

DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

NMS No. AEP-A-00-95-00024-00
Awarded by USAID/Washington
Original Cooperative Agreement No. AEP-5466-A-00-5024-00

ANNUAL PROGRAM PROGRESS REPORT OCTOBER 1, 2002 – SEPTEMBER 30, 2003

USAID Project Office: Office of Democracy & Governance, DCHA

USAID Project No.: 936-5466

CEC No.: 073961419

LOC No.: 72-00-1317

NMS: 10286 / 625

WORLD LEARNING DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

This report documents the Democracy Fellows Program's (DFP) eighth program year (and second extension year), under NMS Cooperative Agreement No. AEP-A-00-95-00024-00. The initial Cooperative Agreement (No. AEP-5466-A-00-5024-00) was effective June 15, 1995.

- The Agreement Officer is Robert Samuel Taylor of the Office of Procurement (M/OP/G/DGHCA).
- The Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) is Wendy Marshall of the Strategies Division, Office of Democracy & Governance, DCHA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PROGRAM OVERVIEW	5
A.	THE FELLOWS	5
B.	THE PROGRAM	5
C.	SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAM MATERIALS	6
II.	EIGHTH PROGRAM YEAR	7
A.	PROGRAM GOAL AND PURPOSE	7
B.	DEMOCRACY FELLOWS' ACTIVITY	7
1.	<i>DC-based Fellows (Democracy and Governance Sub-sectors)</i>	8
2.	<i>Overseas Mission-based Fellows</i>	12
D.	SUMMARY STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL DEMOCRACY FELLOWSHIPS	14
1.	<i>Washington, D.C. Democracy Fellows</i>	14
2.	<i>Overseas Democracy Fellows</i>	14
3.	<i>Fellowship Extensions</i>	14
4.	<i>New Fellowships</i>	15
5.	<i>Pending Fellowship Extensions</i>	15
6.	<i>Pending Fellowship Selection</i>	15
7.	<i>Five Completed Fellowships:</i>	15
8.	<i>Democracy Fellows' Individual Program Descriptions and Periodic Reports</i>	16
E.	DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM ALUMNI.....	16
III.	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION	17
A.	FIRST ANNUAL DEMOCRACY FELLOWS RETREAT	17
B.	MANAGEMENT	19
1.	<i>Coordination with USAID</i>	20
2.	<i>Administrative Support</i>	21
3.	<i>Security Clearance Process</i>	22
4.	<i>Recruitment</i>	22
5.	<i>Candidate Eligibility</i>	23
6.	<i>Nomination and Selection</i>	23
C.	PROGRAM EVALUATION.....	25
D.	OPERATIONAL PROGRAM COSTS.....	25
E.	DEMOCRACY FELLOWS' STIPENDS	26
IV.	PROGRAM RESULTS AND OUTLOOK.....	26
A.	RESULTS	26
B.	OUTLOOK.....	28

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PROGRAM OVERVIEW

This eighth year of the Democracy Fellows Program (DFP) marked a renewed focus on promoting the fellows and their important role in USAID's democracy development mission, and, equally important, a growing sense of a democracy fellows community among current fellows and program alumni. Yet again, the Democracy Fellows exemplified the highest standard of shared commitment and contribution to the cause of democracy worldwide.

A. The Fellows

The wide variety of fellowship activities during this year makes the program distinctive in its ability to move forward such a complex and challenging democracy and governance agenda. At no time in the life of the DFP has there been a greater sense of value contributed by the fellows. Nor has there been a time where the fellows were closer to the cutting edge of democracy development.

The fellows covered the globe this year. From Russia, Mongolia, Kenya, to Malawi, Bolivia, to Indonesia, and beyond, the fellows provided USAID with sound technical assistance and guidance throughout the year. They helped further key parts of USAID's democracy and governance work, but they also added significantly to expanding it in innovative ways. We have used this year's report to highlight some of these progressive approaches that the fellows have added to the democracy development paradigm. In particular we draw attention to a number of fellows' efforts to overcome the destructive force of corruption, in the three distinct but reinforcing areas of the politics of patronage, money in politics, and judicial and legal reform.

B. The Program

The fellows program was again this year affected by world events. The Iraq war made travel clearance difficult for many fellows, as did the shifting the priorities and demands that arose from the conflict and its aftermath. As was the case after the tragic events of 9/11, many fellows' trips were cancelled or postponed. Still, the fellows and the program managed to work around these obstacles, which is a tribute to the excellent working relationship the fellows, World Learning, and USAID maintain.

World Learning continued to recruit qualified candidates for new Democracy Fellowships, while at the same time managing, in collaboration with USAID/DCHA/DG, all aspects of the DFP. One new Democracy Fellowship and a number of additional extensions to existing fellowships were granted, and five Democracy Fellows completed their service during the past year, bringing the number of DFP alumni to 35.

World Learning continued its sound financial management of the DFP. Financial support and benefits flowed to fellows without significant delays or incidents, and the fellows acknowledged effective program management, “particularly the stellar professional and personal service extended by [the DFP management].”

The Democracy Fellows Web site received 11029 visitors, an increase of over thirty percent from the previous year. Of those who visited the DFP Web site, more than eight hundred prospective applicants downloaded DFP application materials this year. The DFP also mailed out and distributed several hundred DFP application packages during FY-2003, resulting in approximately 44 new well-qualified eligible candidates. The DFP also continued to encourage and receive applications from members of minority and under-represented populations.

In a slight departure from previous DFP conferences, we held a practical retreat rather than a conference. The primary objective was to reinforce the notion of a Democracy Fellows community, linking fellows in more direct and complementary ways. We introduced the fellows to the greater World Learning institution to identify useful resources to promote the fellows’ work. We also addressed Fellows’ administrative needs and concerns. The retreat was uniformly described as a success, and the fellows requested that it be an annual event. We intend to honor that request.

The Democracy Fellows Program continues to improve and build on a successful history. The fellows’ contributions to USAID democracy portfolio are now considered integral, and in many cases the source of many of the agency’s cutting edge initiatives. World Learning is proud to be supporting such an important endeavor to promote democracy throughout the world.

C. Supplementary Program Materials

Copies of various Supplementary Program Materials for World Learning’s Democracy Fellows Program may be found in a series of attachments to this Program Performance Report:

- Attachment A: DFP Solicitation and Recruitment Materials
- Attachment B: DFP Application Packets
- Attachment C: DFP Screening, Nomination and Selection Materials
- Attachment D: DFP Evaluation Materials
- Attachment E: Roster of Current and Former Democracy Fellows
- Attachment F: Recruitment Status Reports
- Attachment G: FY-2003 Democracy Fellows’ Program Descriptions and Reports
- Attachment H: Current (FY-2003) Program Description Under the DFP
- Attachment I: DFP Implementation Plan for FY-2004.

II. EIGHTH PROGRAM YEAR

A. Program Goal and Purpose

The Overall Goal of the Democracy Fellows Program is:

To help support a cadre of experienced U.S. technical experts committed to careers in democracy and governance, in order to assist in the promotion of U.S. democracy and governance efforts, and to increase the number or expertise of people working in the field.

The program purpose is to identify, select, support and provide oversight of Democracy Fellows working in USAID assignments that contribute to democracy programs in developing countries, as well as to the fellows' career development and commitment.

During the reporting period, World Learning continued its successful efforts to achieve the program goal and purpose by supporting 11 existing fellowships, and awarding 1 new fellowship. Through their direct service to overseas USAID Missions and in USAID/Washington offices, the fellows provided valuable advice and technical input on a wide range of USAID democracy and governance programs and initiatives. The fellows contributed to USAID's growing body of practical D&G knowledge, while at the same time gaining significant career experience; the combination reflecting the essence of the DFP goal.

B. Democracy Fellows' Activity

This has been an exceptional year for the fellows. Although each fellow has a distinct work plan, the fellows' contributions to USAID's democracy and governance efforts have been in many cases mutually reinforcing and complementary. The range and diversity of activities was as impressive as it has been in previous years, but this year was particularly noteworthy by the remarkable measure of innovation in the fellows' approaches to technical assistance and assessment. The following are summary highlights, of course, but a detailed presentation of the fellows' work is available in the Attachment, "Fellows' Plans and Reports."

One prominent programmatic thread that demonstrates the fellows' "cutting edge" intellectual leadership this year has been in the field of anti-corruption. As examples, we draw attention to four fellows who stand out in their work in this area: Corbin Lyday, Paul Nuti, Gene Ward, and Kevin Bohrer.

The challenge of corruption is of course its complexity – that is, its myriad forms and the variety of contexts that inform relationships at the local level. Weaving together political science, anthropology, and extensive field experience, Corbin Lyday and Paul Nuti collaborated this year on a method of assessing the politics of patronage in D&G program development and implementation. The result was a practical lens through which to view and to address the patronage and clientelist corruption that hinders democratization.

According to the USAID/DHCA/DG “Democracy Report,” the DG Office embraced Lyday’s and Nuti’s basic conclusion that patronage and clientelism are “among the most pernicious of development problems.” Not surprisingly, their work has subsequently led the DG Office “to focus more on patron-client networks and their costs, benefits, functional and resilient nature, conditions that enable them, and the potential gains and risks of strategies for their reform.” (Vol. 9, Number 10) This is indeed a major fellowship contribution, and it will no doubt play a greater role in future USAID D&G development strategies.

Another concern in the broader anti-corruption theme is the influence of money on the democratic process. Dr. Gene Ward, whose fellowship ended this year, spent much of his time researching and writing “Money in Politics Handbook: A Guide to Increasing Transparency in Emerging Democracies.” The handbook’s practical relevance attracted the attention of prominent leaders including former President Jimmy Carter, as well as institutions such as the World Bank, and even the office of the British Prime Minister. The success of Dr. Ward’s fellowship initiative has set the stage for a pilot program to publicize campaign finance reports on the internet in Eastern Europe, a technical assistance project in South Africa, and a disclosure program in Bolivia.

When Dr. Kevin Bohrer’s fellowship began this April, he stepped right into the mix by helping to prepare USAID/Kenya’s anti-corruption action plan and funding proposal. His work on the anti-corruption portfolio also included commentary on the the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs’ draft strategy for judicial and legal reform and anti-corruption activities.

Many other fellows continued working on issues related to conflict prevention and resolution. Again, Michael Bak (USAID/Indonesia) continued providing his field-savvy and analytically sound advice to the mission, even during a prolonged evacuation. In his role as a fellow, Mr. Bak served as a Conflict Transformation Advisor. He concluded his fellowship to join USAID/Indonesia’s Office of Conflict Prevention & Response (OCPR) as a Program Manager and Conflict Advisor.

1. DC-based Fellows (Democracy and Governance Sub-sectors)

▪ **Mark Koenig** – Civil Society/Media (DCHA/DG)

Dr. Koenig’s fellowship ended in June of this reporting period, bringing to a close nearly three years of successful contributions to USAID media-and-democracy programming. In his role as a media specialist, Dr. Koenig conducted substantial research for a major comparative manuscript on media assistance, wrote a variety of analytic briefs, reviewed and commented on numerous USAID studies for publications, and made a myriad of technical assistance trips to USAID missions around the world.

The latter part of Dr. Koenig's fellowship focused heavily on developing independent media strategies for the Middle Eastern region, particularly Egypt. This shift in emphasis for Dr. Koenig was largely due to the post-September 11th realignment of US foreign assistance to Arab and Islamic countries. As with his media work in other regions, Dr. Koenig began to tackle media development challenges such as addressing professional journalism training needs, media business development, legal reforms, and media-sector association building. Dr. Koenig's approach accounted for distinctive Islamic traditions, political sensitivities, and regional conflicts in the initial design stages of independent media strategies for Egypt, and consequently is of clear value to similar efforts in Iraq, and other Islamic countries.

In a candid expression of the DFP's success in promoting "a cadre of experienced US technical experts committed to careers in democracy and governance," Dr. Koenig noted in his final report "that the World Learning program encouraged a very useful professional camaraderie and ongoing exchange of information among the Democracy Fellows co-located in the D/G center – and (especially in my case) with Caryn Wilde at USAID/Russia. I was often comparing notes or consulting with other fellows regarding such issues as: NGO/civil society development (with Caryn Wilde, Carol Sahley and Kimberly Ludwig); Middle East issues (Keith Schulz); and elections/campaign finance/media issues (Gene Ward). Obviously, this sharing of professional experience will continue in my new capacity as a CASU Senior Advisor for Independent Media Development and Democracy Fellow alumnus."

- **Gene Ward** – Elections and Political Processes (DCHA/DG)

With the launch of the Money and Politics Handbook: A Guide to Increasing Transparency in Emerging Democracies at the Carter Center's meeting of the "Council of Prime Ministers and Presidents of the Americas," Dr. Ward delivered his crowning fellowship achievement. As a keynote speaker, Dr. Ward presented to this illustrious group, which included former President Jimmy Carter, the practical outcome of nearly two years of systematic data collection, research, and writing. This major contribution is global in scope and gives USAID a particularly useful tool to further its work in anti-corruption and political finance.

It also is important to note that Dr. Ward's programmatic success as a fellow was complemented by his instrumental contribution to DFP efforts to foster a stronger fellows' community. Indeed, his excellent working relationship with World Learning helped foster the beginnings of a Democracy Fellows Association, and he was often a creative catalyst for fellows' networking and collaboration.

- **Keith Schulz** – Governance/Legislative Strengthening (DCHA/DG)

Mr. Schulz helped the Democracy and Governance Center to improve the design and implementation of legislative strengthening projects. Recently Mr. Schulz has engaged in significant field support to the USAID Mission in Namibia. This work included designing two programs: a national integrity promotion campaign led by the Office of the Ombudsman of Namibia; and a civic and voter education campaign to be implemented by the Namibian Institute for Democracy. Mr. Schulz also conducted an in-country, mid-term evaluation of the current legislative strengthening program in Malawi, as well as assisting USAID/Egypt's DG office to develop its strategy for an additional \$15 million dollars in MEPI-related DG programs for FY-2004. In addition to these analytical contributions, Mr. Schulz has continued to produce legislative strengthening electronic newsletters with information on training opportunities, programs, and lessons learned. This newsletter is sent to DG Officers, USAID employees, and implementing partners engaged in legislative strengthening.

- **Carol Sahley – Civil Society (DCHA/DG)**

Dr. Sahley's work during the first year of her fellowship included the Sub-sector Operational Research Agenda (SORA), which included developing a draft working paper establishing a preliminary framework for assessing civil society programs, as well as developing preliminary guidelines for a comparative research design, and a framework for evaluating civil society's contribution to democratic development. Dr. Sahley provided technical assistance to USAID/Macedonia by assisting in the scope of work development for an assessment of the civil society sector and a review of the civil society programs currently in place. Dr. Sahley also continues to work on drafting a paper that reviews seven country case studies of civil society programs, work initially started by previous Democracy Fellow Dr. Kimberly Ludwig. Dr. Sahley has also been asked to chair a new cross-sectoral working group that looks at the relationship between governance and food security.

- **Corbin Lyday – Strategies (DCHA/DG)**

Dr. Lyday completed a full and successful year as a fellow during this reporting period, and as this year came to a close, World Learning and the DCHA Strategies team agreed to renew his fellowship for a second year.

During this program year, Dr. Lyday, along with Democracy Fellows Carol Sahley, Paul Nuti, and Keith Schulz, played a prominent role in shaping and stewarding the development of the Sub-sector Operational Research Agenda (SORA). Two factors, however, led to a realignment of Dr. Lyday's fellowship focus on SORA. First, as a prerequisite to SORA implementation, the Strategies Team engaged the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) to author the methodology that would gauge the impact of democracy programs. At the same time, USAID's interest in anti-corruption spurred Dr. Lyday to examine the politics of patronage, and ultimately, this topic emerged as his main fellowship theme, essentially replacing the initial SORA objective of country case studies and synthesis reports.

Dr. Lyday subsequently collaborated with Democracy Fellow Paul Nuti in conceptualizing a means of tackling clientelism as an obstacle to effective democracy programming. Dr. Lyday and Mr. Nuti developed a multidisciplinary method with common definitions to overcome stove-piping that often hamper solutions to complex development problems. Their approach has been vetted through a variety of peer reviews, and through this process they created a training module and a practical analytical tool for diagnosing patronage and clientelism in country-context. The result has been an instrument that captures social constraints that are often overlooked in formal institutional analyses.

Dr. Lyday and Mr. Nuti also jointly presented an introduction to the clientelism/patronage module as an advanced course at USAID's Annual D&G Partners Conference. The positive feedback from the Partners Conference subsequently led Dr. Lyday to field-test the tool as part of a D&G assessment for USAID/Tanzania in July. The test demonstrated the potential of the "clientelist lens" to provide context-sensitive recommendations for new program activities.

- **Paul Nuti – Strategies (DCHA/DG)**

In collaboration with Democracy Fellow, Dr. Corbin Lyday, Mr. Nuti acted as the point-person for designing and vetting an innovative approach to confronting clientelism and patronage in USAID democracy programs. Mr. Nuti contributed an anthropologist's perspective to analyzing one of the "most pernicious of development problems" and helped set the stage for field-based testing of a the clientelism/patronage assessment methodology in Tanzania.

Mr. Nuti took on a significant role in the Strategy team's planning and conducting of a training workshop on the "strategic assessment framework [SAF]" during the DG Officers Training held from June 23 – 27. The course was attended by twenty-one DG officers representing fifteen field missions, and it marked their first experience learning how to manage/conduct a DG assessment using the SAF approach. Mr. Nuti was tasked with coordinating all four small group sessions during the day-long training, which entailed crafting and facilitating group exercises that illustrated the analytical steps outlined in the SAF. The experience of "teaching" the SAF to others was invaluable as it tested the ability to conceptualize the rationale for conducting DG assessments and communicate the exercise in a concise, user-friendly manner to a group with varying levels of DG experience.

Mr. Nuti concluded his fellowship August of this year and has gone on to attend the Executive Management Program at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government.

- **Peggy Ochandarena – Rule of Law (DCHA/DG)/Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts**

Ms. Ochandarena's fellowship is unique in that it bridges USAID's Rule of Law team and the Administrative Office of the US Courts. Developing model programs has been a focus of her work, and she has completed protocols for the development of sister court relationships. She has also organized presentations on judicial training and ethics for a group of Jordanian judges, court administration for a Thai court administrator, and judicial independence for a group of Afghani judges and attorneys. She is also researching cultural differences in the Middle East in order to develop a primer that will equip judges providing assistance in that area with a basic understanding of key differences to be aware of as they interact with professionals from that region.

2. Overseas Mission-based Fellows

▪ **Leonora A. Foley** – USAID/REDSO/Nairobi

Ms. Foley serves at REDSO in Kenya as a resource person on Democracy and Governance and Conflict issues, assisting in developing African capacity to manage conflict. Her work over the past year has examined natural resource conflict in the cross-border zone of NE Kenya/ S Ethiopia/SW Somalia. Ms. Foley continued her research for the Ethiopia Conflict Vulnerability Assessment, which highlighted the need for USAID to target resources to marginalized pastoral areas, including a conflict component especially where traditional and modern systems function together. She has also conducted research and analysis for the Burundi conflict assessment for their new Integrated Strategic Plan.

▪ **Bradley Bessire** – USAID/Cambodia

In the final months of his fellowship with USAID/Cambodia, Mr. Bessire's fellowship focused on human rights, including anti-trafficking efforts. This work involved assisting NGOs by helping members of disadvantaged groups obtain land title under the new land law, protecting the rights of workers to organize and obtain fair treatment, and providing limited assistance to help Cambodians deal with past human rights violations such as those committed by the Khmer Rouge. Anti-trafficking efforts included encouraging and supporting of advocacy, trafficking awareness, and select skills training programs for the NGO community. Related activities provided assistance to NGOs who help women subjected to violence and other forms of human rights abuse, including providing quality counseling, legal representation, and vocational training to enable them to start a new life.

▪ **Michael Bak** – USAID/Indonesia

At the outset of this program year, USAID/Indonesia effected a "temporary" evacuation, sending Mr. Bak to Washington, DC. Ultimately, the evacuation lasted 196 days, much

longer than what had been anticipated, and the changed circumstances necessarily altered Mr. Bak's fellowship in-country activities. Nevertheless, Mr. Bak adjusted well to the challenges of evacuation. He remained in contact with key personnel in the Mission, and continued to provide advice and backstopping support to the minimal staff left in Jakarta.

Mr. Bak's role shifted in April when he began working directly with the newly established Office of Conflict Prevention & Response (OCPR), a unit that grew out of the former Office of Transition Initiatives. While on evacuation, he collaborated with another evacuated OCPR staff member to develop the objectives for OCPR.

During the five-month long evacuation, Mr. Bak also participated in a book project that brought together experts on Indonesia across an array of Indonesia-related topics, including economics, political economy, US-Indonesia relations, conflict, and the future of democracy in Indonesia. Mr. Bak joined an illustrious range of contributors, including the former President of Indonesia, Abdurrahman Wahid, and Ed Masters, former US Ambassador to Indonesia. Mr. Bak's chapter, "Slouching Toward Democracy: Social Violence and Elite Failure in Indonesia," focused on conflict and the transition to democracy.

Throughout his fellowship, Mr. Bak contributed to the Mission's knowledge-base through his insight on the conflict dynamic in Indonesia, which was bolstered by a grasp of innovative trends bridging academic and field experience.

In the final months of his fellowship, Mr. Bak's integrated work with OCPR increased the opportunities for synergy and collaboration with the DG portfolio. And, as another example of the DFP's progress towards its goal of promoting continued commitment to democracy development, Mr. Bak concluded his fellowship to take a position as a Program Manager and Conflict Advisor with USAID/Indonesia.

- **Caryn Wilde – USAID/Russia**

Ms. Wilde has accepted very challenging assignments in assisting USAID/Russia with its civil society programming and third sector knowledge base. During a visit from President Bush to Moscow, she prepared background information on civil society prior to the President meeting with key leaders from the third sector. With the Mission receiving a steep budget reduction, as well as a stepped-up exit timetable, Ms. Wilde's innovative thinking has been critical in moving beyond traditional civic education programming. The new programming will concentrate on taking civics curriculum beyond the classroom walls and into the community. By adding value to existing civic education programs, students will have an opportunity to transform classroom theory into real life practice.

- **Kevin Bohrer – USAID/Kenya**

Dr. Bohrer's arrival in Kenya coincided with the launch of the Kenyan National Constitutional Conference, an historic undertaking that will result in a new Kenyan Constitution. Dr. Bohrer was certified as an official observer of the Conference, and attended several sessions.

In the first year of Dr. Bohrer's fellowship, the majority of his efforts have been spent preparing the Mission's anti-corruption action plan and initiating discussions between the Mission's democracy and governance partners and the implementers of the Mission's HIV/AIDS program. In his work on USAID/Kenya's anti-corruption portfolio, Dr. Bohrer provided commentary on the first two drafts of the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs' draft strategy for judicial and legal reform and anti-corruption activities. He also took a lead role in preparing USAID/Kenya's anti-corruption action plan and funding proposal, which was subsequently funded.

D. Summary Status of Individual Democracy Fellowships

During Fiscal Year 2003, World Learning's Democracy Fellows Program administered the following Democracy Fellowships and related activities, with the status indicated as of September 30, 2003:

The Democracy Fellows Program has a cap of 14 fellowships including both U.S. and overseas fellows. After reaching a mid-year level of seven fellows, the Democracy Fellows Program currently maintains seven fellows, leaving space for seven additional fellowships under the current ceiling.

1. Washington, D.C. Democracy Fellows

- USAID/DCHA/DG – Governance team in Washington, DC (Keith Schulz)
- USAID/DCHA/DG – Civil Society team in Washington, DC (Caroline Sahley)
- USAID/DCHA/DG – Strategies team in Washington, DC (Corbin Lyday)
- USAID/DCHA/DG – Rule of Law Team with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts in Washington, DC (Peggy Ochandarena)

2. Overseas Democracy Fellows

- USAID/Kenya in Nairobi, Kenya (Kevin Bohrer)
- USAID/REDSO in Nairobi, Kenya (Lee Foley)
- USAID/Russia in Moscow (Caryn Wilde)

3. Fellowship Extensions

The Democracy Fellows Program demonstrates its success both with USAID and with individual fellows by the high rate of extensions granted during the past year. Virtually every fellow in the life of the program has extended into a 2nd year. During FY 2003 USAID and World Learning granted ten Democracy Fellowship extensions during the year:

- USAID/DCHA/DG – Governance team in Washington, DC (Keith Schulz – 3rd year)
- USAID/DCHA/DG – Elections team in Washington, DC (Gene Ward – 3rd year)
- USAID/DCHA/DG – Civil Society in Washington, DC (Mark Koenig – 3rd year)
- USAID/DCHA/DG – Civil Society in Washington, DC (Carol Sahley – 2nd year)
- USAID/DCHA/DG – Strategies in Washington, DC (Corbin Lyday – 2nd year)
- USAID/Indonesia in Jakarta (Michael Bak – 3rd year)
- USAID/Russia in Moscow (Caryn Wilde – 3rd year)
- USAID/REDSO in Kenya (Leonora Foley – 3rd year)

4. New Fellowships

The Democracy Fellows Program continues to meet USAID's needs for a wide variety of experts in the Democracy/Governance field. The new fellow that commenced his fellowship during FY 2003 demonstrate this:

- USAID/Nairobi in Kenya – Kevin Bohrer

5. Pending Fellowship Extensions

World Learning was working with USAID on one pending Democracy Fellowship extension as of September 30, 2003. USAID sponsoring units and/or fellows have requested World Learning to award the following fellowship extension during FY-2003:

- USAID/DCHA/DG – Governance team in Washington, DC (Keith Schulz – 4th year)

6. Pending Fellowship Selection

World Learning has nominated candidates for the following three Democracy Fellowships, but the sponsoring USAID unit has not yet selected finalists.

- USAID/REDSO in Nairobi, Kenya
- USAID/DCHA/PVC – Private Voluntary Cooperation Team in Washington, DC
- USAID/DCHA/DG – Civil Society Team in Washington, DC

7. Five Completed Fellowships:

A total of 35 individuals have completed Democracy Fellowships with World Learning since the program began. The following fellowships ended during FY-2003:

- Bradley Bessire, USAID/Phnom Penh in Cambodia (3rd year)
- Michael Bak, USAID/Jakarta in Indonesia (3rd year)
- Mark Koenig, USAID/DCHA/DG – Civil Society Team in Washington, DC (3rd year)
- Gene Ward, USAID/DCHA/DG – Elections Team in Washington, DC (3rd year)
- Paul Nuti, USAID/DCHA/DG – Strategies Team in Washington, DC (1st year)

8. Democracy Fellows' Individual Program Descriptions and Periodic Reports.

World Learning has compiled the initial Fellowship Program Descriptions and workplans developed by each Democracy Fellow during FY-2003, along with any revisions to the fellows' program plans. World Learning has also included in these resource materials the periodic fellowship reports that fellows have submitted during the past program year, as well as the Program Descriptions proposed by Democracy Fellows seeking extensions, and a variety of trip and activity reports, and other professional writing that fellows have completed. These materials are included as Attachment G to this report.

E. Democracy Fellows Program Alumni

The fellows' career progress in, and commitment to, democracy development is an explicit expectation of the Democracy Fellows Program. To date, a total of 35 fellows have completed the fellowship.

The DFP has made a concerted effort to revitalize communication and interaction with its alumni base this year. In response to this outreach, ten out of the twenty-three alumni DFP staff have been able to contact have written in about their experience as a fellow and how that experience has influenced post-fellowship career path decisions and opportunities. It is striking, though not surprising, how many have remained in the democracy development track, and have done very well professionally. Here, in the words of the DFP alumni themselves, are just a couple of examples of the diversity of activities former fellows now engage in:

- **J. Michele Guttman**

“... Congratulations on your new initiatives for the Democracy Fellows Program. I was in the first class of fellows, and was very fortunate to have been able to work with Participa, an NGO in Santiago, Chile for a year (1996-1997). I am a lawyer and had practiced since 1982 in a firm dedicated primarily to litigation; my partners were kind enough to allow me to take a leave of absence to do this. When I completed the fellowship, I extended my

leave of absence, and ultimately left the firm to pursue international work. Although my fellowship work with Participa concentrated on women's empowerment and civil society issues, my consulting work since then has focussed on rule of law programs (certainly, however, with substantial consideration and inclusion of civil society and women's rights). My work has primarily been in Latin America, although I was in India earlier this year to help in the design of a women's legal rights initiative, and am scheduled to go to Ethiopia very shortly to perform a legal and judicial sector assessment.”

Since her fellowship, Ms. Guttman has worked as a consultant and team leader on an evaluation of U.S. Dep't of Labor Mediation and Conciliation Projec, which promoted mediation and conciliation of labor disputes in Córdoba, Argentina through the offices of the Secretary of Labor. She was also a member of a team that designed the India Women's Legal Rights Initiative, and recommended activities for USAID/India strategy to promote women's legal rights. In Honduras she contributed to a Democracy and Governance Assessment for the USAID Mission to use in designing and developing its next strategy. In the latter, she concentrated individually on issues and analysis pertaining to the rule of law, municipal strengthening, decentralization, and gender. She has also been a consultant to USAID/Mexico, where she provided general assistance to the Mission in design and development of its rule of law strategy.

- **Mark Thieroff**

“After returning from Prague in 1998 I spent a year in New York where I worked as program coordinator for the Coalition for an International Criminal Court--a network of over 1,000 civil society groups campaigning for the creation of a permanent international criminal court. I headed to law school at the University of Minnesota in 1999 and graduated in May 2002. During law school I worked as an assistant to the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Non-Citizens and represented asylum applicants as a student attorney in the law school's immigration clinic. I spent my first year out of law school clerking for a judge on the Minnesota Court of Appeals and I am currently working for a law firm in Minneapolis.”

III. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

A. First Annual Democracy Fellows Retreat

“Perhaps one of the most personally rewarding experiences and the most profound identity marker of the Fellowship was the World Learning Fellow’ Retreat of December 2002. It was the first time Fellows appeared as a cohesive group with an identity and shared purpose.... The active learning and relating process between the Fellows and World Learning in a very conducive small town setting will remain an outstanding memory of the Fellowship.”

A Senior Democracy Fellow

The sentiments expressed in the quote above do convey the positive reaction from all who participated in the first annual Democracy Fellows Retreat in December 2002 at World Learning headquarters in Vermont. The purpose of the retreat was to contribute to the DFP goal and purpose by identifying, refining, and tailoring ways of supporting and promoting the current group of Democracy Fellows. Essentially, we sought input from the fellows on how to improve and enhance the fellowship experience. We also introduced fellows to the broader World Learning organization, including the School for International Training.

Our intention was to focus on the fellows. In doing so, we covered four main areas with a balance of program and technical D&G emphasis.

1. We sought to reinforce (and in some cases, establish) fellow-to-fellow connections. While many fellows had worked together, many had never actually met or at least spent significant time together. The retreat provided space to explore areas of mutual professional interest, and to identify potential means of collaboration where possible.
2. Throughout the retreat we made efforts to identify relevant resources that support and promote the fellows and their work (and by extension USAID’s democracy agenda), as well as to identify what works and what does not work in the fellowship program.
3. We also used the retreat as a catalyst for fellows to debate and reflect (without the distraction of day-to-day work demands) on the more pressing issues of democracy development in USAID and in general.
4. An explicit aspect of the DFP goal is the fellow’s career development in the field of democracy and governance. The retreat offered a forum in which the fellows could discuss their democracy development career objectives and strategies.

As with fellows’ conferences in the past, this event was scheduled to follow directly after the USAID/DCHA/DG Partners’ Conference and DG officers trainings. This proved to be a particularly important element this year, and it made our choice of a practical retreat rather than a symposium-style meeting all the more effective.

Indeed, the pace and the mix of retreat activities allowed for an appropriate balance of programmatic and administrative attention to the fellow's needs. Below is a summary of participant reactions and observations.

1. Retreat Facilitator's Observations and Fellows' evaluations Summary

The DFP engaged a professional facilitator to guide the retreat activities. The facilitator was chosen for his excellent facilitation skills, and for his extensive experience with USAID democracy and education programs, as well as his familiarity with World Learning and School for International Training.

According to the facilitator's observations of and interactions with the fellows, and from the fellows' direct written evaluations, "the retreat was an unequivocal success." Indeed, it was a success. As the facilitator noted, the fellows uniformly praised the DFP for its efforts to reach out to them, and based on their suggestions, he pointed out that regular retreats where fellows connect with each other in meaningful ways "is an excellent idea."

Consequently, we intend to organize a similar retreat event next year, holding it again at World Learning's headquarters in Vermont. The retreat agenda will be somewhat similar to this year's event, but tailored in a way that responds to fellows' feedback. And we are pleased with how well-received our efforts to introduce fellows to the greater World Learning institution were. The combination met the expectation of identifying useful resources to promote fellows' work and professional relationships.

In short, the retreat was successful in its primary objective of reinforcing the notion of a Democracy Fellows community, linking Fellows and their work in more direct and complementary ways. Perhaps the most striking example came when, at the retreat, the fellows decided to form an association. Current and recent fellows have shown a great deal of interest in a semi-formal arrangement linking fellows and alumni through networking and information sharing, and as an outcome of this first Fellows Retreat, the fellows have established the Democracy Fellows Association. Former fellows will qualify as a member of the association and will have access to the membership directory and other networking resources that will be developed.

B. Management

World Learning's DFP management continued its recruiting, interviewing, screening, nominating and advising prospective candidates, and soliciting programmatic interest and support from USAID overseas missions and domestic units. The DFP handled all functions necessary to field, support, coordinate and provide oversight of all Democracy Fellows in the U.S. and abroad.

Other specific program functions accomplished by World Learning include assisting USAID on and coordinating the drafting of initial Terms of Reference; assisting each finalist in developing a Fellowship Program Description and Workplan; and providing financial, travel, logistics, communications, computer, insurance coverage, and medical and other personnel support to all fellows. Other duties included maintaining organizational liaison with USAID/DCHA/DG and other sponsoring USAID units in Washington, D.C. and abroad; identifying prospective new USAID fellowship sponsors; and performing requested program reporting for USAID's Global and Management Bureaus, for individual Missions and sponsoring USAID units, and for USAID/DCHA/DG.

World Learning conducted individual orientation for the newest Democracy Fellow, and provided in-service support, information, financial, logistic, and administrative services to each fellow.

Rather than holding a conference this program year, World Learning scheduled a two-day retreat in Brattleboro, Vermont. This open forum allowed sufficient time to tackle both substantive issues and administrative matters. It also provided an opportunity for U.S. and overseas fellows, as well as DFP staff, to find common interests and shared goals. Feedback from the fellows was overwhelmingly positive, and a follow-up retreat is scheduled for December 2003.

1. Coordination with USAID.

During FY-2003, DFP staff met with USAID staff on several occasions, including meetings with the program's designated Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO). In addition, DFP staff and DCHA/DG staff consulted by e-mail and phone on a frequent basis. The DFP was in contact and communication with other responsible officials of USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance, and with each of the USAID Missions and offices sponsoring or seeking information about Democracy Fellowships.

As the DFP had recently gained a new Director, a meeting with DCHA/DG senior staff was arranged to make introductions at the beginning of the new fiscal year. The meeting encouraged the discussion of new program ideas and avenues for promoting the program and fellows' accomplishments, as well as to analyze the needs of senior staff and methods the DFP could use to achieve these goals.

Throughout the year, the DFP staff met with DCHA/DG staff to discuss fellowships in transition. For example, issues regarding the ROL/AO fellowship led to several meetings with the program's CTO, the ROL team leader, as well as leadership at the AO, to clarify the proper role of the fellow within the ROL team and her duties with the AO. The outcome of these meetings led to a more fully integrated fellow within both teams, and a more fulfilling workplan for the fellow.

World Learning used these on-going meetings and discussions to accomplish several management objectives, including: (a) keeping USAID informed of DFP progress, problems and issues; (b) obtaining DCHA/DG guidance on the allocation of fellowship slots under USAID program ceilings; (c) facilitating the DFP's dealings with current USAID units sponsoring Democracy Fellowships; (d) insuring fellows' continuing compliance with applicable USAID policies or program expectations; (e) helping to identify possible USAID units that wanted to sponsor future fellowships; and (f) discussing USAID's selection of candidates for specific Democracy Fellowships.

During FY-2003, additional management meetings and discussions between USAID and the DFP routinely occurred in connection with the start, end, or extension of specific Democracy Fellowships, and in conjunction with USAID's regular budget planning and reporting cycles.

2. Administrative Support

The DFP's continued success is based on well-organized and efficient administrative support to the fellows; it is fundamental to the program's purpose. World Learning continued to provide an extensive range of support services for individual fellows worldwide. These services ranged from organizing individual orientation sessions, maintaining effective and timely communications with fellows, to training on travel expense reporting.

DFP administrative support of fellows during the reporting period focused on the following activities:

- Processing monthly fellowship stipends;
- Covering fellows' individual benefits and allowances;
- Coordinating fellows' travel (in accordance with USAID and World Learning regulations and policy);
- Making travel, insurance and other direct vendor payments;
- Handling program expense reimbursements;
- Purchasing appropriate fellowship equipment.

The DFP also manages World Learning's worldwide financial system to support each fellowship. Through its corporate Sponsored Program Services Office, World Learning also provided USAID/M (FA/FM/CMP/DCB) with regular quarterly financial reporting in accordance with the Cooperative Agreement, and a number of more detailed informal financial updates to USAID/DCHA/DG.

In an effort to better meet the needs of our current team of Democracy Fellows, the DFP staff is establishing a Web board that will allow for greater availability and access of information through a more interactive tool for current fellows as well as alumni. This tool has a calendar function that highlights important dates for the program, such as the Second Annual Democracy Fellows'

Retreat, as well as indicating more mundane yet important issues such as travel advance request deadlines and check cutting dates. Also available on the web board will be relevant DG articles written by both fellows, past and present, as well as World Learning staff. It also provides a central location for downloading forms the fellows need to complete, such as the travel expense form. DFP staff are putting the finishing touches on the web board now, and will debut the product live prior to this year's Retreat.

3. Security Clearance Process

During this report year, World Learning processed and received security clearances and/or conversions for four fellows. World Learning also did full conversions for all existing fellows holding clearances prior to World Learning's participation under the National Industrial Security Program (NISP).

Last year the Rule of Law fellow did not need clearance to be placed at the Administrative Office of the US Courts, however, the ROL team leader requested that she obtain one to help facilitate her attendance at USAID/ROL regular meetings. The clearance process for that fellow is underway.

Five fellowships were closed-out during this program year, and were consequently moved from World Learning's list of active clearances.

The DFP encountered fewer delays in obtaining security clearances for new Democracy Fellows this year. Although the process is time-consuming, it moved more smoothly than it has in the recent past. Certainly USAID, World Learning, and the selected fellow all benefit from a quick turnaround on clearances. World Learning remains optimistic that the process will continue to run smoothly, but it is important to note that there are a variety of factors that influence the clearance process, many of which go beyond institutional control. Regardless, World Learning continues to seek the most efficient approach possible.

4. Recruitment

World Learning continued to successfully recruit for qualified fellowship applicants through local and national advertising. As in FY-2002, in order to anticipate as much as possible USAID's fellowship needs, the DFP recruited throughout the year rather than establishing fixed deadlines for applicants. To supplement the qualified candidates available within the DFP database, World Learning conducted targeted recruitment for the USAID/Kenya, USAID/REDSO, and USAID/DCHA/PVC fellowships.

World Learning again sought diversity among the pool of qualified applicants for Democracy Fellowships. The DFP worked successfully with numerous minority- and gender-related

organizations and networks, and continued its efforts to ensure that the program was widely advertised within academic and public policy communities.

The DFP placed advertisements with many different outlets, including print and electronic media, as well as university graduate and law schools, public policy organizations, and professional and academic associations. These efforts continued to attract members of African-American, Hispanic, Asian or other minority or under-represented populations. World Learning's pool of eligible minority candidates for the DFP remained deep.

5. Candidate Eligibility

During the reporting period, the DFP strived to maintain a standard of initially reviewing all applications and notifying applicants of their status within 30 days after completed applications were received. After receiving and acknowledging completed fellowship applications (following the initial technical review), the DFP once again conducted a qualitative review for all fellowship applications, in order to evaluate candidates for the expected range of potential fellowships that might materialize over the coming year. Under present DFP policy, each accepted applicant remains eligible for consideration for one year after being accepted into the pool of eligible candidates. Because of the program's minimal required qualifications, and the nature of a database-oriented recruitment process, nearly all applicants to the DFP passed through both levels of screening.

Throughout FY-2003, the DFP continued to expand and update its database of applicants, qualified candidates, finalists and fellows.

6. Nomination and Selection

The DFP continued to make a specific effort to ensure an equitable review of all candidates for every Democracy Fellowship, including fair consideration of those applicants who come from less traditional backgrounds, or whose academic, personal and work experiences are comparable to, but also differ from, the backgrounds of current USAID personnel.

During the reporting period, DFP staff collaborated with individual sponsoring USAID units, as well as with USAID/DCHA/DG, to identify suitable candidates for five new Democracy Fellowships, both in Washington, DC and abroad. Depending on applicant response and availability, World Learning sought to provide USAID with at least three – and often five or more – potential candidates for each prospective Democracy Fellowship. An efficient, consistent, and open flow of communication continues to enable World Learning and USAID to find the appropriate Fellowship fit that meets the proposed democracy and governance and program needs.

In the selection process, the information exchange between World Learning and USAID necessarily varied, depending on how far along the sponsoring USAID unit was in defining a

potential programmatic slot for the prospective fellow. In most cases, sponsoring units approached the DFP with fairly defined terms of reference that were easily adapted to the fellowship parameters. On some occasions, sponsoring units needed and requested an introduction to the DFP and what it could offer. DFP staff then worked with the sponsoring unit to refine general terms that could trigger focused recruiting. Sponsoring USAID units ordinarily concurred with the DFP's nominations, and selected a single finalist from among the nominees. Some USAID units, however, asked World Learning to continue searching for other more suitable candidates, often seeking individuals with exact skills and very specific work experience profiles. In several instances, of course, staff of the sponsoring USAID unit already knew of a particular individual who quite closely matched the unit's expectations and required qualifications. In these cases, to ensure the best possible fit, World Learning agreed to nominate such individuals as requested by USAID.

The Democracy Fellows Program continued its active efforts to promote diversity in the nomination and selection of qualified ethnic minorities and individuals of other under-represented groups. This effort begins at the recruitment stage, to insure that interested applicants from a wide range of minority populations are made aware of the DFP and of potential Democracy Fellowships. It continues through World Learning's screening and nomination processes, where the DFP carefully reviews *every* candidate to ensure both equal opportunity in being considered, and a fair and transparent review and nominations process.

APPLICANT DIVERSITY FY-2003 NOMINEES					
FELLOWSHIP	NOMINEES	MALE	FEMALE	MINORITY CANDIDATES	SELECTED CANDIDATE
Private Voluntary Cooperation ¹ (USAID/DCHA/PVC)	7	4	3	2	M
Conflict Mitigation and Management ² (USAID/DCHA/CMM)	4	2	2	0	
Civil Society and Media ³ (USAID/DCHA/DG)	3	1	2	1	
USAID/Nairobi	3	3	0	1	M
USAID/REDSO (NAIROBI, KENYA)	3	1	2	0	F
TOTALS	20	11	9	4	

1. Although World Learning recruited and nominated candidates for this fellowship, and a finalist was selected, the finalist declined the offer, and new candidates have been put forward.
2. Although World Learning recruited and nominated candidates for this fellowship, final approval for this fellowship was not received, and therefore no candidate was selected.
3. Although World Learning recruited and nominated candidates for this fellowship, a finalist has not yet been selected.

C. Program Evaluation

World Learning continues to use a variety of methods to monitor and assess each Democracy Fellowship and the overall DFP. Under the fellowship agreement, each fellow submits periodic analytical progress reports on fellowship activities, highlighting results, challenges, and career development. These reports are a substantive, and more formal, barometer of fellowship success. Sponsoring USAID units are asked to review the fellow's reports for their own information and planning, and as an opportunity to assess the fellow's career development and accomplishments during the reporting period, and throughout the fellowship as a whole. The DFP requires that fellows obtain USAID concurrence in any substantive proposed revisions to previously-approved Program Description or travel plans. Although the DFP did not request USAID sponsors to formally evaluate the program this year, the day-to-day communication with the fellows and their sponsoring USAID offices provided additional on-going insight into the status of each fellowship.

Feedback received from both the fellows and the Missions throughout the year continued to be positive. World Learning believes this reflects its steady efforts to be responsive to the needs of the fellows and their USAID sponsors. The DFP's assigned CTOs, and other USAID staff also regularly provided advice and guidance on a variety of programmatic issues over the course of the year, making the overall implementation more successful. Additionally, at the DFP Retreat, fellows were asked to review both the retreat specifically, as well as the broader fellowship experience. Through this tool, DFP staff have sought to make substantive changes to improve and streamline fellowship administration, and to enhance collaboration among fellows.

D. Operational Program Costs

Throughout the life of the program, World Learning has consistently controlled program costs. This continued to be the case in this reporting period. The DFP charged a reduced level of effort for the first eight months of the program year, and these savings was carried forward in the new staff configuration for the remainder of the year. At the same time, the DFP expanded its management of the program, adding one new fellow, extending ten others. Reflecting a trend towards more senior level fellowships, the average total annual program cost per Democracy Fellow this year was approximately \$157,132, as of September 30, 2003.

As stated in last year's Annual Program Progress Report, substantial cost reductions were not expected in this program year because of the following key factors:

- USAID's new program description for the DFP reduces the total number of Democracy Fellows from 20 to 14 in fiscal years 2002 and 2003, with further reductions to 12 fellows in FY-2004 and FY-2005. This will require the program's fixed costs to be allotted over a smaller number of fellows, thereby increasing the relative cost per fellowship.

- USAID units that sponsor Democracy Fellows continue to demonstrate a preference for more experienced senior-level fellows, whose salaries and benefits are necessarily higher than for Junior or Mid-level Democracy Fellows.
- The program continues to see a near-100% extension rate. This tends to preclude World Learning from bringing in new fellows at the starting salaries for each tier (which are lower than for fellows who continue their service). In addition, under the stipend schedule that USAID established in 1998, fellows who extend their fellowships beyond their first year receive sizeable stipend increases (10% - 15% per year), subject to an overall ceiling. Overseas fellows who extend for a full year may receive additional benefits.
- Several overseas missions have elected to provide post-differential of up to 25%, as well as other post-specific benefits available to the fellows since 2001. This change has also raised the per-fellow program cost.

Through World Learning's prudent fiscal management, the program is in good financial shape. Although the DFP does not anticipate a shortfall, it is important to note that, as evident from the points above, substantial cost reductions are unlikely in the remaining program years.

E. Democracy Fellows' Stipends

For FY-2002, the stipend range increased to \$35,519 per year (minimum for a Junior Fellow), up to \$87,400 (maximum for a Senior Fellow).

Minimum and maximum stipend levels for each tier may be adjusted periodically to track the *General Schedule (Not Including Locality Rates)* issued by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, except that there is a fixed ceiling of \$87,400 for any Democracy Fellowship stipend. The established stipend system also provides substantial salary increases when fellows extend. When fellows extend after completing one full year, they receive a 15% stipend increase. When fellows extend after completing a full second year, they receive an additional 10% salary increase. Senior fellows receive a 10% salary increase after both their first full year, subject to the prevailing ceiling. Given the very high rate of Democracy Fellows extensions, World Learning expects that future fellowship costs will increase as additional extensions occur.

IV. PROGRAM RESULTS AND OUTLOOK

A. Results.

The eighth program year continued to see an impressive programmatic contribution by the fellows, enabled by an efficient and effective fellowship support system. Operating in this second year of the new Program Description, the DFP effectively identified, recruited, and supported qualified Democracy Fellows at USAID. DFP activities covered three program elements and one financial element:

- Recruiting: The DFP reinforced its database of quality potential fellowship candidates, and maintained broad national and international recruitment that encourages minority applicants. The on-going recruitment and prompt screening of applicants has ensured a sizeable, dynamic pool of eligible candidates for a range of potential Democracy Fellowships.
- Placement: The DFP continued to support and, where necessary, assist fellowship finalists to draft satisfactory Fellowship Program Descriptions. Incoming fellows draft these work plans based on the fellowship Terms of Reference that sponsoring USAID units prepare. World Learning believes that Fellowship Program Descriptions help promote mutual agreement and expectations on a fellow's activities and responsibilities. For instance, in one case, the Terms of Reference were used to identify and recruit fellowship candidates for a particular USAID unit that subsequently reevaluated its own core needs and subsequently worked with World Learning and the fellow to establish a revised Program Description.
- Fellowship Support: The DFP continued to provide responsive professional, personnel, and financial support for each fellowship. This critical element of the program allowed fellows to concentrate on their contribution to USAID's democracy development agenda, without being diverted by excessive administrative tasks.
- Financial Management: The DFP continued to manage program costs efficiently, and in accordance with USAID regulations and World Learning procedures. DFP staff also worked directly with individual fellows to maximize fellowship resources such as travel and equipment purchase.

Again, an impressive reflection of World Learning's results in developing, directing and implementing the DFP was found in the high interest in the program. During FY-2003, World Learning awarded one new fellowship and nine fellowship extensions. Out of 11,029 visitors to the DFP Web site, more than eight hundred prospective applicants downloaded DFP application materials this year. The DFP also mailed out and distributed several hundred DFP application packages during FY-2003, resulting in approximately 44 new well-qualified eligible candidates. As in previous years, World Learning did not limit the size of the DFP eligible candidate pool; instead, the DFP database includes all candidates who applied to the program and met the program's technical eligibility standards.

USAID also again asked World Learning to extend the current Democracy Fellow or to recruit a follow-on fellow for the majority of Democracy Fellowships during this fiscal year. The DFP has now awarded a total of 64 extensions to 50 Democracy Fellows serving in USAID, and as of September 30, 2003, was discussing with USAID the extension of two additional fellowships.

The vast majority of fellows continue on with successful careers in democracy development, at USAID and beyond, as demonstrated in the alumni updates received in response to increased outreach to former fellows.

B. Outlook.

The Democracy Fellows Program now looks forward to its ninth program year (FY-2004), and third extension year reflecting the Revised Program Description. The program will continue to contribute to USAID's efforts to promote Democracy, by identifying, placing, and supporting qualified democracy practitioners throughout the Agency's democracy programs.

Administratively, security clearance processing for fellows has been better than expected. The length of time that it takes to obtain clearances for a new fellows remains an unpredictable variable to timely placement, World Learning work under the Defense Security Service has gone smoothly, especially in terms of conversion of fellows who have come to the DFP with existing or previous clearances.

The trend towards mid and senior level fellowship continued in FY-2003. Recruitment of more experienced candidates has strengthened the DFP candidate pool, but the demand for more senior level individuals makes placement more difficult. Mid and senior level candidates have tended to have other competitive opportunities within and outside USAID. The DFP remains committed to and has successfully maintained an applicant pool that effectively meets USAID's dynamic democracy and governance needs.

APPENDICES

World Learning
Democracy Fellows Program
Annual Program Performance Report

Attachment A

DFP Solicitation and Recruitment Materials

WORLD LEARNING
DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

Program Solicitation, Recruitment and Advertising Activities

1. Public Media and Advertising Efforts

World Learning recruited applicants during FY-2003 via several targeted and coordinated mechanisms. The DFP placed a substantial number of advertisements in key media, most with a national or international distribution. In most cases the DFP arranged for either on-going or repeated publication of the DFP's recruitment ads in:

- *International Career Employment Opportunities* (special editions on fellowship programs; and on-going both in regular editions and on-line)
- *The National and Federal Legal Employment Report* (on-going and on-line)
- *International Employment Hotline* (on-going)
- *International Employment Gazette* (on-going)
- The American Political Science Association's *APSAnet-PS Online* job-site (on-going)
- *NGO News* (on-going)

2. Academic Recruiting Efforts

Program information was also sent to the Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA) which, in turn, forwarded information and application packets to the career placement offices of each of its 18 member institutions. In addition, the DFP also sent program information and application packets directly to other graduate schools or programs.

3. Association Recruiting Efforts

The DFP supplied additional recruitment materials to numerous professional, and democracy-related associations and organizations. Typical recipients included:

- Africa-America Institute
- American Bar Association/CEELI – Central and East European Law Initiative
- American Political Science Association (and its regional constituents such as the Mid-West Political Science Association, the Western Political Science Association, etc.)
- American Society for International Law
- Association for Women in Development
- Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE)
- InterAction
- International Center for Labor Solidarity
- International Foundation for Electoral Support (IFES)
- International Republican Institute (IRI)
- Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies
- National Bar Association
- National Democratic Institute (NDI)
- National Endowment for Democracy
- Open Society Institute
- Society for International Development
- Other non-profit and for-profit organizations that help to implement USAID democracy and governance initiatives.

DFP application forms and program information were also posted on World Learning's web page, generating an average of approximately 1,000 hits per month to the site's Democracy Fellows Program page. Additional application packages were also mailed to a large number of individuals who had expressed interest directly to USAID or to World Learning via phone, letter, e-mail, personal contacts, etc.

**DEMOCRACY FELLOWSHIP
WASHINGTON, DC**

World Learning seeks applicants for a mid- to senior-level Democracy Fellow to be placed at the US Agency for International Development (USAID), in the The Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation (CMM). CMM seeks to strengthen the capacity of democratic institutions to deal with the identification, management, and mitigation of deadly conflict within and across state borders. Fellowship eligibility requirements include: US citizenship; Master's or Doctorate degree in a relevant field; Minimum of five years work related to the field of Democracy/Governance and Conflict. The fellow should have extensive analytical and/or programming experience in states undergoing political transitions associated with deadly conflicts. It is preferable that a candidate has work experience in countries undergoing transition and in designing and implementing field programs in democracy/governance (DG) and conflict. The fellow's major responsibilities will include the following: Serve as resource person advising on DG/Conflict for USAID missions, non-presence countries, and other operating units inside USAID. Priority areas will include conducting conflict assessments; designing DG program toolkits in areas such as civil society, security sector reform, local governance, conflict/dispute resolution, and media; and disseminating ideas and experiences regarding lessons learned and best practices. Provide services to USAID missions and partners that accelerate implementation of conflict-sensitive DG programs. Focus on issues associated with promoting democratic and peaceful transition in countries affected by conflict, with an emphasis on USAID's role in helping to address issues of recovery, rehabilitation, and political and socio-economic development through democracy assistance. This will include situation analyses, evaluation of political development trends in conflict countries, and program design in a variety of DG sectors (e.g., rule of law, governance, civil society, etc.). Review and comment on DG and CMM documents, strategic plans, results packages, and activities, and implementation of

same, including activities coordinated with other donor organizations. Advise on means for undertaking systematic CMM reviews of USAID mission project portfolios that will enable USAID missions to identify and reduce potential threats to peace through DG programs. Applicants should submit a fellowship application, which are located on the World Learning Democracy Fellows Web page: (http://www.worldlearning.org/pid/dfp/app_process.html). Please send completed applications to: USAID/CMM Democracy Fellowship, Democracy Fellows Program, World Learning, 1015 15th Street, NW, Suite 750, Washington, DC 20005; fax: (202) 408-5397; e-mail: dfp.info@worldlearning.org. Open until filled. CMM requests that the Democracy Fellow be available by June 2003.

