

USAID/LEBANON
ANNUAL REPORT FY 2002

March 2002

Please Note:

The attached RESULTS INFORMATION is from the FY 2002 Annual report, and was assembled and analyzed by the country or USAID operating unit identified on the cover page.

The Annual Report is a “pre-decisional” USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID review(s) of this document.

Related document information can be obtained from:
USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse
1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200
Arlington, VA 22209-2111
Telephone: 703/351-4006 Ext. 106
Fax: 703/351-4039
Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org
Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

Released on or after July 1, 2002

Annual Report Part III: FY 2001 Performance Narrative

A. 2001: The Program and the Context

USAID/Lebanon's current strategy, which began in 1997, blends economic development, policy reform, governance, environmental, and landmine assistance activities in ways that promote sustainable growth, stability, and security throughout Lebanon - a country still recovering from 15 years of civil war and 22 years of Israeli occupation in a region now embroiled in conflict and implicated in terrorist activity.

The cornerstone of the strategy seeks to revitalize and expand economic opportunities in Lebanon's most deprived and devastated rural areas through community-based NGO-facilitated activities. These are strengthened through governance and capacity-building programs that support newly-elected municipalities and civil society organizations, many of which are catalysts for local-level resource mobilization, community participation, sustainable environmental technologies, efficient and equitable water management and, on the human security side, landmine awareness and victims assistance programs. At the national level, USAID focuses on promoting broad-based economic growth and trade, specifically Lebanon's efforts to join the World Trade Organization.

The Septembers that bookend this reporting period were cataclysmic for Lebanon, the Middle East, and the world at large. September 2000, marked by the violent events at Jerusalem's Al Aqsa mosque, triggered the *intifada* which has now claimed thousands of Palestinian and Israeli lives. It was also a major factor in keeping Lebanon's "resistance" alive on the still-disputed Lebanese-Israeli border, with frequent incursions that fueled tension and aggression, increased instability and insecurity, and undermined resettlement, reintegration and revival of the formerly occupied south. September 2001 witnessed not only the advent of global terror, but within weeks the inclusion of Hizballah, viewed by Lebanon as its premier "resistance fighters", on America's short list of global terrorists - putting enormous strain on Lebanon's relationship with the United States.

Punctuating these two events were bright spots that inspired optimism and confidence among the Lebanese, the donor community, and foreign investors alike. Most notable was the new, reform-minded government advocating economic growth and investment nationwide, globalization, privatization, good governance, administrative and municipal reform, sound budgetary and fiscal management, customs reform, democratic elections in the south, and a host of other positive measures. In recognition of the new opportunities stemming from the May 2000 Israeli withdrawal from South Lebanon, and the initial positive steps the Lebanese took to capitalize on it, USAID's program resources tripled to \$45 million in 2001, from an annual average of \$15 million from 1997 to 2000.

These "winds of change", however, were short-lived and overshadowed by some deep-seated structural, political, economic, and regional dynamics that posed a number of challenges for the USAID program. The main one: How to expand a program and still make a difference in people's lives when:

- South Lebanon, the focus for USAID's expansion, remains unstable, insecure, unsettled and unsovereign -- due to perpetual cross-border violations and periodic aggression between Hizballah and Israeli forces; unsafe habitats riddled with mines and other unexploded ordnance; and an overall lack of government presence, as well as social and economic investment.
- The economy, rather than rebounding, continues to deteriorate to the point of crisis, with public debt ballooning from 140% of GDP in 2000 to 170% in 2001; debt-servicing and government operations consuming 95% of the public budget, and economic growth hovering at zero at best.

- The political machinery, continually mired in religious and other cleavages, undermines nation-building and collective action for the common good; and slows or worse yet impedes the kinds of institutional and structural reforms needed to get Lebanon on a sound footing.

