ESF. Center-wide, G/DG processed activities totaling \$17,957,666 in 42 country or regional programs in FY 1998. Of these, \$3,833,448 was

allocated by ESF for non-presence activities in 14 countries or regions. Given that a goal of the Center is to manage mechanisms that are found useful by USAID and other parts of the USG, we believe that any additional staff time required to manage ESF and mission-funded activities is a sound investment, but one with opportunity costs affecting other Center priorities. In addition, the Center faces constraints with regard to the number of procurements that OP can act on each fiscal year. Because State often favors smaller allocations, the number of ESF actions has proliferated, demanding that more staff time be devoted to manage procurements, rather than field assistance and results management.

In terms of processing waivers, the new procedures have reduced staff time, and hence OE costs, therefore allowing USAID to capitalize on opportunities as they appear, develop more timely projects, and be more responsive to State's interests. The new system is an improvement over the previous approach and requires less staff time; however, there is still much room for improvement, particularly in terms of defining criteria for allocating ESF and processes for the allocation. While working in non-presence countries has created some tensions within USAID, especially with reduced personnel and limited OE resources, the Center believes that it is critical for USAID to be seen as serving foreign policy priorities of the Administration.

(5) **Vulnerability:** To reduce USAID's vulnerability, G/DG has chosen as partners only well-established, experienced U.S. NGOs and to date, with one exception, has only utilized cooperative agreements or grants to implement non-presence activities. However, the Center recognizes the potential for problems given G/DG's limited staff and the multiplicity of actions we are handling. G/DG is examining our program oversight role in non-presence countries to ensure that the Center is meeting its management responsibilities appropriately, but scarce financial resources, particularly OE travel funds, will continue to place constraints on ensuring sufficient oversight of non-presence countries activities. G/DG has determined that some ESF should be used for monitoring and evaluation of non-presence country activities. While a dialogue with State is ongoing, there is no agreement on this point to date.

(6) **Regional bureau satisfaction:** USAID regional bureaus were involved and consulted in the process, and PPC and M were notified for each non-presence waiver considered. Last year, PPC interviewed the relevant actors affected by the new procedure and found them satisfied.

(7) **Results:** Overall, 15 waivers for ESF-funded programs in non-presence countries have been authorized since the delegation of authority was granted in March 1997. Specifically, in calendar year 1997, non-presence activities were conducted in Thailand and the East Asian Regional Women's Rights Program, which included the non-presence countries of Fiji, Laos, the Solomon Islands, and Thailand once again. In 1998, programs were authorized in the following countries: Algeria, Cote d'Ivoire, Laos, Lesotho, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Venezuela, and Yemen.

Most of these approved activities are still underway, so the articulation of actual program results is not yet possible; this data will not largely be available until at least the end of 1999. Those programs that were completed were modest in their objectives or for specific events (e.g., elections monitoring, assessment missions, conferences). Annex B-2 lists all non-presence country activities that have been authorized by G/DG and Annex B-3 summarizes what each activity has accomplished to date and/or its expected results. It must be noted that because State has more influence in determining ESF allocations, it increasingly wants to influence programmatic approaches. Therefore, USAID has less ability to ensure that ESF programs can deliver results. In many instances, USAID's preferences, usually based on programmatic concerns related to impact, have been over-ruled by State.

CONCLUSION

The streamlined procedure approved by the Administrator in the delegation of authority to G/DG has definitely expedited the approval process as intended, has improved program design, and has greatly

improved working relationships with State on this sensitive topic. The process does save USAID staff time and reduces overall OE costs. Quality of programming has not been affected by the delegation; rather, USAID's ability to achieve results is more determined by the strategic nature of the program intended to be funded. Regional bureaus have been further protected by a specific clearance requirement in all cases.

The Center still sees major problems in the ESF allocation process that need to be addressed. First, while we are working on criteria for allocation and improvements in the allocation process, there is still much progress to be achieved. In addition, the Center believes that program monitoring could be improved; a major impediment here is that, while G/DG is receiving significant ESF funding for programs, it has not received additional staff to monitor these programs nor travel OE to conduct field monitoring visits.