**MID- OR SENIOR-LEVEL DEMOCRACY
FELLOWSHIP
KENYA**

World Learning seeks applicants for a Democracy Fellow to be placed at USAID in Kenya. Eligibility requirements include US citizenship, a Master's degree, and a minimum of five years substantive experience in the fields of transparency and accountable governance, and economic governance. A solid background in design and implementation of anti-corruption and media development programs, and familiarity with USAID democracy and governance programs is also strongly desired. Professional expertise in two or more of the following is preferred: Assessment and evaluation of transparency and accountability programming and policies; Coordination and integration of democracy and governance programs with other sectoral interventions, including those combating HIV/AIDS; Experience with processes of democratic political development and institution building in a transition environment; and Development and implementation of methodologies and indicators (qualitative and quantitative) to measure program impact. It is preferable that the candidate has work experience in Sub-Saharan Africa, in countries undergoing transition. Kenya Fellowship Application Deadline: Open until filled. Applicants should send a resume or CV and a substantive cover letter that addresses the required qualifications and skills areas to: USAID/Kenya Fellowship, Democracy Fellows Program, World Learning, 1015 15th Street, NW, Suite 750, Washington, DC 20005; fax: (202) 408-5397; e-mail: dfp.info@worldlearning.org.

DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

What is a Democracy Fellowship?

The World Learning Democracy Fellows Program (DFP), in collaboration with USAID/DCHA/DG, places and supports Democracy Fellows throughout USAID. Through these placements, the Program contributes to USAID's efforts to advance democracy in developing countries, while promoting fellows' careers and commitment to the cause of democracy development.



Fellowships are based on the needs of the particular USAID Mission, and contribute to USAID democracy-related programming through a range of supportive activities such as policy analysis, technical assistance on projects, or by developing program strategies and indicators – to name only a few. Current and recent Democracy Fellows have tackled such themes as the intersection of good governance and food security; assessing patronage and clientalism as obstacles to effective programming; and the influence of money and resources in political process development. While fellows provide technical and professional services, they do not assume management duties such as approving contracts/agreements or supervising staff. This allows fellows to focus on programmatic initiatives that can otherwise compete with necessary bureaucratic demands. In short, the fellowship is a targeted means of strengthening a Mission's democracy program impact.

How Does a Mission acquire a Democracy Fellow?

Fellowships are generally awarded for an initial one- (sometimes two-) year term, subject to the Mission's available funding and the mutual agreement of World Learning, the Mission, the Fellow, and DCHA/DG. The initial steps follow the same logic of developing a scope of work. First, the Mission drafts an initial scope, laying out the areas of focus, including proposed activities and desired qualifications. World Learning then does a search for suitable candidates, ordinarily identifying a short list of three or four candidates for interview. Once USAID and World Learning agree on a finalist, the candidate develops (with USAID and World Learning guidance) a written program description (work plan) that defines specific fellowship activities and objectives. World Learning then initiates the security clearance process, arranges travel to post and other logistics that set in motion the fellowship support mechanisms. In brief, World Learning does the administrative work such as paying stipends, benefits, travel reimbursement, etc., and the USAID Mission gets a technical expert in-country.

The approximate all-inclusive* fellowship costs are as follows:

Junior Level:	\$152,682
Mid Level:	\$185,530
Senior Level:	\$189,252

These figures reflect the maximum stipend range for each category. *Costs will vary according to actual stipend and travel lines, and whether the Mission decides to offer post-differential and other post-specific benefits.



Who should we contact?

Applications are accepted on a continuing basis, and individual fellowships are awarded as World Learning and USAID select suitable candidates. To recruit a fellow, please contact David Payton or Ellen Garrett at: dem.fellows@worldlearning.org

Fellowship Applications and additional information are available online at: <http://www.worldlearning.org/wlid/dfp>

DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

What is a Democracy Fellowship?

The World Learning Democracy Fellows Program (DFP) places and supports Democracy Fellows throughout USAID. Through these positions, the Program contributes to USAID's efforts to advance democracy in developing countries, while promoting fellows' careers and commitment to the cause of democracy development.



Fellowships are based on the needs of particular USAID Mission or Washington office, and contribute to USAID democracy programming through supportive activities such as policy analysis, technical assistance, or by developing program strategies and indicators – to name only a few. Current and recent Democracy Fellows have tackled such themes as the intersection of good governance and food security; assessing clientalism as an obstacle to effective programming; and the influence of money in political process development. While fellows provide technical services, they do not assume management duties such as approving contracts or supervising staff. This allows fellows to focus on programmatic initiatives that can otherwise compete with necessary bureaucratic demands. In short, for fellows and USAID alike, the fellowship is a direct and targeted means of strengthening democratic practices and institutions in transitional or emerging democracies.

How is a Democracy Fellowship Awarded?

Fellowships are generally awarded for an initial one- (sometimes two-) year term, subject to USAID'S available funding and the mutual agreement of World Learning, USAID, and the Fellow. The initial steps follow the same logic of developing a scope of work. First, the USAID unit drafts an initial scope or areas of focus, including proposed activities and desired qualifications. World Learning then searches for suitable candidates, ordinarily identifying a short list of three or four candidates. Once USAID and World Learning agree on a finalist, the candidate develops (with USAID and World Learning guidance) a written program description (work plan) that defines specific fellowship activities and objectives. World Learning then initiates the security clearance process, arranges travel to post and other logistics that set in motion the fellowship support mechanisms.

Eligibility

- US citizenship;
- Master's degree or J.D., minimum;
- Foreign language capabilities for some fellowships;
- Ability to receive a national security clearance;
- Relevant professional experience, with academic and/or practical expertise in democracy development, political science, elections, law, government, international relations:

Junior-level (0-5 years related experience) – annual stipend \$35-58K

Mid-level (5-10 years related experience) – annual stipend \$60-84K

Senior-level (10 or more years related experience) – annual stipend \$84-87K

Applications are accepted on a continuing basis, and individual fellowships are awarded as World Learning and USAID select suitable candidates.



Want more Information?

Fellowship Applications and additional information are available online at:
<http://www.worldlearning.org/wlid/dfp>

Attachment B

DFP Application Packets

WORLD LEARNING
DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE APPLICATION

Applications should be submitted as a complete package, including (in order):

1. _____ application form
2. _____ resume or c.v. (name on each page)
3. _____ personal statement
4. _____ USAID Form 1420 (biographical data sheet)
5. _____ pre-addressed return postcard

Please complete your address on the enclosed notification postcard.

Applicants are required to include a salary history form (USAID Contractor Employee Biographical Data Sheet – Form 1420) with their applications. Please complete the enclosed form, leaving items 4 to 7 blank. This information will be used to help USAID determine the appropriate level for the applicant and to establish the fellowship budget.

ASSEMBLING THE APPLICATION

Each application document should be inserted in the above order. Please do not staple or use any permanent binder; we need to copy what you send in. Applications and supporting materials become the property of World Learning and cannot be returned. If you submit an application electronically, you must still submit a signed original application and USAID form 1420 by mail or fax.

TIMELINES

World Learning accepts fellowship applications year-round, and processes applications on a rolling basis. The DFP will mail the notification postcard back to you within one week of receiving your application to acknowledge receipt and to inform you of any missing forms. We can only process completed applications. We will notify you within 30 days of receiving your completed application whether your application is eligible for further consideration. Applications are considered active for at least one year from the date of receipt.

DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

Thank you for your interest in World Learning and our Democracy Fellows Program. This program is primarily supported by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and is intended to achieve several related goals:

- To help support a cadre of experienced U.S. technical experts committed to careers in democracy and governance, in order to assist in the promotion of U.S. democracy and governance efforts, and to increase the number or expertise of people working in the field.
- To identify, select, support and provide oversight of Democracy Fellows working in USAID assignments that contribute to democracy programs in developing countries, as well as to the fellows' career development and commitment.

The Democracy Fellows Program (DFP) plans to offer approximately six - eight fellowships this year, although the final number of fellowships offered annually depends upon available USAID funding and fellowship opportunities. Fellowships are awarded to support USAID democracy and governance programs through work with a USAID overseas mission or Washington office, and thus are not intended for fellows to pursue teaching or independent research. Although most new fellowships will be at mid- and senior levels, a limited number of junior-level fellowships might also be awarded. Depending upon specific USAID program needs, different fellowships may involve a wide range of activities such as providing policy analysis or advice; developing program methodologies and evaluation indicators; or providing technical comment on USAID plans or activities. The specific focus of each fellowship is developed by the sponsoring USAID organization and the pertinent candidate, following tentative selection of a finalist for a particular fellowship.

In reviewing these application materials, please consider carefully whether this type of practical professional fellowship meets your own career needs and expectations. In this regard, we stress a key distinction between World Learning's Democracy Fellows Program and other international fellowships, namely, that these fellowships are not for the primary pursuit of the fellow's own professional research or other independent activities. Instead, our focus is on finding the most highly qualified applicants to support the proposed goals and work activities of the sponsoring USAID office.

For additional information about World Learning or the Democracy Fellows Program, we invite you to consult World Learning's website (<http://www.worldlearning.org/pidt/dfp>) or to contact the DFP staff. Again, thank you for your interest in the Democracy Fellows Program. We look forward to receiving your fellowship application.

February 2002



WORLD LEARNING


DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE APPLICATION

? What are the basic eligibility criteria for a Fellowship?

- Applicants must be U.S. citizens to be considered for the program. USAID provisions authorizing this program limit participation to U.S. citizens.
- Ph.D., J.D. or Master's degree, minimum (an undergraduate degree plus significant related democracy and governance experience may be considered on an exceptional basis when requested by USAID.)
- Previous professional experience appropriate for a USAID fellowship program. Most recent fellows have had some direct experience with USAID democracy and governance programs.
- Academic background or practical expertise in democracy programs, elections, government, law, international relations, political science, or other fields relevant to USAID democracy and governance projects.
- Professional foreign language capabilities may be required for some fellowships.
- Ability to receive a national security clearance.

? What kind of background is the program looking for?




The Democracy Fellows Program currently seeks senior (10+ years) and mid-level (5-10 years) professionals with prior experience in the field of international democracy and governance. Some junior-level fellowships may also be available for those with 0-5 years democracy and governance experience. Current or past employees of USAID are not eligible; however, PSC and institutional contractors or other non-employees who have previous experience in USAID-funded democracy and governance programs *are* eligible, and often have the particular types of experience that USAID prefers. Please note that the DFP is not a vehicle leading to permanent employment with USAID.

? What are the characteristics of a successful application?

Applications must meet all technical criteria for the DFP and be submitted in a complete manner. Those that pass this review are then reviewed against the following criteria:

- Applicant has the specific skills, qualifications and professional experience desired by USAID for the particular fellowship under consideration.
- Applicant indicates commitment to/promise for a successful career in democracy and governance.
- Applicant's Personal Statement clearly illustrates how the applicant's past experiences and participation in this program will contribute towards USAID's democracy and governance goals.
- Application demonstrates suitable language and cross-cultural skills.
- Applicant has appropriate academic and professional background and experience.

? Where are fellowships served? What fellowship assignments are available?



Fellows work in, and as a part of, USAID missions and offices overseas, or in Washington, DC. Because individual USAID units request fellows at various times during the year, we cannot be more specific about which USAID missions or offices will sponsor fellowships during the coming year, or what specific duties those assignments might entail.

? **What stipends and benefits does the program offer?**

Initial stipends are intended to be wage-neutral to the fellow, providing neither financial gain nor loss from previous earnings. USAID determines the skill level needed for each fellowship, which determines the stipend range for that particular fellowship. Individual stipends are based primarily on the fellow's documented salary history, education and experience, and are awarded within a fixed range for each fellowship level. The minimum stipend for each level takes into account the situation of fellows who were full-time students and thus have limited relevant salary history, and often reflects a significant increase. The approximate current stipend ranges for FY2001-2002 are: (a) for junior fellows \$32K to \$54K (GS 9-12 equivalents); (b) for mid-level fellows \$53K to \$76K (GS 12-14 equivalents); and (c) for senior fellows \$76K to \$87K (GS 14-15 equivalents).

In addition to the stipend, the fellowship award package also provides allowances such as individual or family health insurance reimbursement plan; optional illness and evacuation insurance coverage; computer and communications support; travel to/from the DFP orientation, the fellowship site, and annual Democracy Fellows conference; and other USAID program-related travel as agreed to in the Fellowship Agreement Letter. **Democracy Fellowships are not considered US Government employment and fellows do not receive civil service or foreign service employment or retirement benefits. The DFP is *not* able to guarantee travel or other allowances for dependents or others; these are additional benefits that are mission-funded and decided on an individual fellowship basis.**

? **How long does a Democracy Fellowship last?**

Fellowships are awarded for a one-year term, although somewhat shorter or longer terms might be possible under certain conditions (e.g., where a fellow is on an academic calendar or USAID has identified long-term needs.) USAID may extend fellowships, subject to the fellow's performance. Discussions about extensions normally take place during the second half of a given fellowship. Although nearly all Democracy Fellows have extended, there is no guarantee that any particular fellowship will be renewed.

? **What is the timeline for applying to the program?**

Applications are accepted year-round, and are processed on a continuing basis. Individual fellowships are awarded periodically throughout the year as USAID requests new Democracy Fellows. Within one week after receiving your application, we will mail you a postcard acknowledging receipt and requesting any missing forms. Only complete applications will be considered. We will notify you of acceptance into the DFP's "candidate pool" within one month of receiving your completed application. Applications will be considered active for approximately one year from their date of receipt.

Acceptance as a candidate does not guarantee the award of a fellowship; it only indicates eligibility for matching and nomination. The DFP estimates it will receive over 1,000 inquiries from the present solicitation, resulting in several hundred completed applications. We expect that no more than 8 awards will be made for fellowships over the next year.

Awards of fellowships. Individual fellowships are awarded periodically throughout the year as the DFP nominates and USAID selects candidates who best meet the qualifications for specific fellowships. Selection is based on the needs of the sponsoring USAID unit. Fellowships are not awarded until USAID has issued the proposed fellow a security clearance. The DFP conducts a program orientation for new fellows before they begin their fellowships.

? Can you describe the nomination and selection process?

Fellowships are awarded to secure the best match between the available candidates and the particular requirements and preferences of the sponsoring USAID office, at the time USAID is prepared to select a finalist. Criteria for any particular fellowship reflect USAID's needs, as well as the nature and location of that fellowship, and may include specific skills such as foreign language, academic credentials or previous professional experience in a certain field, region or country. The precise criteria for a particular fellowship may be very general or quite specific. Some particularly competitive candidates may be nominated for more than one potential fellowship during the period their applications are active. Other candidates, although eligible, may never be nominated for a specific fellowship.

Upon acceptance as a candidate for the program, World Learning will hold your application in its pool of eligible candidates. When an interested USAID office decides to sponsor a fellowship, DFP staff review *all* qualified and available candidates to identify those who are most suitable, and whose backgrounds and qualifications are most appropriate to the needs and interests of the USAID unit. After personal interviews and reference checks, the DFP will propose one or more of these candidates to USAID. Further interviews or discussions may occur at this point. Eventually, USAID selects a single candidate for the particular fellowship. At this point, that candidate becomes the "finalist" for that fellowship. Please note that this process can take several weeks or even months.

? What happens after USAID selects the finalist for a specific fellowship?

After the individual finalist is notified, s/he completes the paperwork required to obtain a USAID security clearance, and, in coordination with the DFP and the sponsoring USAID unit, drafts a workplan for the fellowship. This plan is based on the activities and scope of work that USAID had previously identified for the fellowship. The finalist's proposed workplan outlines the activities, outcomes and impacts that the finalist will pursue during the fellowship; and how the proposed activities will meet USAID's expectations and goals for the fellowship. The workplan is intended to help insure that the finalist's expectations match USAID's expectations on the scope of the fellowship. After all parties have concurred in the fellowship workplan, and USAID has issued a security clearance (a process which can take two to four months), World Learning makes a formal offer and a Fellowship Agreement is signed. At this point, the finalist becomes a Democracy Fellow and a specific start date is determined.

? If I specify a particular country, am I still eligible for fellowships in other locations?

Unless they request otherwise, applicants will be considered for all opportunities for which they qualify. If a particular country or region is of special interest, please note it on the application. However, this will not limit consideration for fellowships in other regions of the world, as long as other criteria for the fellowship (e.g. language, experience, etc.) are met. If an applicant is interested **only** in a particular country or region, this too should be noted. Such a condition will obviously limit consideration for fellowship opportunities elsewhere, but will not otherwise affect the applicant's chances to be selected for a fellowship in that country or region.

? Can you tell me about some of the current fellowships?

Democracy Fellows currently work with USAID missions and offices overseas or in Washington, DC, in areas such as decentralization and devolution, conflict resolution, the rule of law, and the development of technical indicators. Democracy Fellows have served in Eritrea, Indonesia, Kenya, Chile, Russia, Paraguay, Madagascar, Uganda, South Africa and the Czech Republic. About half of the fellows serve in USAID/Washington. Each fellowship focuses on different aspects of USAID democracy programming (e.g., civil society, judicial administration, elections systems, governance, democratization strategies, etc.) including the design and/or implementation of USAID programs. Please understand, however, that geographic locations and subject areas vary from year to year according to USAID's needs. For descriptions of past fellowships and samples of materials produced by Democracy Fellows, please consult our website.

**WORLD LEARNING
DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM**

APPLICATION FORM

A. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. Name: _____
(title) (first) (last)

2. Social Security Number: _____ 3. Date of Birth: _____
(month) (day) (year)

4. Current Address: _____
(street) (apartment)

(city) (state) (zip code)

Work Phone: (_____) _____

Home Phone: (_____) _____

Fax: (_____) _____

E-mail Address: _____

Above contact information valid until _____

5. Permanent Address: _____
(if different from above) (street) (apartment)

_____ (city) (state) (zip code)

Telephone: (_____) _____

Fax: (_____) _____

E-mail Address: _____

12. Citizenship: _____ 13. Place of Birth: _____
(city, state, country)

14. Dependents: (Indicate dependents proposed to accompany Fellow to the country of assignment.)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Relationship</u>	<u>Age</u>
-------------	---------------------	------------

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

(attach additional sheet if required)

*Please understand that the DFP cannot guarantee any funds for dependent travel or allowances.
 These vary depending upon USAID's needs and available funding.*

B. SKILLS: Please list your current professional skills using the Occupation Codes from the enclosed list.

_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

C. PROGRAM INTERESTS: Please list any areas of interest in addition to the skills listed in section B above using the Occupation Codes from the enclosed list.

D. OVERSEAS EXPERIENCE: Please list all pertinent overseas experience (both specific regions and countries), using the codes from the enclosed list, and note how it was obtained (e.g. living overseas, college study abroad, work abroad, etc.) and how long you were there.

<i>Region</i>	<i>Countries</i>	<i>How Obtained</i>	<i>Duration of Stay</i>
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

E. GEOGRAPHIC INTEREST: Please indicate your geographic areas of interest, both regions and specific countries, in which you are open to placement, using the codes from the enclosed list. All applicants will be considered for fellowships overseas and in Washington, DC., unless indicated below.

1. *Specific Region(s) or Countries of Interest:*

2. Please check here if you do NOT wish to be considered for fellowship opportunities in Washington, DC.
3. Please check here if you ONLY wish to be considered for fellowship opportunities in Washington, DC.

L. CERTIFICATION

I certify in submitting this form that the above facts and statements are true, correct, and complete.

_____ Date _____ Applicant's Signature

Please submit complete application and supporting materials to:

Democracy Fellows Program

World Learning

1015 15th Street, NW, Suite 750

Washington, DC 20005

Tel: (202) 408-5427, ext. 310 Fax: (202) 408-5397

E-mail: dfp.info@worldlearning.org

Website: <http://www.worldlearning.org/pidt/dfp>

WORLD LEARNING
DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Please provide a statement that outlines how your fellowship could contribute to USAID's democracy and governance activities in your area(s) of interest or expertise. Your statement should be no longer than two pages, and should address:

- your professional interests and related democracy and governance experiences to date;
- skills that you would bring to a Democracy Fellowship with USAID; and
- how USAID's democracy and governance strategic goals and program objectives might be advanced if you are selected as a Democracy Fellow.

PROFESSIONAL PROFILE CODE SHEET

World Learning/DFP

OCCUPATION CODES

ADV Advocacy
 AOJ Administration of Justice
 ANT Anti-Corruption
 CED Civic Education
 CMR Civil Military Relations
 CLA Constitutional Law
 CLS Comparative Law
 CPS Comparative Politics
 CRE Conflict Resolution
 CSO Civil Society
 DEC Decentralization
 DIN Democratic Initiatives
 EIS Economic Issues
 ELE Elections
 ENV Environment
 GOV Governance
 ICT Indicators
 IHR Int'l. Human Rights
 IME Independent Media
 JRE Judicial Reform
 LAB Labor Issues
 LGO Local Government
 LRE Legisl. Reform
 MIS Minority Issues
 NGO Non-gov. Orgs.
 PAD Public Administration
 PHE Public Health
 PPA Political Parties
 PPO Public Policy
 PSE Private Sector
 PSR Political Sci. Research
 QAN Quantitative Analysis
 ROL Rule of Law
 SEC Security Issues
 SSR Social Sci. Research
 WOM Women's Issues
 YOU Youth Issues

REGIONAL CODES

CAB Caribbean
 CAF Central Africa
 CLA Central America
 CEE Central/East. Europe
 EAF East Africa
 EUR Europe
 FAE Far East
 GLO Global
 MEA Middle East
 NAF North Africa
 NIS New Independent States
 PAC Pacific
 SHA South America
 SAS South Asia
 SEA Southeast Asia
 STA Southern Africa
 WAF West Africa
 USA United States

COUNTRY CODES

Caribbean

ANT Antigua
 BAH Bahamas
 BAR Barbados
 BER Bermuda
 CAY Cayman Island
 CNA St. Chris/Nevis/Angla.
 CUB Cuba
 DOM Dominican Republic
 GRD Grenada
 HAI Haiti
 JAM Jamaica
 PTR Puerto Rico
 STK St. Kitts
 STV St. Vincent
 TRI Trinidad & Tobago

Latin America

ARG Argentina
 BEZ Belize
 BOL Bolivia
 BRA Brazil
 CHL Chile
 CLM Colombia
 COS Costa Rica
 ECU Ecuador
 ESL El Salvador
 FRG French Guiana
 GUA Guatemala
 GUY Guyana
 HON Honduras
 MEX Mexico
 NIC Nicaragua
 PAN Panama
 PAR Paraguay
 PER Peru
 SRN Suriname
 URU Uruguay
 VEN Venezuela

New Independent States

ARM Armenia
 AZE Azerbaijan
 BYE Belarus
 GEO Georgia
 KAZ Kazakhstan
 KYR Kyrgyzstan
 MOL Moldova
 RUS Russia
 TAJ Tajikistan
 TRK Turkmenistan
 UKR Ukraine
 UZB Uzbekistan

Europe

ALB Albania
 AUS Austria
 BEL Belgium
 BOS Bosnia
 BUL Bulgaria
 CRO Croatia
 CZE Czech Republic
 DEN Denmark
 EST Estonia
 FIN Finland
 FRA France
 GER Germany
 GRE Greece
 HUN Hungary
 IRE Ireland
 ITA Italy
 LAT Latvia
 LIT Lithuania
 LUX Luxembourg
 MAS Macedonia
 MLT Malta
 MON Montenegro
 NET Netherlands
 NOR Norway
 POL Poland
 POR Portugal
 ROM Romania
 SER Serbia
 SLV Slovakia
 SLO Slovenia
 SPA Spain
 SWE Sweden
 SWI Switzerland
 UKI United Kingdom

PROFESSIONAL PROFILE CODE SHEET

World Learning/DFP

Africa

ALG Algeria
ANG Angola
BEN Benin
BOT Botswana
BKF Burkina Faso
BUR Burundi
CAM Cameroon
CAR Central African
Republic
CHD Chad
COM Comoros
COG Congo
DJI Djibouti
EQG Equatorial Guinea
ETH Ethiopia
ERI Eritrea
GAB Gabon
GAM The Gambia
GHA Ghana
GUI Guinea
GUB Guinea Bissau
IVC Ivory Coast
KEN Kenya
LES Lesotho
LIB Liberia
MAG Madagascar
MAL Malawi
MAI Mali
MTA Mauritania
MTS Mauritius
MOR Morocco
MOZ Mozambique
NAM Namibia
NIG Nigeria
NIR Niger
RWA Rwanda
SEN Senegal

SEY Seychelles
SIL Sierra Leone
SOM Somalia
SAF South Africa
SUD Sudan
SWA Swaziland
TAN Tanzania
TOG Togo
TUN Tunisia
UGA Uganda
ZAI Zaire
ZAM Zambia
ZIM Zimbabwe

Middle East

ABD Abu Dhabi
AFR Afghanistan
BHR Bahrain
EGY Egypt
IRN Iran
IRQ Iraq
ISR Israel
JOR Jordan
KUW Kuwait
LEB Lebanon
LIB Libya
OMA Oman
QTR Qatar
SAR Saudi Arabia
SYR Syria
TUR Turkey
UAE United Arab
Emirates
YEM Yemen

Asia

BAN Bangladesh
BHR Bhutan
BRU Brunei
CHI China
TAI Taiwan
HNG Hong Kong
IND India
INA Indonesia
JAP Japan
KAM Cambodia
KOR Korea
LAO Laos
MAY Malaysia
MYA Myanmar
NEP Nepal
PAK Pakistan
PHL Philippines
SNG Singapore
SRI Sri Lanka
THL Thailand
VTN Vietnam

Oceania/Pacific

AUL Australia
CKI Cook Island
FJI Fiji
KIR Kiribati
MLD Maldives
MNS Micronesia
NCA New Caledonia
PAP Papua New Guinea
PLY Polynesia
SAM Samoa
STP Sao Tome & Principe
SOL Solomon Islands
TAH Tahiti
TON Tonga
TVU Tuvalu
VAN Vanuatu

OTHER:

Attachment C

DFP Screening, Nomination and Selection Materials

**WORLD LEARNING
DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM**

APPLICATION REVIEW SHEET

Applicant name _____

Program review by _____ Date _____

(circle one) **accepted** **rejected** **incomplete / discuss**

Placement considerations / red flags / comments:

Please rate on a scale of 1 – 5, with 5 being the most positive or strongest score.

A. Professional development

Will participation in the Democracy Fellows Program contribute to the applicant's professional development?
Has the applicant demonstrated or stated an interest in a career in international democracy and governance?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

B. Potential impact/contribution to the field

Does the applicant exhibit the ability to impact positively upon her/his colleagues and/or upon citizens of newly emerging democracies? Is this applicant expected to be able to make a significant contribution to the Democracy Fellows Program and/or to the field of democracy and governance?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

C. Cross-cultural and personal skills

Does the applicant possess the skills necessary to work and communicate effectively in a multi-cultural or new setting?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

WORLD LEARNING
DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

Applicant Name: _____

Application _____	Resume _____	Personal Statement _____
Synopsis _____	1420 _____	Other _____

Applicant level:	junior (1-5 years) _____	mid (5-10 years) _____ senior (10+ years) _____
Applicant claims:	advanced degree _____	or substantial equivalent experience
Citizenship _____	-----	
Postcard sent _____		
Application Review _____	Accepted	Rejected
Notification sent _____		

Notes:

Attachment D

DFP Evaluation Materials

SPONSORING USAID UNIT'S EVALUATION

Please rate each aspect of the Democracy Fellowship for your team/area. Circle the number which best applies. Please leave blank any questions that are not applicable.

1. How valuable has this fellowship been to the team in terms of the Democracy Fellow's substantive contributions to the USAID team's democracy and governance goals and objectives (e.g. contributions to the technical expertise of the team)?

1 2 3 4 5
not valuable at all somewhat valuable extremely valuable

2. Did this fellowship meet the goals and expectations of the team/office? (You may wish to review the Democracy Fellow's *Program Description and Workplan* to refamiliarize yourself with the specific goals of the fellowship.)

1 2 3 4 5
not at all somewhat very much

3. Has this fellowship had the expected impact on the people of emerging and/or transitional democratic states (i.e., the target population of USAID D/G programs)?

1 2 3 4 5
not at all somewhat very much

4. Recognizing that a fundamental purpose of the DFP is to help develop the next generation of U.S. experts in international democracy, how valuable do you think the fellowship has been for the fellow? Has s/he made progress toward the career development objectives identified in his/her Fellowship Program Description?

1 2 3 4 5
not valuable at all somewhat valuable extremely valuable

5. Please rate the quality of administrative, logistic and financial and program support that World Learning has provided for this fellowship.

1 2 3 4 5
very poor unsatisfactory OK very good outstanding

(continued)

6. Are you interested in, or currently considering, an extension for this Democracy Fellow, or a fellowship for a "follow-on" Democracy Fellow? (An affirmative answer does not imply a firm commitment on the part of the sponsoring unit.)

yes

no

unknown at this time

7. The Democracy Fellows Program welcomes feedback and suggestions on sponsoring a Democracy Fellow, and on any other aspects of the program. These might include administrative aspects of the fellowship and/or programmatic aspects (e.g., selection/preparation of the fellow, technical contributions made by the fellow, ability of the fellow to adjust to USAID and to the assigned D/G team, information to include in DFP Orientations, etc.).

Please feel free to comment on any of the preceding topics or on additional areas:

Other comments or suggestions:

USAID Mentor, Team Leader or
Other Staff Member

Date

Name of Fellow: _____

FY2000-2001

Attachment E

Roster of Current And Former Democracy Fellows

ROSTER OF CURRENT AND FORMER DEMOCRACY FELLOWS

A. Current Democracy Fellows

- 1. Kevin Bohrer**
USAID/Kenya
Nairobi, Kenya (04/01/2003 – 03/31/2004)

Dr. Bohrer's arrival in Kenya coincided with the launch of the Kenyan National Constitutional Conference, an historic undertaking that will result in a new Kenyan Constitution. Dr. Bohrer was certified as an official observer of the Conference, and attended several sessions.

In the first year of Dr. Bohrer's fellowship, the majority of his efforts have been spent preparing the Mission's anti-corruption action plan and initiating discussions between the Mission's democracy and governance partners and the implementers of the Mission's HIV/AIDS program. In his work on USAID/Kenya's anti-corruption portfolio, Dr. Bohrer provided commentary on the first two drafts of the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs' draft strategy for judicial and legal reform and anti-corruption activities. He also took a lead role in preparing USAID/Kenya's anti-corruption action plan and funding proposal, which was subsequently funded.

- 2. Leonora Foley**
USAID/REDSO
Nairobi, Kenya (01/15/2001 – 10/31/2003)

Leonora Foley is serving her fellowship with the USAID mission in Nairobi, Kenya. Goals of her fellowship include acting as a resource person on conflict resolution issues to REDSO/ESA teams; providing services to bilateral AID missions on conflict resolution and democratization issues, particularly in non-presence countries (NPCs); and assisting in the development of local professional and organizational capacity in conflict resolution.

Prior to her Democracy Fellowship, Lee completed her M.A. in Law and Diplomacy at the Fletcher School at Tufts University. Her work experience includes positions with the Harvard Institute for International Development, as well as the American Refugee Committee.

3. Corbin Lyday
Strategies Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (09/1/2002 – 08/31/2004)

Corbin is serving his fellowship with the Strategies team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance, located in Washington, D.C. The focus of Corbin's fellowship includes the Sectional Operational Research Agenda (SORA). Through new and on-going country and sub-sectoral studies planned by the DG Office and the Strategies Team, Corbin hopes to focus the Team's efforts on the question of why certain types of DG programs seem to work, why others do not, and the conditions under which successful programs can be exported from one country and geographic region to another. Other topics of Corbin's fellowship include strengthening cross-sectoral linkages, and performance monitoring.

Corbin holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California at Berkeley, an M.A. in Russian and East European Studies from the University of Michigan, and a B.A. in Economics from the University of California at Berkeley. Prior to starting his fellowship, Corbin had extensive experience with USAID, including serving as a Senior Policy Analyst for the Office of Democracy and Governance for seven years, as well as the Senior Democracy Advisor for the Office of Women in Development at USAID.

4. Peggy Ochandarena
Rule of Law Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance/
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
Washington, DC (07/15/2002 – 07/14/2004)

Peggy is serving her fellowship with the Rule of Law team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance, located in Washington, DC, in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. Through her fellowship, Peggy plans to advise the Committee on the purpose and status of rule of law development programs funded by USAID, with special emphasis on judicial sector reforms; as well as helping facilitate the provision of Committee resources/expertise to assist USAID missions and the DG/Rule of Law Team in carrying out program objectives which involve judicial reforms.

Peggy holds a J.D. from Georgia State University, a M.S.W. from Boston College, and a B.A. from Gordon College. Prior to becoming a Democracy Fellow, Peggy served as Court Counsel for the Palau Supreme Court, as well as Legal Counsel the House of Delegates in the Republic of Palau.

5. Caroline Sahley
Civil Society Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (09/01/2002 – 08/31/2004)

Carol is serving her fellowship with the Civil Society team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance, located in Washington, DC. The focus of Carol's fellowship will be to develop a research methodology for assessing the impact of civil society strengthening activities. This assessment is part of a larger initiative, the Sub-sector Operational Research Agenda (SORA) project, being undertaken by the Office of Democracy and Governance to assess the impact of different types of democracy promotion activities. The aim of the SORA work is to develop a typology of democracy promotion methods and activities, and determine which activities, under which circumstances, have demonstrated the greatest impact.

Carol received her Ph.D. in Political Science from the London School of Economics, and has worked in Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Peru, Ukraine, and Zambia.

6. Keith Schulz
Governance Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (11/01/2000 – 10/31/2003)

Keith Schulz serves as a Democracy Fellow with the Governance team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance. He supports activities that build upon and improve the Center's capacity to act as a technical resource on legislative strengthening issues. In particular, Keith is conducting research in order to determine the correlation between USAID-funded assistance and legislative performance. He also is developing and implementing a training program on legislative strengthening for both new and experienced democracy and governance officers.

Prior to becoming a Democracy Fellow, Keith worked on several USAID-funded legislative strengthening and rule-of-law projects. He also served as a Legal Advisor for The Asia Foundation's Legal Development Project in Cambodia. Previously, he was the Deputy Legislative Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the State of California. Keith has worked in the West Bank/Gaza and Cambodia. He is proficient in Spanish and speaks some Arabic and Khmer. Keith holds a J.D. from the University of San Diego School of Law, and is currently working toward a Master's degree in International Policy and Practice at George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs.

7. **Caryn Wilde**
USAID Mission
Moscow, Russia (05/01/2001 – 05/14/2004)

Caryn Wilde is a Democracy Fellow with USAID's mission in Moscow, Russia. The focus of her fellowship is NGO development across Russia. Her work includes analyzing and making recommendations for directing future U.S. assistance to support NGOs that contribute to a participatory civil society. This includes providing NGOs working on democracy, business and economic reform, and social sector reform with resources and information relating to strategic planning, NGO board development, fundraising, public relations, organizational restructuring, and staff development and training.

Before becoming a Democracy Fellow, Caryn worked as the principal of an international consulting firm that focused on best business practices for emerging NGOs in the CIS, including transferring and adapting western models to promote sustainable organizational development. Caryn has also done independent consulting projects on women's economic empowerment, rule of law/human rights, independent media, and civil society. She is proficient in the Russian language, and holds a MPA from the University of Minnesota.

B. Former Democracy Fellows

1. Cynthia L. Ambrose

**Rule of Law Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (12/15/1999 - 05/04/2001)**

Cynthia Ambrose served her fellowship with the Rule of Law Team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance, located in Washington, D.C. Cindy's fellowship focused on three areas: research and analysis, program development and support, and field support. Her projects included organizing and developing a curriculum for USAID's Democracy and Governance (DG) Training Conference, working with the National Center for State Courts on completing a Case Management/Tracking Guide for DG officers in the field, and assisting the field in developing programs and a democracy strategy for Nigeria. In addition, Cindy's regional assignments included Africa for rule of law, and South Africa for democracy and governance in general.

Cindy received her B.A. in political science from the University of Maryland, a J.D. from Thomas Cooley Law School, and an L.L.M in international development from Georgetown Law. Before becoming a Democracy Fellow, Cindy worked as an attorney in Maryland, specializing in government relations and legislative law. Prior to her work in private practice, Cindy worked for the Federated States of Micronesia in Kosrae. Her work in Kosrae was with the legislative branch. In addition, while in Kosrae, Cindy taught advocacy and writing courses at the College of Micronesia and authored a chapter on issues affecting women in the South Pacific.

2. Nicole C. Barnes

**USAID Mission
Pretoria, South Africa (04/15/1999 - 11/30/2000)**

Nicole Barnes served her fellowship with the Democracy and Governance Team at USAID's Mission in Pretoria, South Africa. She worked with the Local Governance Unit of the DG Team on the implementation of an \$18M, five year bilateral agreement with the South African Government to strengthen local government capacity. Nicole primarily focused on assisting the Mission with identification and monitoring of key policy studies for the South African government, largely related to local government finance issues. In addition, she has worked directly with a limited number of municipalities to facilitate their assistance from USAID.

Nicole earned her Masters in City Planning from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where she studied fiscal decentralization and poverty alleviation. Prior to her fellowship, Nicole worked in Cape Town, South Africa's largest township, to investigate strategies for private sector investment in low income communities. She has also worked on fiscal decentralization research and training in Uganda, and taught in a historically disadvantaged high school in rural South Africa.

3. Michael Bak
USAID Mission
Jakarta, Indonesia (11/1/2000 - 05/18/2003)

Michael Bak served his fellowship with the Democracy and Governance Team (referred to as the Office of Civic Participation and Transition) at the USAID mission in Jakarta, Indonesia. Michael served as the team's advisor on Conflict Transformation and Reconciliation, with a focus on peacebuilding and reconciliation to provide analytical and program advice to the CPT/Conflict team in identifying and disseminating "best practices" in this sector. He also conducted analytical conflict flashpoint studies and integrated new knowledge into future programs.

Michael received his M.A. from the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University in 2000. Before joining the Democracy Fellows Program, he worked as a consultant for the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

4. Robert R. Barr
Strategies Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (09/01/1997 - 08/31/1998)

Robert Barr completed his fellowship with the Strategies team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance in Washington, DC. His focus was on the development of indicators of democracy in USAID's programs on democracy and governance. Specific fellowship activities included developing and testing democracy indicators in the field, and assisting the Center with writing and editing a comprehensive handbook on democracy indicators.

After completing his fellowship, Rob returned to the University of Texas to continue working on his Ph.D. in Comparative Politics/International Relations, a program he began before becoming a Democracy Fellow. His research focuses on the effects of corruption on the style of governance and the process of reform in Latin America. His Master's thesis was titled "Alternatives for the Left: The Strategic Decisions of the Chilean Socialist Party." Rob has taught classes in the politics of environmental issues, U.S. foreign policy, and the role of the military in Latin America. He has also authored several papers on economic reform, drug-trafficking, and privatization in Latin America.

5. Bradley D. Bessire
USAID/Cambodia
Phnom Penh, Cambodia (05/01/2001 - 01/03/2003)

USAID Office of Women in Development
Washington, DC (08/15/2000 - 02/28/2001)

Bradley Bessire served his fellowship with the USAID mission in Phnom Penh, working with the Democracy and Human Rights Program. His work focused on several areas: protection of human rights, rehabilitation of the judicial sector, efforts to combat trafficking in people, support of the commune elections, and assisting the coordination and development of the new DHR interim program strategy.

Bradley Bessire served his first fellowship with the Office of Women in Development in USAID's Global Bureau, while also working with USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance. His primary activities include the development of a women's property rights program as well as projects focusing on legal literacy.

Before becoming a Democracy Fellow, Bradley worked at law firm that works exclusively in Native American rights. He earned his J.D. at American University's Washington College of Law where he also participated in the International Human Rights Clinic. Prior to beginning law school Bradley worked and traveled extensively in Southeast Asia and Central America, where his work ranged from teaching English in Seoul, Korea to setting up a shelter for street girls in Managua, Nicaragua.

6. Gary A. Bland
Governance Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (09/08/1998 - 09/30/2001)

As a Fellow in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance, Gary Bland served as a decentralization advisor and a member of the Governance team. He helped to train USAID DG officers, working to build intra-agency coordination on decentralization and local government, and working closely with missions to help improve programming in this area. His fellowship research project focused on the emergence of local democracy in Latin America.

Gary is a specialist in decentralization and the development of local government. He holds a Ph.D. from the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies. Prior to becoming a Democracy Fellow, he served as a legislative assistant in the House of Representatives and senior program associate at the Latin American Program of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Gary's democracy work has focused on Latin America and he has consulted with USAID, the World Bank, and the United Nations Development Programme.

7. Stephen M. Brager
Governance Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (05/19/1997 - 05/18/2001)

Stephen Brager served his fellowship with the Governance team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance in Washington, DC. Stephen examined various issues in good governance, including legislative strengthening, government integrity, decentralization and local governance. He previously worked on civil-military relations, transitions, and conflict mitigation. In addition, he assisted in the development of training programs for USAID staff in issues of democratization.

Stephen earned his M.A. in political science at the University of California at San Diego. Before beginning his Democracy Fellowship, he worked as a Research Intern at InterAction examining the role of NGOs in strengthening civil society. He was a Teaching/Research Assistant in U.S. politics, international relations, security issues, comparative politics and ethnic conflict at the University of California at San Diego. Stephen has lived in Brazil, Chile, Israel and Spain. His interests cover a wide range of topics, including rule of law, civil-military relations and civil society.

8. Lisa M. Cannon
Development Resources Centre
Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa (10/29/1996 - 10/28/1997)

Lisa Cannon served her Democracy Fellowship with the Development Resources Centre (DRC), a South African NGO located in Johannesburg and Cape Town, South Africa. The DRC serves as a network organization for South African NGOs. During her fellowship, Lisa worked on issues of financial sustainability for NGOs. In particular, she assisted in improving the organizational management capacities of the member organizations, in developing a network of NGOs, in facilitating partnerships with the corporate sector, in increasing citizen support and involvement, and in developing NGO fund-raising strategies.

Lisa has an Ed.M. in International Education from Harvard University and B.S. in Foreign Service from Georgetown. She has worked in Armenia, South Africa, and several countries in Central America. Before becoming a Democracy Fellow, Lisa was an organizational development consultant for NGOs, and helped train Peace Corps Volunteers. After she completed her fellowship, Lisa worked as a short-term consultant for World Learning. Since returning to the U.S., she has accepted a position with Ashoka, a non-profit organization that awards grants to support social entrepreneurs and civil society organizations.

9. Carrie S. Chernov
USAID Mission
Asuncion, Paraguay (01/31/1997 - 05/07/1997)

Carrie Chernov served her Democracy Fellowship with USAID/Asuncion, where her assignment included a wide range of democracy assistance. Specific program areas included: strengthening the capacities of grassroots organizations and NGOs; facilitating private and public partnerships and working accords; supporting Paraguay's efforts in decentralization and local governance; encouraging local civic participation and the development of NGO advocacy skills; and advancing civic education, legal reform and environmental issues. Following the conclusion of her fellowship, Carrie worked for a law firm in Paraguay focusing on NGO advocacy and legal assistance.

Prior to her fellowship, Carrie's career included work as Counsel and Professional Staff Member, US House of Representatives Subcommittee on Environment, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. She was Legislative Assistant for Congressman James Scheuer, and a Consultant on sustainable development with the World Resources Institute. Other positions included Associate Attorney and Legal Consultant with several prominent Washington, DC litigation and environmental law firms; and General Counsel and Business Analyst for an international investments and operations firm. She earned an LLM. in International and Comparative Law at Georgetown University; a J.D. from New York University; and a B.A. (Honors) in History from Brown University. Carrie had previously lived in Spain and the United Kingdom, and has traveled to Botswana, Costa Rica, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

10. Dawn P. Emling
USAID Mission
Pretoria, Republic of South Africa (04/26/1997 - 04/25/1998)

Dawn Emling served her Democracy Fellowship with the USAID Mission in Pretoria, South Africa. There she worked on conflict resolution issues with local NGOs. In addition, Dawn worked closely with USAID/Pretoria's Community Development Foundation Program. During her fellowship, Dawn researched, compiled and edited a forthcoming book of essays by host-country NGO leaders, assessing South African mediation and conflict resolution programs. She also developed an extensive working bibliography on conflict resolution issues. After completing her fellowship, Dawn accepted a position focusing on democracy and governance issues with the USAID Mission in Jakarta, Indonesia.

Dawn received her M.A. in international development from American University in 1993. Before joining the Democracy Fellows Program, she worked as an International Programs Coordinator at the National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law (NICEL). Dawn has lived in both South Africa and Nigeria. Her interests include legislative reform, women's groups, democratic initiatives, advocacy and civil society.

11. Holly Flood
USAID Mission
Asuncion, Paraguay (05/15/1999 - 01/23/2001)

Holly Flood served as a Democracy Fellow with the USAID Mission in Asuncion, Paraguay. She focused on decentralization of health services, strengthening local government, and strategic planning of democracy and governance programs. Holly acted as liaison between USAID/Asuncion and USAID contractors which are implementing health decentralization programs. Holly also provided technical assistance to USAID/Asuncion during its strategic planning process. Holly viewed her fellowship as an opportunity to gain experience applying her skills in program management and strategic planning to the field of democracy and governance.

Holly earned her M.A. in International Affairs at George Washington University. Before beginning her fellowship, Holly was Regional Director for the International Rescue Committee, overseeing the resettlement of refugees. Previously, she served as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Paraguay. Holly is proficient in Spanish and also speaks Guarani and Portuguese. Her interests include civil society, elections, international human rights, public administration, and public health.

12. Leslie L. Gottert
USAID Mission
Antananarivo, Madagascar (11/1/1999 - 09/30/2001)

Leslie Gottert served as a Democracy Fellow with USAID's mission in Madagascar. She focused on assisting USAID's efforts to strengthen civil society and to support Malagasy efforts to increase the responsiveness and accountability of democratic institutions in Madagascar.

Before becoming a Democracy Fellow, Leslie worked as a Consultant and Trainer with various USAID contractors and grantees in Madagascar and Cameroon. Previously, she co-founded Development Graphics, a communications design firm in Benin. She also directed the English Language Program in Benin for the U.S. Information Agency. Leslie is fluent in French and has traveled extensively in West Africa. Her interests include conflict resolution, civil society, and governance. Leslie earned her M.A. in Conflict Resolution at Antioch University; she also holds a B.A. in Studio Art from Brown University.

13. J. Michele Guttman
Corporacion Participa
Santiago, Chile (09/28/1996 - 09/27/1997)

Michele Guttman served her fellowship with *Corporacion Participa* in Santiago, Chile. *Participa* is a highly regarded Chilean NGO whose programs focus on civic education. It conducts training programs in voter education, advocacy, and legal and judicial reform. During her fellowship, Michele worked with *Participa's* advocacy training program and its Global Women in Politics program. She also provided the staff of *Participa* with professional advice on ways to increase citizen participation throughout civil society. Since she completed her Democracy Fellowship, Michele has worked as a consultant with a number of USAID contractors on democracy and governance issues.

Michele earned both her J.D., and a B.A. in Modern Languages, at the University of New Mexico. Before beginning her Democracy Fellowship she practiced law in an Albuquerque, NM law firm where she was a principal. She has lived in Ecuador, and has traveled to Europe and the Caribbean.

14. Linn A. Hammergren
Rule of Law Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (04/01/1996 - 11/2/1998)

Linn Hammergren completed her fellowship with the Rule of Law team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance in Washington, DC. Her focus was on the effectiveness of recent USAID and other rule of law programs, especially in Central and South America and the Caribbean. During her fellowship she developed a series of manuals on judicial training, code reform, and efforts to establish or strengthen prosecution and public defense functions. She also wrote a paper on the socio-political significance of rule of law reforms in Latin America, and helped to promote a network of scholars, advocates and practitioners interested in rule of law issues. Since completing her Democracy Fellowship, Linn has worked at the World Bank on governance issues.

Linn earned her Ph.D. and M.A. in political science from the University of Wisconsin. Her B.A. is from Stanford University. Linn has lived in Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Peru and Venezuela, and previously has received fellowships from the Vanderbilt Center for Latin American Studies, and the Social Science Research Council. She is fluent in Spanish. Her interests cover a range of topics including justice system reforms, national integration and the development of civil society, comparative legal systems, and local governments and decentralization.

15. Elizabeth I. Hart

**Civil Society Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (10/21/1996 - 10/31/1999)**

Elizabeth Hart worked with the Civil Society team of USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance in Washington, DC. Liz pursued the relationship between economic and political liberalization, as well as the roles of the private sector and labor in civil society, and the processes of economic and political reform. During her fellowship she also assisted the Democracy Center in the development and presentation of a series of democracy and governance training workshops to provide technical guidance to USAID Missions. After completing her Democracy Fellowship, Liz accepted a position as a Democracy Officer with the USAID Mission in Lagos, Nigeria.

Liz received her Ph.D. in Politics from Princeton University in 1996. The topic of her dissertation was liberal reform in Ghana. Liz has also authored publications on democratic reform in Africa, and politics in Kenya. She has traveled and worked in a number of African and Asian nations, particularly in Ghana.

16. Abigail Horn

**Bureau for Latin America & Caribbean, USAID
Washington, DC (02/22/1999 - 09/30/1999)**

Abigail Horn worked with USAID's Latin America Bureau in Washington, DC. Abby focused on USAID's anti-corruption initiatives in that region, providing technical input for the Bureau's anti-corruption programming. In addition, Abby also helped to restructure a USAID program on financial integrity. At the conclusion of Abby's fellowship, the USAID Latin America Bureau hired her as a democracy advisor.

Abby earned her M.I.A. from Columbia University in economic and political development, with emphasis on Latin America. Before beginning her fellowship, she was a Fulbright Scholar for one year in Chile. While there, she researched student political participation since Chile's transition to democracy, and worked with the civic group *Participa* conducting civic and human rights education programs. Abby also interned with the Carnegie Endowment of International Peace, updating and editing their book *Nuclear Thresholds*. She has lived in Argentina, Chile and Mexico. Her public policy interests include civil society, NGO networks, elections and anti-corruption efforts.

17. Abigail Horn
USAID Mission
Asuncion, Paraguay (10/01/1997 - 01/31/1999)

Abigail Horn completed her initial Democracy Fellowship with the USAID Mission in Asuncion, Paraguay in January 1999. Abby was centrally involved with Mission programs supporting both Paraguay's recent elections, and national anti-corruption efforts. She worked on anti-corruption efforts, voter education, electoral administration and monitoring, political party development, and judicial strengthening. She also helped Paraguayan NGOs on training methods, approaches, and in addressing problems in civic education and capacity building, particularly with the Paraguayan branch of Transparency International.

Abby earned her M.I.A. from Columbia University in economic and political development, with emphasis on Latin America. Before beginning her fellowship, she was a Fulbright Scholar for one year in Chile. While there, she researched student political participation since Chile's transition to democracy, and worked with the civic group *Participa* conducting civic and human rights education programs. Abby also interned with the Carnegie Endowment of International Peace, updating and editing their book *Nuclear Thresholds*. She has lived in Argentina, Chile and Mexico. Her public policy interests include civil society, NGO networks, elections and anti-corruption efforts.

18. Ann C. Hudock
Civil Society Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (01/01/1998 - 12/31/1998)

Ann Hudock served her fellowship with the Civil Society team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance in Washington, DC. Ann's focus was on the development of government laws and regulations governing the NGO sector, as well as on media development and the role of media in civil society. After completing her Democracy Fellowship, Ann accepted a position as a Human Rights Officer with the State Department's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. She later accepted an appointment as Special Assistant to the State Department's Undersecretary for Global Affairs.

Ann received her Ph.D. from the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex in the United Kingdom. During her fellowship she has aimed to apply her prior academic work to the policy-making process in the United States. She is a member of the Development Studies Association and National Union of Journalists, and has won several awards including a Rotary International Ambassadorial Scholarship, a Regional Award from Soroptimist International, and the Marj Heyduck Journalist of the Year Award. Ann has lived in Sierra Leone and the United Kingdom, and has worked in Central America, Mongolia, South Africa and the Gambia.

19. Brian D. Kelliher
Foundation for Human Rights Initiative
Kampala, Uganda (10/12/1996 - 10/11/1997)

As a Democracy Fellow, Brian Kelliher worked with the Foundation for Human Rights Initiative (FHRI), in Kampala, Uganda. FHRI monitors human rights abuses and the development of legal protections of human rights. During his fellowship, Brian assisted in the training of paralegals, laid the groundwork for a moot court competition to improve Ugandan legal advocacy and representational skills, designed a curriculum for a paralegal training program, and conducted community outreach and education programs. Brian also assisted in networking with other human rights groups in the region.

Before joining the DFP, Brian worked as an Attorney-Advisor in the U.S. Justice Department's Executive Office for Immigration Review, Board of Immigration Appeals. He returned to the Justice Department at the conclusion of his Democracy Fellowship. Brian has a J.D. from George Washington University and graduated in political science from the University of Michigan. Brian previously interned with GWU's Community Legal Clinic and the D.C. Superior Court. He was a Public Interest Law Fellow with Harlem Legal Services, Inc., and a Fellow with the University of Namibia's Human Rights Documentation Center. In an internship with the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, Brian helped to train South African election monitors in preparation for that nation's 1994 elections.

20. Patricia J. Kendall
USAID Mission
Jakarta, Indonesia (03/16/1997 - 11/30/1999)

Patricia Kendall served her fellowship with the USAID Mission in Jakarta, Indonesia. She concentrated on issues of legal and judicial reform, the legal aspects of economic reform, and the development of NGO advocacy and organizational capacities, as well as legal issues relating to democratic participation and human rights. Her Democracy Fellowship has served as a transition from her background as a trial lawyer in constitutional and civil rights law, to the field of international law, and towards efforts to build democratic institutions. Since completing her fellowship, Patty has worked both in the U.S. and in Indonesia as a short-term consultant to USAID contractors in the field of democracy and governance.

Before becoming a Democracy Fellow, Patty was Assistant Corporation Counsel and Supervisory Attorney for the City of Chicago. She holds a J.D. from the University of Illinois and a Master's degree in higher education administration from Vanderbilt University. She has traveled to Australia, Europe, Asia and Southeast Asia, as well as the former Soviet Union. Patricia's interests include the constitutionality of government practices, rule of law, human rights, legal issues relating to women and minorities, and law enforcement.

21. Sepideh Keyvanshad
USAID Mission
Moscow, Russia (07/1/1999 - 09/15/2000)

Sepideh Keyvanshad served her fellowship with the USAID Mission in Moscow, Russia. Sepideh concentrated on issues of anti-corruption, strengthening the Russian judicial system, and building respect for human rights. She used her Democracy Fellowship to gain experience working with USAID in the field of democracy and governance. After completing her fellowship, Sepideh entered USAID's New Entry Professional (NEP) Program.