B. USAID/Lebanon's Competitive Advantage

These challenges, and the increasingly difficult context in which the donor community is operating, are in many respects tailor-made for the USAID program. Over the past four years, USAID has built a reputation as one of the top donor programs in Lebanon, viewed by many as one of the most responsive, expansive, resilient, targeted, high-performing, and quick-disbursing – even though far from the largest. We attribute this to our *purpose*, which is to promote equitable, sustainable, economic and social development in Lebanon over the long-term; our *products*, which are demand-driven, people-focused, affordable, effective, appropriate, visible and accomplishable in the short-term; our implementing *partners* -- PVOs and NGOs, foundations, universities, business associations, and corporations -- who together form a multi-faceted, highly-talented, experienced group capable of navigating effectively at the highest governmental, corporate, and diplomatic levels, as well as at the village and community level; and our operating *procedures*, which are user-friendly, promoting extensive coordination and collaboration with all relevant public and private entities and, in contrast to most donor programs, channeling resources directly to implementing partners.

C. Achievements in 2001

The USAID program, using its advantages to address these challenges, had its best year of performance to date, meeting and in many cases exceeding its targets for FY 2001. Success was not at the strategic objective level, which will take time given the current context and the many factors beyond our sphere of influence. Rather, it was in those intermediate results that fused on-the-ground achievements, new partnerships, and policy and institutional reform. Taken together, the program, particularly its rural development, governance, and trade-related activities, achieved a number of milestones and results that made significant changes in people's lives, and helped the Mission chart an even stronger development path for the future.

Pillar: Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade

This pillar encompasses two of the Mission's three Strategic Objectives: "Reconstruction and Expanded Economic Opportunity" and "Improved Environmental Practices." These are directly linked to the Agency's objectives of improving agriculture, creating equitable economic opportunity for the rural poor, expanding and strengthening private markets, protecting the world's environment, and expanding access to basic education. They also encompass a humanitarian demining component targeting human security – the *sine qua non* for growth and development.

Economic Growth and Agriculture

Activities promoting economic opportunities and agricultural development achieved excellent results in 2001, largely through the flagship Rural Community Development Cluster (RCDC) program, complemented by dairy development, microfinance, and mine awareness and victims' assistance programs. Key to this was (1) the immediate expansion of all five Village Cluster PVOs into South Lebanon, which within a few months enabled USAID to begin activities in new clusters incorporating over 200 villages; and (2) the full integration of USAID/ESF and USDA/416(b) resources and programs in the south, which provided an immediate \$20 million and made the RCDC the most active and responsive donor-funded development program in South Lebanon.

This expansion into the south, as well as into existing clusters in familiar but neglected rural areas, produced a number of on-the-ground achievements which together comprise USAID's "Top Ten Rural Development Hits for 2001". In no rank order:

- Hit #1: Nearly 400 of RCDC's 1,260 activities began in 2001, half in South Lebanon. 254 were completed, the highest annual number and rate to date. Cost-sharing by communities and municipalities jumped to 40%, exceeding the 25% target. Beneficiaries increased from 45% to 70% of Lebanon's rural population, and encompassed 30% of the south's.
- Hit #2: 47,000 new families, nearly 20,000 in the south, accessed improved agricultural infrastructure (irrigation, roads, water storage) and training in high-value crops, adding to 56,000 families already benefiting. Many of them also accessed over 9,000 hectares of improved agricultural land (2,800 in the south), representing 35% of the 26,300 hectares improved to date.
- Hit #3: 1,500 dairy farmers bought 2,750 pregnant heifers imported under a USAID-supported USDA loan guarantee program, adding \$800 of annual net income per cow. Three years and 5,750 cows later, this program – which is close to paying for itself -- has helped reduce Lebanon's reliance on imported dairy products from 80% to 60%, with an additional 15% expected in 2002.
- Hit #4: 8,000 new small entrepreneurs benefited from \$5.5 million in microenterprise loans, bringing the total loan volume to \$20 million servicing 38,000 clients in over 3,000 businesses nationwide.
- Hit #5: 12,000 entrepreneurs without loans, of which 2,000 are in the south, joined an existing 21,000 others in accessing better economic opportunities. 500 women involved in an agri-based cottage industry formed Lebanon's first agricultural marketing cooperative. Their annual per capita earnings average \$1,500, with domestic and regional sales now approaching \$500,000.
- Hit #6: 73 villages approved environmental management plans covering over 6,000 hectares, adding to 200 villages already implementing reforestation, drainage, wastewater and solid waste management, and land terracing activities. The Ministry of Environment endorsed the RCDC's pioneering waste disposal, recycling, and composting technologies.
- Hit #7: Over 300 survivors of mine accidents and their families formed a Landmine Survivors Assistance Center in Jezzine, Lebanon's most heavily-mined area. This Center, whose status is a "Resource Cooperative, seeks to generate \$300-500 monthly per member through a variety of agri-based cottage industries. It is the first of its kind worldwide.
- Hit #8: 475,000 Lebanese, about 85% of whom live in the heavily-mined areas of South Lebanon and the West Bekaa, profited from USAID-sponsored mine awareness campaigns and other outreach activities explaining donor and military efforts to demine high priority areas. These campaigns will hopefully reduce the average number of monthly mine-related deaths and injuries from nine to zero.
- Hit #9: USAID assistance in creating Balamand University's Landmines Resource Center (LMRC) in 1998 paid off in 2001. The LMRC has become the premier resource for social and economic information relating to landmine areas, victims and families – accessed and contracted by government agencies, donors, private demining companies, and Lebanese and U.N. Peacekeeping Forces.
- Hit #10: 13,000 new primary school students, 1,000 of whom are from the south, joined 81,000 previous students in accessing basic education through USAID's school rehabilitation

programs. [Note: Inadequate infrastructure is the major constraint to quality primary education in Lebanon. Lebanon's literacy rate is above 90%.]

These results, achieved primarily through core implementing partners, were heightened by several existing and new "strategic partnerships" forged in 2001. Recognizing the valuable expertise among Lebanon's American Educational Institutions (AEIs), USAID expanded its relationships with the American University of Beirut (AUB) and Lebanese American University (LAU) to enable their faculty to engage more broadly in the RCDC, environmental, water management, and trade-related activities. Similar overtures to the USDA on dairy development and food monetization led to an additional \$30 million of investments during the 2000-2001 period. A new commercial bank partnership with one of our leading microfinance NGOs leveraged \$1 million and several thousand new loans, which we view as a sustainable, private sector-led model for the future.

On the human security side, joint programming of the Mission's ESF resources with NADR and DA resources from the State Department's Office of Humanitarian Demining and the Pillar Bureau's Leahy War Victims Funds, respectively, gave USAID/Lebanon the pre-eminent position on mine awareness and victims' assistance activities within the newly-created multi-donor "International Support Group for Demining." Finally, as the program capitalizes on value-added activities through Information and Communication Technology (ICT), an end-of-year partnership with Microsoft will result, in 2002, in the Mission's first Global Development Alliance (GDA).

The immediate results from these partnerships were the catalyst for two new "mergers", both modeled on the RCDC program, which will have long-term broad-based impact in the rural development sector. These are the World Bank's "Community Development Project" (CDP) and the European Union's "Social Development Fund" (SDF), each of which is funded at \$30 million over a five-year period. Both are now "effective" and in contracting modes. USAID's RCDC partners have played, and will continue to play, a role in both – at a minimum as benevolent advisors, and at a maximum as implementers. This is joint programming and collaboration at its best, and a feather for USAID's RCDC program. Note that this "community-based cluster" approach was adopted in the West Bank/Gaza in 2000 and Serbia in 2001, with USAID/Amman to follow in 2002.

In sum, if "significance" can be defined as a set of results that make a real difference in the lives of the vast majority of one's targeted beneficiaries, through activities that they want, they contribute to, and they eventually own, facilitated by strategic partnerships and alliances that capture the best that public, private, and non-governmental players have to offer, in ways that strive for continuous added-value and sustainability, with new approaches and technologies that can help other programs make a similar difference in people's lives, then USAID's rural development activities in Lebanon are significant.