ANNEX B-2

SUMMARY OF G/DG AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>WAIVER DATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>YEAR OF FUNDS</u>	<u>PROGRAM DESCRIPTION</u>
1. Algeria	2-3-98	\$20,000	FY 1998	Post-election assessment to investigate future programming options to foster democratization
2. Algeria	6-12-98	\$490,000	FY 1998	Parliamentary training program and labor development
3. Cote d'Ivoire	6-12-98	\$250,000	FY 1998	Training of political parties in parliament on constitutional reform
4. Laos	4-21-98	\$300,000	FY 1998	Strengthening the judiciary with respect to economic and business law
5. Lesotho	6-12-98	\$125,000	FY 1998	Post-election consolidation activities for parliament and civil society
6. Oman	6-12-98	\$200,000	FY 1998	Judicial training
7. Papua New Guinea	11-5-98	\$150,000	FY 1998	Short-term technical assistance to the electoral commission
8. Sierra Leone	6-12-98	\$200,000	FY 1998	Technical assistance to the executive and selected ministries
9. Swaziland	6-12-98	\$145,000	FY 1998	Support to NGOs, voter education, and technical assistance on elections administration
10. Thailand	11-5-98	\$200,000	FY 1998	Voter education and support for domestic election monitoring
11. Togo	6-3-98	\$61,000	FY 1997	Pre-election assessment
12. Venezuela	10-19-98	\$250,000	FY 1998	Monitoring of local and national elections in November and December 1998
13. Venezuela	5-28-98	\$41,291	FY 1998	Conference on campaign finance to strengthen transparency
14. Yemen	6-12-98	\$1,348,000	FY 1998	Technical assistance to the elections commission and parliamentary training program focusing on public outreach and policy formation
15. East Asia	1997	\$230,000	FY 1997	Regional women's rights program focusing on violence against women and discrimination in the workplace

ANNEX B-3

RESULTS TO DATE OF ALL G/DG AUTHORIZED NON-PRESENCE COUNTRY ACTIVITIES

Algeria

From March 5 to 10, 1998, NDI conducted a **post-election assessment** in Algeria under CEPPS to examine the options for providing assistance to Algerian parliamentarians and political parties, to determine the significance of recent political events in the context of Algeria's transition to democracy, and to show support for democratic activists in Algeria. The political environment in Algeria has been extremely inhospitable to democracy programming and, despite the regime's control, political leaders and independent observers argued that new institutions provided a political opening. The lower house of Parliament has distinguished itself as a forum for serious debate on national issues and as a means for democrats to communicate with the public, propose reforms, and advocate for more democratic reform. The foreign policy community wanted to examine whether there were now political openings which would permit meaningful support for a democratic transition in Algeria. Through interviews with NGO leaders, journalists, and political figures, NDI provided the USG with suggestions for possible activities to capitalize on the limited political opening in the Algerian system and try to strengthen the hand of those pushing for greater democratization in Algeria.

The Algerian president unexpectedly announced an early presidential election for April 1999, catching most of the Algerian political class off guard. Following consultations with key Algerians as well as USG officials, the **parliamentary training program was postponed**. Once the elections have occurred and political fighting surrounding the presidential elections has subsided, the program will be reviewed and, if implementation is still possible, activities will be re-organized.

Implementation of the **labor program** through G/DG's grant to the Solidarity Center is ongoing, although security problems and the highly politicized environment in Algeria have slowed progress. First, the women's leadership skills program for Algerian union women and the coalition-building program for North African union women were completed in December 1998. The purpose of these activities was to develop regular modes of communication, exchange ideas and solutions for problems, focus on union women's issues, prepare for international meetings, explore union-to-union programs, and develop practical assistance programs to increase contact among union/working women in the region. The regional women's workshop was the first of its kind, and participants began the fledgling workings of an Arab union women's network. Algerian participants returned home with potential, practical approaches to help their union women's district committees and then create a national committee. They were exposed to expanded techniques with which to explore union, workplace, and societal equality, and similar bars to democracy facing the network and its members. As a result of the women's training program, participants have established women's labor committees in greater Algiers as well as in six other regions. These committees are committed to first evaluating the needs and issues of working women. To that end, they are currently gathering baseline information. The Solidarity Center has leveraged additional assistance from NED to support the committees' desire to design a strategic action plan during the first half of 1999.

Second, efforts to re-open the Algerian labor training center are ongoing. An educational consultant recently conducted a needs assessment, still in draft, because of concern regarding the absorptive capacity of G/DG's Algerian partner and personnel problems within the evolving Algerian labor leadership. The training center now plans to begin courses by the fourth quarter of 1999.

Third, since the completion of ESF-funded media training, the readership of the union's weekly newspaper has increased. Improvements in the quality of the publication's layout and reporting, as well as use of better dissemination techniques learned during the training, have resulted in the union's policy

positions being frequently quoted in the general press. Given that the union's new democratically elected leadership has stressed the importance of improving internal and external communication, it is expected that participants will continue to apply these new skills in the context of this commitment.