Sepideh earned her J.D. at the University of Illinois. Prior to becoming a Democracy Fellow, she worked as a Project Coordinator for the National Center for State Courts. She has also been a consultant for the World Bank. Sepideh has lived in Haiti, Mexico, Russia, and Iran. Her interests include administration of justice, conflict resolution, rule of law, human rights, and civil society.

22. Mark Koenig
Civil Society Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (11/1/2000 - 6/15/2003)

Mark Koenig served his fellowship with the Civil Society team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance, located in Washington, D.C. The focus of Mark's fellowship was to conduct research and write technical guides analyzing the best practices and lessons learned from USAID media programs. His work compared USAID media programs with experiences from such other media sector donors as OSI, the World Bank, British DFID and the Ford Foundation, but also addressed larger theoretical issues that importantly shape media development work: e.g., the linkages among press freedoms, media sector development, advertising sector development and economic growth.

Mark holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University. He has a diverse background that includes serving as a visiting lecturer at Northwestern University, Duke University, and the University of Maryland at College Park. He has also served as Senior Media Advisor for USAID/Russia.

23. James P. Kuklinski
USAID Mission
Pretoria, South Africa (04/1/1999 - 03/31/2001)

James "Jaime" Kuklinski served as a World Learning Democracy Fellow with USAID's mission to South Africa. The majority of his work involved assisting the mission with the design and implementation of a \$9 million six-year results-oriented program to strengthen South African civil society and government partnerships for improved policy development and service delivery. In addition, Jaime provided oversight for a senior executive cooperative educational program between Harvard and the University of Witwatersrand (WITS) to provide management capacity to high level managers from the public, private, and public enterprise sectors. He assisted USAID with the management of a grant to the National Democratic Institute (NDI) that promoted public participation in policy formulation and strengthening of democratic pluralism and governance systems. As Activity Manager for the USAID/US Embassy-Public Affairs Section Transitional Support Funds (TSF) Program, Jaime helped to design US and South African exchange activities that support USAID's Democracy and Governance objectives.

Jaime earned his MBA at the Monterey Institute for International Studies in California, where he developed a passion for international economic development and an appreciation for the need for strong alliances between government, private industry and civil society. Jaime served on four occasions as an international elections polling station supervisor with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in Bosnia & Herzegovina and Armenia. As US Peace Corps Country Director in three African nations, Jaime supervised volunteer efforts that brought together civil society, government, and the private sector for purposes of local community development. Before beginning his Democracy Fellowship, Jaime worked as an international relief logistics delegate for the American Red Cross both in Honduras and at the home office in Washington, DC. Jaime's interests lie in civil society strengthening, public sector management capacity building, and promoting corporate social investment.

24. Carolyn J. Logan
REDSO/ESA - Greater Horn of Africa Initiative
Nairobi, Kenya (12/01/1997 - 07/31/2000)

Carolyn Logan served her Democracy Fellowship with USAID's Regional Economic Development Services Offices for East and Southern Africa in Nairobi, Kenya. Carolyn worked in the areas of regional democratic transitions, crisis prevention, crisis management, and conflict resolution. She used her Democracy Fellowship to complete her own transition from the field of engineering to a career in policy and democracy and governance.

Carolyn received her M.A.L.D. in international relations from the Fletcher School at Tufts University in 1996. After completing her Democracy Fellowship, she returned to Tufts to finish her Ph.D. in international relations, a program she began before becoming a Democracy Fellow. Previously, Carolyn spent several years as a professional in water resources

management in India, Lesotho, Rwanda and Somalia. She is especially interested in the relationship of indigenous practices to questions of political conflict, participation and representation.

25. Kimberly Ludwig
Civil Society Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (02/01/2001 - 05/15/2002)

Kimberly Ludwig served a Democracy Fellow with USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance/Civil Society team. In her fellowship she assisted in designing and implementing civil society development strategies. These included exploring synergies between the Africa Bureau and the Civil Society team, identifying opportunities for collaboration and contributing to the Civil Society team's knowledge of African affairs and current programs, and improving the advocacy roles and organizational capacity of Civil Society organizations.

Before becoming a Democracy Fellow, Kimberly was Assistant to USAID/Zambia's DG Advisor, and worked as a consultant for the Institute for Democracy in South Africa. In this activity, funded by USAID's Southern African Regional Democracy Fund, Kimberly evaluated citizen's attitudes and interaction with democracy, government, and the economic system in six countries in Southern Africa. She has authored several papers on issues of democratization and political representation in Zambia. Kimberly is proficient in French and Bemba and holds a Ph.D. from Michigan State University in Political Science.

26. Michael R. McCord
USAID Mission
Asmara, Eritrea (01/01/1997 - 05/31/1998);
USAID/AFR
Washington, DC (08/18/1998 - 09/30/1998)

Michael McCord served his fellowship with the USAID Mission in Asmara, Eritrea where his work emphasized support for the rule of law and democratic elections. He also strengthened local legal training and judicial resources. His efforts included developing a curriculum and teaching a course on "Law and Development" at Eritrea's national law school, and publishing several articles on law in East Africa. His Democracy Fellowship was interrupted when the USAID Mission was evacuated due to the war between Eritrea and Ethiopia. Following his return to the U.S., Mike was awarded a short-term extension of his fellowship, and he worked with Mission personnel who were temporarily based in Washington, DC. There he helped to analyze and design programs supporting the improvement of human capacity in Eritrea's government institutions. After he finished his Democracy Fellowship, Mike accepted a position focusing on democracy and governance with the USAID Mission in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire.

Mike earned his J.D. from the University of Oregon, and his B.A. in economics from California State University in San Diego. He previously served with the International Rescue Committee in Rwanda, Tanzania and Zaire, where he was a refugee program officer. He also worked as a law clerk for a Springfield, Oregon law firm.

27. Sharon L. Morris

**Civil Society Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (09/1/2000 - 09/30/2001)**

As a Democracy Fellow in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance, Sharon Morris worked with the Civil Society team. She examined the ways in which local civil society groups interact with international partners during the process of democratization and democratic consolidation. In particular, she focused on how this interaction influences the stability and content of the new democratic regime.

Sharon holds a Ph.D. and M.A. in Political Science from the University of Chicago. Before beginning her Democracy Fellow, Sharon worked as a Research Associate for The MacArthur Foundation, managing grants in the areas of U.S. foreign policy, media, and globalization. She also conducted research on various aspects of civil society and international security. Sharon's interests include civil society, civil-military relations, and conflict in transitional states. She has worked in Nigeria and Senegal and lived in France, Belgium, and the United Kingdom. Sharon is proficient in French and also speaks some Arabic.

28. Brian C. Murphy

**USAID/REDSO/ESA
Nairobi, Kenya (02/01/1996 - 03/31/1997)**

Brian C. Murphy completed his fellowship with USAID's Regional Economic Development Services Office for East and Southern Africa, and the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative, in Nairobi, Kenya. The objective of Brian's fellowship was to support the growth of democracy in the many transitional and emerging democracies supported by REDSO. Specific goals included assessing the legal and judicial systems of countries within the region; making recommendations and proposals for reform and/or technical assistance; and consulting with legal and judicial officials on conflict resolution and alternative dispute resolution. Since completing his Democracy Fellowship, Brian has worked as a consultant on democracy and governance issues with contractors for USAID and other donor organizations.

Brian received a J.D. from the University of Virginia, and an A.B. in government from Harvard University. His prior federal career included many years as an attorney with the Administrative Conference of the U.S., and extensive service with the Federal Bar Association's international initiatives in support of emerging democracies. His interests include conflict resolution, litigation reform and alternative dispute resolution, administrative law, and international trade regulation.

29. Paul Nuti
Strategies Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (09/1/2002 – 07/31/2003)

Paul served his fellowship with the Strategies team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance, located in Washington, D.C. In collaboration with Democracy Fellow, Dr. Corbin Lyday, Mr. Nuti acted as the point-person for designing and vetting an innovative approach to confronting clientelism and patronage in USAID democracy programs. Mr. Nuti contributed an anthropologist's perspective to analyzing one of the "most pernicious of development problems" and helped set the stage for field-based testing of a the clientelism/patronage assessment methodology in Tanzania.

Pual has over eleven years of experience in project leadership, management, development, and evaluation for democracy/governance, human rights, and international development organizations. He has served as Chief-of-Party and Country Director of Macedonia for the Institute for Sustainable Communities. Paul holds an M.A. in Anthropology and International Development from George Washington University.

30. Shally Prasad
USAID Mission
Jakarta, Indonesia (01/1/1999 - 05/31/2002)

Shally Prasad served her fellowship with the Democracy and Governance Team (referred to as the Office of Civic Participation and Transition) at the USAID mission in Jakarta, Indonesia. Shally focused on developing and implementing training programs in organizational assessment and capacity building for Indonesian civil society organizations (CSOs), as well as providing training and technical assistance on gender issues. She developed and pilot tested training programs in organizational development and gender; facilitated several workshops on organizational development and gender issues for CSOs and USAID; conducted Training-of-Trainers sessions in organizational self-assessment; and institutionalized training programs through Indonesian training organizations.

Before becoming a Democracy Fellow, Shally worked in India and Washington, DC with several women's advocacy organizations addressing violence against women, women's political participation and women's human rights. In Washington, DC, Shally worked on a team to develop and manage subsistence level micro-enterprise and financial sustainability projects with the African Development Foundation. During two years of field work in India, supported in part by the University of California at Berkeley Research Fellows Program, Shally developed and directed a New Delhi-based NGO called WARLAW that provides legal services to survivors of gender-based violence. While in India, she conducted primary research on women's access to health and legal services, and the role and impact of the police and judiciary in asserting women's legal rights. Shally has presented her work at several international conferences and published her findings in books and journals. Shally earned her Master of Public Policy (MPP) from the University of Michigan in 1992. Her interests include civil society, organizational development, capacity building, training, gender, advocacy, and

legal reform. Shally speaks Hindi and Bahasa Indonesia, and has traveled throughout Europe, India, Nepal, and across Southeast Asia.

31. Ronald G. Shaiko

**Elections Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (12/08/1997 - 11/07/1999)**

Ronald Shaiko served his fellowship with the Elections and Political Processes team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance in Washington, DC. Ron was involved with all aspects of elections programs including political party development, civic education and elections administration. He used his Democracy Fellowship to supplement his academic background with practical experience in the field of democracy and governance.

Previously, Ron was an Associate Professor of Government at American University, where he taught courses on U.S. government, lobbying, political parties, legislative behavior and political leadership, and worked as a consultant on a USAID-sponsored legislative strengthening project in West Bank/Gaza. Ron also served as an expert on U.S. government for USA's International Visitors Program, and consulted as a media pollster and political analyst. His Ph.D. (political science) is from Syracuse University. Since completing his Democracy Fellowship, Ron returned to American University, but is also working as a consultant with ARD, a USAID contractor in the field of democracy and governance.

32. Robin S. Silver

**Strategies Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (05/1/1999 - 04/30/2001)**

As a Democracy Fellow in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance, Robin Silver served as a member of the Strategies team. She worked on managing for results initiatives, developing qualitative performance measures and strategies for promoting democracy. Prior to becoming a Democracy Fellow, Robin worked as a Senior Associate in Integrated Democracy Studies in USAID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE). Her focus was democracy promotion in post-conflict societies.

Robin holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California at Berkeley and an AB from Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School. As a Fulbright Scholar, she completed a study on state policies toward immigrant and refugee populations in the Middle East and Europe. Robin has taught at the University of Oregon, Grinnell College and the University of Maryland-Baltimore County. Her research and publications have encompassed public sector reform and decentralization, the development of nation-states, and performance measurement.

33. Sara Steinmetz

**Democracy Office, USAID Bureau for Policy & Program Coordination
Washington, DC (01/06/1997 - 01/05/1999)**

Sara Steinmetz served as a Democracy Fellow in the Democracy and Governance Office of USAID's Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination. She applied her previous research to policy analysis, focusing on the degree of and potential for democratization in host states. She examined the extent to which basic institutions and fundamentals of a democratic political system and culture exist, the degree to which government is transparent, and the level of NGO participation in the policy-making process. One of Sara's particular interests was the democracy transition in Indonesia, and its relationship to local NGOs. Since completing her Democracy Fellowship, Sara has worked with the USAID Mission in Jakarta, Indonesia, and has continued work on a book on democracy and governance.

Sara has a Ph.D. in international relations/comparative politics/political and economic development, and an M.A. in international relations, from New York University; her B.A. is from the City University of New York. She is interested in public policy analysis, political science research, civil society and democratic initiatives. Sara previously worked with the Carnegie Corporation of N.Y. and with the UN Department of Political and Security Council Affairs.

34. Mark Thieroff

**Tolerance Foundation
Prague, Czech Republic (09/30/1996 - 09/29/1997)**

Mark Thieroff served his fellowship at the Tolerance Foundation, a non-governmental organization based in Prague, Czech Republic. The Tolerance Foundation supports the prevention of human rights abuses through education and public awareness programs. Mark's fellowship concentrated on the Foundation's "Article 8 Project," addressing the citizenship rights of Roma people living in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Some of his specific activities included locating victims of abuse; investigating, verifying and documenting their cases for possible presentation to the Czech courts and/or to the European Commission of Human Rights; identifying local lawyers willing to provide legal assistance on a *pro bono* basis; and networking with other organizations involved in related human and civil rights areas. During his Democracy Fellowship Mark published several important articles on the

legal situation affecting ethnic Roma, and helped to prepare a landmark legal case before the Supreme Court of the Czech Republic.

After completing his Democracy Fellowship, Mark decided to attend law school at the University of Minnesota for additional preparation for a career focusing on international human rights. Mark completed his M.A. in international relations at Yale University, and a B.A. in German Language and International Studies at the University of Miami. He has special interests in international human rights, minority issues, transitional and social justice issues, international law, and NGO development.

35. Gene Ward

**Elections Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (09/01/2000 - 6/1/2003)**

Gene Ward is a Democracy Fellow with the Elections team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance. The focus of his fellowship is campaign finance, and he is researching and documenting campaign finance models in order to develop a policy manual or handbook for USAID. Gene also provides support to USAID's field missions in the area of elections and campaign finance in particular.

Before becoming a Democracy Fellow, Gene worked on USAID-funded local government and legislative strengthening programs in Indonesia and Angola. Previously, he was elected as a Member of the Hawaii House of Representatives and as a State Delegate to two national conventions. In addition to his work in the field of democracy and governance, Gene is an expert on small business development. He has worked as a consultant on small business development with the United Nations on several occasions, and was part of the U.S. delegation at APEC talks on Small and Medium Enterprise Development. Gene has worked in Bhutan, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Vietnam, Kenya, and Malawi. He is proficient in Malay/Indonesian and Vietnamese. Gene holds a Ph.D. in Business Sociology from the University of Hawaii.

36. Dwayne Woods

**Civil Society Team, USAID Center for Democracy and Governance
Washington, DC (09/15/1999 - 08/14/2000)**

Dwayne Woods served his fellowship with the Civil Society Team in USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance in Washington, DC. Dwayne's focus was on measuring the impact of civil society advocacy groups on their governments and societies. During his fellowship, Dwayne assisted the Center with conducting and writing civil society assessments in three countries: Mozambique, Mali, and Kenya. He also helped design and present the civil

society team's segment of USAID's Democracy and Governance Training Workshop. Since completing his Democracy Fellowship, Dwayne has returned to his faculty position at Purdue University's Department of Political Science.

Dwayne earned his Ph.D. in political science at the University of Chicago. He has received numerous grants and fellowships, including at the post-doctoral level, in support of his scholarship, and has authored several articles on civil society and labor issues in Italy and African nations. In his academic research, Dwayne has focused on the contributions of labor unions and rural associations to the democratization process in Sub-Saharan Africa. Dwayne is fluent in French and Italian. His interests include civil society, governance, NGOs, comparative politics, and democratic initiatives.

Attachment F

Recruitment Status Reports

WORLD LEARNING
DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

ANALYSIS OF APPLICATIONS
RECEIVED IN FY-2003

FY-2003 Inquiries

<i>Status</i>	<i>Number</i>
Inquiries received	234
Applications picked-up in person	8
Applications downloaded from World Learning's website	865

The Democracy Fellows Program mails out application packets to all individuals who request information on the program. Inquiries are received by telephone, by e-mail, by letter and through web-site requests, and may be made directly to the DFP, to World Learning's headquarters in Brattleboro, Vermont, or to any of its overseas field offices. World Learning also has a regular flow of walk-in applicants, who pick up program materials directly from the DFP office.

Finally, since 2000, the DFP has made its application materials available for individuals to download directly from World Learning's website. This has proven to be one of the most popular methods of obtaining application materials, visitors per month to the DFP "Application Download Instructions" page.

Results of Application Review Process in FY-2003

<i>Status</i>	<i>Number</i>
Eligible for Placement	44
Tentatively Eligible for Placement *	5
Rejected	4
Incomplete	4
TOTAL	57

- Pending receipt of advanced degree.

WORLD LEARNING
DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

ANALYSIS OF APPLICATIONS
RECEIVED IN FY-2003

Applicants By Experience Level

<i>Fellowship Tier</i>	<i>Number Received</i>	<i>Percentage of Total Received</i>
Junior Candidates	18	41%
Mid-Level Candidates	14	32%
Senior Candidates	12	27%
TOTAL	44	100%

By Highest Degree Received

<i>Highest Degree Received</i>	<i>Number Received</i>	<i>Percentage of Total Received</i>
Ph.D.	9	20%
J.D./L.L.M.	11	25%
MA/MS/Other Master's	24	55%
BA		0%
TOTAL	44	100%

By Geographic Region

<i>Geographic Region</i>	<i>Number Received</i>	<i>Percentage of Total Received</i>
United States		
Northeast/Mid-Atlantic	12	27%
DC Metro Area	23	52%
Southeast/South-Central	1	2%
Mid-West/Mountain.	1	2%
West Coast	5	11%
Outside United States	2	5%
TOTAL	44	100%

Attachment G

FY-2003 Democracy Fellows' Program Descriptions and Reports

DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

NMS No. AEP-A-00-95-00024-00
Awarded by USAID/Washington
Original Cooperative Agreement No. AEP-5466-A-00-5024-00

FELLOWS' PLANS AND REPORTS OCTOBER 1, 2002 – SEPTEMBER 30, 2003

USAID Project Office: Office of Democracy & Governance, DCHA

USAID Project No.: 936-5466
CEC No.: 073961419
LOC No.: 72-00-1317
NMS: 10286 / 625

FELLOWSHIP FINAL REPORT

MAY 2003

Michael L. Bäk, USAID/DG/Indonesia and OCPRI/Indonesia
Focus Area: Conflict Transformation & Reconciliation

CONTEXT/KEY ISSUES

As Indonesians continue preparations for their second free elections since the 1950s, the disorder and ambiguities surrounding the process remind us that the country's transition away from New Order authoritarianism remains wrought with difficulties. While history may more kindly judge President Megawati Soekarnoputri with the benefit of hind sight, she continues to demonstrate an inability - or unwillingness - to address issues of national importance, not least among them the deadly regional conflicts that have raged in various parts of the archipelago. By continuing to define many regional conflicts in terms of ethnicity and religion, her Government continues to avoid addressing 'nasty issues' - such as human rights abuse, corruption, and weak rule of law - which underscore so many of the country's violent problems.

The Aceh Cessation of Hostilities Agreement (CoHA) discussed so positively in the previous report, seems doomed to collapse and failure as the government - perhaps taking its lesson from a war elsewhere in the world - seems most willing to rely on "shock and awe" to crush the ASNLF/GAM rebels. The military's push to "embed" media reporters within military units has many worried that the truth of any war to take place in Aceh will not be heard. While both sides blame the other for the CoHA's failure, many observers recognize that the agreement was doomed to collapse from the start, if only because neither side could agree on a common interpretation of what was, in fact, outlined in the CoHA. Last week the international peace monitors - representatives from the Thai and Philippines militaries - left Banda Aceh to head home.

The past year has seen heightened attention to the weak state of Indonesia as providing safe haven for international (and home-grown) terrorists and Islamic extremists. Fragile domestic politics have made it nearly impossible for the security forces to crack down on Islamic extremists, even those openly supportive of violence. The recent bomb attack in Bali - whether motivated by Al Qaeda terrorists, or more likely, by regional militant group(s) in Indonesia - may provide the impetus for the security forces to rein in domestic extremists and provide political cover for President Megawati and her government to act more boldly in face of global terror. The US Government's reaction to these new post-Bali dynamics could either support her struggling government or through anti-terrorist rhetoric unintentionally tie her hands.

The following key issues - as noted in previous reports - framed the delicate conflict transformation work in which I have been engaged while a Democracy Fellow.

Identity. An issue of paramount importance in Indonesia today is the question of national identity and what it means to be Indonesian. However, decades of cultural hegemony by Javanese politicians and

military personalities together with ineffective Pancasila-driven mechanisms for addressing cultural identity within the framework of the Unitary State of Indonesia have left many ethnic leaders off-Java frustrated. As a result confessional groups often claim to represent communities and act unilaterally on their behalf. Often these groups further reduce to adat or ethnic roots. Some even set up, or become associated with, social welfare organizations or similar civil society organizations for their own constituencies in a move to gain increased legitimacy among the grassroots.

Conflict Transformation. The use of the Indonesian security forces during the New Order as the final arbiter of violent disputes, effectively negated the development, evolution and consolidation of civil society organizations and government institutions capable of solving disputes within communities. With the military forces brutally battered in the eye of world and domestic public opinion for atrocities in East Timor, Aceh and West Papua, the security apparatus' capacity to react to violent outbreaks of violence has been severely limited and their willingness to intervene when the territorial integrity of the nation is not in contest has diminished considerably. The consequence of such a legacy is one in which few, if any, institutions (civil society, government or otherwise) exist for arresting negative perceptions or effectively addressing competing interests and grievances.

The New Order regime failed to address latent inter-group problems. Indonesia's government, and by extension Indonesian society generally, lack functional dispute resolution mechanisms - from the national down to the local level - for effectively dealing with potentially bloody conflicts, or even simple disagreements. In-group/out-group dynamics are a firm element of Indonesian society and given the collapse of the judicial system and lack of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, society's ability to manage differences is severely hindered.

Indonesia's deeply entrenched system of elite politics and accompanying patron-client relationships, embedded corruption at all levels of society, and culture of 'thugism', have produced disincentives to follow what weak legal or other institutional channels may exist to address and resolve grievances.

As popular confidence in the apparatus of the state further deteriorates, we can expect groups to express grievances through extra-institutional means given the lack of effective government and CSO capacity (i.e. street justice). As few institutional means exist for arresting negative perceptions, the state demonstrating lack of capacity in using police and security forces to address localized conflicts, and elites entrenching their positions through legitimizing activities in their communities, negative perceptions held by elites begin to appear confirmed. Once serious conflict emerges, violence can easily escalate given weak or non-existent structures for mitigating it. In fact, the New Order's reliance on the armed forces as the final arbiter of inter- and intra-communal disputes has left communities devoid of even a modicum of impartial or legitimate institutions for resolving conflict. Thus, with the military's decreasing role as conflict managers, the potential of violence escalation has increased over the past few years.

PERSPECTIVES ON THE FINAL EXTENSION OF THE FELLOWSHIP

On 01 April 2003, the Mission reassigned me to work with the newly established Office of Conflict Prevention & Response (OCPR). Though I had been working between the two offices for the past 8 months or so, I now reported to the Director of OCPR. While on Evacuation in Washington, I worked with another evacuated OCPR staff member to develop the objectives for the newly created OCPR, which grew out of the former Office of Transition Initiatives.

The Democracy Fellowship allowed the DG team to maintain a resource dedicated to increasing the Mission's knowledge of not only the conflict dynamic in Indonesia but also the latest in academic literature and field experience related to conflict transformation and CMM. Integrated work with OCPR increased the opportunities for synergy and collaboration with the DG portfolio. Moreover, as the Mission continues high-profile work on the 2004 elections, it was equally imperative that DG continue to maintain a firm grasp on the changing situation and conflict potential of both identity-based politics and political Islam which is increasingly being used by politicians of all stripes to solidify a support-base and legitimize politics of exclusion.

The five-month long evacuation in Washington, DC, was particularly difficult both personally and for my many other colleagues who found themselves in the snow and cold of the worst winter in Washington in decades. The following "Impact of Evacuation" was noted in the last Fellowship extension, but worth repetition here as it captures how I attempted to turn an otherwise unfortunate situation into a productive one.

Impact of Evacuation. Contrary to expectations, the evacuation totaled 196 days, much longer than what had been anticipated when Mission staff boarded airplanes in October 2002 to leave Indonesia temporarily. Among other things, the evacuation precluded me from presenting my paper, "*Crisis of Internal Displacement in Indonesia and the Conflict Dynamic*," at an international conference to which I was invited in Krakow, Poland.

While on evacuation, I participated in a book project that brought together experts on Indonesia across an array of topics, including economics, political economy, US-Indonesia relations, conflict, and the future of democracy in Indonesia. Other contributors in the project include Abdurrahman Wahid (former President of Indonesia), Amien Rais (Speaker of the People's Consultative Assembly), Ed Masters (former US Ambassador to Indonesia), Anwar Nasution (Senior Deputy Governor of Bank Indonesia), Jusuf Wanandi (Senior Fellow and Board of Trustees of CSIS in Jakarta), Michael Vatikiotis (Hong Kong SAR editor for the Far Eastern Economic Review) and a number of other foreign and Indonesian experts on Indonesia. My chapter, focusing on conflict and the transition to democracy, is entitled "*Slouching Toward Democracy: Social Violence and Elite Failure in Indonesia*."

Arriving in Washington, we quickly realized that the discourse within the policymaking community in DC with respect to Indonesia was centered

nearly exclusively on 'counter-terrorism'. After much discussion within the team, I wrote an occasional paper relating our work promoting democracy and the Administration's 'war on terror.' This appeared as a brief document entitled, "*Indonesia and Global Terror: Democracy in the Fight against Terrorism.*"

The time spent in Washington provided me with significant opportunities to network with an array of DG professionals and noted Indonesianists. I invested significantly in cross-fertilization with other conflict experts within USAID, particularly USAID/AFR/SD's Conflict Prevention, Democracy, and Governance Team. Through this interaction I was able to attend conflict related workshops and other events, and have learned first-hand how this team supports Missions doing conflict work. I was able to examine the various tools and methodologies the team, and USAID/REDSO, uses in assessing conflict vulnerabilities which better informed my work in Indonesia. My interaction with both REDSO and AFR/SD/CMR resulted in an invitation to join a conflict vulnerabilities assessment team to the Sudan and Kenya. However, that opportunity was pre-empted - after having invested significant time in background research - due to USAID/Kenya's inability to host more expat TDYers.

Having lost two direct hires - one to retirement and the other to Middle East initiatives - I played an active role in the development of the team's elections assistance program through providing input on the formulation of our mechanisms and providing the initial draft of an RFA related to a sub-grant mechanisms to Indonesian CSOs and associations for elections-related programming. I also worked with other DG team members on evacuation to help present our program at various meetings within USAID and with partners in Washington, DC.

Post-Evacuation. Since returning from the evacuation - a month earlier than the rest of my colleagues - I began reporting directly to the Director of the Office of Conflict Prevention & Response. While initially very hopeful that the window of opportunity in Aceh would allow USAID to support an array of initiatives aimed at strengthening the peace accord, our hopes have systematically died as we witness both the ASNLF/GAM and the Government of Indonesia taking increasingly hard lines with each other. While many activists argue that the military option has already begun on the ground, the government has yet to make official any directive to launch a "military solution" to the separatist problem.

Thus, instead of working as intensively on Aceh as previously, I turned much of my attention toward donor coordination, including coordination among donors investing in Bali Recovery (post-October bombing) as well as other areas of the country such as Maluku and Central Sulawesi. Already we have been better able to leverage the funds committed by the US Government to Bali so that our activities both better complement and do not replicate initiatives by other bilateral and multilateral organizations. I have worked extensively with both the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank.

In Bali, working with a local organization Manikaya Kauci, I participated in an extensive 'road trip' in which our team met with each head of Regency Planning Boards (Bappeda - or Badan Perencanaan Pengembangan Daerah) throughout the province of Bali. As a result of

the exercise - in which we met an array of officials from cooperative and creative, to lethargic and self-consumed - we identified a couple regencies in which we will actively engage the government, as we believe our efforts will have the most impact. Through greater coordination with other Donors, I have developed key relationships with AusAID, UNDP, the World Bank and others.

Upon return from the evacuation, my key task was to draw up an integrated list of all human rights related investments by the USG through USAID/Indonesia. This included extensive research into both direct grantees as well as sub-grantees through organizations such as The Asia Foundation and CSSP. The end result was the first integrated list of all investments - across SO teams - that support human rights activities with cross-references to indicate which organizations may have received support from more than one USAID funding mechanism.

With the early termination of this Fellowship to take on a new role within USAID/Indonesia, some Fellowship activities as noted in the latest extension will not be completed

IMPACT OF DEMOCRACY FELLOWSHIP - A FINAL PERSPECTIVE

The Democracy Fellowship has at its core objectives that are meant to both support personal professional development as well as increase the overall impact of USAID support in the areas in which we work. My Fellowship experience has been one of both personal and professional growth and development as well as increased impact at the program level with the teams I worked, namely DG and OCPD.

In the original program description I noted a desire to "develop practical expertise in the area of conflict and reconciliation" with the view that these could be more fully "integrated into future development projects." This objective was clearly met and is demonstrated in more active consideration of conflict dynamics across a range of issues both within the DG portfolio as well as the Mission's activities more generally. Moreover, collaboration with other SO teams helped to identify DG conflict linkages to their efforts. Assessments and papers that I wrote throughout the Fellowship period have addressed these very issues, from Governance vis-à-vis the internally displaced, to the impact of military forces in conflict zones on the HIV/AIDS crisis. Indeed, my collaboration with other SO teams has resulted in my being considered the "virtual HPN (Health Population and Nutrition) team member", having shared much information on HIV/AIDS and conflict as well as issues related to public health and human rights.

A key impact particularly worth mentioning in this final report relates to the manner in which the Mission addresses the internally displaced in Indonesia. Three years ago, much of the Mission's consideration of the issue was seen through the eyes of 'humanitarian assistance' or 'emergency assistance'. Over time, staff increasingly regarded the regional IDP crises through the lens of governance and democracy initiatives and greater thought given to the rights of IDPS as outlined in the "UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement". Now, more offices have expanded thinking on DG issues of peacebuilding and

conflict mitigation in addressing the non-emergency needs of IDPs so as to have greater impact in strengthening environments of peace, preventing future re-displacement or renewed violence.

As a result of the two and a half years working under the Fellowship program, I have developed expertise both in general conflict transformation as well as more specifically on regional conflict issues affecting Indonesia. The Indonesia expertise I previously possessed was brought to bear on my work under the Fellowship and I was able to develop significant skills in the areas of Democracy & Governance as well as conflict transformation in a more systematic manner. My experiences over the past few years have well positioned me as well-versed in the ongoing crisis in Aceh as well as on social violence in Indonesia.

The fellowship allowed me to develop specific skills related to conflict transformation, fulfilling both professional interests as well as Mission needs. I outlined several broad activities, all of which have been met, including: serving as a conflict resource for the team and mission, working more deeply in specific conflict areas and on human rights issues, as well as raising the profile of the internally displaced within the context of DG initiatives. The second year of the fellowship provided many opportunities to accomplish these and now the profile of USAID/DG as a resource to peacebuilders in Indonesia has been enhanced and well noted.

Below are some key 'roles' which I developed while over the term of the Fellowship. These have been noted in previous semi-annual reports but capture the roles I have developed over the course of the Fellowship. These roles, as it were, will largely remain as I begin a new relationship with the Mission as a USPSC.

Technical Expertise/Assistance. I was the only full-time conflict specialist on the DG team. Developing my professional skills in this area allowed me to fill this critical need. Team members turned toward me for advice on conflict related issues - I am viewed as the Team's conflict specialist. I am currently working with two other Indonesian staff to develop a training module that we will be able to give to our local partners. By not only developing my knowledge of the latest in academic literature on conflict, but also through my monitoring and analysis of domestic conflict situations, I helped guide a Mission conflict program that is both well-informed and broad in its approach (i.e. reluctant to rely solely emergency assistance or transition assistance to address conflict).

Through collaboration with OTI (now OCPD) and OFDA/FFP colleagues, as well as colleagues in other related SOs, we are able to craft both a DG and a Mission-wide conflict strategy that is both informed and effective. As a result, I believe that USAID/Indonesia's conflict program as embodied in the OPC can be a model for other USAID Mission's in conflict areas.

Analytical Support/Advisory Role. As noted in the last semi-annual report, the DG office has taken good use of my skills in having me research, evaluate, and analyze various conflict areas in Indonesia to an extent that limited resources in the past did not allow.

As an integrated member of the DG team (and now the OCPR team), I help to evaluate how we might put our limited resources to the best use. This includes not only evaluation of individual grant proposals from local and international NGOs, but also examination of team objectives. We have been able to develop approaches that are both reasonable and defensible in terms of resource allocations.

Working with DG grant managers, I identified areas within existing and pending grants that required further development or attention. The recent inventory of all human rights and conflict activities served as an important reference for the team as decisions continue to be made in terms of resource allocations for the current and next fiscal years. Previously, the team had not mapped all its conflict and human right related activities. We can now see exactly what we have supported and plan to support in the near term. By discovering key trends, we are able to adjust our program accordingly so that we can better meet objectives that we set for our team both in S02 but also in Sp09.

Conflict Resource Person. As the Mission's conflict resource person, I have developed important relationships with contacts in Jakarta and across Indonesia, but also internationally as well. These contacts have not only helped to raise the profile of the Mission's conflict program, but it has served to better inform that program. By constantly monitoring and accessing recent research, I provided fresh perspectives to Mission colleagues. The Mission Director has on several occasions expressed his appreciation for the breadth that I help bring to the Mission's program, by encouraging everyone to go beyond niche programming, i.e. emergency assistance, transition assistance, and so forth.

I continue to emphasize linkages among SO teams using a conflict lens. For example, I've recently begun to explore the relationship between HIV/AIDS and conflict areas. To be sure, recent decentralization initiatives over the last two years have had implications on conflict areas of the country. In developing these linkages, awareness of conflict dynamics among USAID staff has increased over the past two years.

Aceh Resource Person. Aceh contacts and relationships that I have developed over the last few years have proven to be very beneficial to our Aceh program. By better understanding how both 'sides' of the conflict would react to particular interventions, we are able to support initiatives that will have the highest possible impact in the province.

IDP Issues. As noted previously, I remain actively involved in Mission approaches in dealing with the country's IDP problem. As part of my work on internal displacement, I have worked with UN OCHA in pressing for greater dissemination and education on the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.

As I reported previously, in two of our focus areas in particular, Aceh and Papua, I have looked at how USAID can assist and help strengthen NGOs working with survivors of trauma and torture - this is also becoming an important element in our new Aceh strategy. Though

counseling training and related technical assistance is beyond the scope of DG programming, we can have an impact on the institutional capacity building and advocacy training of these NGOs. With strong civil society organizations capable of effectively working with trauma and torture survivors, an environment can slowly develop in which longstanding conflicts may be addressed and resolved. This has been a particularly important endeavor given that (a) mitigating trauma is an important step towards real reconciliation and future conflict prevention, and (b) funding for such organizations is not even considered by OTI or other humanitarian assistance offices of USAID.

REFLECTIONS ON THE DG FELLOWSHIP IN INDONESIA

The past two and a half years with the Democracy Fellows Program has been personally rewarding and professionally challenging. Applying the knowledge that I previously possessed regarding Indonesia to actual development program implementation has been both interesting and frustrating. Interesting in that I can see first hand the value of regional expertise; frustrating in that working within a massive government bureaucracy often proves difficult and sometimes impossible to maneuver through. I should add here that the design of the Fellow Program, particularly in terms of reimbursements, makes it incredibly flexible to take advantages of opportunities that would otherwise be quite difficult given the constraints of travel authorizations and the like.

Through my work under the Democracy Fellows Program I have developed a renewed confidence in my own abilities and expertise. This in turn will prove highly advantageous as I continue my career in international development. Over the course of the Fellowship term, I have recognized that my seemingly divergent interests - namely conflict/human rights and public health - are more compatible than I had previous thought. For a long time I have been keen on learning more about public health, particularly infectious diseases, and have recently spent time thinking about the human rights angles of these issues. I would not be at all surprised if my career moves down that path.

As a Democracy Fellow I worked for the first time within the bureaucracy of USAID. Though proud to be working for the agency of the US government that ostensibly assists the less fortunate of the world, I also found myself incredibly frustrated at times with both the sluggishness of the bureaucracy and the realpolitik that often pervades bureaucratic discussions. Negotiating the divisions between our grassroots programming and the demands of Washington were at times delicate. In the end, however, I do feel that I have added value to the activities of USAID/Indonesia and have developed a better understanding of how to work most effectively within a government bureaucracy which is, for better or for worse, here to stay.

The respect I have gained from both my American and Indonesian colleagues has been equally rewarding. As the youngest USAID expatriate staff member, I was initially confronted with the need to 'prove myself', which I think I managed successfully. I appreciated the help of my colleagues as I worked through the learning curve. I was therefore eager to collaborate more with them. The opportunities

to travel throughout Indonesia and work with Indonesians of myriad ethnic and linguistic backgrounds have been rewarding both personally and professionally as well. It has renewed my hope that the future of this vast nation will be positive and good.

Far and away the biggest challenge throughout the Fellowship term was the five months I spent in Washington under evacuation status. The evacuation, as it were, precluded me from presenting my paper in Krakow, but it is professionally reassuring to know that one's work has been dully recognized. Indeed, this is how I felt when approached to write a chapter on social violence - appearing alongside many noted Indonesia experts - and it may perhaps be the most personally rewarding achievement of the last term of my fellowship.

On another note, I must thank the staff of the DFP - David Payton and Ellen Garrett - for without their attentiveness, support and creativity, I believe aspects of the Fellowship experience might not have been as positive. I appreciate their help and support. They are truly value-added to the DFP, without a doubt.

To World Learning and USAID more generally, I thank these institutions for providing me with an opportunity that while developing my own skills, has helped to set me on a professional track that will be very fulfilling.

FELLOWSHIP FINAL REPORT

MAY 2003

Michael L. Bäk, USAID/DG/Indonesia and OCPR/Indonesia
Focus Area: Conflict Transformation & Reconciliation

CONTEXT/KEY ISSUES

As Indonesians continue preparations for their second free elections since the 1950s, the disorder and ambiguities surrounding the process remind us that the country's transition away from New Order authoritarianism remains wrought with difficulties. While history may more kindly judge President Megawati Soekarnoputri with the benefit of hind sight, she continues to demonstrate an inability - or unwillingness - to address issues of national importance, not least among them the deadly regional conflicts that have raged in various parts of the archipelago. By continuing to define many regional conflicts in terms of ethnicity and religion, her Government continues to avoid addressing 'nasty issues' - such as human rights abuse, corruption, and weak rule of law - which underscore so many of the country's violent problems.

The Aceh Cessation of Hostilities Agreement (CoHA) discussed so positively in the previous report, seems doomed to collapse and failure as the government - perhaps taking its lesson from a war elsewhere in the world - seems most willing to rely on "shock and awe" to crush the ASNLF/GAM rebels. The military's push to "embed" media reporters within military units has many worried that the truth of any war to take place in Aceh will not be heard. While both sides blame the other for the CoHA's failure, many observers recognize that the agreement was doomed to collapse from the start, if only because neither side could agree on a common interpretation of what was, in fact, outlined in the CoHA. Last week the international peace monitors - representatives from the Thai and Philippines militaries - left Banda Aceh to head home.

The past year has seen heightened attention to the weak state of Indonesia as providing safe haven for international (and home-grown) terrorists and Islamic extremists. Fragile domestic politics have made it nearly impossible for the security forces to crack down on Islamic extremists, even those openly supportive of violence. The recent bomb attack in Bali - whether motivated by Al Qaeda terrorists, or more likely, by regional militant group(s) in Indonesia - may provide the impetus for the security forces to rein in domestic extremists and provide political cover for President Megawati and her government to act more boldly in face of global terror. The US Government's reaction to these new post-Bali dynamics could either support her struggling government or through anti-terrorist rhetoric unintentionally tie her hands.

The following key issues - as noted in previous reports - framed the delicate conflict transformation work in which I have been engaged while a Democracy Fellow.

Identity. An issue of paramount importance in Indonesia today is the question of national identity and what it means to be Indonesian. However, decades of cultural hegemony by Javanese politicians and

military personalities together with ineffective Pancasila-driven mechanisms for addressing cultural identity within the framework of the Unitary State of Indonesia have left many ethnic leaders off-Java frustrated. As a result confessional groups often claim to represent communities and act unilaterally on their behalf. Often these groups further reduce to adat or ethnic roots. Some even set up, or become associated with, social welfare organizations or similar civil society organizations for their own constituencies in a move to gain increased legitimacy among the grassroots.

Conflict Transformation. The use of the Indonesian security forces during the New Order as the final arbiter of violent disputes, effectively negated the development, evolution and consolidation of civil society organizations and government institutions capable of solving disputes within communities. With the military forces brutally battered in the eye of world and domestic public opinion for atrocities in East Timor, Aceh and West Papua, the security apparatus' capacity to react to violent outbreaks of violence has been severely limited and their willingness to intervene when the territorial integrity of the nation is not in contest has diminished considerably. The consequence of such a legacy is one in which few, if any, institutions (civil society, government or otherwise) exist for arresting negative perceptions or effectively addressing competing interests and grievances.

The New Order regime failed to address latent inter-group problems. Indonesia's government, and by extension Indonesian society generally, lack functional dispute resolution mechanisms - from the national down to the local level - for effectively dealing with potentially bloody conflicts, or even simple disagreements. In-group/out-group dynamics are a firm element of Indonesian society and given the collapse of the judicial system and lack of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, society's ability to manage differences is severely hindered.

Indonesia's deeply entrenched system of elite politics and accompanying patron-client relationships, embedded corruption at all levels of society, and culture of 'thugism', have produced disincentives to follow what weak legal or other institutional channels may exist to address and resolve grievances.

As popular confidence in the apparatus of the state further deteriorates, we can expect groups to express grievances through extra-institutional means given the lack of effective government and CSO capacity (i.e. street justice). As few institutional means exist for arresting negative perceptions, the state demonstrating lack of capacity in using police and security forces to address localized conflicts, and elites entrenching their positions through legitimizing activities in their communities, negative perceptions held by elites begin to appear confirmed. Once serious conflict emerges, violence can easily escalate given weak or non-existent structures for mitigating it. In fact, the New Order's reliance on the armed forces as the final arbiter of inter- and intra-communal disputes has left communities devoid of even a modicum of impartial or legitimate institutions for resolving conflict. Thus, with the military's decreasing role as conflict managers, the potential of violence escalation has increased over the past few years.

PERSPECTIVES ON THE FINAL EXTENSION OF THE FELLOWSHIP

On 01 April 2003, the Mission reassigned me to work with the newly established Office of Conflict Prevention & Response (OCPR). Though I had been working between the two offices for the past 8 months or so, I now reported to the Director of OCPR. While on Evacuation in Washington, I worked with another evacuated OCPR staff member to develop the objectives for the newly created OCPR, which grew out of the former Office of Transition Initiatives.

The Democracy Fellowship allowed the DG team to maintain a resource dedicated to increasing the Mission's knowledge of not only the conflict dynamic in Indonesia but also the latest in academic literature and field experience related to conflict transformation and CMM. Integrated work with OCPR increased the opportunities for synergy and collaboration with the DG portfolio. Moreover, as the Mission continues high-profile work on the 2004 elections, it was equally imperative that DG continue to maintain a firm grasp on the changing situation and conflict potential of both identity-based politics and political Islam which is increasingly being used by politicians of all stripes to solidify a support-base and legitimize politics of exclusion.

The five-month long evacuation in Washington, DC, was particularly difficult both personally and for my many other colleagues who found themselves in the snow and cold of the worst winter in Washington in decades. The following "Impact of Evacuation" was noted in the last Fellowship extension, but worth repetition here as it captures how I attempted to turn an otherwise unfortunate situation into a productive one.

Impact of Evacuation. Contrary to expectations, the evacuation totaled 196 days, much longer than what had been anticipated when Mission staff boarded airplanes in October 2002 to leave Indonesia temporarily. Among other things, the evacuation precluded me from presenting my paper, "*Crisis of Internal Displacement in Indonesia and the Conflict Dynamic*," at an international conference to which I was invited in Krakow, Poland.

While on evacuation, I participated in a book project that brought together experts on Indonesia across an array of topics, including economics, political economy, US-Indonesia relations, conflict, and the future of democracy in Indonesia. Other contributors in the project include Abdurrahman Wahid (former President of Indonesia), Amien Rais (Speaker of the People's Consultative Assembly), Ed Masters (former US Ambassador to Indonesia), Anwar Nasution (Senior Deputy Governor of Bank Indonesia), Jusuf Wanandi (Senior Fellow and Board of Trustees of CSIS in Jakarta), Michael Vatikiotis (Hong Kong SAR editor for the Far Eastern Economic Review) and a number of other foreign and Indonesian experts on Indonesia. My chapter, focusing on conflict and the transition to democracy, is entitled "*Slouching Toward Democracy: Social Violence and Elite Failure in Indonesia*."

Arriving in Washington, we quickly realized that the discourse within the policymaking community in DC with respect to Indonesia was centered

nearly exclusively on 'counter-terrorism'. After much discussion within the team, I wrote an occasional paper relating our work promoting democracy and the Administration's 'war on terror.' This appeared as a brief document entitled, "*Indonesia and Global Terror: Democracy in the Fight against Terrorism.*"

The time spent in Washington provided me with significant opportunities to network with an array of DG professionals and noted Indonesianists. I invested significantly in cross-fertilization with other conflict experts within USAID, particularly USAID/AFR/SD's Conflict Prevention, Democracy, and Governance Team. Through this interaction I was able to attend conflict related workshops and other events, and have learned first-hand how this team supports Missions doing conflict work. I was able to examine the various tools and methodologies the team, and USAID/REDSO, uses in assessing conflict vulnerabilities which better informed my work in Indonesia. My interaction with both REDSO and AFR/SD/CMR resulted in an invitation to join a conflict vulnerabilities assessment team to the Sudan and Kenya. However, that opportunity was pre-empted - after having invested significant time in background research - due to USAID/Kenya's inability to host more expat TDYers.

Having lost two direct hires - one to retirement and the other to Middle East initiatives - I played an active role in the development of the team's elections assistance program through providing input on the formulation of our mechanisms and providing the initial draft of an RFA related to a sub-grant mechanisms to Indonesian CSOs and associations for elections-related programming. I also worked with other DG team members on evacuation to help present our program at various meetings within USAID and with partners in Washington, DC.

Post-Evacuation. Since returning from the evacuation - a month earlier than the rest of my colleagues - I began reporting directly to the Director of the Office of Conflict Prevention & Response. While initially very hopeful that the window of opportunity in Aceh would allow USAID to support an array of initiatives aimed at strengthening the peace accord, our hopes have systematically died as we witness both the ASNLF/GAM and the Government of Indonesia taking increasingly hard lines with each other. While many activists argue that the military option has already begun on the ground, the government has yet to make official any directive to launch a "military solution" to the separatist problem.

Thus, instead of working as intensively on Aceh as previously, I turned much of my attention toward donor coordination, including coordination among donors investing in Bali Recovery (post-October bombing) as well as other areas of the country such as Maluku and Central Sulawesi. Already we have been better able to leverage the funds committed by the US Government to Bali so that our activities both better complement and do not replicate initiatives by other bilateral and multilateral organizations. I have worked extensively with both the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank.

In Bali, working with a local organization Manikaya Kauci, I participated in an extensive 'road trip' in which our team met with each head of Regency Planning Boards (Bappeda - or Badan Perencanaan Pengembangan Daerah) throughout the province of Bali. As a result of

the exercise - in which we met an array of officials from cooperative and creative, to lethargic and self-consumed - we identified a couple regencies in which we will actively engage the government, as we believe our efforts will have the most impact. Through greater coordination with other Donors, I have developed key relationships with AusAID, UNDP, the World Bank and others.

Upon return from the evacuation, my key task was to draw up an integrated list of all human rights related investments by the USG through USAID/Indonesia. This included extensive research into both direct grantees as well as sub-grantees through organizations such as The Asia Foundation and CSSP. The end result was the first integrated list of all investments - across SO teams - that support human rights activities with cross-references to indicate which organizations may have received support from more than one USAID funding mechanism.

With the early termination of this Fellowship to take on a new role within USAID/Indonesia, some Fellowship activities as noted in the latest extension will not be completed

IMPACT OF DEMOCRACY FELLOWSHIP - A FINAL PERSPECTIVE

The Democracy Fellowship has at its core objectives that are meant to both support personal professional development as well as increase the overall impact of USAID support in the areas in which we work. My Fellowship experience has been one of both personal and professional growth and development as well as increased impact at the program level with the teams I worked, namely DG and OCPD.

In the original program description I noted a desire to "develop practical expertise in the area of conflict and reconciliation" with the view that these could be more fully "integrated into future development projects." This objective was clearly met and is demonstrated in more active consideration of conflict dynamics across a range of issues both within the DG portfolio as well as the Mission's activities more generally. Moreover, collaboration with other SO teams helped to identify DG conflict linkages to their efforts. Assessments and papers that I wrote throughout the Fellowship period have addressed these very issues, from Governance vis-à-vis the internally displaced, to the impact of military forces in conflict zones on the HIV/AIDS crisis. Indeed, my collaboration with other SO teams has resulted in my being considered the "virtual HPN (Health Population and Nutrition) team member", having shared much information on HIV/AIDS and conflict as well as issues related to public health and human rights.

A key impact particularly worth mentioning in this final report relates to the manner in which the Mission addresses the internally displaced in Indonesia. Three years ago, much of the Mission's consideration of the issue was seen through the eyes of 'humanitarian assistance' or 'emergency assistance'. Over time, staff increasingly regarded the regional IDP crises through the lens of governance and democracy initiatives and greater thought given to the rights of IDPs as outlined in the "UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement". Now, more offices have expanded thinking on DG issues of peacebuilding and

conflict mitigation in addressing the non-emergency needs of IDPs so as to have greater impact in strengthening environments of peace, preventing future re-displacement or renewed violence.

As a result of the two and a half years working under the Fellowship program, I have developed expertise both in general conflict transformation as well as more specifically on regional conflict issues affecting Indonesia. The Indonesia expertise I previously possessed was brought to bear on my work under the Fellowship and I was able to develop significant skills in the areas of Democracy & Governance as well as conflict transformation in a more systematic manner. My experiences over the past few years have well positioned me as well-versed in the ongoing crisis in Aceh as well as on social violence in Indonesia.

The fellowship allowed me to develop specific skills related to conflict transformation, fulfilling both professional interests as well as Mission needs. I outlined several broad activities, all of which have been met, including: serving as a conflict resource for the team and mission, working more deeply in specific conflict areas and on human rights issues, as well as raising the profile of the internally displaced within the context of DG initiatives. The second year of the fellowship provided many opportunities to accomplish these and now the profile of USAID/DG as a resource to peacebuilders in Indonesia has been enhanced and well noted.

Below are some key 'roles' which I developed while over the term of the Fellowship. These have been noted in previous semi-annual reports but capture the roles I have developed over the course of the Fellowship. These roles, as it were, will largely remain as I begin a new relationship with the Mission as a USPSC.

Technical Expertise/Assistance. I was the only full-time conflict specialist on the DG team. Developing my professional skills in this area allowed me to fill this critical need. Team members turned toward me for advice on conflict related issues - I am viewed as the Team's conflict specialist. I am currently working with two other Indonesian staff to develop a training module that we will be able to give to our local partners. By not only developing my knowledge of the latest in academic literature on conflict, but also through my monitoring and analysis of domestic conflict situations, I helped guide a Mission conflict program that is both well-informed and broad in its approach (i.e. reluctant to rely solely emergency assistance or transition assistance to address conflict).

Through collaboration with OTI (now OCPR) and OFDA/FFP colleagues, as well as colleagues in other related SOs, we are able to craft both a DG and a Mission-wide conflict strategy that is both informed and effective. As a result, I believe that USAID/Indonesia's conflict program as embodied in the OPC can be a model for other USAID Mission's in conflict areas.

Analytical Support/Advisory Role. As noted in the last semi-annual report, the DG office has taken good use of my skills in having me research, evaluate, and analyze various conflict areas in Indonesia to an extent that limited resources in the past did not allow.

As an integrated member of the DG team (and now the OCPR team), I help to evaluate how we might put our limited resources to the best use. This includes not only evaluation of individual grant proposals from local and international NGOs, but also examination of team objectives. We have been able to develop approaches that are both reasonable and defensible in terms of resource allocations.

Working with DG grant managers, I identified areas within existing and pending grants that required further development or attention. The recent inventory of all human rights and conflict activities served as an important reference for the team as decisions continue to be made in terms of resource allocations for the current and next fiscal years. Previously, the team had not mapped all its conflict and human right related activities. We can now see exactly what we have supported and plan to support in the near term. By discovering key trends, we are able to adjust our program accordingly so that we can better meet objectives that we set for our team both in S02 but also in Sp09.

Conflict Resource Person. As the Mission's conflict resource person, I have developed important relationships with contacts in Jakarta and across Indonesia, but also internationally as well. These contacts have not only helped to raise the profile of the Mission's conflict program, but it has served to better inform that program. By constantly monitoring and accessing recent research, I provided fresh perspectives to Mission colleagues. The Mission Director has on several occasions expressed his appreciation for the breadth that I help bring to the Mission's program, by encouraging everyone to go beyond niche programming, i.e. emergency assistance, transition assistance, and so forth.

I continue to emphasize linkages among SO teams using a conflict lens. For example, I've recently begun to explore the relationship between HIV/AIDS and conflict areas. To be sure, recent decentralization initiatives over the last two years have had implications on conflict areas of the country. In developing these linkages, awareness of conflict dynamics among USAID staff has increased over the past two years.

Aceh Resource Person. Aceh contacts and relationships that I have developed over the last few years have proven to be very beneficial to our Aceh program. By better understanding how both 'sides' of the conflict would react to particular interventions, we are able to support initiatives that will have the highest possible impact in the province.

IDP Issues. As noted previously, I remain actively involved in Mission approaches in dealing with the country's IDP problem. As part of my work on internal displacement, I have worked with UN OCHA in pressing for greater dissemination and education on the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.

As I reported previously, in two of our focus areas in particular, Aceh and Papua, I have looked at how USAID can assist and help strengthen NGOs working with survivors of trauma and torture - this is also becoming an important element in our new Aceh strategy. Though

counseling training and related technical assistance is beyond the scope of DG programming, we can have an impact on the institutional capacity building and advocacy training of these NGOs. With strong civil society organizations capable of effectively working with trauma and torture survivors, an environment can slowly develop in which longstanding conflicts may be addressed and resolved. This has been a particularly important endeavor given that (a) mitigating trauma is an important step towards real reconciliation and future conflict prevention, and (b) funding for such organizations is not even considered by OTI or other humanitarian assistance offices of USAID.