Trade

On global trade and investment, USAID assistance enabled Lebanon hit a key milestone in May 2001 with the submission of its Foreign Trade Regime Memorandum (MFTR) to WTO headquarters – formally launching the accession process and setting the stage for initial Working Party Meetings and negotiations in May 2002 and WTO membership by the end of 2003. Lebanon's signing the European Union - Mediterranean Partnership Agreement in December 2001, which complements the MFTR but whose effectiveness depends on WTO membership, gave increased impetus to WTO compliance, particularly on the services sector. Upcoming Working Party meetings also stimulated further work on copyright, trademark, foreign investment, competition and intellectual property laws, which are scheduled for passage in 2002.

USAID technical assistance in FY 2001 was also instrumental in creating awareness of the WTO and its implications for Lebanon --holding more than 50 awareness seminars targeting the public

and private sectors, NGOs, the media, and universities; distributing extensive materials about the WTO and its agreements; and holding a successful National Forum on WTO accession. Note that all these steps for WTO membership are closely linked to improving the investment climate for USAID's other program priorities, i.e., tourism, agri-business, services, and information and communication technology.

Pillar: Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance

This pillar targets the Mission's Strategic Objective "Increased Effectiveness of Selected Institutions that Support Democracy", which is directly linked to the Agency's objectives of encouraging more transparent and accountable government institutions, promoting politically active civil society, and preventing conflict.

Democracy

USAID's democracy and governance activities, which focus on promoting legislation and building capacity for effective, decentralized local government, received a major boost in August 2001 with a path-breaking agreement, signed with the Ministry of Interior and Municipal Affairs, giving USAID a mandate to expand its pioneering municipal capacity building program from 82 to all 712 municipalities nationwide over the next three years. New leadership in the Ministry recognized that local government, reactivated in 1998 and in the South only since 2001, must play a major role in development decision-making if economic revival and growth was to occur. That USAID had already made great strides in promoting this view, and had helped a number of municipalities design, implement and evaluate modern, computerized management systems and procedures that fit their needs, catapulted our activities from relatively low-key back-stage "pilots" to a highly visible center-stage program.

The beneficiaries of the 82 municipalities are the residents who now see the foundations of local government working more efficiently, providing them services in a more timely and transparent way. The other positive effect is the municipalities' ownership of rural development (RCDC) activities started by village and village cluster committees, which in the long-term will help ensure sustainability. Municipal councils are now assuming responsibility for safeguarding theirs and their communities' infrastructure investments, while at the same time promoting economic opportunities for their constituents.

The above agreement is a critical "process" step for this program – a springboard for future expansion and impact. This would not have happened had we not successfully completed a "basic package" of improvements this year in two urban municipalities, yielding results that indeed changed the way municipalities and their constituents viewed and behaved toward local government, both in day-to-day transactions and in the legal framework governing them. This effort, begun in 1999 under an anti-corruption/good governance activity, targeted Beirut and neighboring Jounieh municipalities, comprised of 1.2 million and 150,000 residents, and 165,000 and 15,000 taxpayers, respectively, for a series of reforms. What resulted in 2001 were:

- New computerized budget, revenue, and personnel systems that are helping these municipalities do better planning and exert oversight of funds and staff, with reliable information available electronically between the municipality and central agencies;
- New taxpayer lists that not only doubled their revenues from \$18 million to \$39 million with the promise of more and better services, but also prevented the manipulation of tax data and records.
- More efficient and transparent processing of forms and applications, cutting the time for certain transactions, such as accessing the appraised value of a building, from six weeks to ten minutes.