Finally, in-country seminars and exchange programs will provide training to over 150 labor activists over the course of 1999. These activities will help labor activists in their quest to become a more independent and democratic, member-driven organization, so that the union can more effectively advocate for workers' rights and participate in Algeria's privatization process and reinforce freedom of association and speech in Algeria. USAID activities were designed to strengthen the capacity of those within the labor union who are working to advance critical internal democratic reforms, in the face of opponents who support the status quo. Over the next year and a half, the union will be reviewing its constitution; the impact of this collection of labor activities may be revealed as this constitutional review process moves forward.

Cote d'Ivoire

CEPPS assistance, utilizing ESF funds, to the Cote d'Ivoire assisted the close-out mission in helping the National Assembly examine the **role of the legislature in consolidating democracy**. NDI conducted seminars for the legislature and, as a result of the new skills and knowledge gained by legislators participating in the seminars, the Minister of Finance was called before the National Assembly for a televised question-and-answer session to explain certain financial policy decisions, an episode remarkable for its public nature and vigorous questioning. Later in the year, the committee dealing with general and institutional affairs proceeded with consideration of an opposition proposal, an unprecedented event in Côte d'Ivoire.

Building on that assistance, additional ESF was allocated when Cote d'Ivoire held elections for the legislature, putting in place a new body viewed as capable of providing oversight of the executive branch. This was viewed in the foreign policy community as a meaningful opening which, with limited support, could have important impact on the Ivoirian government's accountability to its citizens. FY 1998 ESF funds were allocated to the Cote d'Ivoire and used to support an NDI program designed to 1) familiarize Ivoirian legislators with ways of obtaining and incorporating citizen concerns into the legislative and policymaking processes; and 2) encourage the electorate to monitor the actions of its representatives in Parliament. NDI organized seminars on specific issues related to constitutional reform for political parties represented in Parliament and assisted each party to better articulate their own responses to the proposed reforms. The program was designed to promote greater parliamentary accountability, transparency, and efficacy, thereby strengthening both a key democratic institution within the country and increasing citizen involvement in political processes. As a result, legislators are taking such steps as to call ministers before the National Assembly for televised question-and-answer sessions to explain certain financial policy decisions. These episodes are remarkable for their public nature and vigorous questions.

Laos

Laos has made meaningful advances in opening its communist system to the outside world and in promoting the concept of ROL. A small allocation of ESF was made for Laos to address the fundamental issue of information for judges throughout the country. In the context of this ESF-supported economic law **judicial training program**, USAID sent a G/DG staff member to Laos to assess the legal environment and propose a strategic intervention that could be undertaken with limited resources. USAID provided assistance through IDLI to work with 10 Lao experts from the judiciary and the Ministry of Justice to pen and edit a judicial benchbook focusing on economic legal issues. The benchbook, a composite of Lao laws, will be completed by mid-1999 and published in Lao, English, and French. The publications are being presented to all judges, through a series of training workshops to be concluded by the end of calendar year 1999. The program provides judges with guidelines for how to address economic issues—guidelines that heretofore had not existed. Given the overall country context and the small size of

the program, USAID expects modest, but not unimportant, results from this program. The training should lead to 1) some improvements in the quality of judicial rulings as they pertain to economic affairs and, more importantly, 2) exposure of those in the Lao justice sector to the importance of the rule of law, and 3) a beginning of the slow process of stimulating demand for judicial independence and professionalization.

Lesotho

Building on the earlier ESF-supported civic organization work, in FY 1998 ESF funds to NDI through CEPPS enabled the participation of several U.S. monitors on the UN international **election observer delegation**. The delegation noted that the elections were peaceful and relatively well administered. However, post-election program activities with the newly elected Parliament and civil society were postponed due to the breakdown in civil order and ensuing political uncertainty following the elections. In the interim, events will be monitored and close contact maintained with key contacts in-country to enable re-engagement when tensions ease.

Oman

The promulgation of Oman's Basic Law in 1996, a sort of constitution, and modest steps to increase participation in government through a limited legislative franchise created an opportunity for the U.S. to assist an important strategic ally in its political development process. Oman already has close ties to the U.S. military; the legal assistance activity recently initiated will further support that relationship and Oman's political reform. Based on a needs assessment conducted in January 1999, a training program will be conducted including a **judicial training** of trainers component to build Omani judicial expertise in and of itself as well as indigenous training capacity. Experts will then organize a follow-up in-country seminar to provide TOT participants an opportunity to conduct their first training seminar with the supervision and assistance of experts. The program will be completed by the end of calendar year 1999.