REFLECTIONS ON THE DG FELLOWSHIP IN INDONESIA

The past two and a half years with the Democracy Fellows Program has been personally rewarding and professionally challenging. Applying the knowledge that I previously possessed regarding Indonesia to actual development program implementation has been both interesting and frustrating. Interesting in that I can see first hand the value of regional expertise; frustrating in that working within a massive government bureaucracy often proves difficult and sometimes impossible to maneuver through. I should add here that the design of the Fellow Program, particularly in terms of reimbursements, makes it incredibly flexible to take advantages of opportunities that would otherwise be quite difficult given the constraints of travel authorizations and the like.

Through my work under the Democracy Fellows Program I have developed a renewed confidence in my own abilities and expertise. This in turn will prove highly advantageous as I continue my career in international development. Over the course of the Fellowship term, I have recognized that my seemingly divergent interests - namely conflict/human rights and public health - are more compatible than I had previous thought. For a long time I have been keen on learning more about public health, particularly infectious diseases, and have recently spent time thinking about the human rights angles of these issues. I would not be at all surprised if my career moves down that path.

As a Democracy Fellow I worked for the first time within the bureaucracy of USAID. Though proud to be working for the agency of the US government that ostensibly assists the less fortunate of the world, I also found myself incredibly frustrated at times with both the sluggishness of the bureaucracy and the realpolitik that often pervades bureaucratic discussions. Negotiating the divisions between our grassroots programming and the demands of Washington were at times delicate. In the end, however, I do feel that I have added value to the activities of USAID/Indonesia and have developed a better understanding of how to work most effectively within a government bureaucracy which is, for better or for worse, here to stay.

The respect I have gained from both my American and Indonesian colleagues has been equally rewarding. As the youngest USAID expatriate staff member, I was initially confronted with the need to 'prove myself', which I think I managed successfully. I appreciated the help of my colleagues as I worked through the learning curve. I was therefore eager to collaborate more with them. The opportunities

to travel throughout Indonesia and work with Indonesians of myriad ethnic and linguistic backgrounds have been rewarding both personally and professionally as well. It has renewed my hope that the future of this vast nation will be positive and good.

Far and away the biggest challenge throughout the Fellowship term was the five months I spent in Washington under evacuation status. The evacuation, as it were, precluded me from presenting my paper in Krakow, but it is professionally reassuring to know that one's work has been dully recognized. Indeed, this is how I felt when approached to write a chapter on social violence - appearing alongside many noted Indonesia experts - and it may perhaps be the most personally rewarding achievement of the last term of my fellowship.

On another note, I must thank the staff of the DFP - David Payton and Ellen Garrett - for without their attentiveness, support and creativity, I believe aspects of the Fellowship experience might not have been as positive. I appreciate their help and support. They are truly value-added to the DFP, without a doubt.

To World Learning and USAID more generally, I thank these institutions for providing me with an opportunity that while developing my own skills, has helped to set me on a professional track that will be very fulfilling.

Democracy Fellow Progress Report #1
01 April – 30 June, 2003

Professional Goals (as cited in Program Description)

As a Fellow, I am assisting USAID/Kenya in the achievement of their Strategic Objective 6: Sustainable Reforms and Accountable Governance Strengthened to Improve the Balance of Power among the Institutions of Governance. Throughout this endeavor, I am also improving my own skills as a field-based development specialist, deepening my understanding of the practical challenges associated with program implementation, and contributing to a growing body of best practices for achieving participatory good governance. More specifically, I aim to:

- Advance my practical and professional expertise in the promotion of transparency and accountability using innovative approaches, including media strategies and increased access to quality information;
- Improve my technical competency in relation to multi-sectoral approaches to addressing the HIV/AIDS pandemic;
- Expand my range of technical proficiency, with opportunities to pursue pioneering and creative approaches to encourage partnerships between citizens and government;
- Apply and assess theoretical models and academically-grounded approaches to foster democratic political development and institution building in a transition environment;
- Broaden my exposure to, and contacts with, experts on Kenya, African development, good governance, and civil society/media strengthening; and
- Deepen my understanding of the Kenyan political, economic, social, and cultural contexts.

General Description of Fellowship to Date

I arrived in Kenya on 06 April, 2003 and have received very constructive support from the USAID/Kenya DG office as well as from the Mission's administrative and logistical offices (to the extent permissible for an "un-official American"). Most of the initial practical hurdles such as obtaining work permits and identity cards, ensuring communications, and securing housing and transport, have been overcome.

The majority of my efforts have been spent preparing the Mission's anti-corruption action plan and initiating discussions between the Mission's democracy and governance (DG) partners and the implementers of the Mission's HIV/AIDS program. My arrival also coincided with the launch of the Kenyan National Constitutional Conference, an historic undertaking that will result in a new Kenyan Constitution. Along with colleagues from the US Embassy and USAID, I was certified as an official observer for the Conference, and attended sessions as my schedule permitted [see attached summary].

Fellowship Objectives: Progress and Impact

Objective 1: Support the achievement of the DG SO6 “Sustainable Reforms and Accountable Governance Strengthened to Improve the Balance of Power among the Institutions of Governance”

Activities:

- Develop strong working relationships with DG team members.
- Collaborate regularly with other USAID/Kenya SO teams.
- Dialogue with US Embassy colleagues.
- Increase USAID/Kenya coordination and information sharing with USAID/REDSO.
- Develop working relationships with USAID implementing partners, the Kenyan NGO community, GOK counterparts, and other donors.
- Provide USAID/Kenya with written or oral summaries and copies of materials provided during meetings or conferences attended. Share relevant information gained through reading, interviews, and personal contacts as appropriate.

Results:

- Participated in DG SO semi-annual Portfolio Review.
- Remained abreast of current DG issues, providing input to USAID/Kenya Front Office, e.g.: 1) co-drafted memo reporting the Kenya Leadership Institute’s public debate of the Public Officers Ethics Bill (see attached); and 2) observed the Kenyan National Constitutional Conference – wrote summary (see attached).
- Participated on review panel for FY 03 DG program grants program. Selected twelve local partners for governance reforms and conflict activities.
- Collaborated with USAID/REDSO; advised REDSO on their anti-corruption proposal, including opportunities for increased synergies with USAID/Kenya; served on USAID/REDSO’s search committee for a new Democracy Fellow.

Objective 2: Design and coordinate USAID/Kenya’s anti-corruption portfolio

Activities:

- Assess and evaluate the existing transparency and accountability policies and activities of the GOK.
- Exchange information with local NGOs and other donors regarding anti-corruption programming, e.g., Transparency International-Kenya, Center for Governance and Development, UK’s Department for International Development (DFID), and the European Union (EU).
- Prepared and vetted USAID/Kenya anti-corruption action plan and funding proposal (5-year/multi-million dollar).

Results:

- Read and commented upon first two drafts of the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs’ draft strategy for judicial and legal reform and anti-corruption activities.

- USAID/Kenya anti-corruption action plan was well received by the Mission and by USAID/Washington.
- USAID/Kenya anti-corruption proposal has been funded for FY 03.

Objective 3: Improve USAID-sponsored multi-sectoral response to HIV/AIDS in Kenya

Activities:

- Coordinate and integrate USAID-sponsored programs in both HIV/AIDS and democracy and governance.
- Facilitate dialogue, alliances, and activities among donors, NGOs, and the GOK, focusing on good governance and HIV/AIDS;

Results:

- Initial dialogue between SO teams has begun; the USAID/Kenya Office of Population and Health (OPH) has agreed to fund a program officer position with the DG implementing partner the State University of New York-Albany (SUNY). SUNY works with the Parliamentary Service Commission through the Clerks' office to build the capacity of Parliament and to strengthen the committee system, including the Health committee.
- Dialogue has been initiated with the OPH implementing partner the Policy project regarding assistance that DG partners may be able to provide to improve the draft HIV/AIDS bill and to strengthen the advocacy skills of HIV/AIDS NGOs.

Objective 4: Develop and implement performance methodologies and indicators (qualitative and quantitative) to measure program impact of expanding USAID anti-corruption portfolio;

Activities:

(no activities to date for this objective)

Results:

(no results yet to report)

Objective 5: Develop and pursue Fellowship research topic

Activities:

- Informally monitor popular press and survey Mission colleagues for a timely, relevant, and interesting topic of inquiry.

Results:

- Research topic chosen. Over the next several months, I will track and analyze popular expectations for the performance of the new NARC government – the stewards of the “new Kenya” as people are calling it – and the Government’s

ability to meet those expectations. With multiparty democracy functioning for the first time in Kenya, this is a watershed moment in nation's history. But what will the "new Kenya" look like? What are the people's priorities for social, economic, and political development, and how long will they be willing to wait for the Government to deliver these changes? The Kibaki administration has made numerous promises to the populace, including expanded free education, rapid economic growth, job creation, zero tolerance for corruption, improved public services and health care, reduced HIV/AIDS infection rates, a restoration of critical infrastructure such as the roads, railways, and water and electric supply, and increased personal security. How does a young democracy in the developing world harness the public's enthusiasm for good governance, while also maintaining its credibility and integrity when managing donor nations' expectations for progress, and responding to external shocks such as global terrorism, insecurity, and economic recession? I plan to pursue this topic in conjunction with, and in addition to, my contributions to the USAID/Kenya DG team. The conclusions of the final project will depend upon the course of events unfolding in Kenya over the next year.

Challenges

During the reporting period, the principle challenges involved time management and work load. There have been two principle causes of these constraints: 1) the DG office has been short of two staff members; 2) the office has been frequently closed due to security concerns related to terrorist threats. Operating in this compressed working environment, I have not yet been able to meet all of the local implementing partners, GOK counterparts, or donor colleagues. Schedules have been frequently disrupted and meetings cancelled. Furthermore, I have not been able to completely clarify my role on the DG team because the definition of our roles and responsibilities is being deferred until our office is fully staffed. It is hoped that by September we will all benefit from the return of the DG team leader, as well as the addition of a new FSN staff member who will focus on the new rule of law activities. Regarding the security situation, USAID follows the directives of the US Embassy. Although we are unable to influence the scheduling of office openings and closures, the trend of the past two weeks has been more positive.

Related logistical difficulties were caused by the delays in securing a laptop computer (rendering work at home difficult on days when the Mission was closed), and my reliance on the Mission's vehicles – and schedule – for transport to/from the USAID offices (located on the edge of town). Both of these factors have been overcome as I now have a laptop computer and a vehicle.

Movement forward with the USAID/Kenya anti-corruption program has been stymied by delays in the release of the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs new strategy for judicial and legal reform, which also includes the GOK's anti-corruption plans and priorities for interventions. Since USAID/Kenya and the other donors have all pledged to align their interventions with this strategy, and with each others' activities, concrete

planning for implementation is being postponed until the GOK's final strategy is released. The current target date for the release of the GOK's revised strategy is 31 July.

A final ongoing challenge for the next reporting period is the turn-over in US Embassy staff, especially in the Political Section. USAID/Kenya had cultivated a very productive working relationship with Embassy staff, but new relationships will now have to be forged.

Proposed Revisions to Program Description

As relations with REDSO are important to maximizing USAID inputs in the region, I have spent more time/effort than anticipated on inter-Mission collaboration. Since I expect that these demands will continue in the future, I suggest that the liaison role that I am playing between USAID/Kenya and USAID/REDSO be recognized as a valuable element of my first Fellowship objective. This collaboration involves four REDSO divisions: Information, Communications, and Technology; Food Security; and Conflict Management and Governance; and HIV/AIDS. Interactions with these units strengthens USAID/Kenya's anti-corruption and HIV/AIDS interventions, enhances the cross-border impacts of conflict programming, maximizes USAID inputs, and generates innovation through the cross-fertilization of local implementation tactics.

Tentative travel/meeting schedule for the following period:

13-14 July: National Assembly Retreat for Committee Chairs (SUNY/Kenya) – Naivasha

Memo: to files
Subject: Forum on the Ethics Bill.
Date: April 10, 2003.

In attendance: Nancy Gitau, Kevin Bohrer

Kenya Leadership Institute (KLI) hosted a discussion forum on the Public Officers Ethics Bill which was published in January 2003 and is now before parliament.

Participants were drawn from the private sector, civil service, parliament (2 MPs) and CSOs.

History of the Bill:

The bill was first drafted in 2001 and suddenly dropped by the government when the provisions regarding the authority that would be receiving the declarations was seen to contradict the principle of separation of powers within government.

In 2002, the bill was re-introduced, with amendments, and passed by parliament but lapsed without presidential assent.

The current bill is a reiteration of the 2002 version.

Issues raised by the participants included the following:

- It was not clear to the participants what the broad objectives of the bill are. Some people felt that it was more of a declaration of assets bill than an ethics bill and that the government should find a way of addressing the ethics issues either through the current codes or through a subsequent legislation. Others questioned whether legislation was an appropriate, adequate, or effective means of instilling ethics in public service.
- The fact that the declaration of wealth will be done in secrecy and to another public official in the same service commission. There was a feeling that the information generated should be made public.
- That the bill was drafted without reference to what exists. The participants were of the view that the various codes of ethics/conduct already existing in the judiciary, parliament, and the public service are adequate. Yet the new bill did not build on them. Is a comprehensive code of conduct for all public servants needed?
- The various Commissions that would be responsible for public officers as stated in sections 3 (1-9) of the bill have no coordination mechanism or a central office responsible for managing this information. Also, the councilors will be reporting to the ECK, not to the government or their own commission.

- Since the Declaration forms will be submitted to many different commissions, how will the information contained in them be analyzed and compared?
- Under the first Schedule of the bill, the officers declaring wealth are limited to certain job groups. Some participants expressed the need to extend the category to include officers in lower job groups, government contractors, and adult children in the family since here in Kenya there are several people who after acquiring property illegally pass it on to their adult children.
- Was the bill meant to stop corruption or would it provide an incentive to people to hide their wealth abroad?
- What were the consequences of making a declaration? Wouldn't there be a provision made to take care of owning too much? At what point would one's earnings be declared unlawful? What would be the ramifications of "unexplained assets" appearing in a declaration?
- The Declaration form is not rigorous enough and does not provide enough detail. How would such a form be reconciled with, or compared to, an income tax statement?
- There is no provision in the bill on the consequences of liabilities. There should be a statement that people burdened by debts should not hold a public office. This is important given our history here with corrupt judges and senior government officials who owe banks huge debts.
- More details should have been provided on public liabilities including the contentious ones.
- Participants also felt that the bill lacked a training component which was critical to nurturing an ethical culture within the public service and throughout Kenya.
- Some of the problems that have been facing public servants include receiving illegal orders from their superiors, and treading the thin line between performance and politics. Yet there was a sense that this legislation did not seem to go far enough to address any of these issues.

Conclusions:

So what is the purpose of the bill? If it is a declaration of assets bill meant to stop corruption, then it should form part of the current anti-corruption legislation with a view to gathering evidence of corrupt practices. However, as it is, the bill is not an ethics bill although it can enhance the effectiveness of the various codes of conduct in the public service.

The participants felt that the bill is being pushed to meet a donor conditionality that will lead to the release of funds that the GOK badly needs. Otherwise it will not address the unethical behavior of public servants and neither can it stop corruption.

Nonetheless, it was also felt that the bill has introduced the declaration of wealth in the public service, which is important. Unfortunately, the bill is not specific on how to operationalize it.

Whatever form of public service code of ethics/conduct/asset disclosure is passed, it will need a higher public profile.

Instituting a code will require effective leadership and sufficient civic education so that the ideals enshrined in the code are appreciated as values, not merely rules.

While both MPs found the discussions useful, they asked those hosting the forum to forward the comments to the legal committee that is scrutinizing the legislation to enable them make substantive amendments that will improve the legislation.

Summary of the Kenyan National Constitutional Conference Phase I (28 April – 06 June, 2003)

Overview

Number of Delegates: 629

Composition of Delegates: MPs (222), District Delegates (211), Civil Society (NGOs, religious organizations, women's organizations, trade unions, special interest groups) & Political Parties (195)

Organized by: Constitution of Kenya Review Commission (CKRC), with mandate from the Constitutional Review Act, overseen by the Parliamentary Select Committee on the Constitutional Review, and run on daily basis by the Conference Steering Committee

Background: CKRC organized public hearings and then wrote the draft constitution with the assistance of experts

Purpose of Phase I: Discuss the 20 chapters of the draft constitution in plenary sessions

Goal of Phase I: Delegates understand the draft's general principles in preparation for the committee meetings, which were deferred to Phase II due to delays in the Conference

Next Steps: Phase II (7 weeks: 17 August – 30 September)

Substantive Highlights

Cleavages among Delegates:

Among the delegates, many cleavages quickly emerged which endured throughout the Conference. The most prominent divisions among delegates included: Muslims v. Christians (and rifts among the Christians); Civil Society v. Members of Parliament, with Civil Society feeling overshadowed and ostracized by the MPs; Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) v. National Alliance of Kenya (NAK), which is indicative of the rivalries within the NARC; Rural v. Urban representatives; Experts v. the "Wanjiku" (common folk), generating heated debates on the appropriate role of experts in this public forum, as well as the capacity of the Wanjiku to understand and contribute substantively to the discussions; and many sharply divided Ethnic and Regional factions.

Contentious Issues:

Several issues generated significant debate. Those that dominated the conference included whether or not: the position of the Prime Minister should be created, and if so, which executive powers would be included with this office (this was the source of the greatest contention within the NARC, with both NAK and LDP MPs courting KANU MPs for their support); Parliament should be composed of two chambers (the National Assembly and a new National Council); the National Assembly should be selected through a Mixed Member Proportional Representation system, whereby a portion of the seats would be filled from party lists; dissatisfied constituents should be able to recall MPs before their terms are completed; the jurisdiction of Khadis' Courts should be expanded in the constitution; all judges should be sacked as a means of reforming the corrupt and inefficient judiciary; how devolution should be achieved, including the relative powers among the various local levels of authority; and land reform, which raises innumerable land claims and disputes based on ethnic and regional rivalries.

Procedural Aspects:

Overall, the quality of debate was not as high as expected, and many delegates were unfamiliar with the processes and protocols of plenary discussions. Frequently, delegates insisted on debating the finer details of the draft – which is the envisioned task of the upcoming committees – rather than proceeding with general discussions to promote overall familiarity with the issues. Some delegates called for the Conference to proceed with experts only, suggesting that popular participation be secured by amending the Review Act to provide for a national referendum on the final revised draft of the Constitution. Attendance at some sessions was not sufficient to attain a quorum, and MPs were noted as those delegates most frequently absent. The division of powers between an executive and a prime minister was widely misunderstood, as were the specifics of how a “Mixed Member Proportional Representation” system would work. It became widely recognized that the most significant conversations occurred outside of the plenary sessions; sub-group consensus was reached either during the tea and lunch breaks, under the tents (for information dissemination and meeting points for interest groups, lobbyists, and the press), or outside the Bomas venue in the evenings. In a self-critical review of its role in the Conference, Civil Society observed that it was not able to maintain a unified voice regarding the most contentious issues of national importance, while many of the Civil Society delegates tended to advocate for/against single issues (e.g., Khadis’ courts), or align themselves along ethnic/regional lines.

Popular Evaluation:

Some delegates and observers declared the process a major success, citing that it gave Kenyans an opportunity to express themselves. Others noted that no consensus was reached among interest groups, that the process took longer than expected, and that the final weeks were rushed, so much so that all committee work had to be delayed to Phase II. One of the most successful aspects of the conference was the focus on women’s issues, largely championed by the Kenya Women’s Caucus. Women’s groups were the most organized and unified faction among Civil Society, and they were able to secure the recognition of affirmative action as a guiding principle throughout the Constitution, solidifying agreement that women should be guaranteed 30% presentation in all elected positions in Kenya.

Process for Phase II

- 1) 12 committees (some with 2 chapters) examine the draft and present recommendations to the conference. Each committee will include 2 experts.
- 2) Proposals from the committees are debated in plenary.
- 3) Delegates vote on each chapter.
- 4) Adopt the document before the CKRC’s mandate expires in November, 2003.

Meeting Notes:

**USAID, the POLICY Project (health implementing partner), and
representatives from the HIV/AIDS Bill Task Force
(21 May, 2003)**

Attended by: Cathy Mumma (Attorney General's Office)
Otiende Amolo (Rachier and Co. Advocates)
Angeline Siparo (POLICY)
Julie Odhiambo (POLICY)
Bedan Gichanga (USAID – OPH)
Nancy Gitua (USAID – DG)
Kevin Bohrer (USAID – DG)

A thorough briefing was provided by Cathy and Otiende on the Bill's development process, the Task Force's mandate, the Bill's overall principles, and intended content. Cathy and Otiende are both members of the Task Force that drafted the Bill. Otiende explained in greater detail the five issues that were found to be most controversial by the Task Force: Testing, Privacy/Confidentiality, Criminal Law, Employment, and Insurance.

We concluded by discussing the current status of the draft bill:

- The most recent (5th) draft of the Bill is at the Cabinet level. It requires four signatures (MOJ, MOH, Attorney General, and the Office of the President)
- After they sign, it will be published; this is the opportunity for public comment and Parliamentary review.
- The Parliament, however, is not prepared to review the bill. The MPs need an orientation re: the issues in the Bill before they'll be in a position to comment substantively on the content.

This scenario highlighted the following needs and a few possible actions:

- 1) The Bill is currently stalled, even though Kibaki has stated his support for tackling HIV/AIDS. Within the Cabinet, the profile of the Bill needs to be raised and pressure needs to be increased to sign it. The Task Force would like to brief the Cabinet on the Bill, but the Ministers have been pre-occupied with the Constitutional Conference. ACTION: Perhaps one of the planned MSI (Larry Cooley) Implementing Policy Change workshops could involve the Ministers and use the draft Bill as an example in the IPC workshop exercises. However, Larry may not be conducting any workshops until August (earliest), so this option may not be timely enough. AND/OR: Once the Task Force secures an invitation from the NACC to brief the Cabinet, POLICY could also organize a meeting with the Cabinet.

- 2) An awareness raising effort needs to be coordinated for the MPs before the Bill is presented to them.
- 3) A "marketing strategy" should be developed to encourage and shepherd the changes/omissions we would like to see in the draft bill while it is with Parliament. Key stakeholders in Parliament should also be identified. ACTION: the Task Force, along with the NACC, is developing a strategy and identifying stakeholders.
- 4) Health and Legal committees (and others?) should be lobbied before/during the Parliamentary review process.

POLICY also noted that the emerging collaboration with SUNY is important, but not sufficient. While the addition of a health (HIV/AIDS) focused program officer on the SUNY team will help build the institutional capacity of Parliament to address health issues, it is NOT the role of SUNY to lobby Parliament. Additional DG-synergies are needed to respond to the advocacy challenges in the HIV/AIDS policy arena. Nancy Gitau has suggested that there are lessons to be learned – and shared – regarding strategies for engaging Parliament productively. The new Parliament, especially, is a venue for real, productive policy dialogue beyond the MOJ. Perhaps an advocacy orientation session could be held with the existing OPH partners who possess the appropriate technical knowledge, but not the adequate lobbying skills for communicating effectively with Parliament.

Timing remains an issue, and it is not certain when the bill will move from the Cabinet to Parliament.

Strategies for raising awareness among Parliamentarians generally, and lobbying key stakeholders specifically, are yet to be clarified.

The immediate next steps are:

- 1) Task Force secures invitation from NACC to address/brief Cabinet, moving forward timetable for Bill to go to Parliament.
- 2) Task Force and NACC draft "marketing strategy"

Responsibilities/Actions to be planned/coordinated:

- 1) USAID/OPH & POLICY - Determine issues/content that they most want to see changed/omitted in Bill
- 2) [Responsible party?] - Awareness raising and Lobbying strategy for MPs
- 3) USAID/DG & USAID/OPH – Determine additional means, if not partners, for sharing experiences of how best to work with Parliament now that it is an increasingly effective institution.

USAID/Kenya Action Plan for the AFR Anti-Corruption Initiative

Introduction

USAID/Kenya is launching a five-year anti-corruption strategy to: 1) seize the new window of opportunity that has been opened by the historic political change in Kenya; 2) honor the USG commitments to support the new Kenyan Administration in its efforts to tackle graft and strengthen national integrity systems; 3) build upon the solid foundations that USAID/Kenya has already prepared working with civil society, the media, and reform-minded public officials over the past decade; and 4) strengthen the sustainability of the entire Mission portfolio by increasing the public's access to information and enhancing the transparency and accountability of government processes with implications for all sectors, including health and agriculture. As an integral element of the current ISP, the strategy will bolster USAID/Kenya's ability to support the Government of Kenya's (GOK) vision of "a just, democratic, prosperous, and corruption-free Kenya."

Goals and Objectives

With funding through the AFR Anti-Corruption Initiative, USAID/Kenya will launch four sets of interventions designed to promote: 1) greater public awareness of corruption issues and access to information regarding government processes; 2) ethics and integrity among public servants, including the disclosure of assets; 3) procurement transparency through both improved GOK systems and more rigorous monitoring by civil society/private sector; and 4) mechanisms for dialogue and debate among civil society, the private sector, and GOK bodies. The Mission will concentrate its efforts on opportunities relevant to the sectors that are prominent in the USAID/Kenya portfolio, such as democracy/governance and health, and it will initiate pilot programs in the corresponding branches of government, notably Parliament, the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, the Office of the President, the Ministry of Finance, and the Ministry of Health.

This action plan constitutes a critical element of USAID/Kenya's overall efforts to instill greater transparency and accountability in Kenya over the next five years. Later in FY 03, USAID/Kenya will also be drafting an encompassing anti-corruption strategy to harmonize all of the Mission's anti-corruption efforts, including rule of law and judicial reform activities, which will be supported through both DA and ESF funds. The Mission-wide anti-corruption strategy will ensure that the ensemble of anti-corruption interventions are integrated into the USAID/Kenya ISP and that the results achieved through these activities are significant, relevant to the most urgent corruption problems in the Kenyan context, and consistent with the comprehensive objectives of the USG in Kenya.

Background

Kenya turned an historic corner in December 2002 with the election of a new President and the subsequent installation of a new government after 24 years under President Moi. Widely known to be one of the countries most affected by corruption in Africa, and indeed the world (ranked 96 of 102 on Transparency International's 2002 Corruption Perceptions Index), Kenya has a fresh opportunity to tackle corruption. Among both

Kenyans and the donor community, there prevails a great sense of optimism that real strides can be made, not simply promises made and conditionalities met.

The new National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government has identified anti-corruption among its top three priorities, alongside economic recovery and universal access to free primary education. The NARC recognizes that to combat corruption, the enabling environment in which corruption thrives must change. The culture of impunity that has flourished in Kenya must end through reforms in the judicial sector and increased effectiveness in the application of the rule of law, the attitudes towards engaging in graft must be changed by consistently applying improved standards for ethics and integrity, the tolerance for paying bribes must be eradicated through increased civic awareness, the systems for institutionalizing greater transparency and accountability in government processes must be established, and publicly accessible mechanisms for monitoring the use of public assets must be put in place.

To address these issues, the GOK is demonstrating the necessary political will. Each day brings movement towards establishing the foundations for greater transparency and accountability. A new Economic Crimes and Anti-corruption Bill has just passed in Parliament, as has a Public Officers' Ethics Bill. Both are significant steps towards enhancing the institutional framework for fighting corruption. The Public Officers' Ethics Bill requires senior GOK officials to declare their wealth and provides clear conflict of interest rules for public servants. The Economic Crimes Bill formally establishes and assures the independence of the Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission (KACC). With the status and role of the KACC clarified, it will now receive, investigate, and refer corruption-related complaints to the Attorney General's Office (AG). The AG itself, whose inactivity and lack of independence under the previous Administration was seen as a major impediment to advancing the battle against corruption, has begun prosecuting corruption cases. Reporting mechanisms to Parliament from both the KACC and the AG will allow Parliament to play a critical oversight role, further ensuring the transparency of prosecution actions.

Along with the structures necessary for addressing the corruption problems in Kenya, a vital momentum is building. Progress is being made towards the NARC's commitment to "zero tolerance" of corruption and unethical behavior. Corrupt judges, including the Chief Justice and a High Court judge, have been forced to resign following well-founded accusations of corruption. Other corrupt government officials, including more than five heads of parastatals such as the Communications Commission of Kenya and the National Hospital Insurance Fund, have been removed, forced to resign, or have voluntarily retired following allegations of graft and revelations of ill-gotten personal gains. After having stalled prior to elections, a new round of investigations has been initiated by the Anti-Corruption Police Unit. Furthermore, a commission of inquiry has been established to investigate one of the biggest corruption scandals in Kenya's history, the Goldenberg case, involving an estimated \$257 million in fictitious gold and diamond export compensation claims.

Finally, along with progress in policies and momentum towards a corrupt-free Kenya, we have the Kenyan reformers themselves. Several key leaders in the fight against corruption in Kenya have recently moved into positions that will increase their influence as advocates for transparency and accountability. The Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (MOJCA), dormant since the early days of independence, has been reinstated under a well-respected, reform-minded Minister and is currently developing strategies (with support from USAID) to address corruption and judicial reforms. Within the Office of the President (OP), the newly created position of Permanent Secretary for Ethics and Governance has been filled by the former Executive Director of the Kenya chapter of Transparency International (TI-Kenya), one of the most respected, energetic, and innovative anti-corruption advocates in Kenya. Over the past several years, USAID/Kenya has supported these and many other key civil society and parliamentary champions of improved transparency and accountability. As these individuals remain critical allies in the fight against corruption, USAID/Kenya is in a unique position to advance an anti-corruption strategy that builds upon the Mission's strengths and comparative advantage in this arena.

Program Overview

The window of opportunity is here and it is open. The new Government has made promises and the citizens have high expectations. Advances must be made quickly while there is political will for reform, while there is momentum, and while there is public pressure to deliver. Several assessments of the new Administration's first 100 days have revealed that Kenyans continue to identify corruption among their top concerns. President Kibaki has this month reiterated his commitment to creating a "corrupt free" Kenya, determined to be an African leader who follows through with pledges to promote transparency and accountability. Orchestrated by the Minister of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, and with the assistance of the Permanent Secretary for Ethics and Governance, the GOK is currently developing two national strategies for increasing transparency and accountability in Kenya. One will focus on judicial reform specifically, while the other will address corruption and ethics more broadly throughout government processes. USAID/Kenya would like to support both of these strategies. While these strategies are currently in draft form and will not be finalized until June, USAID/Kenya serves on the task force overseeing their development and the Mission is, therefore, well aware of the GOK's priorities, proposed direction of interventions, and needs for assistance in implementing these strategies. The Mission will carry out judicial reform activities using ESF funding while the GOK's strategy for Ethics, Integrity, and Anti-Corruption, the focus of this action plan, will be supported with DA funds.

USAID endorsement of the GOK's priorities will not replace the support we provide to the other critical players in the battle against corruption. Even though it is encouraging to witness the NARC's commitment to tackling corruption, civil society along with the media and reformers within Parliament will continue to play decisive roles in the promotion of transparency and accountability. To be sustainable, broad ownership of the fight against corruption is needed, and this fight must include allies in the private sector while the media must remain a free, unobstructed, and impartial partner in observing, analyzing, and reporting on anti-corruption progress. In this action plan, the Mission

proposes extending greater support to the supply side of the anti-corruption battle by strengthening and institutionalizing GOK frameworks, systems, and processes. This support, however, will be provided *in addition to*, and *in tandem with*, the demand side programs with civil society and the media that USAID/Kenya has been supporting – and will expand – under this Initiative. These demand and supply side interventions converge in their intent to: 1) change the environment in which corruption occurs; and 2) empower citizens with greater knowledge of government processes and the use of public resources. The demand and supply sides also converge in the selection of which branches and units of government USAID/Kenya will be supporting. As the broader Mission portfolio represents substantial investments in the health field, for example, this action plan recommends that, whenever possible, activities such as procurement system harmonization be piloted with the Ministry of Health. Likewise, pilot activities will also be clustered with the Ministry of Finance, the MOJCA, Parliament, and the OP. Relevant partners in civil society and the private sector will be correspondingly paired with these interventions.

Proposed Interventions

USAID/Kenya may adjust the mix of these activities over the next few months as the GOK revises its anti-corruption strategy, the first draft of which was shared with donors on 24 April, and which will be finalized in June. Nonetheless, as the Mission has been in close contact with GOK officials since the NARC Administration took office, this action plan already reflects the GOK priorities and is not likely to change substantially. Continuing dialogue within the donor community reveals that the many foreign governments and international organizations that intend to underwrite anti-corruption programs in Kenya are also awaiting the final versions of the GOK's strategies, and thus no absolute donor activity matrix can be constructed at this time. Despite these uncertainties, USAID/Kenya has been able to narrow down the field of potential interventions. For example, since the spirit of the new Economic Crimes and Anti-Corruption Bill is focused on asset recovery for past graft, rather than on the prevention of future corruption, the Mission will instead support the new Public Officers' Ethics Bill, the intent of which is to strengthen the nation's integrity systems, and thus to change the environment in which corruption can flourish.

Public Awareness

Although corruption is presently a high-profile issue in Kenya, the current momentum for tackling corruption must not be lost. Public awareness of the costs of corruption must be increased, while popular tolerance for all forms of graft must be eroded. To maintain and expand citizen engagement, USAID/Kenya proposes a series of public awareness and involvement efforts, including the following:

1) Mass Media Campaign: Within the OP, the Permanent Secretary for Ethics and Governance has announced that the GOK will be undertaking a five-year anti-corruption campaign with the intention of building and sustaining country-wide support for achieving "zero tolerance" for graft. Intending to replicate the types of multi-media activities pursued through the national HIV/AIDS campaigns, and modeling the implementation after the successful campaigns run by the Electoral Commission of

Kenya (ECK) regarding electoral violence prevention, the GOK expects to engage a private firm to run the media campaign, establish liaison channels with the different public and private media houses, and assign a portion of the activities to partners in civil society. The full scope of this effort will be costly and well beyond the means of any single donor's support. Building upon the success it experienced assisting the ECK in 2002, USAID will sponsor the design phase and initial role out of the mass media campaign in the first year of this action plan. In subsequent years, other donors are expected to support the ongoing implementation of this campaign as they did for the electoral campaign.

2) Bi-Annual Presidential Address on the State of Integrity: Covered by the radio, television, and print media, this bi-annual address will include fact-based progress reports from all of the GOK's different anti-corruption efforts, including all government bodies with Integrity Assurance Officers responsible for codes of conduct compliance, transparency audits of parastatals, assets recovered to date, graft allegations being investigated by the KACC, as well as investigations and cases pending before the AG, the Anti-Corruption Police Unit, the Inter-Ministerial Economic Crimes Committee, the standing Economic Crimes Tribunal, and the Judicial Complaints Registry. In conjunction with the official GOK reports, civil society and the media will offer parallel coverage of the address, tracking progress since the previous report via an anti-corruption "score card." USAID will provide limited support the OP to coordinate the GOK effort, while additional funding will sponsor the civil society score card.

3) National Anti-Corruption Day: Similar to National AIDS Awareness Day, the GOK will designate one day each year to increase the profile of the GOK's commitment to zero tolerance of graft by emphasizing the importance of a corruption-free environment for promoting economic growth and sustainable development. Prior to the day, essay contests will be hosted in schools throughout the country, radio call-in shows will highlight and anti-corruption agenda, and civic education seminars will be held. The day will serve as an anchor for the annual ethics trainings of civil servants (see below) and will be timed with one of the bi-annual Presidential Addresses on the State of Integrity.

Operationalizing the Public Officers' Ethics Bill

With the passage of the new Public Officers' Ethics Bill, the GOK will need assistance in clarifying and implementing the legislation. While multiple codes of conduct already exist among the different branches of the Government, they have not been recently reviewed for benchmarks of minimum standards, consistency, or application procedures. Most public servants are unaware of the codes, their content, or their relevance. The Ethics Bill also stipulates that all public servants must disclose their assets, but no systems are in place for institutionalizing this requirement. To operationalize the Ethics Bill, USAID/Kenya will support the following activities:

1) Review of legislation: The new legislation should be analyzed and clarified to determine if any subsidiary legislation is required. Outstanding issues include the extent to which codes of conduct and asset disclosure procedures will be standardized across

government bodies, and privacy concerns in the disclosure of assets to the public or among government bodies.

2) Review and standardization of existing codes of conduct: Codes of conduct will be reviewed with the intention of establishing minimum integrity standards to which public servants must adhere. Existing codes may be amended accordingly. As part of this exercise, the roles and responsibilities of the various ethics commissions will also be reviewed, including the Public Service Commission (associated with the line Ministries), the Parliamentary Service Commission, the Judicial Service Commission, and the Electoral Service Commission..

3) Training modules for codes of conduct: Once minimum standards for codes have been established, USAID will sponsor the development of training modules for the integrity officers in each of the Service Commissions.

4) Pilot trainings for codes of conduct: USAID will provide the seed funding to begin trainings for key ministries and government offices. These include the MOJCA, the Ministry of Finance, the OP, and Parliament. With matching funding from the Mission's Health SO, similar training will be provided to the Ministry of Health.

5) TA staff advisor: Since strengthening the national integrity system is critical to changing the attitudes towards corruption within the government itself, USAID/Kenya will provide the MOJCA with a technical advisor as it oversees the implementation of the Bill.

6) Review and standardization of disclosure forms: Included in the Public Officers Ethics Bill is a sample asset disclosure form. The different forms and systems currently proposed by the various Service Commissions will be reviewed, and their relative merits compared. If possible, a uniform asset disclosure form will be produced. It is important to harmonize the present paper systems before they become so entrenched, and incompatible, that analysis of their contents in the future will become impossible.

7) Asset disclosure harmonization: Since the GOK has identified the formalization of the asset disclosure system as one of its top priorities over the next five years, and since the USG has a comparative advantage in the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs), the Mission will leverage the existing computer infrastructure that we have already invested in Kenya in order to facilitate and increase the transparency of the asset disclosure system. Through the EXECNET activity, USAID/Kenya is in the process of assuring communication linkages between and among all branches of government. The Ministries, the Judiciary, and Parliament will each be able to access the world wide web, as well as to establish intranet sites. With the EXECNET already in place, this anti-corruption activity would first develop the software to harmonize the asset disclosure forms, and second develop the intranet sites and content necessary to computerize the asset disclosure system.

Procurement Transparency

In order to ensure the proper and efficient use of public resources, greater transparency is needed throughout the GOK's procurement system. As TI-Kenya has noted, "Irregular government tenders and procurements provide probably the biggest loophole for transferring money from public coffers to private hands." The Government has recently pledged to "promote access to information with which the public can hold public officials accountable," as well as to strengthen procurement procedures and appeals processes. To support this effort, USAID/Kenya will pilot a program to increase the transparency and accountability of the procurement systems in several key Ministries and government offices, including the Ministry of Health since the procurement of drugs and other commodities will increase now that Kenya has been designated as a rapid scale-up country for HIV/AIDS funds.

USAID intends to build upon the inputs that the World Bank has already invested regarding the legislative and policy agenda for procurement reform. Much of the ground work has been completed for the draft legislation, but, as the legislation moves forward, and as systems are put in place to reform the procurement systems, USAID will support activities that fall into the following three categories:

1) Legislative and policy agenda: New procurement legislation will be introduced in the October, 2003 session of Parliament. Although drafted with assistance from the World Bank, further of analysis of the legislation is needed, along with advocacy efforts to ensure the appropriate supporting policy framework. Civil society will be engaged in this effort, commenting upon the legislation and policies, lobbying for the decentralization of the current procurement system, and demanding that more information be made available to the public throughout public tenders processes.

2) Tenders harmonization: The implementation of the new procurement legislation will include institutionalizing a modified structure for public procurement and a means for the sharing of information among the different government entities engaged in public tenders processes. Further discussions are required with the Ministerial Tender Boards and Central Tender Board. Ideally, computerized systems will be established that will electronically share the procurement records between the Ministry of Finance and the appropriate line Ministries. With financial support through this Initiative, USAID/Kenya will pilot this program with the MOJCA, the OP, and Parliament. Additional contributions from the Mission's Health SO will allow USAID/Kenya also to pilot the program with the Ministry of Health. Similar to the asset disclosure system described above, the ICT component of this intervention will utilize the hardware and connectivity inputs that USAID/Kenya has already invested in the GOK through the EXECNET activity. The additional Initiative resources, however, are necessary to develop the appropriate applications and web-based content to automate the system.

3) Monitoring secretariat: USAID/Kenya will support the creation of a civil society/private sector effort to monitor the GOK's compliance with the new procurement legislation, as well as the GOK's commitment to render public tenders processes more transparent. As procurement actions must be made public -- currently via the press, and

eventually via the Internet -- a secretariat will be established to compile and track all government procurement actions. The entity could be housed in the offices of either a civil society partner, such as the Kenyan Leadership Institute, or a private sector ally such as the Kenyan Procurement Association. The model for this activity is a similar effort that was successfully begun in Ecuador as reported in the 2002 TI Corruption Fighters' Tool Kit. With recent ICT progress in Kenya and the increased connectivity of the public and private sectors, a web-based monitoring system of the GOK's procurements is timely. Private sector entities such as the Nairobi Chamber of Commerce and the Kenyan Business association are expected to contribute to this effort that will ultimately improve the climate for economic growth in Kenya. By leveraging private sector financing, this effort is also rendered more sustainable.

Tri-Partite Forum

Civil society, Parliament, and the GOK have noted the need to establish an independent, non-partisan platform for the discussion and debate of anti-corruption issues. Such a platform -- the Kenyan Anti-Corruption Coalition -- was created following the Prague International Anti-Corruption Conference. Although informal, it was instrumental in advocating for the reforms that have taken place to date by ensuring that a critical mass of anti-corruption advocates from within the GOK, Parliament, civil society, and the business community was able to share ideas, debate, and eventually form common advocacy positions. The Coalition, however, disbanded prior to the 2002 Presidential and Parliamentary elections. A similar mechanism now needs to be revived and institutionalized. The GOK recognizes the merit of promoting a platform for discussion outside of the government, especially a platform that will bring the private sector more regularly into the public debate arena. USAID will support the establishment of a tri-partite anti-corruption forum to continue the work of the Kenyan Anti-Corruption Coalition. Its secretariat will perform a coordinating role and will be housed by one of the local and very credible anti-corruption NGOs, potentially TI-Kenya. The Mission expects that the liaisons and partnerships formed under this activity will develop into relationships of the Global Development Alliance variety.

Monitoring and Evaluation

A monitoring and evaluation component will be built into each of the activities, particularly through the GOK's own anti-corruption strategy which calls for assessments of the following elements in each of its activities: effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact, sustainability, and gender mainstreaming. It will be important for the GOK to have the systems in place to monitor its own progress, particularly since it is committing itself to bi-annual progress reports. USAID's civil society and media partners will also be establishing monitoring and evaluation components to their programs. These organizations have already implemented USAID-sponsored activities in the past and the Mission has been impressed with their reliable and meaningful reporting. USAID itself will also, of course, be monitoring the progress of this action plan as it constitutes an element of the Mission's ISP, expanding the DG SO's PMP to incorporate the new activities, determining which pilot programs are most successful and appropriate for replication, and adjusting implementation over the five years as needed. Approximately 7.5% of the action plan budget has been allotted to monitoring and evaluation activities.

Implementation Plan

The majority of the overall Mission anti-corruption program, including the ESF-funded support to the judicial reform process, will be obligated through a Development Assistance Grant Agreement directly with the GOK. This agreement will include components of the mass media campaign, the Ethics Bill support effort, and the procurement transparency activity. Additional support to the media campaign, as well as to the Tri-Partite Forum, will be channeled through NGOs such as TI-Kenya, the Kenya Leadership Institute, and/or the Center for Governance and Development. Each of these organizations has already complied with USG accounting regulations and is eligible to receive a grant from USAID.

One of USAID/Kenya's first steps will be the establishment of an anti-corruption advisory board to coordinate the Mission's broader anti-corruption strategy. Members of the board will include representatives from the Mission's DG team, the Health team, the Agriculture Business and Environment Office, the Program Development and Analysis Office, REDSO's anti-corruption program team, and a colleague from the Political Section of the Embassy.

Details regarding the sequencing of the activities that support the different elements of this action plan are included in the Budget and Phasing Table.

Relationship to Existing USAID Program

The expansion of USAID/Kenya's engagement in the anti-corruption arena fits well within the DG SO's existing results framework. Although the Mission's current ISP was conceived during the previous Kenyan Administration, under which there was little room to tackle corruption directly, USAID/Kenya foresaw the possibility that new opportunities to engage directly with the GOK might emerge during the life of the strategy. Consequently, the proposed range of supply and demand side activities targeting increased transparency and accountability complement the existing DG SO "Sustainable reforms and accountable governance strengthened to improve the balance of power among the institutions of governance," particularly through IRs 1 ("CSOs effectively demand reforms and monitor government activities"), 2 ("Increased independence of selected government institutions"), and 4 ("Better informed public and political actors"). The combined ESF and DA funded anti-corruption activities will constitute an increase in USG support for institutional reform in Kenya, reflective of the USG's confidence in the GOK's credibility and commitment to achieving greater transparency and accountability.

The Mission's broader anti-corruption strategy will coordinate the use of both ESF and DA funds, and will represent a harmonized effort between State and USAID. ESF monies will be used primarily to support the Government's judicial reform programs, while the DA funds will underwrite the activities outlined in this action plan. Through NOA DA funding, the DG SO will continue to meet its standing obligations to TI-Kenya, which uses these monies both to fund awareness raising activities, such as the Urban Bribery Index and two studies on the costs of corruption, as well as to support the Kenya

chapter of the African Parliamentarians' Network Against Corruption. The Mission will also continue to support the Center for Democratic Governance (CDG), which has provided critical analysis of the two recently passed pieces of anti-corruption legislation. Both TI-Kenya and CDG are currently funded through 2-year grants that expire in 2004. Without funding through the AFR Anti-Corruption Initiative, however, any expansion of support to other civil society and media efforts aimed at combating corruption would not be possible, and any expansion of institutional support to the GOK would be precluded. With the Initiative funding, the Mission will embark upon the activities outlined in this action plan.

Cross-cutting nature of the project

Increasing transparency in the procurement process and strengthening the integrity systems for public servants will support the entire Mission portfolio and have implications for all sectors. Particularly significant will be the benefits to the health sector as Kenya has been identified as a rapid scale-up country for HIV/AIDS programming. Reforms in drug procurement will ensure that these inputs reach their intended beneficiaries. Greater procurement transparency will also improve the environment for economic growth, and attract greater involvement, and matching support, from the private sector. Furthermore, the public education and media campaigns, combined with the ICT activities, will leverage the investments that USAID has already made in Kenya, mobilize the existing infrastructure, facilitate content development, promote user skills, and increase the connectivity and information sharing among government offices and CSOs.

Relationship to Other Anti-Corruption Efforts

The GOK is in the process of drafting an anti-corruption strategy to prioritize its own efforts and to coordinate the assistance from the donor community. The Minister of Justice and Constitutional Affairs chairs a steering committee that orchestrates the various transparency and accountability efforts supported by the different branches of the GOK. Both the US Embassy and USAID/Kenya have engaged in extensive dialogue with the GOK to determine how best the US can support the GOK's priorities. In the future, USG anti-corruption assistance will be synchronized via the Mission's anti-corruption advisory board. As the Embassy's Public Affairs Office anticipates an anti-corruption focus to its future Speakers Programs, the selected topics will parallel the activities supported by this action plan.

This action plan is also coordinated with REDSO's regional efforts to combat corruption in the trade and transport sector. By targeting hidden transaction costs and inefficiencies along the Northern Transportation Corridor, which links the port of Mombasa to the eastern DCR, USAID will assist the GOK in delivering an early anti-corruption victory. The USAID/Kenya and REDSO activities will mutually reinforce one another as this effort is piloted in Kenya. Both the USAID/Kenya and REDSO interventions may support media campaigns targeted at trucking and trade associations, procurement and ethics trainings for customs and transport officials, and the expanded use and networking of ICTs to improve information flow and transparency.

Among the donors, British DFID will coordinate anti-corruption programming through a sub-committee of the Like Minded Donors group (LiMiD). As all of the donors are currently in the process of re-evaluating their assistance to the GOK in light of the new Administration, the USG, DFID, and the World Bank are expected to be the largest contributors to anti-corruption programs, followed by support from the EU, the Netherlands, and the Nordic countries. DFID is likely to invest heavily in rule of law, specifically access to justice activities, while the World Bank has been supporting the legislation for procurement reform and is also planning to invest in legal sector reform. Through a joint effort, the donors in Kenya have been collaborating with the GOK, providing input for the draft anti-corruption strategy. All of the donors are now committed to aligning their support with the priorities outlined in the forthcoming GOK strategy.

Staffing Plan

The USAID/Kenya anti-corruption efforts will be coordinated by the Mission's new anti-corruption advisor, who also serves as the DG team's cross-sectoral liaison with the Mission's other SOs, particularly the Health program. Additional oversight will be provided by the Post's anti-corruption advisory board. As the promotion of transparency and accountability is a significant element of the Mission's DG program, responsibility for managing the full range of anti-corruption activities will be shared among the DG team members. No additional staff is anticipated at this time.

Illustrative Indicators

Context:

Improvement in TI Corruption Perceptions Index
 Improvement in Urban Bribery Index
 Progress satisfying WB/IMF conditionalities

Public Awareness:

Improvement in the civil society score card regarding GOK bi-annual progress reports
 Increased awareness of corrupt practices, extent and costs corruption (survey)
 Increased citizen confidence in government's battle against corruption (opinion polls)
 Increase in # of incidents reported to the Complaints Center (Office of the President)

Ethics Bill:

of service commissions whose ethics codes are standardized and operationalized
 % of service commissions' integrity officers trained in ethics and integrity
 # of service commissions using ICTs to compile asset disclosure forms

Procurement Transparency:

of line ministries and government offices whose procurement systems are on-line
 # of tenders actions tracked by civil society/private sector secretariat

Tri-Partite Forum:

of consultative meetings hosted by the forum
 # of national anti-corruption legislative and policy actions with substantive input from Forum members

Budget and Phasing

[procurement-sensitive budget table removed]

Leonora A. Foley
Democracy Fellow, USAID/REDSO, Nairobi
Biannual Report
July 1 – December 31, 2002

Professional Goals:

In relation to the main fellowship goal, to act as a resource person on DG/Conflict issues to REDSO, bilateral missions and non-presence countries, this goal were fulfilled through a number of activities throughout the reporting period. In addition, nearly all the activities engaged in over the period related to my research topic examining natural resource conflict in the cross-border zone of NE Kenya/S Ethiopia/SW Somalia.

General Description of the Fellowship:

Much of this fellowship period was spent on analysis and advising on conflict programming, including participating in Conflict Vulnerability Assessment (CVA) for the Ethiopia mission, conducting research and analysis for the Burundi conflict assessment for their new Integrated Strategic Plan, and providing technical guidance and acting as a point person for a FEWS NET famine and conflict pilot study. In addition to these activities, I carried out a number of regular duties including reviewing applications for funding, attending meetings and conferences to report on regional conflict activities, advising on strategic planning, presenting office activities to REDSO staff and others, developing indicators, writing annual and other reports.

Fellowship Objectives and Performance Methods and Activities

Objective 1: To act as a resource person on conflict resolution issues to REDSO/ESA teams.
Activities:

- FEWS NET: Provided technical backstopping and guidance to FEWS NET on this pilot activity integrating famine early warning and conflict vulnerability. Over this period, the activity produced three newsletters, developed networking between stakeholders in the Karamojong Cluster between Uganda and Kenya, and trained pastoralists on interpreting famine early warning information. From October, the end of the pilot phase, and the end of the year, I explored funding options.
- CQUICK: Reviewed and provided technical advice on applications for funding, especially targeting the cross-border pastoral zones.
- For the Performance Management Plan, continued to develop and refine indicators. Established baselines and worked with consultants, REDSO conflict team and partners to report on 2002 results, and establish targets for following years. Worked with the team to ensure indicators and targets met strategic requirements.
- Wrote and edited the Annual Report and Congressional Budget Justification

Objective 2: To provide services to USAID missions and non-presence country programs on conflict prevention and democracy and governance issues.

- Participated in Ethiopia Conflict Vulnerability Assessment (CVA) as a member of the team examining pastoral conflict. Spent five weeks over July and August in Ethiopia engaged in the following: planning the assessment, interviewing individuals in Addis Ababa and in the southern part of the country, writing analysis and recommendations for the CVA, and, upon return to Nairobi, editing various versions of the report for finalization. The pastoral portion of the assessment highlighted the need for USAID to target resources to marginalized pastoral areas, including a conflict component especially where traditional and modern systems function together. To date, the assessment, while still being finalized, has encouraged

dialogue between the Ethiopia Mission and the Government of Ethiopia on addressing conflict both in the pastoral zones and nation-wide.

- Burundi CVA: Carried out research and worked with core team members to develop framework, conduct interviews, prioritize focus areas, and draft writing of report.

Objective 3: To assist in the development of local professional and organizational capacity on conflict resolution.

- My work in this area over this period was limited as the Senior Conflict Prevention Officer handles these activities through PACT/Mwengo cooperative agreement.

Objective 4: To complete a substantial, relatively independent work product to advance the field of DG/Conflict and my post-fellowship career

- Cross-border assessment: Attended a number of meetings or workshops which addressed either specific cross-border or regional pastoralist and/or conflict issues, including regional pastoral policy meeting in Arusha, pastoral NGO meeting in Addis Ababa, CEWARN meeting in Addis Ababa, and mission to Somaliland with the Deputy Assistant Administrator for USAID. Gathered more research documents, on pastoral/environmental conflict.

Objective 5: To increase my skills and knowledge of the effect on relief and development assistance on conflict and the potential for conflict, as well as on the impact of democratization as a conflict-mitigation tool.

- Nearly all of the above activities contributed to this objective, although mainly peripherally as many REDSO-funded programs do not fall into relief and development categories. In addition, the workload for other activities was too high to be able to devote much time to this.

Fourth Semester Summary Report: July through November 2002 World Learning Fellowship: Mark Koenig

Professional Goals & General Description of Fellowship to Date

By way of follow-up to the USAID/World Bank sponsored media assistance conference in Paris last February, I had meetings with four major donors in New York City on July 17, prior to my departure for Russia. I summarized the main themes of the Paris conference as well as USAID's media sector concerns -- particularly the idea of possibly expanding media law support -- with representatives from the Markle, Rockefeller, and Open Society (Soros) foundations, plus the Media Development Loan Fund (MDLF). The New York foundations, in turn, described their current media sector activities.

For me, the most useful revelation was to learn about the communications-related work of the Rockefeller Foundation, which focuses primarily on African media projects and has helped develop a "Communications for Social Change" Model (*See also more about this model in attached Haiti M&E plan*).

MDLF Deputy Director, Harlan Mandel, described recent trends in the provision of low interest loans for independent media firms in transitional countries. He also expressed concerns about increasingly concentrated media ownership patterns in some developing regions, such as Latin America. Markle's Stefann Verhulst explained that his foundation was focusing its main attention on internet/electronic media; and OSI (Jonathan Peizer) updated me on Soros' current media assistance programs, which remain broadly focused, but with reduced funding levels. All four foundations expressed interest in having another small donors' meeting in NYC this autumn, but both David Black and I have been too busy in recent months to add another meeting to our cluttered agendas.