- New “Citizen Reception Offices” where residents can get information on municipal services in one-stop; “Citizen Guides”, listing all required documents, fees, and processing times; a “Citizen Complaint System”, which council members are bound to take seriously; and “Municipal Homepages”, to get all this information on the web.
- Extensive feedback, from council members, municipal workers and constituents that these systems and improvements are making a major positive difference in the way local government works – increasing efficiencies and revenues, encouraging citizen participation, minimizing corruption, and instilling confidence for the future.

These two examples, covering over a third of Lebanon’s population, along with smaller-scale versions in rural areas, became showcases that stimulated demand for nationwide expansion, both from the top and the bottom. They also prompted a serious re-look in Parliamentary Committees of existing Municipal and draft Decentralization Laws, which were modified in 2001 through decrees and, with SUNY assistance, should reach a floor vote by mid-2002.

While USAID is not claiming victory on what will undoubtedly be a continuing and long-term process of local-level institution-building, results achieved thus far – in substance, in geographic and demographic coverage, and in changing attitudes and behavior toward local government – are significant.

On promoting a politically active civil society, the Mission, again with OTI assistance, initiated a “Transparency and Accountability Grants” (TAG) program in mid-2001 aimed at strengthening anti-corruption advocacy at a grass-roots level. Some 29 grants to local organizations throughout Lebanon produced both needed and innovative products that are gaining local and national recognition, e.g, an anti-corruption Monopoly-type game for schools; the publication, explanation, and tracking of a municipal budget; codes of ethics for businesses and NGOs, to name a few. This program has great potential, prompting the Mission to expand it and make it an integral part of its governance portfolio. Results will be reported next year.

Conflict Prevention

On the surface USAID’s activities – agricultural roads, irrigation systems, wastewater treatment plants, cottage industries, management information systems, etc. – can appear simply as a laundry-list of outputs. What’s behind each activity, however, is a home-grown process of consensus-building and collaborative decision-making that fuses local interests together, creates an ethic of collective responsibility and ownership and, in our view, mitigates conflict in conflict-prone areas.

Half of the 1,260 activities implemented thus far belong to “communities in conflict”, many of which were riddled by civil war and occupation, and are still plagued by family feuds, political and religious cleavages, and various social and economic disparities. The program has had success in building bridges in some very divisive communities, notably Christian and Druze villages in the Chouf area. While we will not state that this approach prevents conflict, the root causes of which are multiple and complex, we can confirm that (1) it has brought people together who had never worked together before due to endemic conflict; (2) it has stimulated cooperation in follow-on activities, not simply “one-offs”; and (3) it has created pluralism and diversity in more than 200 hundred recently elected municipal councils, many of whose members emerged from the heterogeneous and representative community-based RCDC village cluster committees.

D. Setbacks in 2001

USAID faced two setbacks in 2001. The first stems from high expectations for South Lebanon that USAID shared with all other donors immediately following the Israeli withdrawal from the formerly occupied zone. The immediate goal was economic revival, resettlement, and reintegration – the three Rs that would make Lebanon whole. This has not yet happened, for reasons explained above. The upshot: while USAID's PVO/NGO partners worked with over 150 communities in the south in implementing nearly 400 activities, most of them were oriented toward small-scale infrastructure, not income-generation. The latter needs higher concentrations of people, security, and investment incentives, which for the most part do not exist and which we cannot directly affect.

The second relates to Congressional holds on FY 2001 program funds, due to issues of sovereignty and Lebanese military presence in the south, not the performance of the USAID program. The mission received no environmental funds in FY 2001, causing delays in expanding its innovative environmental health program. Most affected were activities in solid waste and wastewater disposal in rural areas, all based on appropriate technologies and all approved in early FY 2001 with community contributions in place. We lost almost a year on this program. We can regain this headway and the confidence of communities in FY 2002. What we cannot regain are the cumulative negative effects on the environment and people's health.