Papua New Guinea

As Papua New Guinea prepares for critical elections on Bougainville intended to help end nine years of civil war there, the USG responded to requests for assistance from the election commission to help **strengthen electoral administration** and assess the current voter registration system. The objective of this program was to build professionalism within the electoral commission, strengthen the commission's administrative capacity, support the design and development of training materials and programs for polling place officials, and improve transparency in the elections process. In November and December 1998, a technical assessment was conducted to determine which specific facets of elections administration the activity should target. Follow-on, direct technical assistance to the commission will begin in the third quarter of FY 1999 prior to the Bougainville elections, the date of which has not been finalized.

Sierra Leone

From the outset, ESF support to Sierra Leone was intended to show USG support for those working towards peace, knowing that the environment was not hospitable to achieving long-term results. ESF resources in Sierra Leone were utilized for two purposes. First, experts were sent to participate in and make presentations at the ESF-supported national seminar, "The Military and Democracy in Sierra Leone." The seminar constituted an important step in generating a national **dialogue on the role of the armed forces**. Attended by some 300 Sierra Leone nationals from most parts of the country, the meeting demonstrated that civil society is capable of generating serious ideas and that the government and defense headquarters are beginning to understand the value of developing a partnership with civil society. This activity was complementary to OTI's continuing program of support to civil society groups that are engaged with the government.

Second, USAID-supported technical assistance to the executive in developing a framework to guide the **formulation and implementation of policy on governance in the security sector**. To that end, the

USAID team worked with senior government officials as well as members of civil society and the legislature. Given the current conflict, this activity had but limited impact, beyond once again demonstrating the USG's support for peace in Sierra Leone and revealing to USAID the probable benefits of coordinating future security-related activities with the British government, which is heavily engaged in this matter. In addition, it is hoped that through these activities USAID has positively influenced actors who may emerge as important figures in bringing Sierra Leone back to peace.

Swaziland

FY 1998 ESF-funded CEPPS activities planned for the national elections were cancelled because a ban on political parties and a constitutional impasse led most opposition candidates to boycott the elections. However, the **training of trainers in local government** did occur, and the subsequent training of newly-elected local councilors on such topics as financial management and organization of public meetings is proceeding. More than 75 percent of local counselors serving on Swaziland's 11 municipal councils attended seminars in November and December 1998. It is still too soon to comment on how this training has impacted the quality of local governance, but initial feedback from participants in the NDI conducted training was positive.

Thailand

Thailand, a long-time ally of the United States, adopted a new constitution that changed electoral procedures in the country. Thai voters have traditionally had little trust in the electoral process, and State felt that a low investment could help build **indigenous capacity to monitor elections** as well as help **build voter confidence** there. The ESF-funded program implemented by The Asian Foundation has trained 30 master trainers in electoral procedures under the new constitution, teaching methodologies and administration of domestic election monitoring. The master trainers in turn are conducting regional and provincial training seminars on election monitoring. These trainers, along with 10 other activists, are also working to activate the People's Network, the administrative infrastructure through which national monitoring and training programs are taking place. Written resources such as domestic elections monitoring manuals are also being developed to serve as post-training seminar references. While the activity is still ongoing, the program is on track to meet its objective of strengthening the elections process in Thailand—not simply so that the next election is free and fair, but so that all future elections may continue to improve in quality. To that end, the grantee is working closely with a local organization, Pollwatch, to strengthen its capacity to independently implement elections-related programs like training of election monitors and civic education.

Togo

The USG had a vested interest in receiving a reputable assessment by a respectable international NGO on Togo's pre-election environment to help shape USG policy towards the country. The assessment also helped to visibly demonstrate the USG's interest in peaceful, well-organized and genuinely competitive elections. This ESF-funded **pre-election assessment** conducted by CEPPS partner NDI concluded that, while the electoral environment has improved from the 1993 presidential election, conditions for a fair and transparent election for the June 21 election were not present. It also provided the Togolese election commission with feedback on its performance to date, and gave the international community an impartial and accurate assessment of the pre-election environment and elections preparations.