Also, on October 2-3, I attended Internews two-day symposium entitled "Global Dialogue on Open Media" at Airlie House, Virginia. The event brought together 137 media and development professionals from 43 nations. Panel discussions addressed the role of media in social change and mitigating conflicts. PBS President Pat Mitchell's keynote address analyzed trends in the U.S. and world media, particularly since 9-11; and the symposium also included discussions on relations between donors and implementers of media assistance. During the conference, David Black and I had a meeting with the Internews/Middle East team and with the Western Kentucky University Journalism Department faculty/staff regarding the prospective launch of the new media training and assistance activity planned for Egypt. I also held interesting separate meetings with representatives from the Panos Institute, Internews/Belarus; and Internews/Russia.

Fellowship Objectives / Research

My main writing/research has focused on writing a lengthy background paper on USAID/Russia media programs during the past decade (1992-2002). This project proved to be larger and more time consuming than originally anticipated (also, I was diverted to work on follow-on concepts to the Russian-American Media Entrepreneur Dialogue, or RAMED), but I hope to finish the background paper by mid December.

Performance Methods, Activities, Outcomes, and Impact

D/G Officer Training: On June 27-28, the civil society team conducted a pair of daylong training sessions for two groups of USAID D/G officers (a total of nearly 50 participants) from diverse USAID Missions as well as DC offices. Each day included a breakout session where participants had to quickly design an assistance strategy in a particular D/G area for a hypothetical country called "Patronia" – including a break-out group that was assigned to quickly design a media assistance program. (*See Attached Media Training Exercise*). The d/g training was rated very favorably by the participants.

NEP Training: On November 22, David Black and I provided a training session on media assistance strategies for a ten New Entry Professionals (NEPs). Session included a discussion and video showing of selected Public Service Announcements (PSAs) for a very successful media campaign against domestic violence.

Technical Support to Missions:

Russia: During a TDY in Russia from July 18 to August 10, I gathered much of the information about the Russian media assistance program during the past decade that is needed to write the background paper for USAID Program Planning and Coordination Office (PPC), particularly the periods 1992-96 and the most recent year.

However, somewhat unexpectedly, I spent the bulk of my time in Russia working on a concept paper of programmatic ideas about how to follow-up on a series of high-level discussions called the Russian-American Media Entrepreneur Dialogue, or RAMED, which was initiated by agreement between Presidents Putin and Bush during their Washington-Crawford summit in November, 2000.

Egypt: In early September, the Embassy in Cairo together with the Office of the Director belatedly but strongly approved the concept of starting a journalism training exchange between the Press Syndicate of Egypt and the Internews/Western Kentucky University Journalism Department. In October, I updated my concept paper draft for translations and distribution among decision-makers in the Press Syndicate. David Black and I have also remained in contact with USAID/Egypt as needed – and we also consulted frequently with Internews and WKU.

Haiti: September 22-28: Participated in Mission meeting with Creative Associates, implementer of USAID/Haiti journalism training and civic education program, on September 24, and provided follow-up assistance during and after the TDY to accelerate and improve drafts of work plan for this project, including an M&E plan (*See Attached*). As part of this work, I also attended USAID/Haiti's Second Annual Implementers Roundtable, hosted by IRI in Washington, DC, on October 18.

Haiti: November 11-21: Follow-up TDY to Port-au-Prince, focused mainly on providing advisory/backstop support to the media program CTO (who was undergoing CTO training in the Dominican Republic); helping to finalize media program indicators;

coordinating of media program with USAID/Haiti education program; writing support for the Justice, Democracy and Governance (JDG) section of the USAID/Haiti annual report; plus media training for the CTO when he returned from DR. Partly as a result of the Haiti-related work and TDYs, a much-needed program work plan was submitted by Creative Associates on November 27.

Proposed Revisions to Program Description

During the next six months, my schedule will resemble something like the following:

December 6: Help organize a media panel at Partners Conference on Media in Islamic States for the annual USAID Partners Conference.

December: Complete Russia Background Chapter for PPC worldwide media assessment.

Late January – Early February, 2003: (likely) TDY to Egypt to begin implementation planning for a new journalism training program with the Press Syndicate of Egypt, Internews, and Western Kentucky University Department of Journalism.

February-March, 2003: Likely extended, one month+ TDY to Africa, possibly starting directly after completion of Cairo TDY. My work will focus on assessing the work of the Media Institute for Southern Africa (MISA), headquartered in Botswana with branch offices in eleven African countries across the Southern Africa region. Assessment work will be used to write a short chapter for the PPC worldwide media assistance review. I would also assist the USAID Regional Center for Southern Africa to assess MISA and write a concept paper, which would be used to shape MISA's main programmatic directions when its USAID grant is (prospectively) extended again in September, 2003.

Approximately April/May-September, 2003: **REDUCED TDY/TRAVEL!** I hope to focus completely on *writing* during the closing five-six months of the fellowship. Desired result is an updated and expanded media assistance manual – serving as a probably lengthier follow-on to Ann Hudock's June 1999 *Role of Media in Democracy: A Strategic Approach*.

M&E Ideas re: CAII Work Plan Proposal for Year II
Mark Koenig, DCHA/DG, October 29, 2002

A/G. Assessment of Broadcast Capacity re-labeled as "Community Radio Development" in CAII Work Plan Proposal / + Information Management

The proposal to develop the community radio sector in two phases (15 most advanced stations in Phase I, plus 25 additional stations requiring more assistance under Phase II) appears sensible. Due to the local and national sensitivities of media activities in Haiti, working very carefully with relatively fewer stations may prove preferable to working less effectively with too many stations. *CAII together with USAID/Haiti should confer regularly to find the best balance between working with as many community radio stations (CRS) as possible while also maintaining very high professional standards of assistance work and journalism.*

Assuming that all equipment can be installed under Section "IV.D" of the Scope of Work (Sow) and that training proceeds as planned under Sections C and E, a conference in July is an excellent idea – helping to bring together community radio personnel to share best practices and plant the seeds for future cooperation/association-building in this sector.

One further suggestion from me is to maintain a *periodically updated:*

Inventory or "Atlas" of Haitian Radio Stations:

CAII's half year delay to produce a corrected Baseline Assessment (June, 2002) was unfortunate, but this water under the bridge also carried with it some lessons learned. CAII's ability to develop more trusting relations with radio stations -- and to *get more accurate and detailed* information -- should increase over time as it works with these stations on an evolving array of activities.

Various sections in the SoW (especially IV.A. and IV.F.) outline the range of information reporting needed by USAID and CAII in order to most effectively implement the radio assistance and civic education programs. Collected data as part of the project includes / is beginning to include*/ or might include**/ the following:

1. Region-by-region list of operating commercial, religious and community stations, including address, telephone, other contact information.
2. Network affiliation of each station (if any).
3. Non-operational stations; and also "dark zones" where little or no radio is received.
4. Broadcasting power of transmitter, antenna height, and geographic "footprint" of each station in terms of territory and potential audience reached. (This information is increasingly available for the 40 Community Radio Stations, or CRS, assessed; but probably incomplete for other stations)
5. Electric power sources of each station; and reliability of electricity supply (for 40 assessed CRS only).
6. Other equipment inventory (for 40 assessed CRS only)
7. Estimated listening audience of each station (Note: Survey data difficult to maintain)**

8. Programming content, including especially, the amount of news, public affairs, and civic education programming that a station or network broadcasts (or is willing to broadcast).*
9. Price Cards of Commercial Radio Stations and Networks for Public Service Broadcasts or Announcements (PSAs)*.
10. Charters, Ownership, and License Status of stations (especially for CRS).
11. Financial self-sustainability of station (especially CRS)*. Simple measures could involve diversity of revenue sources, whether station has a marketing department, advertising revenues, or strategic plan for self-sustainability, etc.
12. Training Needs: staff size and level of professional training or experience of journalists and media managers of each station (especially for CRS)*
13. Professional/Associational links of station (if any)*
14. Level of Professionalism / Qualitative Content Measures of News and Public Affairs-Related Broadcasts of stations, especially CRS (verification of facts, multiple points of view, non-partisan balance, etc.) *Note: Obviously, difficult to measure, likely requiring carefully designed content analysis, which is costly.***
15. Political orientation of station or network (if any):* **Notes:** (1) This measure is inversely related to #14, insofar as a strong partisan bias represents an important marker for a lack of professional balance; and (2) Although political orientation is not noted under *IV.Tasks, A. Assessment of the Scope of Work*, Section V does clearly state that: "Most radio stations and journalist associations have a political orientation along the general lines of pro- or anti-government. The Offeror must pay particular attention to these subtleties to avoid the appearance of supporting one political element over another."
16. Changes in the Knowledge, Attitudes and/or Behavior of Listeners: **Note:** This will be the most difficult variable to measure!!!

The information needs of this project are large, but CAII is already gathering much of this data as a normal part of its work. A question arises how best to organize and make this growing and increasingly valuable data base available within USAID/USG/Haiti community – as well as to larger publics where possible. Formats of presenting this data can be found that can help measure project results, assist other USAID projects, and promote the development of the independent media sector in Haiti. Here are a few ideas:

Radio Atlas: Information that would be useful for other USAID Projects / and Others: Much of the information gathered by CAII, especially items 1-5 and 7-9, would be very useful for USAID and other development programs, Haitian public officials and/or advertisers who need to deliver media messages to the Haitian population. CAII could potentially perform a valuable public service by making commercially non-sensitive information available to the public (via periodically updated web site, small print runs, or even photocopies). This information could include: station contact information, audience reach, prices information, etc. for anyone wishing to use commercial and/or community radio to get out a message.

- If CRS could charge for some public service announcements (PSAs), this could help them partially defray their costs, helping stations achieve self-sustainability.

- A "Radio Atlas" might be published jointly with AJH and/or FPH, or perhaps together with a new association of community radio broadcasters -- as a way to assist association building among Haitian media professionals.

Semester M&E Reporting; and End-of-Project M&E Reporting: CAII for its semester and end-of-project reports needs an M&E plan that updates data on most of the 15 factors that were initially explored (directly and indirectly) in the Baseline Assessment. Here are some suggestions, sequentially from 1-15, how to handle M&E and other information reporting needs.

The most basic data categories 1-4 describe the "footprint" or transmission zone of radio broadcasting, particularly community radio, in Haiti, especially in the towns and rural areas outside PAP (*the capital city has over 40 radio stations already, and therefore does not need CRS*). As CAII makes antenna and transmitter improvements for about 40 CRS, the project staff will gain progressively better data on the territory reached by FM radio signals. Some of this information might be presented on tables, for example:

M&E Sample Table A: Data Categories 1-4 (Tables can be changed depending on CAII judgment, for example, to include separate columns for Phases I & II or other information)

Region/population	June 2002 Baseline: % population reached by Community Radio Station (CRS) signals	June 2003: after Phase II: % populatn reached by Community Radio	Number of CRS / other radio stations (mainly private or religious) in 2002 // 2004	% population in radio "dark zones" w/o FM radio signal: 2002//04 (2004 = target)
Haiti / 8+ million	30%(?)	70% (?)	60?/200 in 2002// 75?/225? In 2004	20%? // 5%?
PAP / 2.5 million	0% (not needed)	0% (not needed)	0/43 // 0/43+?	0%
West			6/	
North			3/	
Northeast			1/	
Northwest			2/	
South			5/	
Southeast			3/	
Grand' Anse			4/	
Center			4	
Artibonite			4	
Sample region	20%	80%	3/6 // 5/8	10% // 5%
-----optional -----				
also, major towns				
Cap Haitian				
St. Marc, etc.			1/4	

Items 5-6 concern the electric power systems and equipment inventories of CRS. Mundane equipment inventory records for each participating CRS, will suffice. CAII might report a few key achievements, including *numbers of*: improved antenna towers, newly installed transmitters, improved electric power backup systems, etc. following the completion of Phase I and II equipment drops.

In the final analysis, the most telling measures of success for #5-6 will be broadened transmission footprints of the CRS (item 4) and measurable increases in reliability and numbers of hours of broadcasting by each CRS (*CAII might want to make arrangements with the CRS to get better reporting on the actual airtime by each participating station*).

M&E Illustrative Table B: For Data Categories 5, 6, and 8.

	Average weekly airtime before equipment drop	airtime devoted to community affairs // to civic education	Average weekly airtime after equipment drop	... of which, airtime devoted to community affairs	... of which, airtime devoted to civic education
Station #1	<i>Sample data</i>				
Station #2	10 hours	8 hours // 2	20 hours	16 hours	3 hours
Station #3	20 hours	10 hours // 3	30 hours	20 hours	5 hours
.....					
Average among assisted CRS	15 hours	9 hours // 2.5	25 hours	18 hours	4 hours

Items 7 & 16: Listenership → Changes in Listeners' Knowledge, Attitudes & Behavior:
 These variables will prove the most difficult to track, but USAID/Haiti and CAII may be in a privileged position with respect to survey data, since Public Diplomacy's Radio Listening Survey (PDRLS) and the CID-Gallup polling over time should provide some insights about the impact of expanded community radio broadcasting. This section will outline some design suggestions for PDRLS which (if PD can incorporate) would help measure the effects of the CAII community radio support activities on local audiences. (*Comments on the CID-Gallup questionnaire were already made in a separate memo*).

We should acknowledge at the onset that using survey research to reveal effects by media messages on mass audiences involves large methodological hurdles – since questionnaires and sampling must be well designed, media effects may be temporary and many additional factors are at play to influence citizens' attitudes and behavior (socio-economic, political and security conditions; word-of-mouth communications, etc). Still, survey research may reveal correlations which suggest, but rarely by themselves prove, a causal link between the planned civic education radio campaign and changed attitudes or behaviors by radio listeners. *In addition*, using a *communications for social change model* as noted in Section D below, CAII could supplement survey research results by involving community radio activists to help measure the impact of civic education radio programs.

Over-Sampling (and Control Region samples) in some CRS regions (before and after CAII assistance): If possible, PD and/or CID Gallup should conduct an over-sampling in selected (preferably "typical") regions where CRS signals and programming are boosted through CAII assistance – both in periods before and after the signal/programming boost takes place. Possibly also, regions which do not receive the 12-part civic ed series could be surveyed as control samples – providing some indication of public knowledge and attitude trends where the 12-part series fails to reach. These survey techniques (use of over-sampled and control regions) would help isolate with better reliability those effects created by the CAII civic education series.

Due to a focus on the media, the PD survey can collect more detailed information about audience media usage and preferences than the CID-Gallup poll – for example:

- Which media outlets, especially radio stations, do respondents use and how much. (in more detail than provided in CID-Gallup) The PDRLS might ask which radio shows, genres, and personalities are most popular among listeners.
- Respondent topical preferences: Which subjects are most interesting for listeners? For example: local, Haitian and/or international news; economics or business conditions; agriculture-related topics; politics; water supply; environment; sanitation systems; garbage collection; police services; family; children's upbringing and education; home; health and medical care; sports; music, entertainment; etc.. This information could help community radio stations structure their programs in ways that are most attractive to their local audiences.

If possible, PDRLS should include questions to improve CAII's measurements of the civic education series and journalism-related activity results. Glen Slocum's memo of September 4 includes many useful suggestions (especially sample qualitative questions on pp 6-7 and radio outcome indicators on page 8). His recommendations will need sharper refinement depending on consultations with Public Diplomacy (re how much PD is willing to adapt PDRLS to CAII needs) and upon the amount of resources USAID/Haiti is willing to devote to additional "mini-surveys" and other M&E mechanisms.

Given the sweeping scope of the 12-part civic education series, it may be wise for us to focus on measuring attitudinal/behavior changes in priority areas deemed to be most crucial by USAID/Haiti and/or most pertinent to the functions of community radio.

Here are a few sample questions in the media / community radio areas:

(1-5 scale: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree; or no reply):

- Media should provide coverage of all points of view. (1-5)
- Media should show deference to public officials, and the government should penalize or close media that it feels are too critical. (1-5)
- Media should be permitted to cover all points of view, including unpopular opinions that are held only by a small minority of people. (1-5)
- Radio stations and other media generally provide truthful coverage of events in Haiti. (1-5)
- (open ended question): Which media outlets do you find to be most truthful *in the sense of providing balanced coverage of all points of view?* (note: *italics portion may need to be re-worded to avoid biasing answers to some of above questions*):
 - a. _____
 - b. _____
 - c. _____
 - d. _____
 - e. *Almost all media in Haiti that I know are truthful*
 - f. *No media in Haiti that I know are truthful.*
 - g. Difficult for me to say.

---areas of media interest / (especially for community radio)---

- In your opinion, are there any (local) issues that need greater attention by the media (by your local community radio station)? _____open answer

---- other questions ---

- It's best for me to wait to see what PD (and USAID/Haiti) has in mind for RLS or other survey options before making more specific suggestions.

Items 9-10: Price cards; ownership and license status: Information should be available to other USAID implementers, and possibly published in Radio Atlas.

Item 11: Financial self-sustainability of community stations: See Section "E".

Items 12-14: Professional level of Community Radio Trainees. See Section "C".

Item 15: Political orientation of radio stations, with preference for relatively more professionally balanced reporting. Internal judgment call by CAII in regular consultation with USAID.

B. Development of Civic Education Cassettes:

- My comments are found in earlier memo.
- M&E: none: simple completion of tapes that are approved by USAID

C. Training of Journalists in Civic Education Subject Areas :

M&E: I'd recommend one or two possible methodologies here:

(1) (best) Content comparison of radio reporting scenarios before/during/after training: Ideally, if possible, CAII instructors might create a multi-month mentoring relationship with their community radio students and alumni. Students before, during, and after the initial 4-5 day training might submit a series of written radio reporting scenarios (or tapes of radio reports) to their instructor. These scenarios can be evaluated and compared for progress over a several month period along several qualitative/professional dimensions: verification of facts, multiple perspectives, depth of analysis, originality or likely interest to audience, formatting, style of language/presentation, etc. CAII instructors should be able to summarize any improvements (but also any continuing weaknesses) among their students in semi-annual program reports to USAID. Possibly also, students/alumni can participate in their own self-evaluation – which provides them a greater sense of professional participation in the educational process.

Logistics will be a major challenge for continuing multi-month mentoring relationships. In professional journalism training activities in other countries, alumni and instructors

often easily stay in touch by email – but few Haitian community journalists will enjoy that luxury. Other options include: mailing of written scenarios or of cassettes, follow-up by instructors as visiting consultants at the community radio stations, or meeting again at community radio conferences.

Instructors can use a crude numeric grading system to rate sample student/alumni radio reporting scenarios before, during, and after the training sessions – possibly also including the self-evaluations by the alumni themselves. The main purpose of this grading exercise would be for its educational effects – light professional pressure on the students/alumni to excel – but these results could also be reported in CAII semi-annual reports to give USAID some feel for how this educational activity is going. If possible, CAII might also include a few specific examples of improved reporting scenarios in appendices of semi-annual reports.

Grading of student/alumni radio scenarios before/during/after 4-5 day training sessions: (numeric grading system determined by instructors – sample matrix)

Separate grading before, during, after training	Verification of facts?	Multiple perspectives?	Clear attribution of sources	Style/ format / analysis / etc	Overall grade
Student 1					
Student 2					
Student X					
Class Average					

(option 2) (also OK) Mini-Surveys of training participants before and at end of 4-5 day training sessions. CAII could use a small questionnaire about professional journalism knowledge of the participants – before and after the training -- to crudely measure some of the lessons learned. The end of the training survey could also include questions asking the respondents for their opinions about the usefulness of the training sessions.

(Other, earlier comments from MK, below – nothing new)

- Giving CAII flexibility to include a few commercial radio professionals in this training is a good idea – with details/numbers to be worked out as program proceeds.
- As CAII rewords this curriculum, they should be able to find an interesting, constructive, and professional balance among differing facts and interpretations. For example, instead of requesting two negative examples under each civic ed topic, the instructor could invite one POSITIVE example (where local authorities did something well) and one NEGATIVE example (where things went wrong) For the negative cases, there should also be discussion why things went badly – and how to find constructive solutions
- As one option, the four-day training could begin with the Journalism module on Day 1.
- In subsequent days dealing sequentially with the 12 civic ed topics, the participants could experiment with different journalistic approaches (straight reporting, interviews, in-studio discussion with officials, experts and/or citizens, call-in talk show, out-of-studio formats, etc). to address each topic.

- Much will depend upon the quality of the trainers -- and the animation the trainees -- who, as community radio journalists, may prove to be quite active as discussants.
- If the quality of instructors is high (perhaps CAII could provide some quick adult training instruction for the trainers if needed), then minimalist curriculum planning may suffice.
- However, it would be better to have a better developed civic ed curriculum, and to treat the civic ed topics in diverse ways in order to make the 4-day training more interesting and useful for the participants. For example ...
- Some modules might be logically condensed into a unified half-day discussion, such as police + justice; elections + parties; or transparency + corruption.
- Special speakers could be invited to add to the discussions -- a lawyer, representative from NDI, NGO representatives, a Transparency International specialist if available, etc.
- Given as many as 40 participants, small group discussions and break-out activities are probably essential. Potentially, several break-out groups could compete with each other to see who develops the most original approach to a particular civic ed topic.
- Because there will be 3 (or maybe 4?) civic ed training sessions over a period of several months, the CAII training team will become something of a "road show" -- steadily accumulating experience as it moves from one region to the next. Improvements along the way will be possible.
- A USAID representative -- perhaps Sharon with your knowledge of Creole and adult training knowledge? -- might attend the first session, and make helpful suggestions for future improvements.
- Is it possible or desirable to expand to a 5 day training format? A curriculum addressing civic journalism plus 12 civic ed topics is a tall order for 4 days.

D. Procurement and Installation of Radio Station Equipment:

- The technical training of staff at stations receiving equipment is very sensible. The work plan may need to specify in more detail what kinds of training, and at what costs. Creative Associates home office can help fill in details.
- Possible Uses of 100 Radio/Cassette Recorders: CSO Outreach + M&E: CAII's distribution of 100 portable cassette recorders could help create useful *linkages* among community radio stations and their audiences, including local civil society organizations (CSOs). In addition to extending CRS programming to audiences beyond the stations' signal range, the distribution of portable recorders could also facilitate other positive results such as: (a) keeping oral &/or written listener logs for each portable unit as a running record of the CRS's recorded listenership and listener reactions to the CRS programs. Each radio station would effectively collect direct audience feedback to its recorded broadcasts; (b) the results from recorder logs could be tabulated in useful ways for CAII's M&E to get a broad sampling of audience reactions (positive, so-so, or negative) from remote regions to the Civic Education series or other programs; (c) CRS could easily use the portable recorders to create networks of local amateur correspondents or stringers to record discussions and stories in remote settlements in their localities; (d) portable recorders could be lent or granted to the most active local CSOs, allowing CSO members to listen regularly to CRS programs and encouraging CSO activists to submit stories or announcements for airing on the local CRS; and (e) portable recorders could go to activists or CSOs working with other USAID-supported health, food or JDG programs to facilitate media coverage or support for that activity.

- Administration of the Cassette Players by Community Radio Stations: CAII has a full plate of tasks already, so my suggestion is that CAII distribute the portable recorders based on a simple competition among the community radio stations and/or other USAID projects. Each station (or other USAID partners) could nominate several candidates to receive the recorders, including brief plans how they proposed to use the recorders. Alternatively, stations might retain ownership of the portable recorders, but circulate the recorders among different CSOs or stringers. CAII could award the initial batches of recorders to those stations with the best proposals, and (subsequently) award further recorders to those stations which begin to make the most effective use of the recorders.
- Possible added benefits: M&E: The recorder distribution/use plan sketched above could greatly assist CAII with M&E. CAII could create awards or incentives to those stations which provide the most regular and detailed recorder log reports. Stations would learn that demonstration of results can assist self-sustainability, by helping the stations document to public officials and other potential donors the efficacy of their community-oriented radio activities. Participatory Evaluation: Involving the stations and activists in measuring results may also help create a sense of ownership and accomplishment in the station's local community or zone of broadcasting (*See the paper I left with Moha, titled "Communication for Social Change" by Figueras, Kincaid, Rani, and Lewis*). While measuring results, the activists witness first-hand the results of their activities.
- Radio reporting festivals/competitions to encourage improved civic journalism and community reporting: CAII could institute competitions or radio festivals among stations – perhaps starting with the planned conference of CRS next spring. Community radio professionals (and amateur activists) would have a chance to hear, discuss and compare the best – and the less than best – radio stringer and CSO activity reports from throughout Haiti. These listening and discussion events would also contribute to the professional development and sense of journalistic community among radio station professionals in different departments.
- More than 100 recorders? If these ideas work well, the program could be expanded at relatively low cost.
- M&E:

Sample Log Sheet for portable recorder "X" circulated by Station "Y"
(assumes at least one literate person is present)
(fictitious answers – just for example)

User of Recorder: Youth Group in Village "Z"

Date/Time: April 1, 2003, 8-10 PM

Activity: Group listened to and discussed Episode 12 of CAII Series on Civic Action

Number of listeners/participants: 15

Participant Reactions:

Episode was useful	8
Not useful	4
No opinion	3

Most interesting Comments *(transcribe from taped discussion by group):*

Any suggestions by participants for a local civic action that might be attempted?
Most participants said they did not have enough time and energy to become active in local community life, but 3-4 expressed interest in starting an activity group to deal with problem of helping to reduce narcotics abuse in their village.

E. Fund Raising Training for Community Radio Operators:

The CAII assessment showed that community radio stations were often less developed, and less self-sustaining, than earlier CRS assisters might have hoped. As sustainability-related training evolves, and CAII comes to know the stations' finances more intimately, I would hope that CAII could produce a short study with deeper analysis about what techniques worked (or didn't work) in earlier efforts in the 1990s to assist these stations. Why in the period before RAMEK did only 15 (out of up to 75) community radio stations attain some degree of self-sustained operation? What were the challenges and/or less effective practices that resulted in the failure of many stations? And what are the best practices by CRS which can increase their chances of achieving self-sustainability.

M&E: CAII might track a number of elements relating to the institutional development and financial self-sustainability of community radio stations, including (for example) the station's diversity of funding sources, whether or not the station has a business plan and marketing or advertising department, or other criteria that CAII might suggest:

Sample M&E Matrix: Economic self-sustainability of community radio stations:
(CAII may identify markers better suited to Haitian conditions!)

	Business plan in 02	Business plan in 03	marketing or ad dept in 02	marketing or ad dept in 03	# of funding sources, 02	# of funding sources, 03
Station 1	no	yes	no	no	2	3
Station 2	no	no	no	no	3	4
Station 3	yes	yes	no	yes	3	4
Station X	no	yes	no	no	2	3
Average Station	25%	75%	0%	25%	2.5	3.5

F. Advocacy Training for Journalist Associations:

- I'd suggest conducting the bulk of this training in year 3, or possibly starting late in Year 2. Once the community radio program activity is further underway, RAMEK will be perceived as a more serious local partner and enjoy greater savvy about local journalistic conditions. RAMEK's increased experience during Year 2 should create more leverage for its initiatives and more incentives for AJH, FHJ, and/or other media-related organizations to cooperate in joint activities.
- Training could encompass not simply advocacy training; but also broader training for civic journalism and for institutional development of media industry and professional organizations.
- M&E Plan for Advocacy Training: Let's wait a bit, and create detailed M&E plan only after a more specific training curriculum is determined.
- Mid-Career Training Institute?: Although very far beyond CAII's scope of work, USAID/Haiti, CAII, PD, other donors and potential local/Haitian partners might tentatively explore how to create a mid career journalism training institute. Haiti appears to need such a permanent training institution – and efforts to build a new journalism training institute would also help serve as a fulcrum for building a broader sense of community among Haitian media professionals.
- During November tdy, I'll try to start a rough draft concept memo about Year 3 advocacy and other professional association options -- it being understood this memo need to be revised as I/we gain more detailed knowledge about the receptivity of the Haitian media community to CAII initiatives.

G. Information Management and Logistical Support:

- Some M&E recommendations above might be used in CAII semi-annual and final reports.
- Logistical support: When VIPs visit -- and CAII provides logistical support -- RAMEK participants might be able to get some useful professional experience return. For example, radio journalists might welcome opportunity to interview visiting Congressmen, high level diplomats or USAID officials ... as a story for their community station. (But a Warning: RAMEK participants, if they've been well trained, may ask some tough questions --which would be a good thing)

Media

Journalists during colonial times enjoyed substantial press freedoms, which expanded briefly during the early years of independence. But the three decades of authoritarianism (1960s – 1980s) deeply undermined Patronia's earlier traditions of media independence and journalistic professionalism. Authoritarian elites established control over all printing houses and broadcast stations, placing cronies in the key editorial and executive positions.

The initial years of democratic transition witnessed an exhilarating liberalization of media. Government reformists eased editorial oversight of state-owned radio and TV. Newspapers were privatized; private radio and TV stations also appeared; and the quality of journalism improved in the early 1990s. Led by a generation of venerable sixty-something media professionals, who revived the pre-authoritarian media traditions, the news media enjoyed several heady years of reasonably balanced coverage of current events laced with lurid exposes of the crimes and corruption of the authoritarian period. Newspaper circulations (and profits) rose to record levels as titillated readers perused shocking revelations from the past.

Regretfully, the media's progress of the early 1990s stalled by mid decade. Professionalism among most younger journalists and editors remains weak – a problem that worsened as the pre-1960s generation of senior editors largely retired by 2000. "Paid journalism" is growing: poorly paid reporters increasingly accept under-the-table cash to write slanted PR "news" stories for corrupt politicians and businessmen. Shady business interests are buying media properties to use them as vehicles for partisan politics, corporate lobbying, sensationalism, and tawdry entertainment (to get quick profits). Corruption and oligarchy characterize media advertising markets. State authorities and broadcasters have reacted defensively, leading to an increased application of libel laws and media content regulations that remained unamended since the authoritarian period. Meanwhile, many minority Ys and Zs feel that heavy X ownership of the media has led to a growing prevalence of X-language broadcast and print media, thereby crowding out minority languages, values, and views points – and increasingly offending minority cultural sensitivities.

Reputable newspapers, radio and TV stations have struggled to maintain their market shares. Recently a small coalition of media-sector CSOs approached the Embassy Public Affairs Officer (PAO) with an unsolicited proposal to stem the troubling decline in Patronia's journalistic standards. PA supports a successful partnership between Patronia State University's Journalism Department (PSUJD) and Middle America College (MAC). PSUJD and its Alumni Association are members of the loose reformist media coalition, allied also with the still state-dominated Journalists' Union and a small NGO called the Press Defense Fund. None of these organizations has much experience in implementing Western donor grant programs. PAO is impressed by the coalition proposal, but lacks any extra PA funding – so she approached USAID and is very open to working cooperatively with the Mission.

USAID/Patronia has never before attempted a media assistance program. The Mission Director remains skeptical about working in this delicate, new area ... and requests more information about the proposers' ability to handle a grant (and also about other media sector options) to be convinced that launching a new media program is a good idea.

World Learning Fellowship: Mark Koenig
Fifth Semester / Final Report: October 2000 through June 15, 2003,
with detailed reporting for final semester (December 1, 2002 to June 15, 2003)

I. Professional Goals & General Description of Fellowship to Date

This report draws some general conclusions from the entire 2 3/4th year period of my World Learning Fellowship, but concentrates primarily on the final semester from 12/01/02 to 6/15/03. The closing period proved to be quite distinctive because my fellowship work focused so heavily on developing independent media strategies for the Middle Eastern region, especially Egypt, while also involving some inter-related planning and preparation for my transition to a new contractual-employment status within USAID.

The focus on the Middle East was not at all anticipated by my initial fellowship work plan when it was drafted three years ago, but obviously 9-11 redirected much USG foreign assistance activity (including the work of several World Learning democracy fellows) to Arab and Islamic countries. In fact, the Middle East prior to 2001 represented the only region of the world largely untouched by USAID independent media activities (although some programs had been tried). Arab countries will likely pose many similar media development challenges as found in other regions of USAID work, addressing professional journalism training needs, media business development, legal reforms, and media-sector association building as found in such contexts as post-socialist or post-authoritarian transitions in Africa, Eurasia, Asia and Latin America. But the Arab region will pose additional special challenges, beyond a full array of d/g and independent media development problems present elsewhere, including: distinctive Islamic traditions, political sensitivities, and regional conflicts. Responding to these challenges and sensitivities in the initial design stages of independent media strategies for Egypt, Iraq, and other Islamic countries thus required much of my attention during the final semester of the fellowship.

As noted in the 3rd Semester report, I began working on a prospective journalism training program for Egypt in the spring, 2002, but much of the detailed follow-on work for Egypt took place in the final semester, including my longest tdy of the fellowship (See Egypt in Section IV). Elsewhere in the Middle East / Eurasia region, I also provided some technical advice for a soon-to-be-launched Internews media law and journalism training initiative in six countries of the Middle East / North Africa, wrote a short concept paper for developing independent media in Iraq, and conducted initial information gathering to begin design of follow-on media programs in Afghanistan after mid 2004 when the USAID Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) completes its media program. Support work for at least two Middle East media activities (Egyptian journalism training and the Internews 6-country program) will dovetail to some extent into my new status at the USAID DCHA Office of Democracy and Governance (D/G) as a CASU, which will include work as a CTO (cognizant technical officer) for these two activities.

In terms of my immediate and long-term professional development, the World Learning democracy fellowship provided a very positive experience: I significantly broadened my professional development experience beyond my earlier mainly Russia-focused background to become more familiar with many other developing or transitional regions and countries (directly during long-term

TDYs to Egypt, Haiti, and Belarus; but also in the course of providing "virtual support" to missions in post-Soviet Central Asia, Middle East, Latin America and Africa).

II. Fellowship Objectives / Research

In December-January, I completed my contributions to the Introductory and Russia chapters of the USAID PPC report on media development assistance.

During these nearly three years, I've expanded my research file system for media developments in perhaps fifty countries throughout the world where USAID or other donors work (or may work) in the media and d/g sectors, so I will be better positioned to become engaged in specific media or general democracy development work in those countries. I wrote numerous short analytic papers, and reviewed for comment many other USAID studies for publications. The single aspect of the democracy fellowship where I was slower to engage than expected was the drafting of a major guidebook or study about the media development sector as a whole. In part, this change in plans occurred because PPC jumped in to conduct its own major study -- and I spent considerable time providing support to that PPC undertaking. Also, I made a judgment call that it would be useful to gain further global experience before drafting a major comparative manuscript or guidebook for media assistance. In effect, the World Learning fellowship research and travel experience will position me well for writing more serious manuscripts (or collaborative efforts) during the next few years in my new capacity as a CASU Senior Advisor for Independent Media Development.

III. Performance Methods, Activities, Outcomes, and Impact

Partners Conference Panel on "Media in Islamic Societies": (December 6, 2002): I drafted the thematic framework and helped to organize a successful panel discussion about media industry conditions in the Middle East, and how, potentially, USAID and other international donors might provide assistance to develop independent professional media in these countries. James Clad of PPC moderated a panel consisting of Middle East specialist Jon Alterman, German Marshal fellow with journalism experience in Turkey (Mustafa Malik), and a managing editor from the newly launched USG-funded Middle Eastern radio network, *Radio Sawa*.

PPC Conference on USAID Media Assistance Experience, May 13, 2003: I participated actively in an in-house PPC conference attended by 30 USAID D/G colleagues together with several media consultants and representatives from several media assistance organizations (IREX, Internews, ICFJ, Soros Foundation). The daylong conference discussed a recent PPC report, which reviews USAID's media development experiences during the past two decades. The meeting participants devoted particular attention to how to apply best practices from the PPC report -- and how to make other needed adaptations -- to provide effective assistance under Middle Eastern media industry conditions.

Tuesday Group Presentation, June 11, 2003: I summarized my tdy work in Cairo for start-up of a new journalism training program and initial research of other possible media activities in Egypt.

USAID D/G Officer training: (June 23/25, 2003): Even though this training event occurred after the fellowship ended, much of the preparation took place before June 15. Our civil society team provided successful training for 50 (two groups of 25 each) junior D/G officers from USAID Missions throughout the world and from AID/Washington. My role involved presentation of a one hour introduction to media assistance strategies, and I also assisted with breakout group discussions throughout each daylong training event.

IV. Technical Support to Missions:

Egypt: From January 31 to April 11, I conducted my longest ever (ten week) tdy to USAID/Egypt primarily to provide detailed design and administrative preparations for a soon-to-be-launched Journalism and Media Manager (Training) Program (JMMP), but also to explore other media sector program options for Egypt. Beginning next autumn, JMMP will be implemented jointly by the Egyptian Press Syndicate, Ahrām Regional Press Institute, Internews, and the Western Kentucky University (WKU) Journalism Department to provide 10 weeks of intensive US-based journalism training to 50 Egyptian media professionals (for three successive groups of 16-18 journalists during the next academic year).

In support of JMMP, I performed the following tasks:

- Consultations with Egyptian partner (or potential partner) organizations, including the Press Syndicate, Ahrām Regional Press Institute, and Journalism Department faculty from University of Cairo, University of Alexandria, and October 6th University.
- Individual consultations with other donors, plus two donor forum meetings, that included the UK, Danish, Dutch, and Swedish embassies, UNDP, World Bank and European Union. Multilateralism in media sector assistance should contribute importantly to the quality, professionalism and credibility of these activities in Egypt – and in neighboring countries.
- Coordination with the U.S. Embassy, especially Public Affairs.
- Technical support to work out some travel and visa procedures for Egyptian participants, program and budget refinements, paperwork for GOE approvals, etc.
- Drafted a position description for new FSN (Foreign Service National, i.e., Egyptian) USAID Mission employee to oversee new media activities.

In addition, I also:

- reviewed other USAID/Egypt programs which earlier or currently include(d) media components – to identify possible program synergies with new media initiatives. Most promising areas of USAID assistance included: children's television, economic and business reporting, and possibly health-related media campaigns.
- explored other media sector assistance options, and drafted a concept paper which outlined possible work in the broadcast sector – both at the national as well as local levels; and
- monitored the English language press in Egypt and – to a lesser extent – Egyptian state television broadcasts. Because my tdy coincided with the periods of the final UN debates on Iraq and the ensuing war in Iraq, much of my attention was also devoted to gauging Egyptian public and media sentiments vis-à-vis the war and how this affected the possibilities for USAID development work with potentially sensitive areas of journalism and the media.

Iraq: During the first two weeks of June (and the final two weeks of the fellowship), I became quickly enlisted in planning efforts to design d/g programs for post-Saddam Iraq. My piece of the puzzle was to draft a brief concept memo outlining a strategy for developing independent media in Iraq during the next 5 years. I had meetings with members of the USAID Iraq assistance team, received initial report by USAID/OTI implementing organizations returning recently from Iraq, and met a delegation of European Community representatives who are also exploring prospective EC d/g programs in Iraq.

Afghanistan: In early 2004, the USAID Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) will complete its initial/transitional program to begin developing independent newspapers and radio stations in Afghanistan. In June, 2004, administration of these programs will transfer to the USAID Mission in Kabul, so in the past several months I began gathering information and had consultations with OTI to prepare for planning USAID Mission follow-on programs for the Afghan media.

V. General Observations and Results following this nearly three year fellowship:

For me professionally, the World Learning fellowship at the Office of Democracy and Governance (DCHA/DG) proved to be a very positive professional learning experience, which involved interesting work and exposed me to a very broad array of: developing and transitional country contexts; experienced development officers worldwide from USAID and other donors; and media professionals from throughout the world. The fellowship enabled me to continue building an expanding complex network of professional contacts. The work experience and professional exposure under the fellowship should help me provide improved USAID officer training presentations and also improve my own technical assistance work in the d/g and media sectors – staying with USAID as a CASU in the immediate future, yet potentially in moving to other positions in future years.

In terms of service to the sponsoring organization (USAID), I am hopeful that my work helped move USAID d/g and media programs at DCHA/DG (and perhaps also the work of other donors) in some of the following directions:

- Greater awareness by USAID and other donors of the critical importance of professional, independent media for achieving other d/g and development goals, including better governance, reduced corruption, enhanced economic growth prospects, improved citizen knowledge about health, environment, legal, and many other important public issues. The above themes were publicized by a major international media assistance workshop co-hosted by the World Bank and by USAID/DCHA/DG in Paris in February, 2002; and by two smaller donor workshops in Washington, DC, in the autumn, 2001.
- Greater attention by USAID and other donors to the importance of improved media laws and support for developing an Enabling Environment for a Free and Independent Media (also the title of a booklet published by Oxford University in 2002 with assistance from USAID/DCHA/DG).

- Better coordination of media assistance with other bilateral and multilateral donors, including, specifically, the creation of a Media Donor Consultative Group in Cairo.

To the best of my knowledge, my support work for several USAID missions helped improve media programs in the field in several instances. For example:

- Assisted (virtually) USAID/Central Asia Republics with drafting and review of an RFA in 2000-2001. The mission said it was very pleased with the RFA program description; and with the results of the competition.
- Reviewed USAID/Belarus media programs in detail in the Spring, 2002, and made program recommendations.
- The USAID/Haiti community radio program got more seriously underway after the completion of my two short tdys in Port-au-Prince in the Autumn, 2002. I assisted with improving contractor/Mission program communications, recommended a measurement and evaluation plan, made improvements in the program description; and addressed other issues.
- For USAID/Russia, I assisted with a difficult transition in its print media program; provided technical support for the PPC chapter describing the 10 year experience of the USAID/Russia media program, and made over time various program recommendations. Recently, for example, USAID approved a grant program that included some ideas from a concept paper I drafted at the mission last August -- for regional media development initiatives. These recommendations, and the grant activity, are serving as follow-on to the Mission supported Russian-American Media Entrepreneur Dialogue (RAMED) in 2001-2003.
- Technical assistance for Middle East media activities is described above.

Finally, I would note that the World Learning program encouraged a very useful professional comraderie and ongoing exchange of information among the Democracy Fellows co-located in the D/G center -- and (especially in my case) with Caryn Wilde at USAID/Russia. I was often comparing notes or consulting with other fellows regarding such issues as: NGO/civil society development (with Caryn Wilde, Carol Sahley and Kimberly); Middle East issues (Keith Schulz); and elections/campaign finance/media issues (Gene Ward). Obviously, this sharing of professional experience will continue in my new capacity as a CASU/Democracy Fellow alumnus.

World Learning Democracy Fellowship
Quarterly Report (September – November 2002)

Corbin B. Lyday, Ph.D. *CB*
Office of Democracy & Governance
USAID/DCHA

Professional Goals

Over the past decade, democratic breakthroughs in the former communist world, southern Africa and Latin America have helped re-focus attention not only to democracy, but to the fundamental processes of nation- and state-building. Related to this process is simultaneous move by democracy practitioners to develop stronger results frameworks for democracy assistance programs. USAID's Office of Democracy and Governance has played a key part in leading the move away from a static, input-oriented approach toward democracy-building toward a more results-oriented framework. Through its country and emerging sub-sectoral studies, critical lessons about the democratization process are beginning to emerge from the recent experience of developing and transition states.

My larger professional goals closely match such recent developments. As senior democracy advisor for the Bureau for Europe and Eurasia, I developed practical expertise to address key issues of timing, sequence and focus within democratization programs. Electoral contestation, representative government, the rule of law, and strong civil society institutions may be necessary, but they are not sufficient to address the next generation of democratic challenges. Ethnic conflict, uncontrolled urbanization, corruption and trafficking in persons were areas I focused to help counter political backsliding in the post-communist region. As I started my fellowship, my hope was to develop more substantive professional and practical expertise to incorporate these issues into democracy-building in other geographic regions as well.

General Description of Fellowship to Date

Mongolia Tour of Duty (TDY). One of my first assignments included participating in a three-person five-year program design for USAID/Mongolia during the month of October. Although Mongolia is off the beaten track, it has received a relatively high degree of per capita USG technical assistance since 1991. That, together with its strong pro-American and pro-reformist political commitments, underscores its importance as a moderate, democratically-oriented Central Asian state. USAID has had a tightly knit program involving two strategic objectives (SOs), and the program design reinforced this by proposing essentially a joint, cross-sectoral EG/DG approach whenever feasible for the next five years. I produced the first draft of the Mission's strategic objective flowchart, and strongly pushed the team to think of objectives that would link the larger political and economic objectives of development

together. Designing programs from such a perspective is still far from accepted practice at USAID, but examples such as these, despite Mongolia's small size, may prove illustrative of how to create cross-sectoral programs in other countries and regions. It also helps to place USAID at the crosshairs of development issues that other donors and financial institutions frequently pass by.

DG Officers Advanced Course Planning and Design. As part of its December 2002 annual DG training course, two fellows were asked to co-facilitate an advanced course entitled "Strategies for Overcoming Bad Governance: The Case of Clientelism and Patronage Regimes." Paul Nuti and I helped shape the basic research design, offered suggestions to the researchers to guide their paper and presentation, and developed an agenda and companion toolkit for participants to use to help diagnose the extent of patronage within a given country.

Fellowship Objectives

Originally, I planned four major activities to be undertaken in conjunction with the DG Office in descending order of importance: (1) SORA research; (2) cross-sectoral development; (3) performance monitoring; and (4) personal research. In reality, both the objectives and the mix among them has been overridden by the exigencies of the DCHA/DG re-organization.

SORA. Only at the December 2002 Partners Conference did Office Director Jerry Hyman lay out his fundamental vision for how SORA should proceed. The months of September-November, therefore, were marked by fundamental uncertainties within both the Strategies and SORA teams as they recognized the absence of a basic methodological continuum within the country case studies, and therefore, no consensus for them to continue without more specific guidance. By December, the DG office hopes to define that agenda both publicly and privately, and the future boundaries of SORA research have had to wait until then. One SORA presentation, however, did stand out: a presentation for Jay Ulfelder, the Technical Manager of the State Failure Task Force entitled "Modeling the Fate of Partial Democracies," presented at an informal 'tuesday group' gathering of agency democracy practitioners. The presentation underscored what may end up being USAID's biggest challenge: evidence that foreign aid is most effective only at preventing states from backsliding into failure, but not very effective at all in promoting states to "graduate" toward higher tiers. This presentation will influence SORA's research agency as we begin to investigate the 'why' aspects of the research presented by others.

Cross-Sectoral Linkages. Despite seminal work done within USAID on this issue in past years, I was struck by how little on-going research or encouragement for cross-sectoral research, strategic design and programming

there actually is. There is as yet no formal mechanism linking the DG Center to EGAT or any other centers that could explore such linkages, and it is becoming clear that DG must take the initiative for this to take place. Even within the DG Center, the prevalence of stove-piping, team isolation and bureaucratic turf is much stronger than I realized it would be. I believe that the results of the patronage course as well as the Mongolia program design can help build the foundation for DG to begin to take a stronger initiative in promoting cross-sectoral thinking and strategic design.

Performance Monitoring. Due to re-organization, internal disagreements over SORA and its implications, and the long TDY overseas, performance monitoring has hardly emerged as a theme for my fellowship. The study on patronage shows that USAID may be far too focused on indicator development with regard to formalized institutions, and far too unfocused on informal institutions and behaviors. Part of a serious approach to the development and refinement of indicators then, would be to take a step backward to try to correct the imbalance between the two.

Personal Research. Developing the patronage seminar has neatly coincided with the expansion of my own proposed research agenda that focuses on continuing my professional interest in corruption as obstacles to international development. Working on the training course has reinforced my sense that some of the most interesting challenges facing USAID are those where the divisions between public and private sector are poor at best, and where cronyism acts as an ordering device in societies otherwise too dysfunctional to strengthen and prosper. 'Political fatigue' and short-lived reform efforts are actually the effects of patronage politics and my research hopes to bring out this causal argument more strongly.

One area not contemplated in the workplan involved the role of country backstopping. As Director Hyman sees it, DG country backstopping needs to be expanded and developed. In November, the ANE team developed its formal backstop list, and I was named backstop for **Lebanon, Morocco and Mongolia**. Strategic programming meetings for Morocco started immediately in November, and I was personally requested by USAID/Morocco Mission Director Jim Bednar to come to Morocco to design a strategic objective. Tentative plans are for a three-person Morocco DG strategic design to take place in the last three weeks of February.

Performance Methods and Activities

Trip Report: Mongolia Strategy Assistance Team: Recommendations for New Five Year Strategy, FY 04 -FY 08 (attached).

A Patronage Toolkit and Cheat Sheet: two handouts to be given participants at the DG Advanced Training Course in December (attached).

Outcomes and Impact

By creating a five-year program design for a USAID field mission with strong, overlapping, cross-sectoral EG/DG linkages, I have helped to create an example where theory actually meets practice, and supported internal agency arguments for 'bigger picture' analyses that try to program outside of narrow bureaucratic turf. It is far too early to say whether this approach will develop its own momentum, but I am committed to using my fellowship as a tool for such advocacy with the new mission director and the head of the strategies team.

Proposed Revisions to Program Description

Given the uncertainties with SORA so far, it is unclear where the first sectoral and subsequent country case studies will take place, let alone intersect. It is also clear that country backstop duties may end up displacing indicator development, at least for the short-run. The patronage issue will continue to grow, and is already beginning to encompass some of the recent research undertaken at the World Bank to develop governance indicators for the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). The fact that two of my backstopping countries, Morocco and Mongolia, have been singled out as likely MCC countries may involve a much stronger focus governance indicators, and might compel research in the direction of linking informal patronage institutions together with more formal governance ones in a larger framework. These are some of the issue that I hope to tackle during the second quarter.

Travel

I anticipate a TDY to Morocco for the second quarter of my fellowship (February-March 2003), and possibly a first country test case study for a patronage assessment in May-June (possibly Guyana).

**Mongolia Strategy Assistance Team:
Recommendations to USAID/Mongolia for
New Five Year Strategy (FY 04 – FY 08)**

I. Introduction

Mongolia still suffers from many familiar problems associated during the timeframe of the previous strategy from FY 1998 -2003: foundations for democracy not firmly in place; economy inefficient with low investment levels; economy vulnerable to economic shocks; poor communications and transport networks; and environmental degradation.² These problems are broad, long-term themes, which will likely persist into the new strategy period.

Since the strategy was written, Mongolia has experienced several years of slow growth, partly as a result of harsh winters, or *dzuds*, low export commodity prices, and the international downturn. In 2001, GDP grew by only 1.4%. The private sector, however, continues to grow at double-digit rates. The successful transfer of state-owned enterprises into private hands, the entry of new businesses, growing markets for tourism and mining, and a boom (or possible bubble) in the construction industry mark a continuing consolidation toward a market economy. Roughly 80% of the economy is now in the private sector.

Lurking under the surface, however, are prospects for slower private sector growth: businesses continue to face barriers from the public sector, privatization has mostly been completed (with the exception of Most Valued Companies), a recent credit boom may turn into a "bust," and there are growing concerns about the budgetary situation due to civil service pay rises. A worsening fiscal situation may provoke unravelling of the IMF Poverty Reduction Growth Facility (PRGF) agreement and possibly a more unstable monetary situation. Economic decline in rural areas has prompted migration to peri-urban areas and jeopardized achievements in social indicators.

On the political front, Mongolia's situation is not looking too bright. In addition to one party dominance by the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (MPP), Mongolia faces a serious governance challenge. Implementation of laws is a growing problem. Parliament quickly passes laws with little public consultation, resulting in frequent amendments, changes, and instability in legislation. The judicial system is weak and underdeveloped. Corruption, accountability, and lack of transparency are increasingly being cited as problems.

¹ Formally presented to USAID/Mongolia in Ulaanbaatar, October 25, 2002, for discussion and review by USAID/Washington Mongolia Strategy Team: Rebecca Cohn (ANE), Team Leader; Corbin Lyday (DCHA), Jennifer Tikka (ANE) and Fred Witthans (EGAT).

² See Mongolia Internal Assessment: USAID Country Strategic Plan for Mongolia, FY 1998 – FY 2003. April 2002.

II. Strategy Development

Against the above backdrop, the strategy team developed a proposed results framework, drawing on the long-term themes which persist and addressing new developments. In October 2002, a four person team from USAID/W visited Mongolia for two weeks to assist the mission in the development of a new five year sustainable development strategy for FY 2004 – FY 2008. The purpose of the team was to review relevant sectoral analyses, explore the appropriate mix of mission activities, and validate the mission's proposed overall strategic approach.

Following an intensive travel schedule and meetings with key government officials, private sector organizations and individuals, contractors and grantees, NGOs, and other donors, the team has prepared a draft results framework to kickstart the strategy development process.³ The proposed framework validates the mission's current focus in the two areas of economic growth and democracy and governance. Reflecting new political and economic developments, the team also proposes some changes to the strategy, including addressing governance concerns, linking the private sector to the legal and judicial sectors, implementing legal reforms, more strongly encouraging public-private sector dialogue and civil society demand for responsive government, improving transparency and information dissemination, and developing indigenous human capacity.

Rather than a mandate, the draft framework below is a *suggestion* to the mission to highlight possible types of interventions. In recognition of management and budgetary constraints, the results framework prioritizes each intermediate result in order of importance to assist in making strategic choices and eliminating activities beyond the mission's manageable interest. It is highly possible the mission may choose to eliminate certain intermediate results, collapse intermediate results, or make certain themes cross-cutting.

III. Guiding Principles:

- Build on previous USAID investments
- Maximize USAID comparative advantage – can work directly with private sector and civil society
- Be mindful of mission management constraints
- Marry the public and private sectors. Private sector eventually bucks up against public sector constraints.
- Generate greater transparency, accountability, and participation
- Increase indigenous capacity and institutions
- Foster DG and EG linkages
- Link grassroots and policy chain

³ See Annex for list of organizations/individuals consulted.

IV. [Proposed] New Strategic Framework, FY 2004-2008⁴

Strategic Objective for Democracy and Governance (SO)

Strengthen both the Supply and Demand for 'Good Governance' and Accountable Political Institutions;

Intermediate Results (IRs)

IR 1 Comprehensive Legal Reforms Implemented (EG IR 1) [NCSC] *Priority #1*

- Judicial Training, Ethics, Enforcement and Court Management
- Prosecutorial Reform and Strengthening (DG IR 4)
- Commercial Law Application and Development

Rationale: The Government of Mongolia has passed many laws in recent years, but the implementation of these laws has been disappointing. USAID could help improve implementation of legal reforms through judicial and prosecutorial reform and training. A focus on commercial law application and development ensures synergies with private sector issues, such as dispute settlement and enforcement of contracts

Possible mechanism: National Center for State Courts

IR 2 Increased Citizen Demand for Responsive, Transparent and Accountable Government *Priority #2*

- Public Hearings, Citizen 'Watchdog' and Monitoring Strengthening
- Information Transparency and Media Professionalism (EG IR 2 and 4)
- Civic/Voter Education and Indigenous Election Monitoring [IRI]
- Rural Civil Society and Governance Functions Professionalized (Pilot) (EG IR 2) [Gobi]

Rationale: Mongolian officials often make "closed door" decisions and quickly pass laws with little public input. Not surprisingly, laws sometimes turn out to be inappropriate and are therefore repeatedly amended. Citizens complain that they are not properly consulted in this decision-making process. USAID could help private sector actors to organize to demand a more transparent and accountable government.