Table 1: Annual Report Selected Performance Measures

December 3, 2001

Indicator (all data should pertain to FY or CY 01)	OU Response			Fund Account	Data Quality Factors
Pillar I: Global Development Alliance: GDA serves as a catalyst to mobilize the ideas, efforts, and resources of the public sector, corporate America and non-governmental organizations in support of shared objectives					
1 Did your operating unit achieve a significant result working in alliance with the private sector or NGOs?	Yes	No X	N/A	ESF (ends FY 2004)	
2 a. How many alliances did you implement in 2001? (list partners) b. How many alliances do you plan to implement in FY 2002?	1			ESF	
3 What amount of funds has been leveraged by the alliances in relationship to USAID's contribution?	\$65,000				
Pillar II: Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade: USAID works to improve country economic performance using five approaches: (1) liberalizing markets, (2) improving agriculture, (3) supporting microenterprise, (4) ensuring primary education, and (5) protecting the environment and improving energy efficiency.					
4 If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the EGAT pillar, did it/they exceed, meet, or not meet its/their targets? 000-001: (Reconstruction and Expanded Economic Opportunity)	Exceed	Met X	Not Met	ESF (ends FY 2004)	
4 If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the EGAT pillar, did it/they exceed, meet, or not meet its/their targets? 000-005: (Improved Environmental Practices)	Exceed	Met X	Not Met	ESF (ends FY 2004)	
USAID Objective 1: Critical, private markets expanded and strengthened					
5 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X		
USAID Objective 2: More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged					
6 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes X	No	N/A	ESF	Data quality for this objective is assessed semi-annually for approximately 25% of all ongoing and completed activities through a unified reporting system that all implementing partners apply, as well as through regular field trips.
USAID Objective 3: Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable					
7 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes X	No	N/A	ESF	Data quality for this objective is assessed semi-annually for approximately 25% of all ongoing and completed activities through a unified reporting system that all implementing partners apply, as well as through regular field trips.

Indicator (all data should pertain to FY or CY 01)	OU Response			Fund Account	Data Quality Factors
USAID Objective 4: Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded					
8 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No X	N/A	ESF	
9 a. Number of children enrolled in primary schools affected by USAID basic education programs (2001 actual) b. Number of children enrolled in primary schools affected by USAID basic education programs (2002 target)	Male	Female	13,431 21,890	ESF ESF	Data reflects the number of students that have benefited from school infrastructure or equipping projects in the poor rural areas of Lebanon. Male/female disaggregation will take place at a later date. Data reflects the number of students that have benefited from school infrastructure or equipping projects in the poor rural areas of Lebanon. Male/female disaggregation will take place at a later date.
USAID Objective 5: World's environment protected					
10 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No X	N/A	ESF	
11 a. Hectares under Approved Management Plans (2001 actual) b. Hectares under Approved Management Plans (2002 target)	6,191 hectares 14,735 hectares			ESF ESF	Information from management plans is reviewed and tabulated semi-annually through a special reporting and regular field visits. Information from management plans is reviewed and tabulated semi-annually through a special reporting and regular field visits.
Pillar III: Global Health: USAID works to: (1) stabilize population, (2) improve child health, (3) improve maternal health, (4) address the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and (5) reduce the threat of other infectious diseases.					
12 If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the Global Health pillar, did it/they exceed, meet, or not meet its/their targets?	Exceed	Met	Not Met	N/A	
USAID Objective 1: Reducing the number of unintended pregnancies					
13 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	N/A	
USAID Objective 2: Reducing infant and child mortality					
14 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	N/A	

Indicator (all data should pertain to FY or CY 01)	OU Response			Fund Account	Data Quality Factors	
USAID Objective 3: Reducing deaths and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth						
15 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	N/A		
USAID Objective 4: Reducing the HIV transmission rate and the impact of HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries						
16 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	N/A		
USAID Objective 5: Reducing the threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance						
17 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	N/A		
Pillar IV: Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance						
18 If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance Pillar, did it/they exceed, meet, or not meet its/their targets? 000-002: (Increased Effectiveness of Selected Institutions which Support Democracy).	Exceed	Met X	Not Met	ESF (ends FY 2004)		
USAID Objective 1: Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened						
19 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	N/A		
USAID Objective 2: Credible and competitive political processes encouraged						
20 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	N/A		
USAID Objective 3: The development of politically active civil society promoted						
21 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No X	N/A	ESF	Results are monitored and assessed through semi-annual reports, meetings with beneficiaries and implementing NGO and site visits.	
USAID Objective 4: More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged						
22 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes X	No	N/A	ESF	Results are monitored and assessed through semi-annual reports, meetings with beneficiaries and implementing NGO and site visits. Also, additional requests for support are indicators of success and good implementation.	