Venezuela

The issue of transparency in the funding of political campaigns and parties loomed large in Venezuela. There was no effective system to regulate contributions and the USG wanted to support Venezuelans fighting for reasonable financial controls and public disclosure. Approximately 100 members and staff of the Venezuelan Election Council, members of Congress, other key government officials, civic leaders, political party representatives, journalists, and topical experts attended the **conference on political party and campaign financing** organized by IFES through the CEPPS mechanism. A collection of laws from

19 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean relating to public financing of political parties and election campaigns was distributed to all participants.

Preservation of constitutional democracy is a major U.S. interest in Venezuela. The 1998 elections were a watershed event in the democratic transition there. In light of substantial investments and close economic political partnership with Venezuela, the United States has a vested interest in ensuring that Venezuela continues to strengthen political institutions and processes. Using ESF, G/DG supported an IRI **electoral observation team** that determined that the December 1998 presidential elections were open and transparent, providing for the international community and, more importantly, Venezuelans themselves an independent assessment of the elections. This helped instill greater confidence in the Venezuelan elections process. The team coordinated with local democratic leaders and activists to increase observation efficacy and communicate their concerns to the relevant authorities, and provided elections officials with specific actionable recommendations for further refinements in the electoral administration process.

Yemen

International **pre-election assessments and election observations** conducted in FY 1997 by NDI using ESF ensured that Yemen's April 1997 elections were open, peaceful, and competitive. International support during the pre-election period also led to substantial recognition of the need for increased women's participation in the election process. International election observation allowed delegates to make specific recommendations for improving future election processes. The delegation's statement was credited by political party and governmental leaders as helping to ensure public confidence in the results of the elections. The Center contributed to this process in its management of ESF resources and through direct participation in the process.

Based on the successful electoral process supported earlier with ESF, and recognizing that Yemen is the sole Arab country with an independent election commission and that Yemen's government has shown a commitment to multi-party democracy, the USG built on the democratic gains to date through ESF support to fund IFES and NDI **assistance to the electoral commission and Yemeni parliament**. Negotiations with the Supreme Elections Committee are ongoing and a planning meeting in March 1999 is expected to finalize the design of the technical assistance program. Focus group research has been conducted to better inform the content of the parliamentary outreach program. The research, unprecedented in Yemen's history, has helped inform parliamentarians of the interests of their constituents. The focus group studies will be used to engage 30 parliamentarians and organizations within each of those constituencies to expand legislative responsiveness to the public and to better inform the Yemeni citizenry on Parliament's role—thereby strengthening Parliament as an institution. Because of the overall magnitude of ESF support in Yemen, G/DG supported a TDY to Yemen to determine the status, effectiveness, and any results of activities funded with ESF. During this TDY, G/DG confirmed the status of these activities with the implementing partners, U.S. embassy staff, and host country counterparts, and it obtained information on their effectiveness from these sources; subsequently G/DG provided guidance on mid-course corrections as appropriate.

Asia regional women's rights program

Laos, Thailand, Fiji, Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands were authorized to participate in this regional program which also includes the USAID presence countries of Cambodia, Indonesia, Mongolia, and the Philippines. Through activities designed to 1) strengthen the regional network of women's organizations in East Asia, 2) maximize the cross-fertilization of ideas throughout this network, and 3) fortify the capacity of organizations within this network, the program seeks to improve indigenous efforts to **protect the rights of women**, particularly as they pertain to gender violence and workplace discrimination. The activity is on-going, and USAID expects to see programmatic impact in several areas. Local partners are collecting data and training on gender violence in the Pacific Islands so that the

specific nature of the problem is better understood. Advocates plan to use this information to better design legislation regarding gender violence, bolster public education campaigns, garner public and political support for legal reform, and discuss with government agencies how both government and civil society can better respond to gender violence. In Laos, USAID has trained three women on gender issues so that they can serve as key trainers in a "gender and the constitution" program, publicly highlighting the subject of women's empowerment in a manner that heretofore has not occurred. These women are being linked with resources and individuals from elsewhere in the region, in hopes of opening this closed society to the outside world. Lastly, in Thailand, efforts to develop a women's rights network, including a core of expert trainers in women's rights have proved successful. The trainers have been frequently invited to conduct workshops by universities, NGOs, and governmental agencies. Several women have been appointed to national legislative committees. Most importantly, the network is working with labor groups to pressure the government on issues related to health and safety in the workplace; as of last year, more than 30,000 Thai had signed their names in support of the proposal.



Center for Democracy and Governance
Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support, and Research
U.S. Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523-3100
Tel: (202) 712-4209
Fax: (202) 216-3232