Possible mechanisms: International Republican Institute. Mercy Corps International (under Gobi).

⁴ Items marked in red are essentially new activities, with linkages between strategic objectives marked in blue. **Bolded brackets** denote an existing or proposed implementor, when known.

IR 3 Greater Political Competition and Party Accountability Fostered *Priority #3*

- Political Party Accountability, Platform Development **[IRI]**
- Electoral Reform Geared toward Longer-Term Political Stability **[IFES]**
- More Transparent Interest Group/Political Party Connections **[IRI, NDI?]**

Rationale: Political competition in Mongolia is increasingly threatened by both a legacy of one-party dominance and stability, ironically caused by the transfer of power from the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (MPRP) to the opposition in 1996, then back again in 2000. After the most recent parliamentary election, the MPRP holds 72 out of 76 seats, despite winning only about 51% of the popular vote. Unlike some other transition states, Mongolia's election laws award winners according to a strict first-past-the-post, take-all system that does little to strengthen political party development and professionalism. USAID could strengthen political professionalism and parliamentary development by encouraging electoral reform, interest group development and party accountability.

Possible mechanisms: International Republican Institute. National Democratic Institute. International Foundation for Election Systems. SUNY University.

IR 4 Parliamentary Oversight, Professionalism and Accountability Strengthened *Priority #4*

- Professional Legal/Economic Expertise/Policy Analysis of key Committees (EG IR 2)
- Oversight Functions vis-à-vis Government and Executive Branch **[SUNY/IRI]**
- Increased Audit/IG functions to Counter Fraud and Misuse of Funds (EG IR 1)
[Treasury IG]

Rationale: The State Great Hural lacks professionalism and many key functions found in a modern parliament, including oversight of the executive branch, expertise in its committees, and transparency and public participation in decision-making. This contributes to several key problems: poorly crafted laws, a lack of checks and balances on the executive branch, and little oversight of budgetary decisions. USAID support to improve oversight functions and audit capacity/IG functions could also help counter the increasing misuse of funds by public officials, particularly those made available through the international donor and development community.

Possible mechanisms: SUNY/IRI (oversight functions), Treasury IG (audit/IG)

Strategic Objective for Economic Growth (SO)

Expand the contribution by selected economic sectors and small/medium enterprises to create new markets to stimulate private sector growth;

Intermediate Results (IRs)

IR 1 Improved Enabling Environment for Private Sector Growth [EPSP]

Priority #1

- More Commercially-Responsive Legal and Regulatory Environment (DG IR 1)
- Stronger Private and Public sector Policy Dialogue and Cooperation **[TCI]**
- Continued Energy Sector Commercialization
- Professional Assistance to Support Remaining MVC Privatization
- Stronger Information and Data Dissemination Among Key Players (DG IR 2)

Rationale: Mongolia's future lies in the private sector. The private sector share in the economy now constitutes 80%. However, further progress is restrained by public sector constraints, from the macroeconomic policy level down to the microeconomic level. Domestic and foreign investors continue to face legal and regulatory barriers to doing business (customs, taxes, inspectors, judicial sector). Energy sector commercialization remains incomplete. The state crowds out the private sector with remaining privatization of MVCs (banking, insurance, oil and gas, cashmere, airlines). In addition, there is a lack of public-private sector dialogue on key economic issues. Transparency and information dissemination over constantly changing laws and regulations is also problematic.

Possible mechanisms: Development Alternatives, Inc. (EPSP), Nathan Associates (TCI)

IR 2 Promotion of Economically Competitive and Environmentally Sustainable Natural Resource-Led Growth (DG IR 2)

Priority #2

- Private Sector Business Development and Professionalism **[Gobi, TCI]**
- Ecologically Sustainable Rural Development Practices
- Eco-Tourism, Travel and Adventure Markets
- Cashmere Production, Processing and Marketing
- Other Processed Animal Product Markets
- Value-Added Rural Market and Small Business Development

Rationale: Mongolia's economy remains reliant on low value products and a few volatile export commodities, such as cashmere, copper, and gold. The challenge in Mongolia is to facilitate broader private sector development, such as higher value-added production, SME creation, and agricultural growth, while simultaneously protecting the natural resource base upon which rural populations derive their livelihoods. USAID could facilitate private sector led growth through work to add value in select sectors such as tourism, cashmere, and animal-related products; SME creation in urban and peri-urban areas; and environmentally sustainable agricultural activities.

Possible mechanisms: Mercy Corps International (Gobi). Nathan Associates (TCI).

IR 3 Strengthen and Expand Financial, Credit, Housing and Accompanying Markets
[EPSP, Gobi]

Priority #3

- Mortgage and Secondary Markets
- Banking and Agricultural Credit Development (DG IR 2)
- Pension Fund Development
- Commercial Insurance
- Lien, Encumbrance, Debt and Commercial Legal Applications (DG IR 1)

Rationale: With interest rates of 3-4% per month, Mongolia's financial markets face many challenges, including a lack of access to affordable credit for small and medium sized borrowers, poor rural finance provision, and a limited mix of financial products, such as mortgages, leasing, insurance, and pension funds. In coordination with other donors (ADB may engage in this area), USAID could help strengthen and expand financial, credit, housing, and accompanying markets.

Possible mechanisms: Development Alternatives Inc. (EPSP). Mercy Corps International (Gobi). Fannie Mae International Housing Finance Services (mortgage markets). International Real Property Foundation (real estate and mortgage markets).

IR 4 Strengthen and Develop Mongolian Indigenous Capacity to Support Private Enterprise and Business Skills Management

Priority #4

- Integration of professional microenterprise (firm level) practices with macroeconomic (policy level) practices
- Business Scholarships and Management Skills Training
- Information Dissemination to Universities, Policy/Professional Institutes (DG IR 2)

Rationale: While Mongolia has a relatively well educated population, the quality and relevance of the education does not meet the needs of a modern market economy. Mongolia lacks relevant skills from the firm level up to the policy level. USAID could help develop indigenous capacity to gain the appropriate education and training to formulate appropriate policy analysis, improve management skills, and to generally operate in the free market. University linkages could also help create higher quality domestic research capacity, e.g., policy/economic analysis, agriculture.

Possible mechanisms: Academy for Educational Development, State Department Public Diplomacy (exchanges).

V. Recommendations

General

- Millennium Challenge Account: Track MCA developments and reserve "space" to prepare Mongolia for part in MCA. The strategy should offer some suggestions of how the money would be used in Mongolia if chosen (e.g., leveraging the private sector).
- Donor coordination and strategic alliances: Look to private/public alliances and strategic alliances with other donors. Ratchet up donor coordination. Strengthen oversight of foreign aid and early alerts to AID/W and others.
- Prioritize interventions: We have prioritized interventions in the SOs. Take it as far as funding allows. Show additional results with additional funding.
- Management: Add management capacity, especially DG PSC.
- Sustainability: Can be addressed through transfer from expatriate to indigenous source of TA and analysis.

Democracy and governance Corbin...help!

- Consider the 'bigger picture' of judicial reform that would encompass the private bar, the procuracy, and (through leveraging the British National Criminal Intelligence Service, the Open Society Institute, GTZ, and other donors), the police. Such a program, although broader focused than judicial reform, is possible due to a small legal community and congruence of key laws (civil/criminal code and procedure, procuracy and judiciary) already passed. Commercial law development and training for both the procuracy and judiciary should form a part of such an approach.
- The IRI program needs to be streamlined, focused, and much more country-sensitive or it risks irrelevance to larger USG objectives. More important than political platforms, messages and spin should be the encouragement of political party accountability, transparency and broader political interest group formation. Domestic election monitoring, public hearings and support of possible electoral reform will also help to professionalize and stabilize Mongolia's political system without risking charges of interference in the country's domestic affairs by one or another political party.
- Governance, as a political 'good' suffers both because of a lack of supply and lack of demand. As long as demand for good governance remains weak, political parties will remain unaccountable and political stability uncertain. Until now, USAID has been focused on the supply side of the equation with little positive results; the challenge will be to craft strategies and programs that will stimulate the 'demand' side of this critical equation. In other transition states, USAID has repeatedly found that its democracy and governance programs were underfunded and insufficiently

focused to have much effect. USAID/Mongolia is encouraged to consider re-balancing its portfolio to emphasize the above political challenges.

Economic growth

- Consider more coordination between individual projects, e.g., EPSP, TCI, and JRP.
- Consider a more proactive economic policy program. Respond to the Prime Minister's requests, but also push forth a policy agenda where pressing reforms are needed.
- Consider implementing the results of the Investor Roadmap or MAPS survey. Build into programs. Microeconomic issues concerning the private sector, including customs, taxes, licensing, access to finance and export markets, information on laws and regulation, and the judiciary, continue to serve as barriers to business growth. Petty corruption and the misinterpretation of laws and regulations within many of these areas is also an issue which could be linked to DG activities.
- Continue work in the energy sector and privatization (e.g., Mongol Daatgal), possibly under the policy program. Assess the degree of appropriate involvement and coordinate with other donors.
- Take the competitiveness initiative forward to the next level, including pushing hard for public and private sector dialogue, working with the entire supply chain in the tourism market (e.g., hotels in UB and other locales, camping equipment, transportation), and consider re-engagement in animal and animal-related products.
- Capacity building: Training from the firm level to the policy level. Develop university linkages/research institutes.
- Consider any additional sector analyses, e.g., energy sector, Arid Land Consortium research on agriculture, water, wheat.
- Consider focus groups of herders and aimag leaders, associations, in developing program.

ANNEX: LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED**National government:**

Roundtable with senior government counterparts on economic development
Roundtable with senior government counterparts on political reform and future priorities
Member of Parliament (Enkhbold)
Minister of Justice
Deputy Minister of Justice (Munkh-Orgil)

State owned enterprises:

Ag Bank
Gobi Cashmere Factory
Darkhan-Selenge Electricity Distribution Co. (S. Gankhuyag)

Provincial "aimag" government:

Governor of Darkhan
Legal representatives from Dalanzagad Governor's Office
Altanbuleg Customs Official
Deputy Governor of Erdenet
Chairman of Dundgobi Aimag, Citizens Representative Hural (Sandagiin Urjin)

Contractors and grantees:

Economic Policy Support Program, DAI (Harry Bauman, Uyanga, Tsolmon Natsag)
Barents Privatization Initiative (Jivko Nenov)
The Competitiveness Initiative, Nathan Associates (Michelle Morgan, Alan Saffery)
Judicial Reform Program, NCSC (Robert La Mont, Charlie Ferrell, Mary Frances Edwards)
International Republican Institute (Jackson Cox, Bayaraa Sanjaasuren)
CHF Small Business Development (Greg Lassiter)
Gobi Initiative (David Dyer, Stevan Buxt, Jargalsaikhan Ser-Od)
XasBank

Donors:

Asian Development Bank (Barry Hitchcock, Darius Teter)
IMF (Michael Martin)
World Bank (Saha Dhevan Meyanathan)

NGOs:

Soros Foundation (Stephen Vance – former Gobi Initiative COP)
The Asia Foundation (Steve Noerper)

Private sector/individuals:

Erdenet Chamber of Commerce Representatives
Mongolian Tourism Association (Ts. Bayarsaikhan, Shagdarsuren Nergui)
Roundtable with private individuals on Mongolian political reform and future priorities
Roundtable with private individuals on Mongolian economic development priorities

Chris Finch (former Soros Country Representative)
Master herder Puntsantsogvoo's breeding cooperative in Tsogt-Ovoo soum
Head of Mandalgov Food Processing Company

A PATRONAGE 'TOOLKIT'

Corbin Lyday, Ph.D.
Paul Nuti
Office of Democracy & Governance
USAID/DCHA

Why a Toolkit, and not Just a Tool?

At the beginning of this section, you were given a Skeleton Diagnostic Tool for analyzing patron-client systems. You then broke into small groups in order to make sense of the diagnostic and say *why* the information was important and worth knowing. Both parts—the *what* and the *why*—are needed for a 'good' governance assessment to work well.

The larger *Patronage Toolkit* presented below attempts to do that by adding 'flesh' to the original skeleton tool to create a basic framework for a governance assessment. *Data* (the answers to the original skeleton diagnostic questions) are augmented by *interpretation* by asking other underlying and supplementary questions that must be answered as well. The goal of both is to generate a central *finding*—a 'take-away point' to help guide programmatic intervention, for each of the six sections. There may be other findings as well—we have tried to pick what we thought made the most sense for each section.

I. CULTURE, SOCIAL RELATIONS AND TRADITION

Finding. *Hidden cultural and historical perceptions of identity, values and tradition are often more insightful than 'open' political and economic institutions in explaining how a society's resources end up being distributed. Societal consensus invariably depends first on questions of identity, allegiance, and loyalty, moving toward formal institutions only afterward.*

Interpretation. *How do cultural [racial, linguistic, religious, clan, ethnic] and historical traditions determine the different ways that dominant and marginal groups vie for and secure access to critical resources, such as education, jobs, economic wealth and other sources of power?*

- *What is meaningful and valued (i.e., what are the imperatives) within social relationships, and how do these things influence access to resources, productive assets, social mobility, and decision-making?*
- *Are primary identities and loyalties largely familial and clan/ethnic-based, or civic/statist? In case of competition, which identities and loyalties get favored, and why?*
- *To what extent does poverty or political instability exacerbate or reduce pre-existing loyalties based on family, clan, ethnic group, or other particular?*

Data

- How extensive are poverty and lack of ownership of or access to productive assets? How stable are incomes?
- What is the degree of social and ethnic heterogeneity? Are there marginalized minorities?
- What is the degree of elite monopolization of economic resources?
- What dependency relations exist between elites and the poor?
- Is there religious or historical legitimation of clientilism?
- Are ethnic or familiar ties important to political and economic decision-making?
- Are social relations primary hierarchical and vertical, or egalitarian and horizontal?

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STATE AND THE ECONOMY

Finding. *The less clear boundaries among public, private and informal institutions are, the less distinct and potent any conception of the "public good" will be. In such societies, the state is more a clientilist distributor of resources and access to power and less an 'honest broker' or advocate of last resort for individual and institutions with competing claims.*

Interpretation. *Does the state play more of a 'broker' role, arbitrating disputes and conflicts among its citizens and institutions, or does it play more of a 'dispensary' role, using laws and institutions to facilitate and apportion access to power?*

- *Is a conception or notion of the 'public good' felt and articulated, and do elites and publics alike share some concept of it, even if they differ about its meaning?*
- *What distinctions, if any, do citizens make among the public sector, private sector and 'third' (not-for-profit) sectors? Do each of the sectors recognize these distinctions as well?*
- *What values/principles or incentive structures has the state established to influence how resources are allocated and disputes settled?*

Data

- To what extent do public agencies operate as legal-rational bureaucracies? What is the proportion of political appointments in the civil service relative to regular career employees?
- How clear are the boundaries between public and private sectors? Do leaders see state institutions mainly as a means for rent-seeking and personal corruption?

- Does the state dominate economic decision-making? How large and important is the public sector in comparison to the private sector, especially the informal sector?
- How scarce or abundant are government resources? What assets are actually or potentially available for patronage?
- Do one or more social/ethnic groups monopolize decision-making? Do policies and programs regularly favor/exclude certain groups?
- How transparent are government regulations and procedures? Do citizens know what services they are entitled to? How accountable are government agencies for the application of regulations and procedures?

III. AGENTS OF RESTRAINT AND ENFORCEMENT

Finding. *Clientelist systems frequently function in near secrecy, with clear rules and regulations known only to insiders, but rarely by outsiders. Yet such systems clearly interact—and frequently—with more formal institutions, to their own advantage. Because the ‘foxes frequently guard the henhouse’ in such situations, options and remedies to break down or undercut clientelist systems may be difficult to discern and harder to implement.*

Interpretation. *What institutional, legal, and organizational systems of checks and balances exist that inhibit (or encourage) clientelist practices, both externally and internally?*

- *Are sanctions applied to those within patron-client networks who violate unspoken contracts and agreements? How visible, both inside and outside the network, are such sanctions?*
- *What constitutes an official abuse of power and how are such abuses redressed or prevented?*
- *Does the state ever rule ‘against’ itself in legal, political or economic disputes? Are such decisions reported and enforced?*
- *Do citizens understand the limits of their rights, responsibilities and entitlements? Does government try to disseminate this information? Are concepts of transparency and information-dissemination even well grasped?*

Data

- Do changes of government take place through open and fair elections? What is the degree of vote buying, coercion or other irregularities?
- Are there alternative political parties, and are they programmatic or personalized? Are there effective community organizations? What other interest groups exist that act or could act as a countervailing power to patron-client networks?

- Do people have a choice among competing patrons or are they locked into monopolistic dependency relationships? To what extent are new patrons emerging or likely to emerge?
- What is the relative balance of power among the executive, judicial and legislative branches of government?
- What other institutional and legal checks and balances exist that inhibit clientelist practices? Ombudsmen? Secret ballots? Others?

IV. ACTORS AND ACTIONS

Finding. *Understanding the patterns of participation and non-participation in clientilism—who the stakeholders and outsiders are, why they participate/don't participate in it, and how well the system delivers—is essential for identifying prospective programmatic entry points.*

Interpretation. *Who takes part in and who is left out of patron-client networks?*

- *How are the interests of citizens, groups and constituencies aggregated, communicated into the public domain, and reconciled or negotiated?*
- *What are the principal motivations for participants in a patron-client network? Put differently, what do individuals, communities, and businesses get out of participating in one?*
- *How do patron-client networks treat different groups (ethnic, religious, linguistic, clan, socio-economic classes) in different ways?*

Data

- How prevalent are favors and special considerations for constituents? How widely are patronage jobs and contracts distributed? Who is appointed?
- What is the frequency of demands for bribes and kickbacks in return for service delivery?
- Are there particular sectors that exhibit high degrees of clientelistic practices?
- What is the distribution of public goods and services? Do many people/groups have a chance of being assisted by government? Who is left behind?
- Who are the patrons? Intermediaries? How personalized are patronage relationships? Direct to national leaders? Mediated by political parties, by ethnic or religious groups, or by lower-level administrative officials?
- What constituencies exist for reforms? Where are they located (state, civil society, private sector)? Are they mobilized (what actions will they take to support or oppose change?)

V. APPARENT FUNCTIONS AND RECIPROCITY

Finding. Participation in client-patron systems creates both positive and negative effects, neither of which is generally well understood by those who participate in them.

Interpretation. What resources/material benefits do patrons and clients receive, and how efficient is the patron-client system at distributing them?

- How good is the patron-client system at distributing the goods and favors it promises within an established network? Would those promised, but not receiving goods, be likely to turn outside the network for them, or do deeper loyalties prevent defection?
- If ordinary people do not wish to participate in a patronage network, what options exist for them to secure basic resources/material benefits and service delivery?
- What price—economic, social or political—do those who refuse to participate in patronage systems pay? Is the price sufficient to deter those within the network from defecting?
- In what ways is it possible to link the operation of patron-client networks with the prevailing notion or conception of the “public good?”

Data

- How much do clients give up in these relationships, and what do they get in return?
- For patrons, are the economic impacts of clientilism and patronage perceived as substantial or marginal?
- Are the resources channeled through clientilistic networks consumed or invested? Are they employed locally or transferred abroad? If consumed, is this in the form of quasi-public goods (political pork) or mainly individual favors?
- What is the perceived impact of clientilism on private investment, both domestic and foreign?
- Are the current levels of patron-client relations accepted as tolerable or is there widespread outrage?
- Have the current levels and patterns of clientilism led to social/ethnic tensions and unrest, cynicism and political apathy?

VI LATENT FUNCTIONS AND HIDDEN OUTCOMES

Finding. Patronage has less visible costs and benefits as well. It can help glue a deeply unstable society together, even as it sows the seeds of its future destabilization. It can rob a country of innovation, yet simultaneously answer deeper societal needs for stability, order and predictability.

Interpretation. What are the unseen costs and benefits of a patron-client system to a given society?

- *Do ordinary citizens feel that clientilism is a deep political and economic drain, a regrettable but necessary price for survival and doing business or even a positive trickle-down economic and political system that ultimately benefits the poor?*
- *To what extent do patron/client networks generate or rob the country of innovation, imagination, and independent thinking?*
- *Do patronage networks encourage or discourage a winner-take-all mentality? Do they help secure access to power and influence for those who would otherwise not be likely to have them?*

Data

- Are there hidden or unintended social benefits of patron-client networks? For example, is clientilism an essential social safety valve? A means of integrating new groups into the larger society? A way to co-opt elites?
- Do the recipients of patronage do their job regardless of how or why they got it?
- Does clientilism compromise core state functions? For instance, is the central bank politicized? Is clientilism so bad that a technocratic elite has not emerged within the civil service?
- How large is the *net* cost of clientilism to society as a whole? To poor people in particular?
- Are these relationships breaking down or evolving? If so, what is replacing them?

ADDRESSING PATRONAGE IN TECHNICAL PROGRAMS A "Cheat Sheet" for DG Practitioners

Corbin Lyday, DGHA/DG

As the preceding discussions and Toolkit indicate, finding a strategy to address patronage in a meaningful way can be challenging indeed. But an explicit focus on patron-client systems contains the following benefits, which greatly add to the quality of DG programs and have important implications for cross-sectoral linkages with economic growth, health, education and other sectors. As the Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith paper mentions, they include:

An Expanded Awareness of the Role of Culture in Governance Systems

- ◆ We have a better understanding of how culture, social relations and traditions influence state-society interactions, institutions and economic choices;
- ◆ We understand that patron-client systems have useful and functional characteristics of *reciprocity* and *saliency*, which helps explain their persistence over many years;

A Better Understanding of When Intervention is Worth the Cost

- ◆ We have a much more precise way of distinguishing between patronage practices that are clearly illegal or dysfunctional, and other activities that do not necessarily undermine the rule of law, property rights or deter investment;
- ◆ We are more realistic about possibilities for rapid political and economic change, and clarify our own roles as encouragers, not providers, of good practices and institutions which will mitigate the effects of clientilism;

An Increased Focus Within DG and other Portfolios

- ◆ We can target interventions much more specifically on sectors, behaviors, practices and social groups;
- ◆ We can adjust interventions to take into account backlash and the unintended consequences of change;

Four Broad Strategic Approaches to Clientilism in DG Programs

Each of the above can then be used to help formulate four approaches toward mitigating clientilism. Some of these have been used in varying degrees by donors as part of an anti-corruption program. The success or failure of each depends to a large degree on timing, sequencing, country background and fine-tuning issues raised above, and each contains advantages as well as disadvantages. The following is a 'cheat sheet' designed to summarize and answer some of the more basic issues arising from each.

I. CONTAINMENT

Primum Non Nocere ("Do No Harm"). Beginning with a democracy practitioner's version of the Hippocratic oath makes sense, especially when we immerse ourselves into unknown territory. A bad situation can easily be made worse by clumsy, misguided or unsustainable efforts at rapid change. Avoiding intervention in certain situations where resources might actually provide fuel to patron-client systems is the first rule-of-thumb. A perfect example can be found in *highly predatory, rentier or failed states*, such as **Sierra Leone**. In countries like these, the

political and administrative systems are so completely compromised that assistance to them can only become compromised as well. Whether one can even address patronage in such countries is questionable at best.

Post-Conflict States. Rebuilding functional governance systems in countries only just emerging from conflict is a task fraught with just such possibilities. A strong donor presence brought into a country during post-conflict reconciliation efforts may inadvertently restore a patronage system broken during the conflict process (Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff 2002). *Containment* of patronage in this case would imply that donors do nothing to help a single group monopolize the reconstruction process or obtain the resources necessary to do so.

Insufficient Information. A containment approach may be appropriate in situations where insufficient information exists to support other interventions requiring additional assessment and analysis, such as the kind envisioned in the Toolkit. In such cases, there may well be relatively benign clientelist practices operating amid pernicious ones, but too little about both known to help distinguish between them.

Advantages. In deeply corrupted, violent societies where client-patron networks exercise retribution on defectors it is both critical not to endanger counterparts or to give comfort and assistance to those networks.

Disadvantages. Limiting contact with corrupt government institutions that must, at the very least, permit NGOs to exist, can be difficult and may still involve unintended risks.

II. INFORMATION DISSEMINATION AND CIVIC EDUCATION

Publicizing Corruption's Costs. A second strategy centers on *information dissemination* aimed at attitudinal change, involving media, education organizations and NGOs. The theory behind such such programs is that if people understand the frequently hidden costs of corruption patron-client systems generate, they will be less likely to participate in them. This has been one of USAID's principal anti-corruption strategies so far.

Advantages. If programs at expanding awareness of the costs of clientilism can be coordinated with programs to target improvement in *specific* governance areas, chances for success rise appreciably. However, the way such programs are introduced into society is as important as their content, perhaps more so (see below). To be effective, such programs must lead to an *institutionalization of mechanisms* through which citizens can press for their rights undistorted by patron-client relationships. Programs must systematically, rather than haphazardly, introduce new perspectives, values, and beliefs into societies with entrenched behavior patterns and give them the right *incentives* for engaging in new behavior.

Disadvantages. Crash campaigns and sloganeering, especially in countries with long histories of such approaches to enforce public morality (such as the post-communist world), are frequently useless and can even backfire. One of the unintended consequences of such campaigns supported by USAID, such as in **Bulgaria**, was rising dissatisfaction with a reformist government that spoke much about corruption, but did little to stop it. Journalist training alone is insufficient, for example, if not followed by visible improvements in governance, active prosecution of law-breakers, etc.

Assumptions? All too frequently, we assume that when governments are corrupt, NGOs are somehow ethical. But clientilism is a society-wide practice corrupting not simply the state, but societies and NGOs as well. Safeguards must be built in to programs to speak to clientelist behavior within non-governmental and informal sectors as well.

III. ISLANDS OF INTEGRITY

Jump-Starting: Reform by Example. This strategy focuses on promoting reform within a few key agencies and public institutions *already committed to it in principle* in a 'bandwagon' theory of social change (when a few lead, others will follow for fear of being left behind). One example frequently used here is the participatory budget process in **Brazil**. The model has already spread to many cities, influencing decision-making structures at the state level. The key lies in *carefully* choosing entities to work (autonomous governmental agencies, ombudsmen, special investigatory bodies, advocacy and watchdog groups) to establish transparent practices, set ethical standards, and raise the bar for governance performance generally lacking in developing countries. This offers a quiet way to mobilize inside constituencies for reform and against clientelism when 'noisier' methods would likely be counterproductive by inviting strong backlash.

Local Government. A similar approach to the same issue involves strengthening decentralization and democratic local governance (DLG) efforts to break up 'triangles of accommodation' (national-level bureaucrats, crony party politicians, and local bosses) where they disadvantage the poor. A critical aspect of DLG involves:

- (a) institutionalizing the representation of marginalized groups on local councils and other 'first-level' governing bodies;
- (b) strengthening the efforts of such groups to express themselves and mobilize political pressure toward less clientilistic ends; and then
- (c) using that influence to change the pattern of service distribution toward more egalitarian and less clientilistic patterns.

Results So Far. USAID's experience shows that the above approach to DLG is mixed, particularly when patron-client relationships have a long history (**Philippines, Karnataka** state in India). Without strong, co-operative integrated programs incorporating political party development, media attention and civil society development, such approaches can easily be derailed.

Clarification of Local Roles. One larger, less explored question with regard to DLG concerns the extent of local elections and fiscal autonomy. Façade democracies frequently hold regular, contested elections at national levels, but local politics tends to be more clientilistic, with elections less contested, and fiscal control hazier. A critical 'first step' for DLG efforts against patronage involves clarifying national v. local budgetary authority and taxation.

Advantages. With regard to DLG, since clientelist systems reinforce clan and ethnic affiliations, a DLG strategy focused on co-operation *across* clan and ethnic lines can both impact the larger political environment as well as help break up clan networks. At a national level, enlisting a 'bandwagon' approach to reform can help generate strong incentives for change from within, and modify the burden of proof from reform efforts toward existing clientelist behaviors.

Disadvantages. Donors have frequently made poor strategic and tactical choices with regard to predicting the behavior of institutions. In **Georgia**, using the judiciary to spark systemic reform throughout the larger legal system was derailed through the government's own unwillingness to pay the costs of reform in the belief that donors would pick up the tab for it. In addition, on both national and local levels, this strategy may involve making strategic choices of *which* organizations to funnel reform efforts through—choosing one over the other in an environment marked by high levels of mutual suspicion may inadvertently create winners and losers and new political agendas.

IV. ALTERNATIVES TO PATRONAGE

Generating Other Competitive Nodes of Power. This strategy uses changes in electoral law, administrative procedure or other windows of opportunity to back emergent political parties or civil organizations that will act as countervailing forces against entrenched patron-client networks. (Such an electoral change might include reforms that allow voting for individuals rather than established party slates, for example, thus reducing the legal ability of established patronage networks). Generating issues-oriented platforms for new parties may help to counter the influence of established patronage-based parties. The **Uttar Pradesh** case exemplifies this strategy, where one party is trying to create more transparent agricultural marketing services for small farmers. Another such party has helped create participatory municipal budgeting in **Brazil**. A DG strategy to help ensure that such parties are well-positioned to solve problems and delivery services is one that also counters the influence of patronage networks.

Advantages. If patronage stems largely from monopoly, then a strategy designed to break up a monopoly by offering participants alternatives undermines the very concept of patronage. This option stands the greatest chance of being self-sustainable provided that the organizations involved can carry on this work by themselves once technical assistance has been delivered.

Disadvantages. Alternative modes of power are not immune to patronage and cronyism themselves and can easily be corrupted by outside funds. If amounts and assistance are excessive, or if political sensitivities arising from association with the U.S. Government are high, assistance may deligitimize those very groups in the eyes of others in society.

**World Learning Democracy Fellowship
Quarterly Report (December 2002 – February 2003)**

**Corbin B. Lyday, Ph.D.
Office of Democracy & Governance
USAID/DCHA**

Professional Goals

As I started my fellowship, my hope was to develop more substantive professional and practical expertise learned from working on transition issues in Europe & Eurasia and translate that experience into other geographic regions. In so doing, I hoped to supplement knowledge of democratization interventions by the Office of Democracy and Governance (the DG Office) by. Those original goals have not changed since the inception of the fellowship, but they have had to be increasingly tailored not only to USAID organizational limitations, but also to new unexpected travel restrictions imposed by the looming war in Iraq.

Description of the Fellowship to Date

Continuation of First Quarter Events: Mongolia. Designing a DG program for USAID/Mongolia during the month of October 2002 was my first comprehensive assignment for the DG Office. After producing a draft strategic objective flowchart, USAID/Mongolia's mission director returned to Washington in February seeking comments and revisions. In that discussion, much of my original design linking political and economic objectives together in a more systematic fashion was kept. However, rather than expand programming, USAID/Mongolia has had to rescale its designs based on the strong likelihood that existing programs would have to be cut, given Mongolia's inclusion on the Millenium Challenge Account (MCA). Ironically, this has hurt USAID's programs even as it confers no real benefits, as yet, to Mongolia. I worked during this time with USAID/Mongolia and CDIE to justify an even stronger focus on the Rule of Law sub-objectives given these new budgetary realities. But the inclusion of Mongolia as a likely designation for MCA spending places the country in an unusual and not necessarily advantageous position. Many observers feel that if MCA is spent through cash transfers, rather than in the form of development programs or grants, it will only deter, rather than reward, any serious anti-corruption initiatives coming from government or civil society. The Mongolia experience may be a harbinger of the still largely unexplored issues associated with the MCA.

Stand-Alone 'Patronage Toolkit.' After formulating a *Patronage Toolkit* for the DG Officer Advanced Training in December 2002, Paul Nuti and I continue to develop a stand-alone publication on patronage, one that should serve several different functions. We envision the Toolkit as forming part of a formal DG assessment, becoming the basis for an informal sector-based review, and being used to develop new program concepts or to assist a mission in the writing of an annual report. We have been drafting this

document, and scheduled a power point presentation to the larger DG office Tuesday Group in April.

On-Going Discussions with USAID/Kenya. Toward this end, I begun a dialogue with USAID/Kenya to develop this in the context of the new Kibaki Government which came to power in December 2002 on a strong anti-patronage and anti-corruption political agenda. The mission, however, is experiencing potentially dramatic cutbacks in funding and plans have been interrupted by the threat of Middle Eastern war and the ambassador's decision to curtail all travel to East Africa. In the meantime, I have responded to USAID/Kenya requests for a resource base of consultants to help the Government to develop modern income and assets disclosure laws. Together with Gene Ward, who has been compiling a DG publication on this issue, World Learning fellows were instrumental in supplying the mission with what it needed in very short order (Attachment A).

Continuing Fellowship Objectives

Originally, I planned four major activities to be undertaken in conjunction with the DG Office Strategy Team in descending order of importance: (1) SORA research; (2) cross-sectoral development; (3) performance monitoring; and (4) personal research. In reality, both the objectives and the mix among them has been overridden by the exigencies of the DCHA/DG re-organization.

SORA/MIDAS Tasks. The research agenda for SORA (which has tentatively been renamed *MIDAS—Monitoring the Impact of Democracy Assistance*) is unfolding slowly. Paul Nuti and I drafted a new goal and objective statement for the research, which was then vetted before the Strategy Team and subsequently approved by the DG senior staff (Attachment B). In February, at the Strategy Team portfolio review for the Office Director and Deputy Director, division chief Margaret Sarles announced that both Bruce Kay and I would be the technical leaders for the office's research efforts. (As a fellow, I cannot have CTO responsibilities so these must be given to Bruce.) I prodded the Team to rename SORA given that the term has no meaning outside the DG office. Despite some criticism that the new name might conjure images of pots of money—MIDAS has been tentatively selected. (As a myth describing how a fool discovered the difficult path to wisdom, I feel the name could not be more appropriate to the effort.) In the third quarter, Bruce and I will create a short-term contract for outside methodologists to review DG's approach so far in the country and sector studies—to ask whether it is congruent with the new Statement and if not, how we might alter the approach and future research.

One problematic aspect of the new research involves data collection for the last two years. With the ending of the formal R4 review process and the collection of program information by program code, there is no established way of retrieving basic expense and obligation information from missions since FY2001. We are working on ways in which this might be done more easily and

systematically, but I suspect we will be forced to ask each mission to compile this information on a case-by-case basis. (The Strategies Team hopes soon to prepare a short 'wish list' of necessary information to be collected from missions to see just how much we are spending on DG by category and subfield.)

TDYs. I was asked by USAID/Morocco's Mission Director in January to participate in a DG assessment scheduled for March. Eventually, the mission made the decision to bring in an all French-speaking team for the assessment and Wendy Marshall (DG) was asked to participate in my stead. But this decision was only communicated to me through third parties, and I felt it showed a certain weakness surrounding the Washington-based Fellows. Paul and I have both raised the issue of whether our work is sufficiently communicated by the rest of the Team to field missions, but answers have been inconclusive. In general, there is no formal introduction of Fellows to the field, and our relationships with missions have been informal, ad hoc and occasionally disorganized. The advent of war has made this even more problematic. USAID/Morocco ultimately decided to isolate the DG team in Rabat, and DG finally decided it was not worth participating in.

Other Goals. By placing patronage firmly under the office's research agenda, I hope to link (1) and (4) of my own goals more systematically. But as with travel, I am discovering that there is little visible support by the office for formal cross-sectoral analyses and assessment. How to work around that remains problematic.

Outcomes and Impact

As SORA/MIDAS has slowly regrouped, the opportunity to make quick impact has diminished, at least temporarily. There is much less support for 'bigger picture' analyses within DG than I once imagined, and the wheels of the bureaucracy make progress difficult to discern. By the third quarter, I hope the MIDAS agenda becomes clearer and my responsibilities in them more specific. By then, some of the travel restrictions will also hopefully have lessened. If not, making progress on patronage research, designing program linkages, and sharpening field-based assessments will face new difficulties.

Expected New Research Areas

Despite difficulties, new MIDAS research priorities are already emerging. Some of them include:

- (a) analysis of the recent Rule of Law/Administration of Justice Achievement Study undertaken by MSI for DG, published in November 2002;
- (b) a review of all existing USAID DG-related evaluations and assessments with the goal of compiling them into some kind of focused database (there is currently none);
- (c) a possible role for USAID/DG as it contemplates the development of governance indicators to support the Millenium Challenge Account;
- (d) a sector-based patronage analysis, most likely surrounding political party development.

Still unanswered by the Team are the direction of future country case studies, if any, and common methodological approaches for sub-sectoral studies. This is still the most important work MIDAS would do, and it must be returned to quickly. I am hopeful these issues will begin to clarify more systematically during the third quarter.

**World Learning Democracy Fellowship
Third Quarterly Report (March 2003 – May 2003)**

**Corbin B. Lyday, Ph.D.
Office of Democracy & Governance, USAID
Strategic Planning and Research Division
USAID/DCHA**

Professional Goals

My original goal to develop more substantive professional and practical expertise in democracy/governance issues and translate that to specific programs more globally was the original goal of the fellowship. During the third quarter, these goals got a definite boost with the supportive atmosphere surrounding a formal presentation to the DG Center and other interested parties on patronage and clientelism work, and the specific opportunity to translate that research into practical application in at least one USAID mission. The support of Margaret Sarles, the supervisor for the Strategic Planning and Research Division, was critical in that development. In addition, I had the opportunity to advance my own professional reputation outside the confines of a USAID program through my governance course for a major human rights institution.

Fellowship to Date

Tuesday Group Presentation. On April 22, Paul Nuti and I formally presented a summary of on-going patronage and clientelism research in a power point presentation and discussion before the 'Tuesday Group,' a regular DG forum open to the DG Office and those interested in DG issues from other offices. Over 45 people showed up, making it one of the largest attended fora for such discussions, according to DG's Information Unit, which organizes the group meetings. Paul and I made use of some of the latest studies and thinking on the relationships among clientelism, political party development and economic growth in our presentation and made the case for why we believed this issue now merited such attention (Attachment A).

The interest generated by the presentation, together with the questions, discussions and comments that followed, exceeded our expectations of interest and support. There was wide general consensus that this issue is one whose 'time has come' and deserving of more formal study and incorporation by the DG office. Jerry Hyman, the DG Office Director, attended the presentation and stayed 45 minutes overtime to participate in the informal discussions surrounding these topics, and afterwards complimented both of us for a job well done. (Jerry is not known for effusive flattery, so we both took his comment as justifiably rare praise.)

The discussions and research on this have crystallized for me that the weakest link in USAID's programmatic responses to patronage is its political party development programs. The implementers of these programs (the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and the International Republican Institute) have had remarkably

little to say about patronage in their programs. For its part, USAID has failed to spur them to research this issue or think critically how to promote contestation and interest group agglomeration in environments dominated by cronyism and clientelism.

Continuation of the Stand-Alone 'Patronage Toolkit.' The April presentation spurred new edits and changes to the *Patronage Toolkit* developed at the DG Officer Advanced Training in December 2002. Our thinking that this toolkit should both serve as a component of a formal DG assessment in-country as well as a stand-alone document has increased. While Paul has been developing his own version of this as part of his fellowship obligation, I have focused on trying to make it the beginning of a larger DG User's Guide on clientelism that could be adapted, with minimum changes, to a given country and mission.

USAID/Tanzania: A Patronage Case Study? Shortly after the presentation, the opportunity to test the patronage research arose in a short TDY to Tanzania to participate in the mission's initial concept paper discussions for an ambitious new ten-year strategy. I saw this as an opportunity both to help the mission conceptualize its goals more politically as well as to lobby it to support the research Paul and I had been engaged in for the past 6 months. The Mission agreed to the Patronage Toolkit being used as part of the formal once in five-year DG assessment for Tanzania (scheduled to take place in July.)

interessanti → Why Tanzania? Tanzania offers a rich tableau for the study of political clientelism because of the country's strong socialist legacy and its past role in diffusing ethnic and tribal politics. Alone in sub-Saharan Africa, political appeals to ethnicity and tribalism simply do not work in post-Nyerere Tanzania, where a new nation-state—cemented by the universal adoption of the Kiswahili language—have changed African politics for good. Ironically, this has meant that clientelist politics has flourished in the recent ten-year history of limited electoral contestation and democratization (as the only type of 'sanctioned' politics). We believe the upcoming July assessment—in adopting the Patronage Toolkit—will be able to steer potential programs toward civil society strengthening, improving legislative performance and publicizing state corruption in a much more focused fashion as a result of this component.

Raoul Wallenberg Institute for Human Rights and International Law Short Course on Corruption and Governance. The week immediately following my TDY to Dar es Salaam, I was invited by the Wallenberg Institute in Lund, Sweden to give a series of presentations and seminars to employees, international students, program officers and staff on incorporating governance into an international human rights perspective. My TDY also included outside speaking engagements at the University of Malmo Law Faculty and the Department for Peace and Conflict Studies which were attended by the US Embassy Public Affairs Officer from Stockholm, where I was asked very specific questions about USAID activities and policies in Afghanistan and Iraq, among other things. The questions about US policy were hard-hitting and direct, in contrast to the questions on corruption and governance. The Institute is only beginning to consider

corruption as a human rights issue, and has not yet formulated ways of approaching the issue from a programmatic standpoint. Informally, I was told that the program officers considered my presentation to be one of the more effective capacity training opportunities they had had in recent years.

SORA: Framing the Problem for SSRC. Work on SORA abruptly changed focus during the third quarter, with a strategic decision by the Division Chief to sub-contract much of the work framing the definition of impact and attribution. I participated in early discussions with the National Science Foundation on how best this might be done; eventually the decision was made to use a sole-sourced mechanism to hire researchers recommended directly by the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). I drafted the initial scope of work for the researchers, who have now been chosen and will help DG to define and chart its future work regarding impact and attribution. At this point, the formal SORA team has essentially disbanded, with the understanding that work has passed to the SSRC.

Country Case Study Synthesis. During this time, the second draft of the long-awaited six-country synthesis was finally completed by the contractor (Management Systems International) and presented to the DG Center for comment. I launched an intranet website where the former SORA team and other staff could post comments to the synthesis, and discuss where we go formally from it. The consensus was fairly widespread that the synthesis did not meet expectations of either performance or analysis, and the larger question of whether the country case studies themselves are ultimately useful or important remains on the table. At some point, it is anticipated that the SSRC will tackle this issue, among others, in its larger discussion of how DG should approach its larger research portfolio.

USAID/Mongolia: Presentation of New Five-Year Strategic Objectives. During May, USAID/Mongolia made its formal presentation, based in part on my analysis and summaries during the first quarter. Due to budget cuts, the Mission had decided to curtail more ambitious DG programs, and after some discussion, all sides (the ANE Bureau, USAID/Mongolia, DCHA/DG and EGAT) agreed to the new five-year country strategy (2003-2008).

Continuing Fellowship Objectives

By the third quarter, my four major activities (SORA research, cross-sectoral development, performance monitoring, and research into patronage and clientelism) had all undergone extensive change and amendment. In reality, both the objectives and the mix among them have been overridden by the exigencies of the DCHA/DG re-organization. The last (patronage and clientelism research) has now moved into front and center, as the possibilities for crafting a working tool to be woven into many potential DG assessments emerge. I have initially offered to teach a segment of the Advanced Training in December 2003 on qualitative indicators (which was just recently published) and I am now working with Pat Fn'Piere and other members of the governance team on cross-sectoral indicators. In essence, SORA has almost disappeared as a major component of

my work—what SORA work there is now limited to providing a backstop to the work of the outsourced SSRC teams. That team has already begun reviewing the 300+ assessments already compiled by the Information Unit to see if they have any interesting evidence at all about impact and attribution.

Upcoming Work (DG Trends Analysis). Paul and I also briefly prepared an outline for a potential future DG trends analysis, which would documents not only budgetary and programmatic tendencies over the past few years, but try to summarize the most cutting edge issues related to democracy research and direction for the next few years. The hope is that the DG Center will be a repository not only for basic information about programs, budgets, directions, and issues, but also serve as the agency's think tank for determining what future programmatic and policy directions might look like. Some interesting new research by Marina Ottoway (*Democracy Challenged: The Rise of Semi-Authoritarianism*) and Fahreed Zakharia (*Illiberal Democracies*) presents the issue of democratization in decidedly multi-dimensional and darker terms than it has so far been presented, and we hope to use some of that on-going research to ask policy questions and propose responses.

New TDY? Upon return from Tanzania and Sweden, I was asked by the head of the DG Office in USAID/Caucasus to participate in a 2-3 week governance and human trafficking assessment. Georgia has recently been notified by the State Department that it has fallen from a Tier II (making significant progress on meeting minimum anti-trafficking standards) to Tier III (not making progress and not meeting minimum standards). Yet there is little understanding of the scope of the problem, the ability of state and non-state actors to respond to it, and how it relates (or does not) to the growing problem of gender-based domestic violence. The assessment (currently scheduled for August) is to measure the ability of state and non-state actors to respond to what is perceived as a growing threat to democratic stability and the rule of law.

Outcomes and Impact: Expected Research

The ability to weave a new component into the DG Assessment process has major implications and is already a real achievement. During the fourth quarter, the details of how this process will unfold in Tanzania (and presumably for other countries and missions) will be clearer. I will consider my fellowship successful if I can point to a new type of democracy research incorporated into all future DG assessments and approaches that ultimately help strengthen new and existing DG programs in transition and developing countries.

**World Learning Democracy Fellowship
Fourth Quarterly Report (June 2003 – August 2003)**

**Corbin B. Lyday, Ph.D.
Office of Democracy & Governance, USAID
Strategic Planning and Research Division
USAID/DCHA**

Professional Goals

Gaining additional practical expertise and applying new research to global democratization issues and programs remains the primary purpose of my fellowship to date. By the fourth quarter of my first-year fellowship, the contours of that research and expertise have become clearer. The agency's interest in the politics of patronage and clientelism has emerged as my principal niche, displacing the original plan for the Sectoral Operational Research Agenda (SORA), the continuation of country case studies and accompanying synthesis reports. The fourth quarter was dominated by preparations for the Tanzania DG Assessment in July, and the accompanying new clientelist lens for that analysis, and the subsequent follow-up with USAID/Tanzania on recommendations for new program activities, and a subsequent Tuesday Group presentation on the team's findings.

Fellowship to Date

Strategy Team DG Assessment Training. In June, the strategy team conducted its introductory democracy training to overseas officers, with two direct-hire employees doing the bulk of the presentations. In fact, the role of both Democracy Fellows was minimal, mostly that of small group discussion leaders. The highlight of the course was a case study of a recent DG assessment of Honduras. The conclusions focused on the competitive gridlock the two major political parties have managed to create and sustain over many years in the country. In essence, the analysis relied on a clientelist lens to derive its conclusions. The course reinforced my strong sense that the key to understanding clientelist politics lay in a careful examining of party politics in a given country, and influenced my preparations for the Tanzania democracy assessment in July.

Tanzania DG Assessment: A Clientelist Lens. A six-person team ended up dividing into three groups over three weeks, traveling in all to Dar es Salaam, Zanzibar, Arusha (north), Dodoma and Iringa (south). In Dodoma, the entire team met with members of Parliament and senior government officials and advisors for three days. A broad sense of dissatisfaction on the part of a party-dominated parliamentary system increasingly in competition with an aloof and non-transparent government and executive branch began to emerge. A formal institutional analysis would likely have stopped at the line separating the official (and unofficial) separation of powers between the legislative and executive branches of the country. But underlying the contest over power was another picture: that of a potential split within the ruling party itself--the Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM)---that already dominates both branches of power. Younger, more

articulate members of the ruling party have increasingly little patience for the increasing resistance to democratization and pluralism the older, more established party institutions show. In that, the country mirrors the political evolution of other socialist states in transition, almost all of which were marked by disaffection, walkouts and ultimately the collapse of the ruling party itself.

Party Politics in a Multiparty Authoritarian State. Tanzania is not Hungary, however. It does not border prosperous democracies eager to embrace new transition states with military and economic alliances. Domestically, even as the ruling party and government continue to make halting and controlled steps toward greater pluralism, it seems also clear that the prestige and predominance of the ruling party may actually be increasing. The new constitutional commitment to multipartyism in 1995 has given it the legitimacy it has lacked for two generations, and its past regional access, agricultural base and professional roots are simply no match for those few opposition groups currently vying for power. The party retains substantial political, economic and social control.

A History of Controlled Patronage. Typical of one-party socialist states, the CCM in Tanzania periodically re-centralized power and authority from 1963 onward, rotating appointments for regional and district commissioners throughout the country precisely to prevent the emergence of regionally-based patron-client loyalties that have always been a trademark of political life in places like Latin America. And even when multipartyism was formally blessed in 1995, strict laws against regionally- or confessionally-based political parties were enacted, following the history of *ujamaa* socialism under former President Nyerere. While the strongest opposition party, the Civic United Front (CUF), is sometimes accused of catering to Islamic separatists on Zanzibar today, the proportion of Muslim leaders of CCM is probably even greater than that of CUF, further 'heterogenizing' political loyalties in a country whose population is fairly evenly split between Muslim and Christian.

An Absence of Effective Appeals to Tribal Politics. This intolerance for ethnic, tribal or confessionally-based political life has implications for a study of political clientelism in the country. Stability and order were purchased in exchange for the suppression of pluralism, and regional, tribal and confessional politics equally. Tanzania stands relatively alone throughout most of sub-Saharan Africa in that appeals to ethnicity and religion simply do not carry weight in political life. Clientelism has thus been limited both by past discipline, as well as by current poverty. Unlike Kenya, where a distinct middle class is clear, Tanzania's socialist legacy has inhibited the development of a powerful urban class and its politics retains a strong anti-urban, anti-intellectual, agrarian bent.

The Tradeoff: Clientelism v. Authoritarianism? The future is far from clear. With even a weak, but continued democratization, the growth of regionally-based politics---and the informal clientelist elements of payback, reciprocity, vote-buying and bribery that go with it---seems inevitable. But the Party is under strong internal pressure to revisit the reform process, control its

own corruption and stem dissent. The Party may try to abolish its own party primary system in the name of curbing corruption. A dilemma is emerging: on one level, democratization enables alternative voices to be heard at increasingly lower levels of governance; on another, it also increases opportunities for the kinds of regional political kleptocracies that have undone other sub-Saharan African societies. Exploring this trade-off will be the focal point of the second year of my fellowship.

Other Patronage? The Role of the Donors. The assessment revealed another source of clientelism, however, one with even more serious implications for USAID and USG policy more broadly. Already 45% of Tanzania's budget (and that of many other sub-Saharan states) is paid for through 'basket funding' supplied largely by the British, Scandinavians and the Dutch. Little thought and research is going into the effects such large foreign disbursements have on the demand for good governance from within, however. A new kind of patron-client relationship is emerging, involving reciprocity between the Government and the donors, but not between the Government and its own people. In return for minimum accountability to the international community, the donors will increasingly subsidize basic health and education costs in the budget. The arrangement is fairly stable, and shows promise of becoming even stronger, with the additional \$40-100 million in FY2004 funds USAID/Tanzania is expected to receive from President Bush' new AIDS funding. An explosion in opportunities for new types of clientelism, a grey and black market in anti-retrovirals, and the larger skewing of supply and demand for public sector have simply not been studied.

Programmatic Implications? It remains too early to state whether this kind of clientelist lens has really helped a USAID overseas mission to sharpen its programs. It may actually expose the dangers in existing programs in other sectors, like health, where there has not been much political analysis. In the DG sector, the team's recommendations focused almost entirely on the few parliamentary tools available to spotlight the growing need for village-level accountability of the executive branch and the growing articulation of the executive-legislative contest for power. Another recommendation---instituting random public expenditure reviews at village or district levels may do a great deal to strengthen relationships both between end-users and local authorities and limit the ability for local executive graft.

Informally, however, the message I left behind with USAID/Tanzania was the necessity to focus more long-term on the larger electoral landscape, perhaps by acting to promote the voice of local NGOs calling for the introduction of non-partisan elections (currently illegal under the overly strong Westminster-style party system), constitutional reforms and stronger moves toward a federal structure, which the country currently lacks. In the long-run, such structural reforms, combined with economic growth, could be the most important element in actually pluralizing the country within legal and institutional bounds.

More problematically, I came away with a strong sense that the utility of a clientelist tool in democracy assessments is directly proportional to the quality of the technical team in place. USAID/Tanzania specifically hired a 'patronage consultant' whose doctoral dissertation and 20 years in the country focused on the politics of land reform, and who brought attention to the local government reform effort. Within the team, however, his initial assessment of the extent of the clientelist overlay differed sharply from that of another expert---a local Tanzanian political scientist. One of the weaknesses of the tool then, as for the larger democracy assessment process goes, is that a USAID research team coming from outside is ill-equipped to capture the dynamics of much informal politics in a 2-3 week assessment process.

Nonetheless, as Office Director Jerry Hyman has pointed out in an article lambasting an oversimplified critique of USAID, "[o]ur problem is to find ways of addressing [issues like corruption and patronage] without being paralyzed by the complexity that [they] impose on us....The alternative, once again, is to be paralyzed by complexity."¹ Despite objections that the resulting snapshot is too simple, I believe that even a snapshot of these informal but critical political behaviors carries both analytical and programmatic value that will eventually translate to better programs.

SORA. As the Social Science Research Council started to author the methodology to help gauge the impact of democracy programs, my role in SORA receded to the background. A draft paper formally presented to the Democratization Advisory Panel in August convened by USAID laid out some of the main issues surrounding multi-method testing the SSRC has recommended. I attended the presentation, and found the SSRC to have fairly accurately identified the key flaws and obstacles before the DG Office. Yet the SORA team found deep flaws with the menu of options recommended, believing finally that it would not help answer fundamental questions about sequencing, sectoral strategies and 'proof' of program effectiveness.

Transfer to AFR Team. At the end of the fourth quarter, I requested that I be formally transferred from the ANE backstop team to the AFR one. Both personal dynamics as well as the direction of current research seemed to make this a better direction for me. Margaret Sarles, the Division Chief, accepted this, and I plan to join the Africa backstop team formally in the second year of my fellowship.

Annual Report Summary

In many respects, my work with the Democracy Office has been challenging, exciting, and I have been fortunate to be given wide latitude in the formulation and development of research topics, and I continue to enjoy the professional respect of my colleagues. In other respects, working with USAID is also a source of frustration. A distinct hierarchy keeps non-direct hires in relatively subordinate or supporting roles, with responsibilities stove-piped in much the same way as the larger Democracy Office

¹ Gerald Hyman, "Tilting at Straw Men," *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (July 2002), 31.

is. Ironically, the Strategies Team sometimes fails to elucidate clearly understood and articulated goals and interim benchmarks for itself---an unusual position for a strategically-oriented team. The work on clientelism has also been somewhat isolating and similarly stove-piped, a feature I hope to remedy during the second year of my fellowship by drawing more involvement, support and buy-ins from the governance, elections and civil society teams into the further development of the clientelist issue.