Indicator (all data should pertain to FY or CY 01)	OU Response			Fund Account	Data Quality Factors
USAID Objective 5: Conflict					
23 Did your program in a pre-conflict situation achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	ESF (ends FY 2004)	
24 Did your program in a post-conflict situation achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No X	N/A	ESF (ends FY 2004)	
25 Number of refugees and internally displaced persons assisted by USAID	Male	Female	Total 12,540	ESF	In FY 01, 12,540 individuals adding to the 13,325 reached so far have benefited from the community development projects implemented in their villages. These activities have significantly contributed to their return and resettlement in their villages.
USAID Objective 6: Humanitarian assistance following natural or other disasters					
26 Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	N/A	
27 Number of beneficiaries				N/A	

Table 2: Selected Performance Measures for Other Reporting Purposes

The information in this table will be used to provide data for standard USAID reporting requirements

Indicator (all data should pertain to FY or CY 01)	OU Response			Fund Account	Data Quality Factors
Child Survival Report					
Global Health Objective 1: Reducing the number of unintended pregnancies					
1 Percentage of in-union women age 15-49 using, or whose partner is using, a modern method of contraception at the time of the survey. (DHS/RHS)					
Global Health Objective 2: Reducing infant and child mortality					
2 Percentage of children age 12 months or less who have received their third dose of DPT (DHS/RHS)	Male	Female	Total		
3 Percentage of children age 6-59 months who had a case of diarrhea in the last two weeks and received ORT (DHS/RHS)	Male	Female	Total		
4 Percentage of children age 6-59 months receiving a vitamin A supplement during the last six months (DHS/RHS)	Male	Female	Total		
5 Were there any confirmed cases of wild-strain polio transmission in your country?					
Global Health Objective 3: Reduce deaths and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth					
6 Percentage of births attended by medically-trained personnel (DHS/RHS)					
Global Health Objective 5: Reducing the threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance					
7 a. Number of insecticide impregnated bed-nets sold (Malaria) (2001 actual) b. Number of insecticide impregnated bed-nets sold (Malaria) (2002 target)					
8 Proportion of districts implementing the DOTS Tuberculosis strategy					

HIV/AIDS Report

Global Health Objective 4: Reducing the HIV transmission rate and the impact of HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries

<p>a. Total condom sales (2001 actual)</p> <p>9</p> <p>b. Total condom sales (2002 target)</p>					
<p>a. Number of individuals treated in STI programs (2001 actual)</p> <p>10</p> <p>b. Number of individuals treated in STI programs (2002 target)</p>	Male	Female	Total		
<p>11 Is your operating unit supporting an MTCT program?</p>					
<p>a. Number of individuals reached by community and home based care programs (2001 actual)</p> <p>12</p> <p>b. Number of individuals reached by community and home based care programs (2002 target)</p>	Male	Female	Total		
<p>a. Number of orphans and vulnerable children reached (2001 actual)</p> <p>13</p> <p>b. Number of orphans and vulnerable children reached (2002 target)</p>	Male	Female	Total		
<p>a. Number of individuals reached by antiretroviral (ARV) treatment programs (2001 actual)</p> <p>14</p> <p>b. Number of individuals reached by antiretroviral (ARV) treatment programs (2002 target)</p>	Male	Female	Total		

Victims of Torture Report					
Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance Objective 7: Providing support to victims of torture					
15	Did you provide support to torture survivors this year, even as part of a larger effort?				
16	Number of beneficiaries (adults age 15 and over)	Male	Female	Total	
17	Number of beneficiaries (children under age 15)	Male	Female	Total	

Global Climate Change					
USAID Objective 5: World's environment protected					
18	Global Climate Change: See GCC Appendix				

Annual Report Part IV: Updated Results Framework

SO 1 Reconstruction and Expanded Economic Opportunity

IR 1.1 Selected rural communities revitalized

Indicator: 1.1.1 Incremental number of hectares irrigated; cultivated; improved; or accessed.

Indicator: 1.1.2 Number of families accessing new and improved social infrastructure.

Indicator: 1.1.3 Number of clients accessing expanded economic opportunities.

IR 1.2 Small/Microenterprise enhanced

Indicator 1.2.1 Number of informal sector loans delivered

Indicator 1.2.2 Loan repayment rate

Indicator 1.2.3 Lender profitability ratio

IR 1.3 Improved Economic Policies

Indicator 1.3.1 Number of initiatives adopted by sector development boards

IR 1.4 Expanded Capital Market

Indicator 1.4.1 Percentage increase in trading capacity

IR 1.5 Improved Dairy Production

Indicator 1.5.1 Total volume of milk produced per year from USDA cows

SpO 2 Increased Effectiveness of Selected Institutions Which Support Democracy

IR 2.1 Ministry of Municipal and Rural Affairs (MOMRA) providing technical assistance and information to municipalities

Indicator 2.1.1 Information System is operative

IR 2.2 Improved operation of key central agencies to support local government budgeting, administrative and financial management.

Indicator 2.2.1 Central and intermediate agencies are disseminating information related to local government

IR 2.3 Pilot municipalities are able to interact with central agencies and provide services effectively/fairly

Indicator 2.3.1 Municipalities have adopted and are using the automated budget system

Indicator 2.3.2 Time used to complete transactions is reduced.

IR 2.4 Parliament is informed on various policy options offered by qualified staff and able to oversee government budget.

Indicator 2.4.1 Professional staff analyses delivered to members of Parliament and Committees.

Indicator 2.4.2 Members of Parliament use bill-drafting services.

Indicator 2.4.3 Members of Parliament use the automated budget system.

IR 2.5 Strengthening civil society participation in public life

Indicator 2.5.1 TBD

SpO5 Improved Environmental Practices

IR 5.1 Percentage of non-AUB individuals or groups who are using AUB technical assistance to make decisions.

5.1.1 % of lab capacity used for environmental analyses.

- 5.1.2 number of new clients requesting environmental analyses.
- 5.1.3 % of clients satisfied with quality of analyses.

IR 5.2 Number of villages known to change or initiate activities to improve or maintain the condition of water resources.

- 5.2.1 % of cluster villages designing/implementing an environmental management plan that integrates activities affecting water resources.

IR 5.3 Improved understanding of landmine prevention practices

- 5.3.1 Number of individuals accessing landmines information and awareness activities.

Annual Report Part VII: Environmental Compliance

In 1997, at the time the current strategy was approved the ANE General Counsel approved a categorical exemption for Lebanon of the provisions of 22 CFR 216, based upon “notwithstanding authority” contained in the language of the 1997 FAA. This notwithstanding authority for Lebanon has been contained in foreign assistance appropriations through FY 2002, and is expected to continue for the immediate future. Therefore, no Initial Environmental Examinations (IEE) or Environmental Assessments (EA) are anticipated in the coming year.

Although the Lebanon program operates under this exemption, activities under Special Objective 3 – “Improved Environmental Practices” – are in compliance with IEE and EA standards. All implementing partners carry out environmental impact assessments before undertaking any work and after completion, ensuring that activities are environmentally sound. This is particularly important for solid waste and wastewater treatment facilities, as well as non-polluting infrastructure, i.e., agricultural roads, irrigation canals, water storage facilities, etc.