DEMOCRACY FELLOWSHIP PROGRESS REPORT #1
September – November 2002

PROFESSIONAL GOALS

As stated in my initial Program Description, I envision a post-fellowship professional track that allows me to serve as a foreign affairs policy analyst, legislative/public affairs specialist, or advisor on democratic development. Ideally, I would serve on Capitol Hill for a congressional committee with a foreign affairs or foreign assistance/appropriations portfolio or in the office of an individual Member of Congress with a strong interest in global policy, or even on the campaign staff of a congressional or presidential candidate seeking to develop a foreign affairs platform. A special interest that I have continued to develop during the last few years is speechwriting, particularly on subjects related to democracy assistance. I would expect speechwriting to be a key area of responsibility for me in any post-fellowship professional position I assume. Finally, I foresee civic education in my future. At some point, I hope to work with young people – in both formal and informal settings – on possibilities for democratic participation.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

The first quarter of my Democracy Fellowship has helped me crystallize the professional goals described above, particularly the speechwriting dimension. I have developed a much deeper appreciation for the innate power in the 'language' of democracy and for its potential effectiveness in communicating compelling foreign assistance messages to the public. In addition, the Fellowship has been instrumental thus far in mapping out the interplay between lessons learned from democracy assistance initiatives in the field and decision-making and/or policy development within the DG Office at USAID.

More generally, the Fellowship – with the Strategic Planning and Research Division of the DG Office – has proceeded in a manner consistent with the initial Program Description, with only a few minor adjustments. To review briefly, my Fellowship was to be built around two principal areas of work: 1) the sectoral operations research agenda (SORA); and 2) advancement of a new applied research agenda on patronage and clientelism in emerging democracies. It is these two areas that have indeed been the focal points of my work thus far. Other areas of work outlined in my Program description – such as country backstopping and participation on DG assessment teams – have been slower to develop. Details on progress made in these areas of work follow in the "Objectives" sections of the report.

The Fellowship has been highlighted by a number of "backdrop" issues that have in one way or another shaped the quality, pace, and content of the experience. First, the entire first quarter of the Fellowship was spent without the security clearance required to work full-time at the USAID office. This situation made it challenging to establish a consistent work pattern and stay abreast of office events/discussions connected to my emerging responsibilities. It also disallowed access to the USAID telephone and computer systems, thereby limiting my ability to stay in the communications loop. Second, the DG Office anticipated a leadership change during the reporting period, resulting in a somewhat "unsettled" work environment. A consequence of this was that the priorities of the office were not entirely clear and it was at times difficult to know where to turn for guidance and direction, particularly with regard to carving out my niche as a Fellow. And third, I may not have been as prepared to navigate (let alone manage) a federal bureaucracy as I would like to have been. Having spent my entire professional life in the NGO sector, learning how to do this has been and continues to be a significant dimension of the Fellowship. Further, a thorough orientation to the DG Office – how it works, what other USAID bureaus/offices it works with, etc. – may have been helpful in this regard. In short, these three issues were constant backdrops that influenced the overall experience of being a Fellow.

FELLOWSHIP OBJECTIVES

As noted in my initial Program Description, the objectives of my Democracy Fellowship are as follows:

- 1) *To assist the Strategies Team generally in the development and deployment of research, monitoring, and evaluation tools/approaches that facilitates quality control over USAID's democracy and governance program design, implementation, and measurement;*
- 2) *To develop and/or improve analytical, strategic, and institutional skills that will enable me to authoritatively communicate the substance and impact of USAID democracy and governance programming to a range of audiences;*
- 3) *To gain practical expertise and a broader, more nuanced understanding of the process of providing USAID field missions with quality, responsive, targeted technical assistance in democracy and governance areas; and to examine how input from field missions [results data, programming experience, etc.] contributes to shaping Agency-level policy and planning;*
- 4) *To develop and exercise technical leadership in a particular area(s) of democracy and governance that may be useful in designing USAID program activities or in advancing a line of applied research.*

PERFORMANCE METHODS/ACTIVITIES & OUTCOMES/IMPACT

Objective #1: Work under this objective has centered on the SORA initiative. As a core responsibility of my fellowship, I was assigned to assist the SORA team in designing and articulating this office-wide research initiative. In addition, I was tasked with contributing to the development of the SORA concept paper on Political Party Assistance [1 of 4 sub-sector concept papers outlining a research protocol and plan], specifically, drafting the 'rationale' section. In general, progress on the SORA initiative, which was launched two years ago, has been slow and this has made it challenging to identify a niche for myself. First, SORA's status within the DG Office has been unsettled until very recently, resulting in a leadership/management void, keenly felt by everyone on the SORA team. Without appropriate guidance, the team operates as a group of 'free agents' lacking the authority to make decisions and/or set priorities. Second, the content of SORA is still very much in flux, as there is no office-wide consensus on even the objectives and long-term outcomes of the exercise. Consequently, my SORA work has lacked rhythm, momentum, or a plan since the target is always moving. And third, as noted above, my role on the SORA team is still unfolding. I am admittedly not a research methodologist or a research project manager, so it has been difficult to nail down a role that is consistent with my skill set. There seems to be some interest in developing a communications role on the SORA team, designed to articulate the SORA work [in laymen's terms] to the rest of the DG Office and to other constituencies through various fora [updates, briefers, etc.]. This is a role I have expressed interest in and it will likely take shape during the next reporting period. Lastly, with the recent leadership change in the DG Office [the appointment of Jerry Hyman as Director], the SORA initiative has risen to the very top of the priority list. As a result, signs of leadership and proper management have begun to emerge and the investment of the SORA team has risen somewhat. These developments suggest that I will be on firmer footing with regard to SORA in the months ahead. At the very least, I will know precisely what I will contribute to the initiative. In short, only small steps have been taken toward meeting this objective of the fellowship.

Objective #2: In this area of work, I have undertaken a number of activities aimed generally at becoming more conversant in the language and culture of the DG Office. In November, I made it known to a couple of leaders in the office that I was available to write speeches or develop talking points on matters related to the work of the DG Office. This was quickly followed by requests to

assist planning teams in crafting talking points for Assistant Administrator Roger Winter and Administrator Andrew Natsios on the occasion of the annual DG Office events. This was indeed a very gratifying experience and it allowed me an excellent opportunity to learn how USAID messages are shaped and synchronized at different levels within the agency. I have served notice to others within the DG Office that I hope to take on other speechwriting/talking point assignments, as necessary. In addition, as noted above, I have been pushing to establish a communications role/function on the SORA team in order to improve the team's general outreach to the DG Office. Should I assume this role/function as I hope to, I would be in a position to learn a great deal about intra-agency knowledge dissemination, and articulate the SORA platform. One of the most challenging tasks to date has been trying to understand institutional relationships at USAID/DG – for example, how various offices and bureaus cooperate on joint areas of responsibility, or where decision-making authority resides. As a Fellow, it is not imperative that an inordinate amount of time be invested on this, but it seems as though one gains legitimacy, visibility, and credibility when one understands the institutional culture. I have decided that this is a worthwhile investment, particularly if I wish to advance a new area of research – i.e., patronage and clientelism [see #4, below]. As alluded to in the overview section, I feel a much better job of orienting new Fellows to the DG Office AND its collaborative relationships with other bureaus and offices could have been provided. Lastly, I have spent a fair amount of time familiarizing myself with the DG assessment and strategic planning cycles, both in advance of participating on an assessment during the fellowship period and with a view to being in a position to anticipate the Washington-based tasks required in assisting USAID field missions with strategy development. This has entailed document reviews, primarily. In short, I believe a number of good steps have been taken in meeting this objective, as I am gradually learning how to operate in this very new institutional context.

Objective #3: My efforts to contribute in meaningful and substantive ways to the field support relationship between the DG Office and USAID field missions are very much in their formative stage, although inroads have been made. The difficulties inherent in sorting out the USAID bureaucracy notwithstanding, my work on the patronage and clientelism research agenda has helped clarify HOW the Strategies team goes about its field support work. Specifically, as the patronage/clientelism work progressed in the lead up to the DG Office annual events in December, I noted that the team offers the field missions a range of analytical services designed to help inform the strategy development process and fine-tune programming options. Depending on level of interest, availability of resources, and a host of other factors, a particular mission may request the Strategies team to set up a full-blown democracy assessment or pull together a conflict vulnerability assessment, among many other analytical service options. The patronage/clientelism work may evolve into an assessment exercise whereby missions that sense a need to examine or diagnose the extent of patron-client networks in their country contexts will have an analytical approach available to them. Accordingly, in shaping the patronage/clientelism package with DG field officers in mind, I have been helping to develop a market for its use, once it is in final form, by gauging interest among field officers in the topic and noting countries that may be appropriate for field-testing the approach [as a value-added step in their strategy development, for example]. In sum, the exercise has been instructive in terms of learning how the Strategies team provides support to the field missions. In addition, I have also been assigned backstopping responsibilities for Malawi, Tanzania, and REDSO. While the backstopping function of the DG Office has been under review and therefore unsettled during this period, the basic contours have begun to take shape and I have been working closely with the Africa Coordinator to stay abreast of the office-wide discussion on this matter. At the moment, I am essentially learning how to be an efficient, effective backstop by compiling country resources and contacts, familiarizing myself with country programs, reviewing current strategy development plans, recognizing action cues, etc. The only immediate progress made at this point is that a firm commitment to conducting a full democracy assessment in Tanzania is emerging. This will fully "operationalize" the backstop position in that there will be communications and documents to track and analyze as the assessment approaches. In addition, it will crystallize the many reporting/consulting relationships that drive the field support relationship with USAID/Tanzania.

Objective #4: A considerable amount of time during this first fellowship reporting period has been spent advancing a new area of applied research, on patronage and clientelism. Along with the SORA initiative, this has been the principal area of work for me and will continue to be for the remainder of the fellowship. Working jointly with Corbin Lyday, another Democracy Fellow, I have coordinated the intellectual and logistical preparation of a training module for DG field officers, to be delivered at the Advanced DG Officers Training Workshop in December. This has entailed exploring prospective ways to operationalize a set of analytical tools for diagnosing patronage and clientelism, as well as highlighting the reasons why patronage and clientelism matter to the effective implementation of DG programs worldwide. Pending the outcomes of the training workshop, Corbin and I have begun to consider countries where the patronage and clientelism package might be field-tested. Throughout the research and preparation, we have become convinced that patronage and clientelism may well be key "entry points" in assessing the performance of DG programs as they are manifestations of the power/influence of informal institutions. Further, we are noting that patronage and clientelism are cross-sectoral phenomena – i.e., they are not simply a "DG issue", but rather they appear in all USAID program sectors. In short, the patronage and clientelism work has been significantly advanced during this period, and I have felt some degree of ownership in assuming a central role. During the next few months, we expect to lay out a series of next steps for the patronage and clientelism work, that will include consultations with the anti-corruption and money-in-politics groups, development of a portable briefing module for outreach within and outside of the agency, a set of publications for dissemination of the research, and a field-testing agenda.

PROPOSED REVISION TO PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The following revisions to the original program description are being proposed:

- The uncertainty surrounding the SORA initiative will be clarified during the next reporting period [December – February]. At that time, I will be able to pinpoint exactly what my role and contribution to the initiative will be.
- It is not clear whether the exercise [launched by former Fellow Robin Silver] to develop and operationalize a manual of qualitative performance indicators will be prioritized by the Strategies team and, if it is, whether I will have a role on this. For the moment, this exercise is not a priority.
- Adjustments to the second quarterly travel plan will be necessary, due to various shifts in work priorities and content during the first quarter. These adjustments should reflect the following: 1) NO SORA Country Case Study trips should be planned, as the Country Case Study model is under review; 2) the Tanzania democracy assessment field work period is scheduled to run from February 24 through April 18. A three-week trip for the assessment team will fall sometime during this period.

DEMOCRACY FELLOWSHIP PROGRESS REPORT #2
December 2002 – February 2003

PROFESSIONAL GOALS

As stated in my initial Program Description, I envision a post-fellowship professional track that allows me to serve as a foreign affairs policy analyst, legislative/public affairs specialist, or advisor on democratic development. Ideally, I would serve on Capitol Hill for a congressional committee with a foreign affairs or foreign assistance/appropriations portfolio or in the office of an individual Member of Congress with a strong interest in global policy, or even on the campaign staff of a congressional or presidential candidate seeking to develop a foreign affairs platform. A special interest that I have continued to develop during the last few years is speechwriting, particularly on subjects related to democracy assistance. I would expect speechwriting to be a key area of responsibility for me in any post-fellowship professional position I assume. Finally, I foresee civic education in my future. At some point, I hope to work with young people – in both formal and informal settings – on possibilities for democratic participation.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

I would characterize the second quarter of my Democracy Fellowship as somewhat of a “negotiation”, during which I worked at assimilating into the complex institutional culture of the DG Office at USAID. One dimension of this negotiation was to reconcile my own work style with that of several others with whom I am in regular contact, and shape performance expectations with them. This has proven to be challenging primarily because, in my opinion, work styles here are very much mediated by the bureaucratic culture of USAID. The consequence is that work styles can only be understood through the bureaucratic filter, and this takes a great deal of sustained concentration. A second dimension of this negotiation has been to strike a balance between what I am able to offer this fellowship [in terms of intellectual content] and what I seek to take away from this fellowship, in terms of professional development. At this point, I have the sense that I am taking more away than I am giving, as I have gained many valuable insights into the “business” of democratic development in a donor context. As the fellowship proceeds, however, I believe that more of a balanced “give and take” will emerge, as my work takes on more focus.

As was the case during the first reporting period, the Fellowship has been highlighted by a number of “backdrop” issues that have in one way or another shaped the quality, pace, and content of the experience. First, the anticipated leadership change in the DG Office took effect on the first day of the current reporting period [December 1, 2002]. Not surprisingly, the transition to a new Director has been at times smooth, at times exciting, at times bumpy, and at times utterly mysterious. The essential point is that leadership transitions within federal bureaucracies take time, as this one certainly will. It will take, at least on my part, much more engagement with the new leadership to understand the limits, possibilities, and parameters of the work we do. Second, the difficulties encountered by the SORA initiative [see under *Objective #1, below*] have cast a bit of a pall on this aspect of the Fellowship. It has been frustrating for SORA team to have labored without proper guidance and management for so long, and equally frustrating to keep track of the many visions of SORA that exist within the DG Office. From a motivational standpoint, it has been somewhat dispiriting to be associated with an initiative to which I can contribute only sparingly, and which will most likely begin in earnest long after my Fellowship has concluded. And third, I have begun to consider the possibility of extending my Fellowship for an additional one-year period AFTER I complete my studies at John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University from September 2003 – June 2004. In entertaining this as a serious proposition, I have been consulting colleagues in the DG Office and strategizing to make it happen. This may slightly influence the content of the balance of my Fellowship period in terms of taking on tasks/responsibilities more germane to the proposed extension period.

FELLOWSHIP OBJECTIVES

As noted in my initial Program Description, the objectives of my Democracy Fellowship are as follows:

- 1) *To assist the Strategies Team generally in the development and deployment of research, monitoring, and evaluation tools/approaches that facilitates quality control over USAID's democracy and governance program design, implementation, and measurement;*
- 2) *To develop and/or improve analytical, strategic, and institutional skills that will enable me to authoritatively communicate the substance and impact of USAID democracy and governance programming to a range of audiences;*
- 3) *To gain practical expertise and a broader, more nuanced understanding of the process of providing USAID field missions with quality, responsive, targeted technical assistance in democracy and governance areas; and to examine how input from field missions [results data, programming experience, etc.] contributes to shaping Agency-level policy and planning;*
- 4) *To develop and exercise technical leadership in a particular area(s) of democracy and governance that may be useful in designing USAID program activities or in advancing a line of applied research.*

PERFORMANCE METHODS/ACTIVITIES & OUTCOMES/IMPACT

Objective #1: During the second reporting period, work on the SORA initiative slowed considerably as procedural and structural issues continued to emerge, and new leadership was designated. In early January, the SORA group presented a summary of its recent work for the senior staff of the DG Office, with a view to securing support and soliciting guidance for the future direction of the project. The presentation generated numerous questions, particularly concerning the scope of the research, the level of rigor envisioned in the research, and the overall management of the project. In short, the presentation proved to be diagnostic as a change in leadership followed shortly after. Margaret Sarles, chief of the Strategic Planning & Research Division, was appointed to lead the research program in the DG Office, the centerpiece of which is SORA. Since this appointment, SORA meetings have continued and Margaret is gradually formulating a revised vision of the project. An initial exercise during this transitional period was to develop a streamlined set of three SORA goals. Together with my Fellow colleague, Corbin Lyday, I drafted the first cut of these goals and then worked with the Strategies team to finalize them. Otherwise, for the moment, my level-of-effort on the SORA initiative has been reduced as the group considers options for: 1) contracting the research out; 2) integrating the four sub-sector research approaches into a common research design; and 3) identifying what evaluative research on DG programs has already been undertaken, and assessing its relevance to and/or compatibility with the SORA work. Further, a new management structure [other than the appointment of Margaret Sarles] that specifies roles and personnel has yet to be developed, so my precise contributions – beyond the ad-hoc requests to review/comment on articles, and offer input at SORA meetings – are not well-defined at present. As reported in my first progress report however, I anticipate contributing to the communications function of the SORA work once a management structure is established. Recent tasks assigned to me reflect Margaret's understanding of the role [communications] I am prepared to assume. In sum, progress continues to be very slow in meeting the first objective of the Fellowship.

Objective #2: I have continued my efforts to understand how to operate within the DG Office institutional culture/bureaucracy, and to comprehend the many annual procedures and processes related to the work of the Strategies team. In addition, I have attempted to be more proactive in "moving around" the agency with a view to building relationships across bureaus and identifying

constituencies and/or potential audiences for the SORA work as well as for the research on patronage and clientelism. I made written contributions on behalf of the Strategies team to both the Annual Report preparation process and the annual Portfolio Review. These contributions essentially required that the SORA work and the patronage work be synopsised and/or projected into the next 6-12 months, for the purposes of overall DG Office planning, both budgetary and programmatic. While preparing these documents was essentially a bureaucratic task, it was, nevertheless, highly instructional in providing a "mapping" of sorts of how the SORA exercise and the patronage work fit into the general work plan of the DG Office. Further, in drafting the documents using a clear and sparse format, I became more familiar with a style of writing that appears to be preferred in government circles. As the SORA group began to reconstitute itself late in the reporting period, I have been asked to think more substantively about how to best communicate the SORA work within and outside of the agency. Specific action steps on this are not imminent at this time, given the transitional state of the SORA initiative, but I have at least commenced some work in this area by reviewing the DG Office Communications Strategy document [1999-2003] that currently guides DG Office outreach. Lastly, together with Corbin Lyday, I have accelerated consultations on the patronage research across bureaus in order to generate more cross-sectoral buy-in [more on this under *Objective #4*, below]. This has been very helpful in augmenting my "big-picture" grasp of how DG Office initiatives are vetted and supplemented by input from other offices and bureaus. In sum, I believe modest progress was made in meeting the second objective during the reporting period.

Objective #3: In the area of field support, I have acquired a more detailed grasp of what is required to prepare for a democracy and governance assessment during the past two months. Early in the reporting period, it became clear that I would join a team in conducting a DG assessment in Tanzania in mid-March. Consequently, I have been very much at the center of discussions – with the DG Officer in Tanzania, with Strategies team colleagues, and with the contractors [Associates in Rural Development] – supporting the organization of the assessment. Among the many tasks undertaken in advance of the assessment [originally scheduled for March 17 – April 4, since postponed] were a Tanzania document review, consultations with the Tanzania Desk Officer in the Africa Bureau, comment on the DG section of the USAID/Tanzania pre-strategy concept document, logistical coordination with the ARD team, and consultations with DG Office staff about their "first assessment" experiences. In general, the intensive preparation for the Tanzania assessment has been a useful exercise in illustrating the strategic benefits of quality field support. In conversations with the USAID/Tanzania DG Officer, the fundamental need for USAID/Washington buy-in to the mission's planning and for USAID/Washington analytical support was quite evident. An important insight from these conversations is that programmatic and budgetary support for USAID mission's is driven significantly by the quality of the analytical work that buttresses proposed program direction, and by the extent to which the mission can communicate its case to Washington in a compelling manner. From a field support perspective, this underscores the need for a highly evolved and coordinated working relationship between the DG Officer and relevant Washington staff. During the reporting period, I began contributing to a small working group of DG Office staff on how the Global Development Alliance [GDA] might best support DG work in the field. The prevailing view in the DG Office is that GDA has been very effective in facilitating public/private partnerships in sectors such as health and environment, but that the "fit" for such partnerships in the DG sector is not as well-defined. The working group, which commenced its work in late February, intends to generate a slate of potential activities AND partners for DG programs in Rule of Law, Elections/Political Processes, Civil Society, and Governance. These will then be shared with field missions so that they may be in a stronger position to leverage additional resources for DG programs at a time of shrinking budgets. In sum, progress in meeting the field support objective has been steady.

Objective #4: The work undertaken late last year in advancing the applied research on patronage culminated in the execution of a two-day training workshop on this topic for 26 USAID Democracy Officers in December. The training workshop marked the high point of my fellowship to date as it was a challenging, intellectually stimulating, and gratifying exercise. The workshop offered Corbin Lyday and I our first opportunity to test-market a "patronage toolkit", an analytical

resource developed to assist field missions in diagnosing patronage and examining programmatic options/directions that mitigate its effects. The feedback from the workshop, co-led by Corbin, myself, and Derrick Brinkerhoff [author of the background paper on patronage, commissioned by the DG Office] was extremely positive and encouraging, as the subject seemed to strike a chord among the DG Officers, most of whom work in countries ridden by patronage. As a result, several field missions have expressed interest in piloting the toolkit to generate analysis or information that might be helpful at various stages of their strategy design or program implementation processes. Since the workshop, we have extended the discussion on patronage to several other "constituencies" within the agency with a view to building additional support for possible field applications. Recent consultations with USAID staff from the Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture & Trade, the Bureau for Africa, the Anti-Corruption team in the DG Office, and several other DG Office staff have helped fine-tune ideas on how to frame and apply the 'analytical lens' the patronage toolkit potentially offers. For example, this resource may be useful as a supplemental optic for anti-corruption assessments, or as a stand-alone lens for investigating specific DG issues such as budget transparency, political parties as vehicles for patronage, or decentralization. These are some of the promising ideas for field testing that have emerged. In addition, work proceeds on developing a Power Point presentation on the patronage research that can be adapted to various internal [USAID] and external audiences. Preliminary plans have been outlined for a series of publications to disseminate the patronage research in stages, as it progresses. The first publication – a monograph produced by World Learning – will constitute the principal written product of my fellowship period. In sum, progress in meeting this objective was significant during the second reporting period.

PROPOSED REVISION TO PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The following revisions to the original program description are being proposed:

- Adjustments to the third quarterly travel plan will be necessary, due to various circumstances and shifts in work priorities during the second quarter. These adjustments should reflect the following: 1) The Tanzania democracy assessment has been postponed and is not as yet rescheduled. It is likely that the assessment will be undertaken sometime during the third quarter, pending developments in Iraq; and 2) With travel restrictions forthcoming, I am beginning identify opportunities to travel domestically [and perhaps internationally to low-risk countries] to attend conferences that are germane to the patronage work. I hope to participate in at least two of these conferences, while USAID business travel [i.e. the Tanzania assessment] is on hold.

DEMOCRACY FELLOWSHIP PROGRESS REPORT #3

March – May 2003

- Paul Nuti -

PROFESSIONAL GOALS

As stated in my initial Program Description, I envision a post-fellowship professional track that allows me to serve as a foreign affairs policy analyst, legislative/public affairs specialist, or advisor on democratic development. Ideally, I would serve on Capitol Hill for a congressional committee with a foreign affairs or foreign assistance/appropriations portfolio or in the office of an individual Member of Congress with a strong interest in global policy, or even on the campaign staff of a congressional or presidential candidate seeking to develop a foreign affairs platform. A special interest that I have continued to develop during the last few years is speechwriting, particularly on subjects related to democracy assistance. I would expect speechwriting to be a key area of responsibility for me in any post-fellowship professional position I assume. Finally, I foresee civic education in my future. At some point, I hope to work with young people – in both formal and informal settings – on possibilities for democratic participation.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

The third quarter of my Democracy Fellowship was highlighted by intensive preparations for a democracy assessment trip to Tanzania that was eventually postponed [due to the conflict in Iraq], participation in a DG strategy development exercise for the USAID/Guyana mission, and a highly successful presentation of the patronage/clientelism work to the DG Office. In general, the anticipation of making my first – and perhaps only – trip to the field was the central theme during the quarter. When it became clear that the Tanzania assessment would be postponed, it was a priority for me to identify an alternative as quickly as possible, primarily because the Tanzania assessment was to be rescheduled after the conclusion of my fellowship, and because other opportunities did not seem feasible. Accordingly, I communicated my interest in an appropriate field assignment known to two other regional teams [Latin America/Caribbean AND Eastern Europe/Eurasia] in late-March and was fortunate to be recommended for the DG Strategy development exercise in Guyana [details below, under Objective #3]. From a professional development perspective, the trip to Guyana was extremely helpful in clarifying USAID's overall strategy development process and sharpening my grasp of the nuances in the support/technical relationships between field missions and the DG Office. Further, the Guyana trip affirmed my own view that at least one TDY should be built into the workplan of all Washington-based Democracy Fellows in order to capture the full range and course of DG assistance.

The third quarter also marked a high point for the progress of the patronage/clientelism work as a Tuesday Group presentation was made for over 35 DG Office staff [the presentation and related activities are described in more detail below under Objective #4]. The single most important outcome of the presentation was the confirmation that the DG Office is "on board" and invested in the development of field applications for this area of research. Specific modalities are yet to be worked out, but it was critical to secure the broad support of the office and the leadership, and the presentation certainly accomplished this. Other notable developments during the quarter included my effective withdrawal from the SORA exercise [described below under Objective #1], initial discussions on the nature/scope of my final fellowship product on patronage/clientelism [described below under Objective #4], and continuing efforts to extend my fellowship in the Legislative & Public Affairs Bureau beginning in 2004 [described below in the Proposed Revisions section at the end of the report].

FELLOWSHIP OBJECTIVES

As noted in my initial Program Description, the objectives of my Democracy Fellowship are as follows:

- 1) *To assist the Strategies Team generally in the development and deployment of research, monitoring, and evaluation tools/approaches that facilitates quality control over USAID's democracy and governance program design, implementation, and measurement;*
- 2) *To develop and/or improve analytical, strategic, and institutional skills that will enable me to authoritatively communicate the substance and impact of USAID democracy and governance programming to a range of audiences;*
- 3) *To gain practical expertise and a broader, more nuanced understanding of the process of providing USAID field missions with quality, responsive, targeted technical assistance in democracy and governance areas; and to examine how input from field missions [results data, programming experience, etc.] contributes to shaping Agency-level policy and planning;*
- 4) *To develop and exercise technical leadership in a particular area(s) of democracy and governance that may be useful in designing USAID program activities or in advancing a line of applied research.*

PERFORMANCE METHODS/ACTIVITIES & OUTCOMES/IMPACT

Objective #1: During the third reporting period, the SORA initiative was essentially reworked into a series of new tasks calling on a combination of contractors and DG Office staff to: 1) develop a comprehensive research design [3-6 months]; 2) build a cohesive, consensus knowledge base/vision within the DG Office of what a successful democracy program and a successful democratic transition are; and 3) analyze the existing record of evaluations, studies, and research undertaken on USAID democracy-promotion activities. In brief, the SORA initiative has been completely transformed, and is now more structured and centralized within the leadership of the Strategic Planning & Research Division [Margaret Sarles]. While this transformation has been met with a range of reactions among individuals previously [and still] associated with the initiative, it has most definitely hastened my own withdrawal. The principal reason for this is that I no longer saw a clear-cut role that was well-suited to my skill set. In addition, information about SORA has become less accessible since it has moved into the realm of procurement, so my investment [as well as that of others] in the exercise has diminished considerably. And lastly, Margaret and I have a tacit understanding that there wasn't much point in me trying to identify a niche on something that won't even get started in earnest until well after my fellowship period ends. It made sense, therefore, to reduce my engagement in SORA and focus on other priorities. Separately, I was tasked with developing a trends analysis model that the regional teams might use to produce annual trends analyses on democracy. These trends analyses would ultimately benefit the SORA initiative by providing consistent data on DG programs and trends, a consistent analytical framework, a common format, and a rich baseline. In mid-May, I submitted a draft trends analysis outline format that met with the satisfaction of the Strategies team, which is now working on making it operational. In sum, progress on meeting Objective #1 of my fellowship was mixed during the quarter, as the SORA work essentially ceased.

Objective #2: During the third quarter, I was able to put into practice my improved grasp of how DG strategies are conceptualized, developed, and vetted. Building on what I had learned in preparing for the Tanzania DG assessment – particularly the sequencing of consultations with the field mission and relevant bureaus/offices, and the tasks necessary to *design* the analytical agenda – I was well-prepared to shift gears and contribute to the *implementation* of the analytical work in Guyana. With the Conflict Vulnerability Assessment and Democracy Assessment already

completed for Guyana, the challenge was to transform the findings of these to studies into an over-arching strategic framework for the DG portfolio of USAID/Guyana for the next five years. This proved to be a highly precise exercise requiring the distillation of research data into a Strategic Objective [DG], supporting Intermediate Results statements, sub-Intermediate Results statements, and activity clusters. It was for me a very satisfying exercise in that it challenged my ability to process contextual information and craft meaningful text that captured the essence of the analyses AND provided USAID/Guyana with the appropriate direction/guidance. Most importantly, the Tanzania preparation and the Guyana SO/IR exercise together consolidated my understanding of the *full* strategy development exercise. This marks a significant advance in my grasp of the institutional and operational environment here at USAID. I am now able to discuss SOs and IRs without squinting. Meanwhile, I continued to seek out speechwriting opportunities during the reporting period. I collaborated with Democracy Fellow colleague Carol Sahley on a speechwriting assignment for Judith Gilmore, Director of the PVC [Private and Voluntary Cooperation] Office at USAID. In April, Ms. Gilmore participated in a panel on civil society at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. Carol was initially tasked with the assignment and sought my assistance. Together, we prepared a comprehensive set of talking points, drawing on both the civil society literature and the experiences of USAID in advancing civil society around the world. Ms. Gilmore was pleased with what we drafted and the speech was well-received. As always, it was satisfying to have an opportunity to communicate the work, motivations, principles, and accomplishments of the DG Office and USAID in a compelling manner for public consumption. In short, some progress was made in meeting the second objective.

Objective #3: In the area of field support, the third quarter of the fellowship provided good opportunities to be engaged and to make concrete contributions. As noted above, I was assigned to be a member of a team [MSI consultants] tasked with conducting a DG strategy development exercise in Guyana for the USAID mission there. On many levels, this experience was ideal in illuminating the practical [as opposed to virtual] aspects of providing technical support to a field mission. Prior to departing for Guyana, I was involved in a series of meetings with the Guyana Desk Officer, the Latin America/Caribbean team, and the MSI team to plan the exercise, determine division of labor, and reach consensus. While in Guyana, I assisted in conducting focus groups with stakeholders to vet the findings of the Conflict Vulnerability Assessment and the Democracy Assessment. In addition, I participated in all team/mission discussions concerning the results of the focus groups and the development of a strategic framework [SOs and IRs] for the DG portfolio. My most concrete contributions to the final product [the draft strategy document] were the rationale section for IR 1 [*Inclusion and Participation in Policy-Making Increased*] and the section on intra-IR synergies. In sum, assisting the mission in its strategy design was highly educational and it was gratifying to note that the USAID/Guyana Mission Director, DG Officer, and U.S. Ambassador were extremely pleased with what we produced. Separately, as the backstop for Malawi, I was involved in a round of intensive consultations aimed at getting someone from the DG Office assigned to go to Malawi for a one-week program design exercise. While this may seem like a simple matter, it was actually quite complex and involved as there were several layers of internal politics and a host of miscommunications to cut through. Again, it was highly educational in terms of learning how to manage the institution AND the field/headquarters relationships. In the end, ironically, Democracy Fellow colleague Carol Sahley was selected to assist USAID/Malawi. In short, good progress was achieved in meeting Objective #3 during the reporting period.

Objective #4: Work on the patronage/clientelism research agenda continued during the third quarter and culminated in a special Tuesday Group presentation [by Democracy Fellow colleague Corbin Lyday and I] to the DG Office on April 22. The presentation served two purposes: 1) it outlined intellectual AND functional rationales for incorporating targeted research on patronage and clientelism into USAID's standard analysis of DG contexts; and 2) it challenged the DG Office to invest in the continued development of testable analytical field resources for research and data collection on patronage and clientelism. The Power Point presentation was designed to be a standing outreach tool on patronage and clientelism that can be adapted to a range of different audiences. Indeed, we anticipate delivering a modified version of the presentation for the current

New Entry Professionals [NEPs] group sometime in July. The response to the presentation in April was overwhelmingly positive [35 DG staff attended; a normal Tuesday Group draws between 10-20 people]. The feedback received during the discussion indicated that investigating INFORMAL institutions – the basic premise of our approach to addressing patronage and clientelism – is in fact something many staff members believe USAID should be doing more routinely. Further, it was widely acknowledged during the discussion that patronage and clientelism penetrate virtually all sectors of USAID's work [health, agriculture, economic growth, etc.], most likely undercutting the effectiveness and reach of USAID programs in these sectors. At the conclusion of the presentation, it appeared that the task of making available an analytical resource capable of diagnosing the existence of patronage/clientelism and illuminating its operation and scope was something that the DG Office will remain committed to achieving. This impression was reinforced in an ensuing meeting with Strategic Planning & Research Division chief Margaret Sarles who encouraged us to continue working on ways to make the analytical tool operational [i.e., create a module]. Accordingly, I am presently in discussions with Margaret and Corbin on drafting what will end up being my final written fellowship product. We are debating whether it should take the form of an article/monograph or a "user's guide" or orientation to the patronage/clientelism toolkit. In any case, the original plan to disseminate the research in stages still stands. The only possible change in this plan would be the nature and content of the first publication in the series envisioned. In sum, progress in meeting this objective was significant during the third reporting period.

PROPOSED REVISION TO PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

No revisions to the original program description are being proposed for the next quarter.

As noted earlier in this report, I have continued to actively explore the possibility of extending my Democracy Fellowship for an additional year in the Legislative & Public Affairs Bureau at USAID, beginning in June of 2004 after completing graduate school. At present, I am still in discussions with key decision-makers in both the DG Office and in LPA, and have received mixed signals thus far. The challenges continue to be as follows: 1) ensure that the extension arrangement contains sufficient democracy content [i.e., advances the DG objectives of the agency]; 2) identify funds from a combination of the DG Office, LPA, and balances of expiring Fellows budgets to underwrite the extension; and 3) persuade the DG Office and LPA that a 1-2 year investment in a dedicated DG liaison within LPA will advance the interests/objectives of each office. I will be drafting a summary document that outlines the proposed extension and begin pitching it more aggressively to these decision-makers. I would like to have a decision on this one way or another shortly before my current fellowship period concludes at the end of July.

FINAL REFLECTIONS

Democracy Fellowship – Paul Nuti, 9/2002 – 8/2003

OVERVIEW

This document constitutes a general reflection of my Democracy Fellowship period, from September 2002 through July 2003, during which I served as an advisor to the Strategic Planning & Research division of the Democracy and Governance Office at USAID/Washington. The comments herein are intended to highlight several over-arching issues/themes that emerged in my work as a World Learning Democracy Fellow, and supplement the descriptions of day-to-day details and accomplishments contained in the four quarterly progress reports submitted to World Learning over the last 11 months. I am hopeful that those who administer the Democracy Fellows program will find these comments useful in some way, perhaps to enhance the overall experience of future Fellows. The issues/themes below are described in no particular order.

THE LONG USAID LEARNING CURVE

For those such as me who have not previously worked in a large federal bureaucracy, the experience can be nothing short of jarring. The institutional environment of USAID is uniquely shaped by a multitude of unseen, unpredictable forces [budgetary, micro-political, macro-political, global trends, etc.], making it extraordinarily difficult to “map” or navigate effectively within the space of a year. Many USAID colleagues with whom I have discussed this issue have noted that it took them *at least* 6-8 months to figure out important things such as how the agency/office was organized, who the relevant decision-makers were, how their individual and/or team responsibilities fit into the overall mandate of the office, and what procedures were critical to know in order to function effectively. In brief, the learning curve at for people new to USAID can be very, very long and this is something that I had not anticipated at the outset.

My experience as a Democracy Fellow in the DG Office at USAID faithfully reflected the sentiments of my colleagues, noted above. While I certainly expected a fairly typical “breaking in” period of perhaps a couple of months, I was caught off guard by general disorientation I felt for the first seven months of the fellowship period. This manifested itself in a number of ways: 1) a lack of supervisory guidance with regard to the substance and direction of my work; 2) a prolonged inability to conceptualize the full cycle of democracy assistance programming [from concept paper to country strategy] until very late in my tenure as a Fellow; 3) the rather extreme decentralization of responsibility within the DG Office, resulting in overlapping mandates and uncertain accountability; and 4) tentativeness on my part in knowing when it was or was not appropriate to offer my services on any number of DG Office initiatives. In addition, the learning curve was compounded by other factors including the ongoing reorganization of USAID under the new Administrator, and leadership changes in the DG Office as well as in the Strategic Planning division. All of these circumstances made it seem like I had two full-time jobs that were mutually dependent: undertaking the work outlined in my program description AND learning how the agency worked, at a very fluid period in time.

In retrospect, I am truly grateful for the opportunity I had to work as a Fellow in the DG Office, and for having learned so much about the mechanics of USAID democracy assistance. It isn't entirely clear to me how future Democracy Fellows might be better prepared to work in a highly bureaucratic environment, except for maybe shoring up the initial orientation period by insisting that the appropriate USAID supervisor/team provide a series of thorough briefings on operations, policy, procedures, and programming [among other things] upon commencement of the fellowship. On the other hand, it may be the case that acclimation to USAID is very much an individual matter. Some may adapt to it with flying colors, like fish to water, while others may take much longer to find a comfort zone. At the very least, the DFP might consider being more attentive to this issue in its recruitment and placement of future Fellows.

CREATIVE CONTROL

In conversations with both DFP and USAID staff at the start of my fellowship, I was alerted to the existence of a "tension" in the *perception* of what a Democracy Fellowship really is: a distinction [or appointment] that afforded qualified democracy professionals with an opportunity to make a signature, creative contribution to USAID/DG OR a convenient staffing arrangement that afforded USAID some degree of flexibility in filling personnel gaps. In my experience, it was most definitely somewhere in the middle – at times I felt as though I was indeed making a useful and somewhat creative contribution, while at other times, I felt more like I was an extra hand on deck. As I understand it, there are in fact provisions in the cooperative agreement with World Learning that do circumscribe the nature of the work that Fellows are expected to undertake. I do recall being told that I would not be permitted to "manage" or to "do" work that would be ordinarily assigned to USAID staff. Yet at the same time, I was very much a part of the Strategic Planning & Research division and I aligned my work priorities accordingly. The net result of this ambiguity, in my case, was that I did not always feel that I had creative control over my fellowship.

More specifically, I recall being apprised of the different options I had for assisting the Strategies division during my fellowship period. On one hand, I was pleased to have a choice among these options [applied research on patronage and clientelism, development of the Strategic Operations Research Assessment – SORA, participation in at least one DG assessment, and work on qualitative DG indicators], but was privately disappointed that I could not pursue initiatives that reflected my interests and experience more closely [such as building philanthropic sectors in transitional democracies, civil society strengthening, human rights advocacy, or outreach and message development for the DG Office]. Meanwhile, it seemed that some Democracy Fellows [of longer tenure] had carved out specific niches for themselves and enjoyed a higher degree of creative latitude than others, and I did not entirely understand why that was the case. In the end, ironically, the SORA initiative never found its footing during my time as a Fellow, I was unable to participate in a DG assessment [primarily due to the outbreak of war in Iraq], and the qualitative indicators exercise was not a priority [it had been started by a previous Fellow]. These circumstances left the patronage and clientelism initiative as the centerpiece [shared with a Democracy Fellow colleague] of my work. While it was certainly very satisfying to have advanced this initiative significantly, I occasionally wondered whether I might have made other substantive contributions had I felt as though I had more creative control.

Again, it is likely that the creative control issue is one that is continuously negotiated by the individual Fellow during the course of a fellowship period. Some are perhaps more effective advocates for what they wish to accomplish than others, and are therefore able to "work the system" to secure more creative latitude. In my case, I was so thrilled at being appointed a Fellow that I did not think to question or modify the specific terms [i.e. the work agenda] of the position, and happily accepted the opportunity to make a contribution. For future Fellows, it may be useful to ensure that the work agenda is truly a negotiation so that some measure of creative control is established at the start.

TIME LIMITATIONS

Another issue that may have been unique to my fellowship was that of time limitations. As described above, the learning curve at USAID is enormous, and the latitude to be creative is somewhat limited by the needs/agendas of the sponsoring team/division. Taken together, these two circumstances produced constraints on what could be accomplished in the space of 11 months. I felt this acutely for several reasons: 1) I knew in advance that I would not be extending my fellowship; 2) it took me considerably longer than I thought it would to learn how things worked at USAID/DG; 3) a couple of the initiatives that I was slated to be involved in did not unfold as envisioned; and 4) I was sharing the workload on the patronage and clientelism initiative. As a result, I often wondered whether I would be able to register any meaningful accomplishments during my limited time as a Fellow.

The larger issue, I suppose, is whether the fluid circumstances at USAID *always* permit Democracy Fellows to make meaningful contributions in a finite amount of time. To refrain what has already been noted yet again, not all Fellows are created equal and some are, by virtue of their experience and personal qualities, in a stronger position to "craft" the fellowship so that they can get the most out of it and accomplish a great deal, regardless of any time constraints. I suppose what I am saying, in a circuitous way, is that a degree of *realism* should be integrated into any Fellow's program description so that the time constraints do not loom as a threat to what one may accomplish, particularly under such new and unpredictable circumstances. This is probably best achieved by upgrading the specificity of the program description negotiation [between USAID, DFP, and the Fellow] to reflect a rational, clear-eyed assessment of what is possible to accomplish, *given existing circumstances at USAID*.

RESOURCES

In a word, the resources available to a Democracy Fellow are abundant. In particular, the travel budget is extremely generous, and the miscellaneous budget is more than sufficient. The issue, in my experience, is *how operable* these resources were in light of the circumstances that prevailed during my fellowship period. At the outset, with a seemingly firm program description in place, it appeared likely that I would be able to take advantage of the large travel budget and the miscellaneous budget, to a lesser degree. The program description called for 1-2 trips to the field to advance the SORA country case study process, 1-2 trips on DG assessments, and if possible, a trip to attend a professional conference of some sort. What I did not anticipate, however, was: 1) the lack of direction within the DG Office on the SORA initiative, which resulted in the suspension of the country case study work; 2) the fairly intense competition

within the DG Office for placement on a DG assessment team [not to mention the war with Iraq, although that was an altogether unique circumstance]; and 3) the increased rigor by the new leadership of the DG Office in justifying all costs, particularly those involving travel. In the end, I was only able to use a fraction of my travel budget for a strategy development trip to Guyana. So, while I at one point reveled in the bounty of my travel budget, it was not in fact available to me unless its use fully comported with Strategies division needs and unless its use could be justified as a necessary expenditure.

I will yet again suggest that I could have been more proactive in positioning myself to use the travel budget [for example, by communicating more with the field missions and alerting them to the fact that I was a Fellow with a particular skill set and I had a travel budget], yet it was well into the fellowship period that I began to figure out how it all worked, and how I might have secured additional travel opportunities. With regard to the miscellaneous budget, I did not always recognize *what* I could have used this budget *for* as my work priorities [with the singular exception of the patronage and clientelism initiative] were somewhat unsettled during much of my fellowship. There was a time when I thought I might use the miscellaneous budget to take a professional development course. I mistakenly thought I was relatively free to do so but discovered that if the course did not contribute directly to the work I was engaged in, it would probably not be approved. In addition, I was not as strategic in exploring ways to use the miscellaneous budget to amplify the patronage and clientelism initiative [such as purchasing relevant books or attending relevant conferences that addressed the subject in some way]. So, in retrospect, I do wish I had had a better handle on how to make the generous resources more operable. A suggestion for future Fellows would be, to the extent possible, to map out a fairly specific plan for tapping these resources [in consultation with DFP and appropriate USAID supervisors] and get the plan pre-approved.

OBJECTIVES MET?

The program description for my Democracy Fellowship set the objectives below. I briefly note whether each of the objectives were/were not met.

- 1) To assist the Strategies Team generally in the development and deployment of research, monitoring, and evaluation tools/approaches that facilitates quality control over USAID's democracy and governance program design, implementation, and measurement;

This objective was met only in a very limited way. The centerpiece of this objective was to be my contributions toward advancing the SORA initiative. As my quarterly progress reports document, the SORA initiative was essentially restructured and contracted out, thus limiting input from many DG staff who were initially assigned to it. At the very least, early discussions of how to design the SORA research protocol were useful, and certainly insightful for me.

- 2) To develop and/or improve analytical, strategic, and institutional skills that will enable me to authoritatively communicate the substance and impact of USAID democracy and governance programming to a range of audiences;

Overall, I was pleased with progress on this objective. I was able to, on three separate occasions, assist various DG staff in the preparation of talking points and speeches on subject matter related to the work of the DG Office. These opportunities enabled me to hone skills that I had hoped to develop while serving as a Fellow, and positioned me to extend my interest in the areas of speechwriting and public affairs into future professional endeavors. In addition, I earned a reputation in the office [in some quarters] of being a polished writer and the feedback I received from DG staff on various writing assignments was quite positive. I do feel that I am able to communicate the substance and impact of DG assistance programs more effectively now than when I commenced my term as a Fellow.

- 3) To gain practical expertise and a broader, more nuanced understanding of the process of providing USAID field missions with quality, responsive, targeted technical assistance in democracy and governance areas; and to examine how input from field missions [results data, programming experience, etc.] contributes to shaping Agency-level policy and planning;

I believe good progress was made in achieving this objective, particularly toward the end of the fellowship period. After a prolonged period of figuring out what was expected of me as a DG country backstop and finally understanding the lengthy cycle of steps involved in producing a DG strategy, I was able to make meaningful contributions to the Tanzania and Guyana missions, as they developed their new DG strategies. I was also able to develop a nuanced appreciation for the field-Washington relationship, particularly where budgets and programmatic/foreign policy priorities are concerned. This is clearly a useful perspective to have as I look toward the prospect of doing more policy/legislative work in the areas of foreign policy and foreign assistance in the future.

- 4) To develop and exercise technical leadership in a particular area(s) of democracy and governance that may be useful in designing USAID program activities or in advancing a line of applied research.

By a significant margin, the most progress was made in meeting this objective. The patronage and clientelism initiative proved to be the anchor of my work, essentially from the outset. By the end of the fellowship period, my colleague Corbin Lyday and I had become THE in-house resources on the subject and we had produced a standing power-point presentation and a field-testable analytical tool to supplement future DG assessments. Perhaps most importantly, we had secured DG Office investment in this research to the point where more resources for the next fiscal year were earmarked to extend it. There is no doubt in my mind that patronage and clientelism are on the DG "radar" and will continue to be in the years ahead. Accomplishing this was very satisfying for me.

A FINAL WORD

In reading the above, one might possibly conclude that my experience as a DG Fellow was negative. This is most definitely not the case. The above comments are not at all intended to be complaints about things or regrets of any sort. They are simply observations about the way my Democracy Fellowship unfolded. Some things worked out and some things did not. The

bottom line for me is that I have grown immeasurably as a democracy professional, and I have done so within the institutional context of USAID, perhaps the most influential development assistance agency in the world. I met extraordinary people who are completely dedicated to providing quality democracy assistance and I am now a part of a network of democracy professionals that I will always be able to draw upon in future endeavors. Indeed, one of the most significant moments of my time as a Fellow was when I listened as the incoming Director of the DG Office, Jerry Hyman, made "cadre development" one his three top priorities for the Office. I recall feeling very supported and encouraged by this, as I too believe very much in upgrading the democracy assistance profession, and sharpening the work we do in the field. My Democracy Fellowship accelerated my development as a democracy practitioner and for this I am very grateful.



Democracy Report

Volume 9, Number 10

June 2003

PATRONAGE & CLIENTELISM: AN ANALYTICAL LENS FOR DG PROGRAMMING

*Paul Nuti, USAID Office of Democracy and Governance
Corbin Lyday, USAID Office of Democracy and Governance*

SUMMARY:

Patronage and clientelism are emerging as major development challenges affecting the outcomes of DG programs across countries, regions, and stages of transition. In response to this, the DG Office commissioned a paper on the topic for an advanced course on clientelism presented at the 2002 Partners Conference. The course was led by two World Learning Democracy Fellows, Corbin Lyday and Paul Nuti, who presented a summary of their ongoing research during this Tuesday Group session. Using a multidisciplinary approach, they suggested how USAID might recast some of its analytical tools and technical interventions to take into account these informal but critical social institutions.

ISSUES:

What is patronage? What is the relationship between patronage and DG issues? What do we gain and/or lose by looking at patronage? What are some examples of previous DG programming that involved taking patronage into consideration?

Background

Nuti and Lyday began with an explanation of what prompted the DG Office's interest in patronage and clientelism. A DG assessment on Macedonia revealed several elements of patronage and identified state resources as the centerpieces of patronage networks. The politicized regulatory environment could check abuses, and reformers were in short supply because they formed part of the patronage network. These dynamics generated questions about the significance of patronage in the Macedonian context and if it were an isolated case.

Evidence was also mounting elsewhere to suggest that patronage undercuts democratization. Assessments from Georgia, Jamaica, Mozambique, and Nepal all described political cultures defined by extreme poverty and the animation of formal political institutions by traditional practices and kinship. These two dynamics have profound influences in maintaining patronage.

In addition to the evidence from the assessments, Nuti and Lyday had to consider a central question: Is patronage a development issue? Their initial analysis of this question designated patronage and clientelism as "among the most pernicious of development problems" even though there was no analysis that illuminated its sources, forms, functions, and dimensions. Subsequent work by Abt Associates established lines of inquiry into the connection between patron-client networks and democratic governance. As a result, the DG Office started to focus more on patron-client networks and their costs, benefits, functional and resilient nature, conditions that enable them, and potential gains and risks of strategies for their reform.

Lyday and Nuti's subsequent background paper offers a platform for grappling with these issues as they relate to DG programming. The draft paper establishes a common vocabulary, informs a training module, and introduces an analytical tool for diagnosing patronage and clientelism in the field. The training module validated assessments' point that patronage and clientelism were keenly felt in many DG contexts and established demand for analytical work that could address

the issues. Missions in Georgia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Tanzania expressed interest in either using some of the session content or piloting the analytical tool.

Definitions and Wellsprings of Patronage and Clientelism

Three key characteristics define patronage and clientelism. First, patronage and clientelism are informal in their operation in highly personal, particularistic, familiar, traditional, and culturally bound settings where decisions are made on the basis of implicit understandings, patterns of interaction, and norms. Second, patronage and clientelism are unequal and reciprocal when people or groups of people who are unequal in power provide goods and services to each other for mutual benefit, creating a social compact of utility, security, and meaning. Third, patronage and clientelism networks are also a form of social capital, negotiating and contesting the boundaries of public and private spheres.

The appearance and persistence of patron-client networks across so many political systems indicates that they are a profoundly meaningful form of social organization and social capital that glues societies together. Patron-client networks assume meaning and significance through cultural consensus, and are frequently the organizing principle of society. In the examples of Georgia, Mozambique, and Nepal, each cultural context exhibits behaviors that safeguard patron-client networks. Political identity and power are animated by culture, which bears directly on the core questions that concern patron/client relationships: who gets what, who has the power and how is it used, and what meaning is assigned to it. Understanding the culture may help diagnose "disconnects" between the role of traditional authorities and the influence of national political leaders and compliance with the national legal code.

Political transformations result in renegotiated identities, loyalties, and relationships, influencing patron-client networks. This has the potential to change the rules of the informal political game in ways that may alter the balance of public good and private interest. If patron-client relationships, however constituted, provide some value or meaning to people, they will likely continue to assume their role as arbiters of power because of their resilience and adaptability to assume new forms as societies change. These networks thrive in situations of scarcity and political change, and are problem-solving strategies for poor, marginalized groups with no other choices, where official procedures and service delivery are untenable. The networks then exist for rational, economic self-interest.

What Do We Gain by Looking at Patronage?

An analysis of patronage and clientelism enables a more accurate reflection of social constraints. The typical DG approach to programming focuses on formal institutional analyses that are rooted in cultural and political biases, including a strong predisposition to see political development in terms of the relationship between the individual and the state. Most analytical measures, like Freedom House, are based on a conception of how much freedom states grant to individuals. However, some of the most important political relationships exist among communities, and between communities and the state. Starting there focuses on reciprocity and constraints that stem from reciprocity, which constitute the unspoken codes of conduct underlying most societies and which can be far more significant than individual constraints.

More specifically, analyzing patron-client relationships sharply brings into focus the fact that loyalties are frequently divided and do not naturally drift toward a western "nation-state" concept. Ethnicity, region, religion, tribe, caste, and clan are all first lines of identity, not second. When identities conflict, first lines of identity generally win. That is important for understanding actors, actions, and consequences in the larger political game, and it leads to a better understanding of DG problems in terms of embedded social compacts.

Additionally, the group dynamic may at some level even be dysfunctional, but this does not mean they do not operate under rules or without sanctions. Patron-client networks do serve a rational purpose. When public goods are scarce, patron-client relationships and personalized systems help citizens navigate the bureaucracy and secure public investment for development.

Furthermore, in public good-scarce societies, like Turkey and countries in Latin America, the choices people face are rarely between absolute concepts of democracy and authoritarianism. The choices made are best thought of as a continuum of very few benefits to society at large to very particularized benefits to a select few.

Programs to Match the Game?

Nuti and Lyday discussed how practitioners could develop programs that match the complexity of patronage and clientelism and how to alter the environments that enable patron-client relationships. The challenge facing all reformers and transition states is lack of social capital. Instead of attracting citizens, this can cause them to fall into the clientelist trap by buying clients. Young democracies spend more money on the public sector than old ones. Programs for these states must help them find new ways of building public capital, rather than buying it. More social capital means more legitimacy, less incentive for clients to ask patrons for favors, less incentive for patrons to make up the public goods deficit through public sector spending, and less skewing of economic and political goods.

The case of USAID/Mexico is a good example of DG programming addressing the prevalence of patronage and clientelism. USAID/Mexico helps municipalities increase capacity to leverage themselves for international bond markets and the new government is breaking the old exclusive patron-client ties. New laws that increase transparency as well as funding to state governments are also helping to break through patron-client relationships.

In scenarios where patronage networks are especially difficult, practitioners should try to maintain contestation but keep intermediaries independent by strengthening the credibility of NGOs, interest groups, farmers association, independent labor unions, and some mayors' associations. The goal should be to prevent new oligopolies from stabilizing.

Even when political breakthroughs have happened, they have sometimes been riddled with corruption and incompetence. Nuti and Lyday explored whether DG programs could contain this trend. They provided two examples from USAID Missions in India and Macedonia. In India, the Bharatiya Janata party is already using patronage not just to reward friends, but specifically to bestow exclusive goods to Hindus and deny them to Muslims. USAID/India is currently not involved in the larger political environment but if it were, how would it reverse or contain this trend to address the narrowing public capital space in India? In the case of Macedonia, UASID has invested a large amount of resources in the country but the problem remains that public values are not attached to public resources. The result is a free-for-all for public officials and their clients. The state and its self-interested leaders shake down citizens by swapping favors for power. Citizens in turn shake down the state by investing in the clientelist system and legitimizing those leaders out of economic desperation, personal bitterness, the need for scapegoats, and a passion for asserting identity above all other social goods.

Nuti and Lyday also discussed the potential of DG programming has to strengthen clientelist systems. In Russia, USAID and other donor policies favored rapid privatization to move necessary resources from state into private hands. In Nuti and Lyday's opinion, practitioners did not understand how the Soviet system worked in practice. Public divestment was exactly what the patronage-based elites wanted. The result was that wealth and power devolved to an even tighter circle of political elites. Problems also arose in Bosnia, where donors committed to rapid elections as a path to modernity and European values and as a way to diffuse ethnicity. The problem was that elections strengthened patronage networks, instead of weakening them.

Nuti and Lyday suggested approaches in other sub-sectors such as local government and rule of law that could decrease levels of patronage and clientelism. Using alternative sources of authority to make new channels of patronage, helping people come up with better formal rules and training people to enforce those rules, and improving service delivery to help decrease reliance on porkbarrel spending for legitimacy all may help ameliorate the conditions leading to patronage and clientelism in developing countries.

Discussion

A participant stated that, since patronage and clientelism exist in circumstances of scarcity, there is no guarantee of equity for clients. The participant disagreed with the way the presenters portrayed patronage and clientelism as beneficial to the democratic process. Nuti and Lyday clarified their view that patronage and clientelism are functional and create social capital; they exist in a realm where social and public goods are defined differently and exchange of gifts is completely useful. Other participants stated that the definition of public good was vague and needed to be more specific.

An audience member stated that USAID should have been engaging in an analysis of patron-client networks 20 years ago as they were not only prevalent in developing countries but in American politics as well. A longer historical overview of how clientelist systems have changed around the world warrants greater consideration. Lyday agreed, noting that it was often patronage that raised civic participation in U.S. political history. Learning from this example might lead practitioners to better understand personal incentives for participation and how societies and types of people behave and function.

Another attendee noted that, while patronage is indeed a strategy of political competition within weak states, the economic component of patron-client networks needs to be further explored. Other avenues that require exploration are the circumstances of groups excluded from patron-client relationships. Are all citizens eventually incorporated into the system of patron-client relations or are some always excluded, never to become clients?

An audience participant observed that the presentation focuses on political parties in both traditional and modern societies. However, further attention needs to be drawn to whether the focus of patron-client relations is individual or local. The participant stated that the cases of patronage and clientelism discussed seemed to be of state-owned goods in the hands of state ministries who serve as patrons to select citizens or clients. Furthermore, the transnational dimensions of patron-client relationships are powerful and involve political financing and engagement across borders, making them more complicated than domestic patron-client relationships.

Discussion concluded by addressing the larger issue of how practitioners can think of ways to break the system of patron-client networks down and not reinforce it. Participants inquired whether they should focus on informal or formal structures and attempt to increase the number of patrons by encouraging political competition. Nuti and Lyday stressed that the solution lies with the ability of practitioners to build state capacity and to focus on the patrons and clients instead of merely trying to break apart their system.

This issue of *Democracy Report* summarizes the April 22, 2003 Tuesday Group. DR is an internal document and should not be redistributed (forwarded) outside USAID. Send comments to Shamila N. Chaudhary, schaudhary@usaid.gov, at the DG Office.

Previous issues of *Democracy Report*, DCHA/DG technical publications, and a wide array of other democracy and governance information can be accessed at the DG Office's intranet site: <http://inside.usaid.gov/G/DG>.

Progress Report for July 15 - October 15, 2002
Peggy Ochandarena
Committee on International Judicial Relations,
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts

This is the first progress report of Peggy Ochandarena, the first Fellow assigned to the Committee on International Judicial Relations (hereinafter "the Committee"), at the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts ("the AO") in Washington, D.C.

Professional Goals

My professional goals include serving as a liaison between the Committee and USAID; developing and participating in activities to support international judicial reform; and augmenting my professional credentials in international development work. For the reason explained below, the liaison role has been difficult to work on, but the goal remains the same as changes in the situation should allow for this goal to be accomplished. The other goals are being accomplished and remain the same.

General Description of Fellowship to Date

In this initial period, the expected adjustments occurred, as the agency began to identify specifically how the fellowship placement would fit into the existing staffing structure, and I began to learn how the Committee, the AO, and the international development community function in relation to each other. Particular tasks have been identified and assigned to me, and I have suggested and begun projects. Some of the expected objectives and activities have been assigned to other staff, and thus should be deleted from the fellowship plan. I am doing some activities not contemplated previously and those should be added to the plan. I attended the International Bar Association conference in Durban, South Africa, where the Human Rights Institute (a subsection of the IBA) sponsored a number of sessions on legal and judicial reform. I accompanied a judge to Ghana to conduct an on-site assessment of the judicial system there. We met with the Vice President, the Chief Justice, a number of judges from every level of Ghana's courts, the Minister of Justice, the Ghana Bar Association Vice President, officers of legal NGOs, the dean of the law school, and other key Ghanaian and American representatives. I am drawing up a list of activities to assist the Ghanians in judicial development, and will begin taking steps to achieve those acts. The trip report will follow this report shortly.

This time period has been one of major transition for the rule of law team within the Democracy and Governance Office at USAID. As a result, for the most part, there has been no team leader, and virtually no team, with which to interact. As staff are added there, I have contacted them and begun establishing working relationships. As USAID's reorganization takes shape, and critical positions are filled in the near future, there will be an increased opportunity for the anticipated liaison role to take shape.

Fellowship Objectives

The fellowship objectives include serving as a liaison between USAID and the Committee; facilitating Committee resources to assist in achieving USAID program objectives; and performing tasks in furtherance of international judicial development, and conducting outreach to other entities involved in rule of law projects. These objectives all remain as identified.

Performance Methods and Activities

1. The first performance method, to accomplish the Committee - USAID liaison role, was designed to be achieved by my attendance at USAID's rule of law team meetings. Those meetings have not occurred, for the reason cited above. I have attended other meetings at USAID as the opportunities arose, including a survey of current efforts in rule of law work, planning sessions for a sector analysis project, and meetings with the Committee Chair and key USAID administrators. I have participated in a new monthly interagency rule of law meeting that includes USAID staff. Additionally, I have attended numerous other presentations and meetings sponsored by various government agencies and NGOS on topics of interest to rule of law efforts. I have participated in weekly staff meetings and regular conference calls at the AO with Committee staff. I have planned presentations for several conferences, including a break out session for the USAID's Partners' Conference addressing judicial reform in Islamic societies, an outline for a discussion on "lessons learned" at the Committee's semiannual meeting, and general informational presentations for two State Department National Council on International Visitors' conferences.

2. The second performance method was the development of model programs addressing judicial policy, court administration, judicial ethics, and other relevant topics. A number of these topics already have model programs drafted and in use. I have begun compiling protocols in other areas, such as orientation of new fellows, notification of U.S. agencies abroad when judges travel, a compilation of judicial assessment tools, and guidelines for development of sister court relationships. These areas are more administrative than substantive. As of yet, there has been no identification of the need for substantive models programs to be drafted. As this potential still exists, however, this performance method should remain in the plan, in case Committee members or AO staff request a program on a particular topic.

3. The next performance method is working with law schools to support the Committee's Judicial Observation Program. This task is already adequately staffed and this performance method should be deleted from the plan.

4. The fourth method is to draft outlines, memoranda, and articles. At the request of the Committee Chair, I drafted an article for the op ed page of the local newspaper outlining the importance of judicial reform in international development work. I compiled a list of accomplishments resulting from the work of judges on USAID-sponsored projects for use in an article by a USAID administrator. This method is ongoing, as specific topics and documents are identified and requested.

5-6. The fifth method is to research significant cultural differences which may impact programs and incorporate findings in program designs. This method ties in with the sixth method, which is to identify and administer an evaluation of past and present programs. I have just began this method, and am in the process of identifying various evaluation tools that would be appropriate for application to our programs.

Outcomes and Impact

1. I have prepared the presentations for judges participating in three workshops, as identified above.
2. I have, on four occasions, identified electronic resources as requested for transmission to judges abroad. For example, I identified recent law review articles on adjudication of intellectual property issues for Chinese judges. Another staff member has been assigned the task of hosting and coordinating training for international visitors here.
3. I have compiled administrative protocols in Fellow orientation, judicial assessments, and notification of U.S. agencies abroad when judges travel.
4. I have not developed any new observation programs, as previously discussed.
5. I have researched and drafted one article on the role of judges in international development work, and one paper outlining judicial accomplishments abroad.
6. I have not drafted any recommendations regarding cultural issues to date.
7. I have not begun work on program evaluation to date.

Proposed Revisions to Program Description

Additions

I have taken on several tasks which were not included in the initial fellowship plan. They should be incorporated into the plan as follows:

Performance methods and activities:

- 1) Serve as staff liaison to at least two working groups of the Committee by supporting the members, preparing the agenda for meetings, and following through with tasks as identified.
- 2) Coordinate the identification of appropriate judges for international projects upon request and facilitate their travel as needed. For example, I located a French-speaking judge to address criminal procedure issues in Algeria, and a judge to present at a seminar in Taiwan on enforcement

of intellectual property judgments.

3) Compile a list, and follow through, on identified tasks to promote judicial development in Ghana.

4) Facilitate new project of distance video conferencing with judges and attorneys in Central and South America by identifying American judges, topics, video facilities, times, and gathering written Spanish material.

Anticipated Outcomes and Results:

1) Organize two workshops by formulating the agenda and facilitating the discussion, in conjunction with the working group chairperson.

2) Match at least four judges with projects and identify and provide the administrative and substantive support they will need to successfully complete their projects.

3) Identify and send at least three packages of materials to Ghanaian judges, legislators, and NGO staff.

4) Coordinate at least two distance video presentations.

Deletion

Delete the third activity on the fellowship plan and its related outcome, regarding working with the Committee's Judicial Observation Program.

Anticipated Travel

During the next quarter, I will attend the Fellows retreat in Vermont in December. I will attend the Committee's semiannual meeting in Sanibel Island, Florida, on January 13-15. Although I do not have international travel identified at this time, other needs may arise; it seems typical that little lead time is given for international projects.

Progress Report for October 15, 2002 - January 15, 2003

Peggy Ochandarena
Committee on International Judicial Relations,
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts

This is the second progress report of Peggy Ochandarena, assigned to the Committee on International Judicial Relations, at the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts in Washington, D.C.

Professional Goals

My professional goals include developing and participating in activities to support international judicial reform, and increasing my professional credentials in international development work. For the reason explained below, the liaison role previously identified has been eliminated, but the other goals are being accomplished and remain the same.

General Description of Fellowship during this period

In this period, I have begun a number of projects, completing some of them as described below. My duties continued to be refined, with further deletions and additions since the last report. In a recent meeting, clarification of my relationship with the Democracy and Governance Office at USAID was made. The Deputy Director of the DG office has stated that the fellowship position was not intended to serve as a liaison between the AO and the DG office, but rather as a staff position to further the activities of the Committee. I have not been invited to attend any rule of law staff meetings to date, or any meetings at the DG office. However, I have been invited to begin participating in the DG office's SORA project. I attended a retreat for all Democracy Fellows in Vermont, and a conference in Rome on the reconstruction of the judicial system in Afghanistan. I had an active role in planning and participating in the Committee's semi-annual meeting, in which 75 guests from the international development community attended.

Fellowship Objectives

The fellowship objectives include serving as a resource to the Committee to assist in achieving USAID program objectives, performing tasks in furtherance of international judicial development, and conducting outreach to the international development community involved in rule of law projects.

Performance Methods and Activities

1. Participate in agency and community meetings. I have participated in an ongoing monthly interagency rule of law meeting, and will continue to participate and occasionally organize such meetings. I continue to attend presentations and meetings sponsored by various government agencies and contractors on international rule of law efforts. I have participated in weekly staff meetings and

regular conference calls at the AO with Committee members and staff, and in the Committee's semi-annual meeting.

2. Develop model programs addressing judicial policy, court administration, judicial ethics, and other relevant topics. I completed protocols in various areas, such as orientation of new Committee staff, preparation of judges for their trips overseas, and guidelines for development of sister court relationships. I formulate program agenda for international visitors and coordinate the presentations to those groups. For example, I organized a presentation on judicial training and ethics for a group of Jordanian judges, a presentation on court administration for a Thai court administrator, a presentation on judicial management of class action litigation for a group of Thai judges, and a presentation on judicial independence for a group of Afghani judges and attorneys.

3. Draft outlines, memoranda, and articles. I compiled materials for two presentations on the Committee's work for a judge to deliver at State Department conferences. This method is ongoing, as specific topics and documents are identified and requested.

4. Research significant cultural differences which may impact programs and incorporate findings in program designs. I have identified the Middle East as the first area in which to develop a primer on cultural differences that will equip judges providing assistance in that area with a basic understanding of key differences to be aware of as they interact with professionals from that region.

5. Identify and administer an evaluation of past and present programs. I coordinated a "Lessons Learned" session at the Committee meeting in which more than 20 people shared their observations on what has/not been successful in judicial development programs. I will identify judicial development programs sponsored by USAID for evaluation. I will participate in USAID's SORA project.

6. Serve as staff liaison to at least two working groups of the Committee. At present, I staff the following Working Groups: Asia/Pacific, Eastern Europe, Middle East, Africa, Commercial Law, and Sister Courts. I coordinated sessions for three working groups at the recent Committee meeting, including drafting the agenda, identifying and inviting key guests, and participating in the sessions.

7. Coordinate the identification of appropriate judges for international projects upon request. I identified judges for the following projects: a seminar for judges in Thailand comparing inquisitorial and accusatorial systems; a conference on Taiwan enforcement of intellectual property decisions; a French-speaking judge to address criminal law reform in Algeria; and criminal justice system reforms in India, as well as assisted in the preparations for these trips.

8. Compile a list of tasks for follow up from the trip to Ghana. The list has been completed and some of the tasks accomplished. For example, I drafted a letter to the American Bar Association recommending their support of a project to renovate a judicial training center, and provided information on our financial disclosure laws to the Ghana legislature. The remaining tasks will be addressed as the judge overseeing the project directs.

9. Facilitate distance video conference sessions. I have facilitated two projects by identifying

Spanish-speaking judges who are willing to participate, identifying topics, soliciting Spanish materials for the presentations, and coordinating the logistics. The first project was an information gathering session where we conferenced with judges in Ecuador and identified topics they wanted training on; the second, also with Ecuador, was an overview of the federal and state court system in the U.S.

Outcomes and Impact

1. Organize at least one interagency rule of law meeting. Facilitate the participation of Committee members and USAID personnel in at least one of the other's conferences or meetings.
2. Develop at least one model program or protocol, such as a resource list or manual for purposes of training new judges about international development. Develop and coordinate programs for at least three groups of international visitors.
3. Draft at least one outline, article, or speech as directed.
4. Draft at least one primer on cultural differences which impact programs in judicial development.
5. Evaluate at least two past programs in which judges participated, and disseminate the findings of the evaluation.
6. Coordinate activities within the region or substantive area of the Working Groups to which I am assigned; staff at least three Working Group sessions at the next Committee meeting.
7. Identify and facilitate the travel of judges for at least three international projects.
8. Complete all tasks on the Ghana project list by sending at least two more packets of information to Ghana.
9. Facilitate at least one more distance video conference.

Anticipated Travel

During the remainder of the year, I anticipate the following possibilities for travel: conferences on judicial independence in the Middle East and Asia; a conference on research and evaluation; and travel to countries to evaluate past projects. Another possibility is a trip to Mongolia to assist in an assessment of legal reform efforts there.

Caroline Sahley
World Learning Fellowship Progress Report
USAID/Office of Democracy and Governance
First Quarterly Report, November 30, 2002

Professional Goals and Fellowship Overview

My professional goals for this fellowship are to gain a strong theoretical understanding of the key issues in democracy and governance, as well as developing practical and professional expertise in the field of democracy promotion. I hope to deepen my existing knowledge of civil society strengthening activities, while also gaining valuable exposure to related areas of democracy promotion, such of rule of law, governance, and political processes programming.

The primary goal of my fellowship is to assist the civil society division of the Office of Democracy and Governance in developing, refining and evaluating its civil society strengthening activities.

Fellowship Objectives

The specific objectives for the fellowship as set out in the original workplan are as follows:

- 1) To design, test, and implement a framework for assessing the impact of civil society strengthening programs.
- 2) To support civil society programs in the field by providing technical assistance and advice to USAID missions.
- 3) To provide technical leadership on key practical and conceptual issues relating to civil society strengthening.

Specific activities and methods used to achieve these objectives are described below.

Performance, Methods and Activities

The first objective, developing a framework for assessing the impact of civil society strengthening programs has been the primary focus of my work since I began my fellowship. The assessment effort, known as the Sector Operational Research Agenda, or SORA, is an office-wide initiative to evaluate USAID's democracy assistance. Since the appointment of a new Office director, SORA has been made a priority, and concerted efforts are being made to coordinate and integrate the sub-sectoral evaluations. While this renewed effort to adopt a coordinated approach to SORA will increase the time needed

for planning and may delay field work for several months, I believe that adopting an integrated approach to evaluating democracy assistance methods will generate more useful results.

As part of the SORA project, I developed a draft working paper that sets out a preliminary framework for assessing civil society programs. I organized a working group of civil society practitioners and researchers to review and comment on the paper. An improved and refined draft will be completed in early 2003, and will form the basis of the upcoming civil society assessments.

The second objective, to support civil society programs in the field by providing technical assistance and advice to USAID missions, has been a small part of my fellowship in the first quarter but is building gradually. I have reviewed and provided comments on a proposed civil society program in Panama. More significantly, I have begun preparations for a TDY to Macedonia in January of 2003, to assist with the design of a civil society evaluation. I expect that my role in providing technical support to missions, as well as regional bureaus within USAID, will increase throughout the year. I have not performed any backstopping activities to date, although I have recently been assigned Peru and Bolivia.

The third objective, to provide technical leadership on key practical and conceptual issues relating to civil society strengthening, has largely taken the form of research on the role of religious organizations in USAID democracy programming. Over the past three months, I collected data on USAID programs that provide support to religious organizations, and drafted several case studies. In addition, I designed and delivered a training course on this topic for the New Entry Professionals Program.

In addition, I planned to informally monitor civil society programming in Islamic countries. I have monitored and supported recent efforts to develop a regional network of civic education organizations in the Middle East, and drafted a summary proposal for this work for consideration by the Middle East Partnership Initiative. The lack of a security clearance, however, precluded my active participation in the Islam and Development Working Group organized by the E&E Bureau. This Working Group brings together individuals from throughout the Agency to discuss and coordinate work in Islamic countries. In forthcoming quarter, time permitting, I may rejoin the working group.

Outcomes and Impacts

It is difficult to point to significant outcomes and impacts so early on in the fellowship. Yet, I can point to the following achievements of the first quarter of my fellowship.

- I have helped the SORA team develop preliminary guidelines for a comparative research design. My efforts, alongside those of the other SORA researchers, are leading to the development of a research design that is integrated in its approach and consistent across all sub-sectors. I believe that adopting a comparative

methodology will facilitate comparisons across countries, as well as across sub-sectors, and will enable us to produce generalizable findings.

- Although the SORA project has been slow in getting started, I have developed a draft framework for civil society evaluation, and have modified it for use in an upcoming evaluation of USAID funded labor programs. Parts of this framework may also be incorporated into an assessment to be conducted in Macedonia in 2003. Piloting and testing this framework will enable me to refine the framework for future use by missions elsewhere.
- My work on religious organizations in DG programming will become a resource for the civil society division. This package of materials, including a set of overheads, extensive talking points, and written case studies, will be expanded and used for future training for DG officers.

Proposed Revisions to Program Description

1. Under fellowship objectives and activities #2, (backstopping democracy programs) omit reference to Ethiopia, Kenya and Zambia. I will be backstopping Peru and Bolivia.
2. The timetable for the SORA project is increasingly unclear, and it is not certain that it will be possible to complete three country case studies and a draft synthesis paper by August 2003. Hopefully by the end of the second quarter of my fellowship, the timetable for SORA implementation will become clear.

Travel Plans

1. At this stage it is unclear if field research on the SORA project will be undertaken in the first quarter of 2003.
2. I plan to travel to Macedonia in January 2003, to assist the mission with the design of a civil society evaluation process.
3. Additional field support visits may be undertaken in the next quarter, although no plans have been finalized at this stage.

Caroline Sahley
World Learning Fellowship Progress Report
USAID/Office of Democracy and Governance
Second Quarterly Report, February 2003

I Professional Goals and Fellowship Overview

My professional goals for this fellowship are to gain a strong theoretical understanding of the key issues in democracy and governance, as well as developing practical and professional expertise in the field of democracy promotion. I hope to deepen my existing knowledge of civil society strengthening activities, while also gaining valuable exposure to related areas of democracy promotion, such of rule of law, governance, and political processes programming.

The primary goal of my fellowship is to assist the civil society division of the Office of Democracy and Governance in developing, refining and evaluating its civil society strengthening activities.

II Fellowship Objectives

The Fellowship objectives as stated in my original workplan were as follows:

- 1) To design, test, and implement a framework for assessing the impact of civil society strengthening programs.
- 2) To support civil society programs in the field by providing technical assistance and advice to USAID missions.
- 3) To provide technical leadership on key practical and conceptual issues relating to civil society strengthening.

III Performance, Activities, and Impact

1) Civil Society Assessment

The first objective, developing a framework for assessing the impact of civil society programs, primarily takes the form of my participation in the SORA project. The Sectoral Operational Research Agenda is a large scale evaluation effort that will assess the impact of USAID's DG programs worldwide.

The program has undergone significant change since the inception of my fellowship. Initially, the SORA research effort was organized as four distinct sub-sectoral studies, loosely related through an ad hoc committee. Each sub-sector study was being designed and managed independently by each sub-sector team within the DG office. In January,

the SORA researchers briefed the DG office senior staff on progress made to date on the research design. Among the issues raised by the SORA team was the need for clarification of the overall project management structure and decision making authority. At that meeting, the Chief of the Strategies Division, Margaret Sarles, was formally appointed as head of the research program.

The appointment of a SORA manager will facilitate overall program coordination and will help ensure that the sub-sector studies are comparable. However, the overall management structure of the program has yet to be decided, and key questions, such as whether to conduct the research in house or through a contractor have not been resolved.

Little substantive progress was made on the civil society component of SORA this quarter. My level of effort on SORA is somewhat reduced at the moment, and is likely to stay reduced for the next quarter. However, weekly SORA meetings are being held and I will continue to stay involved and contribute to the design of the project.

2) Technical Assistance to USAID Missions

Macedonia TDY: The primary focus of my activities over the past quarter was to assist the USAID mission in Macedonia to develop a scope of work for an assessment of the civil society sector and a review of the civil society programs currently in place. I traveled to Macedonia at the end of January and spent a week working with the mission to clarify their expectations of the assessment process, develop a framework for the sector assessment and refine questions for the program review.

The assessment design drew in part from the draft SORA working paper developed last quarter, which presented a tentative framework for evaluating the effectiveness of civil society programs. The final assessment design was very well received by the mission staff in Macedonia.

Although the draft SORA framework was itself not appropriate for the needs of the mission (which requested a methodology that included both a civil society sector assessment and program review), the Macedonia assessment design did benefit from prior SORA work. This technical assistance request provided an excellent opportunity to field test some of the more conceptual tools developed as part of the SORA work and allow mission staff to provide feedback on its practical relevance in the field. This input, in turn, will feed back into the SORA research design.

LAC Backstopping: In December, I began backstopping Peru and Bolivia, and over the past quarter have begun to review program documents and background materials; initiate contacts within the LAC Bureau; and attend meetings/workshops on issues relevant to Latin America. There are no clear outputs or impacts to point to at this stage, although it is important to point out that backstopping functions are requiring an increasing level of effort as relationships with mission and bureau staff are developed. It is likely that activities associated with backstopping will increase over the next quarter.

3) Technical Leadership on Key Issues Relating To Civil Society

Cross-Sectoral Research: A variety of initiatives are underway at USAID to transcend the 'stovepiping' that tends to occur in programming as a result of the Agency's structure. In December, I was involved in reviewing a research paper that considered the synergies between USAID's education and democracy programs. I reviewed the paper, and helped the contractor better address the potential impact of DG programs on the quality of, and access to, education. Similarly, I have recently joined an ad hoc committee that will advise contractors engaged in a study that looks at the links between energy sector reform and DG. My participation on the advisory committee will ensure that the study include a civil society perspective, and consider issues relating to citizen participation in decision -making. I plan to participate in other cross-sector activities as opportunities emerge.

Democracy Partners Conference: The Civil Society Division assumed a lead role in organizing the annual democracy partners conference in December. I served on the review committee for proposals on the theme of "Failed and Failing States". The conference was extremely well attended, despite adverse weather conditions, and received positive evaluations from most participants.

Civil Society Research Papers: An increasing amount of time was spent this quarter reviewing a series of papers produced by the Civil Society Division that are in draft form and are awaiting revision and publication. I have reviewed and commented on a paper on CSO advocacy which is soon to be published as a technical publication. Most significantly, I am currently revising a paper drafted by Harry Blair and Kimberly Ludwig that synthesizes seven country case studies of civil society programs. It is likely that over the next quarter, a significant proportion of my time will be spent revising this paper.

IV Proposed Revisions to Program Description

The fellowship objectives as stated in the original workplan remain relevant and valid. The activities used to achieve these objectives may need to be modified slightly, and the timeline and levels of effort should be revised to include a slower start-up of the SORA project, and a greater role in on-going civil society research efforts.

1. The timetable for the SORA project is increasingly unclear, and it is highly unlikely that fieldwork will begin in the next quarter. The amount of time that I will devote to the SORA project may decline this quarter, as overall project management and implementation plans are still in the process of being designed.
2. Under Activity #2, revise 'research on role of religious organizations', to read 'research on civil society issues', to reflect participation in various research

efforts within the Civil Society Division. The level of effort for these activities will increase in the next quarter.

VI Travel Plans

1. I plan to attend a monitoring and evaluation conference in Holland at the end of March. The conference is entitled, Measurement, Management and Accountability?, and is being organized by INTRAC. The conference will be held in Soesterberg, Netherlands.
2. Additional field support visits may be undertaken in the next quarter, although no plans have been finalized at this stage.

It is also important to note that given current international political environment, USAID DG officers are being asked to review and carefully prioritize their travel plans for the next few months. Some of the mission support and research activities planned for my fellowship could be disrupted over the next few months.

**Caroline Sahley
World Learning Fellowship Progress Report
USAID/Office of Democracy and Governance
Third Quarterly Report, May 2003**

I Professional Goals and Fellowship Overview

My professional goals for this fellowship are to gain a strong theoretical understanding of the key issues in democracy and governance, as well as developing practical and professional expertise in the field of democracy promotion. I hope to deepen my existing knowledge of civil society strengthening activities, while also gaining valuable exposure to related areas of democracy promotion, such of rule of law, governance, and political processes programming.

The primary goal of my fellowship is to assist the civil society division of the Office of Democracy and Governance in developing, refining and evaluating its civil society strengthening activities.

II Fellowship Objectives

The Fellowship objectives as stated in my original workplan were as follows:

- 1) To design, test, and implement a framework for assessing the impact of civil society strengthening programs.
- 2) To support civil society programs in the field by providing technical assistance and advice to USAID missions.
- 3) To provide technical leadership on key practical and conceptual issues relating to civil society strengthening.

III Performance, Activities, and Impact

1) Civil Society Assessment – SORA:

The Sectoral Operations Research Agenda (SORA) program is still in the planning stage, and is undergoing a profound transformation. The management of the program has been turned over to the Strategies Division, and as a result, the SORA 'team' is no longer playing a leading role in program planning and design discussions. My participation in SORA over the past quarter has been significantly reduced and currently, the time I dedicate to SORA is minimal.

Currently, the Strategies Division is engaging a contractor to assist with the research design. It is possible that once the research design process is actively underway, that the SORA 'team' may be expected to play an active role in the process. At the moment, however, the extent of this role is unclear.

One of the issues that has yet to be clarified is the role of the Strategies Division vis-à-vis those of the SORA 'team'. Those of us assigned to work on SORA, who are not also

members of the Strategies Team, are not always well informed about the SORA planning process. Limited communication about progress on SORA planning has made it difficult for me to estimate the amount of time I will be devoting to this program in the near future.

2) Technical Assistance to USAID Missions

Malawi TDY:

As in the last quarter, a considerable portion of my time has been spent focusing on field support issues (both backstopping and TDYs). In May, I traveled to Malawi to assist the USAID mission in the design of a democracy program. The circumstances surrounding the Malawi program are somewhat unique. The British Department for International Development has made a conditional grant of 7 million pounds to USAID-Malawi for democracy programming. This amounts to a significant expansion of the existing democracy program, and as a result, the mission had requested support and technical assistance from the DG office for the initial program design.

I spent ten days in Malawi, helping the DG office clarify its objectives and refine its proposed activities. I presented a draft program description for the mission that they will be able to expand upon and refine over the next few weeks. Overall it was an interesting assignment, and hopefully my visit helped the mission think through some challenging issues relating to its civil society portfolio.

LAC Backstopping:

My backstopping responsibilities have gradually increased over the last few months. Most significantly, Ecuador has been recently added to my current backstopping responsibilities. Over the past few months, I have been spending time reviewing program documents, key strategy papers and daily news articles relating to these three countries. In addition, I have been attending meetings in the Latin America Bureau on relevant issues as they arise.

The DG office is refining the roles of backstops as part of its field support mission, and is encouraging backstops to be more active than they have been in the recent past. I am hoping to build strong relationships with the democracy officers in these countries and stay in regular contact with the mission staff. It is possible that future field support visits could flow from these backstopping assignments.

3) Technical Leadership on Key Issues Relating To Civil Society

Much of my efforts have been dedicated to activities that can contribute in some way to pushing forward the technical and analytical agenda of the civil society team. This includes participating in the civil society research agenda, cross-sectoral working groups, and the design of training materials for democracy officers.

Civil Society Research Papers: I have continued to work on drafting a paper that reviews in some depth seven country case studies of civil society programs. This paper draws on case studies completed several years ago, and requires significant updating and editing. The final format for publication has yet to be determined at this time.

In addition, the civil society division has a backlog of papers in draft form that need to be reviewed and revised. Along with other members of the division, I reviewed and provided substantive comments on papers relating to NGO advocacy, faith-based organizations, and links between civil society and political parties.

Cross-Sectoral Working Groups:

Education: In the last quarter, I advised consultants working on a research effort that looked at the links between education programs and democracy. The paper is now being published jointly by the Office of Democracy and Governance and the Office of Education. Early drafts of the paper emphasized the education sector and failed to adequately highlight the impact of DG programs in education issues. My participation resulted in a more balanced publication, in which the contributions of democracy and governance programs to improving education are recognized and highlighted.

Energy: I am currently participating in a working group that focuses on governance and civil society issues in energy reform processes. This includes advising the consultants on topic selection, participating in working group meetings and seminars. I hope that my participation will help focus attention on the issue of civil society participation in energy reform.

Training Plans: The civil society division has been working actively in the design and development of new training courses for the advanced democracy officers training in December. Division members have been encouraged to develop concept papers and draft training content for consideration for use in December. I have drafted two concept papers; one on methods for evaluating advocacy programs, and a second focusing on the role of faith-based organizations in democracy programming. Final decisions about which courses are to be offered will be made later this summer.

IV Proposed Revisions to Program Description

The fellowship objectives as stated in the original workplan remain relevant and valid, although objective one is linked to SORA, and may not be achievable by the end of my fellowship. Objective two should also be amended to read, "technical assistance and advice to USAID missions AND REGIONAL BUREAUS."

The most significant change to the workplan, as noted in my previous quarterly report, is the reduced time spent on SORA, and increased time spent on technical assistance and the broader civil society analytical agenda.

VI Travel Plans

At the moment I do not have any specific travel plans for the fourth quarter of my fellowship, although field support opportunities may arise.

Caroline Sahley
World Learning Fellowship Progress Report
USAID/Office of Democracy and Governance
Fourth Quarterly Report, August 2003

I Professional Goals and Fellowship Overview

My professional goals for this fellowship are to gain a strong theoretical understanding of the key issues in democracy and governance, as well as developing practical and professional expertise in the field of democracy promotion. I hope to deepen my existing knowledge of civil society strengthening activities, while also gaining valuable exposure to related areas of democracy promotion, such of rule of law, governance, and political processes programming.

The primary goal of my fellowship is to assist the civil society division of the Office of Democracy and Governance in developing, refining and evaluating its civil society strengthening activities.

II Fellowship Objectives

The Fellowship objectives as stated in my original workplan were as follows:

- 1) To design, test, and implement a framework for assessing the impact of civil society strengthening programs.
- 2) To support civil society programs in the field by providing technical assistance and advice to USAID missions.
- 3) To provide technical leadership on key practical and conceptual issues relating to civil society strengthening.

III Performance, Activities, and Impact

1) Civil Society Assessment – SORA:

My participation in the SORA (Sector Operational Research agenda) has evolved throughout the first year of my fellowship. For the first quarter or two of my fellowship, SORA related research absorbed the majority of my time. In fact, I perceived it as the central objective of my fellowship, leading to the development of several civil society case studies which would become my final fellowship “work product”.

Changes in the management structure of SORA, and the increasing likelihood that most, if not all of SORA’s research activities will be contracted out, has meant that SORA has occupied a declining proportion of my time. Over the last three months, my efforts on SORA have been largely limited to commenting on the draft research proposal developed by the SSRC.

As a result, it is difficult to point to any clear outputs or impacts of my efforts on this project. I hope that the working paper I drafted has contributed in some way to the office debates surrounding the methodological challenges of evaluating democracy programs and has helped advance the research design. Certainly, in terms of my own professional development, it was a positive experience to sharpen and enhance my own rusty skills in the area of research methodology. I certainly feel more conversant in the key issues of research design, including case selection, and qualitative vs. quantitative data collection methods.

In addition, as part of my SORA activities, I developed a matrix that lays out a framework for evaluating civil society's contribution to democratic development. Time permitting, I may wish to further develop and test this tool in the second year of my fellowship.

It remains unclear what role I and other DG office staff may be expected to play in the program in the future. As noted in my revised fellowship program, there are a growing number of projects that are demanding of my time. Although no firm decisions have been made at this stage, it appears likely that my efforts on SORA will remain at a low level, playing a limited advisory role.

2) Technical Assistance to USAID Missions

Over the last quarter, my primary mission support activity has involved ongoing advice and assistance to the Malawi mission. I drafted a section of a Program Description for a new democracy program, and continue to advise and support the mission on its development.

In many ways, the support to USAID missions has been one of the more satisfying activities of my first year. Although I undertook a limited number of TDYs (Macedonia and Malawi), this on the ground experience in a USAID mission has been invaluable, both in terms of understanding how USAID functions, and learning about democracy programming in different contexts.

Opportunities to provide technical assistance to USAID missions, however, are sporadic and somewhat unpredictable. It is difficult to anticipate what opportunities may arise in the next year and how much time might be devoted to these activities.

LAC Backstopping:

My backstopping responsibilities have gradually increased over the last few months. I have developed relationships with DG officers in my backstop countries. I was originally assigned Peru and Bolivia, with Ecuador being added to my list of countries several months ago. It now appears likely that the responsibility for backstopping Ecuador will be transferred in the next quarter to another DG staff member.

Over the last several months, I have been increasingly involved in providing technical assistance and support to the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) Bureau. The Bureau has recently seen a reduction in its DG staff, and in response, they have requested support and assistance from the DG office. I have been providing assistance on a variety of civil society related activities, including planning for civil society participation in the Summit of the Americas process. I anticipate that these activities will continue to grow in the next year, although they need to be carefully managed to ensure an appropriate balance with DG office priorities.

3) Technical Leadership on Key Issues Relating To Civil Society

Much of my efforts have been dedicated to activities that can contribute in some way to pushing forward the technical and analytical agenda of the civil society team. This includes participating in the civil society research agenda, cross-sectoral working groups, and the design of training materials for democracy officers.

Civil Society Research Papers: I have continued to work on drafting a paper that reviews in some depth seven country case studies of civil society programs. In this quarter, I worked on a second draft of a synthesis paper, which draws from seven existing case studies. These case studies, which were completed several years ago, are now somewhat out of date. The civil society division will need to determine whether to invest staff time and resources in updating and rewriting these case studies.

Cross-Sectoral Working Groups:

Energy: Over the last quarter I have participated in the energy cross-sectoral working group. In this group, a team of consultants has been engaged to draft a working paper that looks at the links between energy and governance. I have agreed to comment on drafts of the civil society section as it is developed.

Food Security: More recently, I have been asked to chair a new working group that looks at the relationship between governance and food security. The objective of the working group is to develop a draft strategy for addressing food security from a governance perspective. Possible short term products include several desk-based case studies, an issue paper and in a draft analytical framework. This assignment has the potential to absorb a significant proportion of my time, and is a challenging - and welcome - addition to my fellowship objectives.

Training Plans:

Over the last three months, the civil society division has been working actively in the design and development of new training courses for the advanced democracy officers training in December. It is possible that some of the training activities will be contracted

out, so that our direct training responsibilities will be limited. Still, the entire team has been actively engaged in designing training objectives, discussing potential topics, and developing a coherent two day outline.

IV Proposed Revisions to Program Description

The most significant change to the workplan is the reduced time spent on SORA, and increased time that will be spent looking at governance and food security issues. My second year fellowship program description defines in more detail the expected changes to my activities.

VI Travel Plans

At the moment I do not have any specific travel plans for the next quarter.

Keith Schulz
Democracy Fellows Progress Report
January, 2003

Time Period of Report: June 1, 2002 through December 31, 2002

This report covers the time period between June 1, 2002, and December 31, 2002 and represents my third Democracy Fellows Progress Report. The first progress report covered the time period between November 1, 2000 and May 1, 2001; the first six month of my Fellowship. The second progress report covered the time period between May 1, 2001 and May 31, 2002. My Fellowship is with the Center for Democracy and Governance in the Global Bureau of USAID in Washington, D.C. Within the Center, I act as the legislative strengthening advisor on the Governance Team.

Fellowship Objectives

My objectives for this Fellowship are to assist the Center to develop a more extensive framework of information and knowledge of the issues and factors affecting the development of democratic legislative institutions in countries undergoing political transition or reform. In so doing, it is envisioned that the work and research undertaken under this Fellowship will help to improve the design and implementation of legislative strengthening projects so as to achieve more democratic, representative, transparent, and accountable legislative institutions.

Fellowship Activities

During the time period covered by this report, I engaged in significant field support to the USAID Mission in Namibia. I spent three weeks in August of 2002 in Windhoek, Namibia assisting the Mission in developing and designing two programs: a national integrity promotion campaign led by the Office of the Ombudsman of Namibia; and a civic and voter education campaign to be implemented by the Namibian Institute for Democracy. My work on these programs included drafting workplans, meeting with persons involved in these programs, and advising the Mission on different programmatic options and alternatives. I also wrote an article about USAID's innovative legislative strengthening program, currently being implemented by the National Democratic Institute. This article was

posted on USAID Namibia's website and subsequently used by the Mission in its 2003 strategy and portfolio review.

During the past seven months, I provided significant technical assistance to other Missions through reviewing and commenting upon legislative strengthening strategies and proposals; by providing information and guidance on legislative strengthening issues in response to information requests; and helping Neil Levine, the CTO for the Deliberative Bodies IQC, manage and administer task orders under the IQC. Among the country Missions for whom I have provided significant technical assistance in the form of written comments or guidance are Ghana, Uganda, Mali, and Tanzania.

I continue to produce legislative strengthening electronic newsletters that contain news and information about legislative strengthening programs, activities, lessons learned, conferences, workshops, training opportunities, etc. This electronic newsletter is sent to a network of DG Officers, USAID employees, and implementing partners interested in, or engaged in, legislative strengthening. During the time period of this report, three newsletters were prepared and distributed.

Over this time period, I prepared and conducted two significant training courses for USAID DG Officers on legislative strengthening issues. In June, with the assistance of Scott Hubli, Senior Governance Advisor at the National Democratic Institute, I conducted a one day introductory course on legislative strengthening as part of the DG Office's week long training course for new DG Officers. In December, I helped the Governance Team organize and conduct a two day workshop on Budgeting and Public Finance for the Advanced DG Officers Training Course. As part of this two-day workshop, I prepared and presented a module on the role of legislatures and parliaments in the national budget process.

I also engaged in significant donor coordination activities through attendance at two international conferences. In October, I attended the first conference of the Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC), held in the Canadian Parliament Building in Ottawa. This conference, which was sponsored and organized by the Canadian International Development Agency and by the World Bank Institute, is an effort to help develop both an international and regional networks of parliamentarians and organizations, to address and combat corruption and

corruption related issues. I was able to disseminate much of the GOPAC and corruption related information I gathered during the conference to USAID's DG Officers through the LS Network Newsletter.

In November, I attended the Legislative Policy Dialogue Conference, organized and hosted by the UNDP and the Belgium Government, which brought together representatives from a number of different donor and implementing organizations that work in the field of legislative strengthening. The purpose of the conference was to exchange ideas, opinions and experiences about legislative strengthening programs and activities.

Fellowship Research

My primary Fellowship research project is to study the impact of USAID legislative assistance activities on the democratic performance of legislative institutions. As part of my research, I have gathered an extensive body of literature on assessment and evaluation methodology and techniques. From these materials, I prepared a draft Research Design and Methodology for this study. This design and methodology sets forth a research protocol and methodology for conducting an assessment and evaluation of USAID legislative strengthening impacts. Although I originally began preparatory work for this impact study on my own, the study has become part of a larger research agenda being pursued by the DG Office. The DG Office's Sector Operational Research Agenda (SORA) is a large-scale effort to evaluate the impact of USAID DG assistance both in specific countries and across specific sectors. Consequently, much of my work over the past year has been to work with other members of the SORA Team to ensure that our methodologies and approaches to our respective sector studies are compatible and designed to achieve the answers and results that the DG Office is seeking in the SORA process.

During the past seven months, I advanced the legislative strengthening portion of the SORA process through the convening of a working group of 10-14 legislative practitioners, specialists, and research methodologists to review, comment upon, and develop a final research methodology and protocol to guide the research and evaluation process for the impact study. The working group met two times, in all day sessions, to discuss a range of research and methodological issues. These discussions led to the drafting of a research protocol and approach for the legislative strengthening impact

assessment. The next step is to operationalize the research protocol and to begin the research portion of the study.



FINAL
Democracy Fellowship Report:
November 15, 2000 to June 1, 2003

To:
World Learning Institute

by

Gene R. Ward, Ph.D.
Sr. Democracy Fellow, Political Finance, USAID
Bureau of Democracy, Conflict & Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA)
Office of Democracy & Governance – Elections & Political Processes Team

June 6, 2003

1. INTRODUCTION

This report covers the totality of the fellowship period for Gene Ward from its inception November 15, 2000, to its conclusion, June 1, 2003.

It will highlight a few of the fellowship's activities and accomplishments while at the same time taking an evaluative look at the fellowship, and the fellowship program. It concludes with some recommendations for future program considerations.

I. ASSIGNMENT SUMMARY:

The Fellowship remained very specific and very focused throughout the 2 ½ year period. From the initial USAID interview in the fall of 2000 for the position of Democracy Fellow in Political Finance, it was very clear until the very end of the assignment of what was to be accomplished.

THE PRODUCTION OF A MONEY IN POLITICS HANDBOOK:

This is the major accomplishment of the Fellowship. It follows from the specific assignment begun at the beginning of the Fellowship to develop a handbook on money and politics. "Money in Politics Handbook: A Guide to Increasing Transparency in Emerging Democracies," was subsequently researched and written during the duration of this Fellowship. As previously reported in detail, this activity was accomplished by a series of activities which involved:

- A. Conducting a needs assessment survey with USAID field missions to assess needs and interests of Democracy Officers in the subject.
- B. Development of a research design for USAID partner (IFES) to collect the pertinent data in 118 countries.
- C. Meetings with the experts in the field throughout the world by participation in a dozen international conferences on 3 continents.
- D. Conceptualizing and drafting pilot programs that promote transparency in political finance for field testing by IFES in the field.
- E. Vetting of handbook rough drafts with partners and USAID personnel.
- F. Major review and edit by senior USAID leadership.
- G. Doing a final draft using a technical editor.

Two stages will follow the completion of the publication:

- 1) the first is the monitoring and management of the pilot programs that have been established in Eastern Europe to put campaign finance reports on the Internet, a technical assistance project in South Africa, and a disclosure program in Bolivia.
- 2) the second is the distribution of the handbook throughout the world, to every extant political party, elected official, and watchdog NGOs in particular.

OTHER ACTIVITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES DURING THE FELLOWSHIP

In order that the full nature of the Fellowship period is understood, the ancillary roles and responsibilities played by the Fellow should also be briefly mentioned in this final report. There was a multiple of activities taking place in addition to and in conjunction with the primary role of completing a handbook on money in politics and a few are listed below:

- 1 **Participation in DG Annual Training Events:** As trainer and counselor for DG officers in the overseas USAID Missions.

2. **Field Backstopping:** serving/supporting the Missions in the field in the countries of Bangladesh, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Philippines, and East Timor.
3. **Conference Panelists:** 12 international workshops on 3 continents were attended on the subject of money in politics and political corruption. The Fellow served as a panelist on the majority of conferences.
4. **Expert Monographs on political finance.** The Fellow authored 3 papers in addition to completing a handbook on money in politics. Two papers were for the OAS, and one was for Transparency Int'l.
5. **UN Conventional on Anti-Corruption Wordsmith.** The Fellow entered a dialogue on disclosure with the US negotiators assigned to craft the UN position on the United Nations Anti-Corruption Convention.
6. **McCain-Feingold – American Campaign Finance Advisor.** The Fellow served to keep the Agency abreast of domestic political finance as well as international political finance.
7. **Founder of DG Design Committee.** Participated in the design and facelift of the DCHA/DG Office premises with icons and photos symbolizing the successes of democracies in the world.
8. **CTO Trained, step 1.** Took the initial CTO (chief technical officer) training (generally just open to direct hires) to learn more about the language and guidelines of monitoring contracts and grants
9. **Panelist at Int'l Conferences:** Attended 12 international workshops, the majority of which had me present a paper on money and politics.
10. **Handbook published and distributed:** (pending summer of 2003)

II. TRAVEL SUMMARY

- Global Forum III Conference, Seoul, Korea: May 27-June 1, 2003
- Carter Center Conference, March 17-20, 2003 (Atlanta)
- Trinidad Conference: March 6 to 7, 2003 (Port-of-Spain)
- OAS Vancouver Conference: Dec 4-6 (Canada)
- World Learning Retreat in Vermont: Dec 12-14 (Brattleboro)
- Serbia Conference: October 23-27, 2002 (Belgrade)
- Costa Rica Conference: October 3-4, 2002 (San Jose)
- Ukraine Conference: April 27-May 2, 2002 (Kiev)
- Oxford Conference: March 16-21, 2002 (UK)
- Bangkok Conference: January 14-16, 2002 (Thailand)
- Brijuni Conference, October 13-17, 2001 (Croatia)
- Seoul Conference: June 28-30, 2001 (Korea)
- Mexico City Conference: June 6-8, 2001 (Mexico)
- The Hague Conference: April 24-25, 2001 (Netherlands)

III. SOME ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

A. International Relevance: The "Money and Politics Handbook: A Guide to Increasing Transparency in Emerging Democracies" is a landmark publication. It is the first of its kind on disclosure and USAID is the first donor to publish on the subject. It is already being cited in journal articles, and at one point in its early existence, a draft copy was requested by the British Prime Minister's Office at 10 Downing Street due to a campaign finance

scandal. It is hoped that this early impact will continue and its value to the international community sustainable.

B. High Profile Launching at Carter Center: This was a high water mark of the Fellowship. As a previous legislator, it was indeed an honor to have been requested to launch the handbook at the Carter Center's March 2003 meeting of "The Council of Prime Ministers and Presidents of the Americas" that was held in Atlanta, Georgia. The Fellow was requested to be the luncheon speaker at the first day of the conference, but told that President Jimmy Carter always excused himself at dessert time when speeches were to begin. Much to the Fellow's surprise, the Fellow was invited to have lunch at the President's table and the President stayed on at the luncheon through the Fellow's speech on disclosure in money and politics. It is not known if the President Carter ate dessert that day or liked the subject of the speech.

C. Collaborative With Other International Agencies: World Bank and Organization of American States (OAS). Through the Fellow's presence at the key international conferences in money in politics, he was invited to make 3 presentations for the Organization of American States and a presentation to the World Bank headquarters. Linkages have also just made with the UN Secretariat in New York.

D. Sharing/Information Exchanges with World Bank: The presentation of the findings of USAID handbook at the World Bank was another high water mark for the Fellowship. Correctly or incorrectly, the World Bank's image of knowing development better than most, made the Fellow's invitation to the Bank a special one. Of course, perception is often overshadowed by reality, and some of the narrow questions received from Western Europeans in the audience made the Fellow doubt the subject was thoroughly yet understood by the Bank. Future exchanges with the Bank should clarify that, but the Fellowship provided the network and the linkage for this opportunity.

E. Word Learning Retreat: Perhaps one of the most personally rewarding experiences and the most profound identity marker of the Fellowship was the World Learning Fellows' Retreat of December 2002. It was the first time Fellows appeared as a cohesive group with an identity and a shared purpose. The location of the retreat held at the World Learning Headquarters in Vermont added a special effect to the event, and the way that snow fell within minutes of our arrival at a resort in the hills of Brattleboro was a most impressive display of World Learning having friends in high places. The active learning and relating process between the Fellows and World Learning in a very conducive small town setting will remain an outstanding memory of the Fellowship.

III PARTING OBSERVATIONS

1. Democracy Boot Camp: The Fellowship is an excellent mechanism for supporting the Democracy efforts of USAID and raising up a set of skilled

professionals. The caliber of Fellows has been most impressive and the contributions of each have been very noteworthy.

2. The WLFP System is Changeable: World Learning has proven itself to be a flexible organization and able to meet the needs of Fellows. Fellows were greatly enheartened by the new medical coverage that occurred following a year of intense discussions with USAID, World Learning, and the Fellows. From virtually a kernel of a program, the health coverage program grew into a very substantive coverage.

3. Fellows enjoy a unique status: USAID has more than a garden variety of hiring mechanisms, but none is quite as unique as the Democracy Fellows Program, and the rather unique identity it engenders. Fellows are to some extent considered the technical leadership or research gurus and in the DG Office and are active contributors to the intellectual content to the office. Few have standing by rank, but simply the power of ideas places them in a unique category. Fellows should therefore always have both academic as well as applied skills. It is also recommended that Fellows remain contractors rather than employees of World Learning.

F. Travel is Key: the capacity to travel as a Fellow is another unique feature of the Fellowship, and one of the most attractive features for USAID. Fellows have served as the marines in a number of occasions and could be the first to pick up and travel to meet the needs of the field missions. This unique travel package should remain unchanged.

IV RECOMMENDATIONS

1. World Learning and Needs Assessments: It is suggested that World Learning consider an approach that could be more active in the area of recruitment and placement of Fellows, with World Learning having a better idea of what the DG Office lacks before it sends out a call for applications, or interviews. World Learning leadership could liaise more with the Democracy Office leadership to accomplish this early anticipation of the needs of the Agency. It could also be more pro-active in recommending to USAID areas it should consider for Fellows rather than only waiting for USAID requests.

2 Quantity is Important: The quality of Fellows encountered has been outstanding but the number of Fellows could ideally be increased. There are some specialized needs as indicated in 1 above that World Learning Fellows could fill. The contract ceiling of 17-20 Fellows appears to be rather low compared to the needs of USAID.

3 Importance of Workplans: The specificity of assignments with this Fellow has been excellent. Others may have lacked specificity to some degree, but nonetheless point to the need for continuing importance of workplans for Fellows. Ideally past workplans can be archived and accessed by new incoming Fellows.

- 4 **Importance of Orientation to USAID:** Probably the most exciting but the most awkward time of the Fellowship is the first 3 months in USAID. The Agency has not developed an integration/orientation methodology wherein new personnel are briefed systematically or thoroughly on who's who and who does what in the Agency. It is not likely that this sub-cultural or myopic trait will change in the near future, and World Learning should consider assigning a Fellow to the task of developing an Orientation to USAID's Office of Democracy. This would not only encompass the needs of Fellows, but all new personnel in the Democracy Office.
- 5 **Retreat:** It is strongly recommended that the Fellows retreat become an annual event, or at least bi-annual and be located at the World Learning headquarters campus in Vermont.
- 6 **Alumnae Organization:** As the number of Democracy Fellow 'Graduates' grows, the need for setting up some type of organization or communication mechanism arises. The purpose of this would be for Fellows to keep in touch with World Learning and each other. It is likely that Fellows will be placed in strategic positions within and without USAID in the USG, and could serve as a unique networking mechanism for future references for both World Learning as well as the Fellows themselves.
- 7 **Beyond World Learning:** World Learning's experience with the Fellowship program should prepare it as a key mentor to the USG to continue to fund the program, regardless who wins the next bid, or who is attempting to secure the contract. The learning curve of the Fellows program is embedded in World Learning, and ideally the organization will see to it the program survives regardless of who is its overseer.

V OVERALL RATING OF FELLOWSHIP AND USAID ASSIGNMENT

The Fellowship accomplished what it set out to do from the first day to the last day. The overall accomplishment is a new program or window of opportunity for democracy promotion in emerging democracies.

On a more personal note, one of the most fulfilling things about being a Democracy Fellow and working with USAID was that USAID strives to think the highest, latest, and most penetrating thoughts on any development subject we are intellectually capable of thinking about. At the same time we always ask ourselves how can this information apply to a particular development problem or program and have a practical application? This mix of mind stretching with practical applications not only has been very professionally rewarding and intellectually stimulating, it has been an atmosphere of elevated practicality that few organizations experience or can appreciate. The USAID Office of Democracy is neither university or think-tank, but a combination of both plus a 'skunkworks' for create approaches to development.

Lastly, this Fellow will continue to at USAID largely in the same capacity as before in money in politics. From being a Senior Democracy Fellow, I will become a Senior Advisor in Political Finance. Instead of a Fellow's scarf, I will be wearing a CASU

cap, that is how insignificant the change could be. Finally, the Fellow is greatly appreciative and indebted to the fine relationship and the fine people at World Learning, particularly the stellar professional and personal courtesies services extended by David Payton.

FINAL COMMENT:

The lasting value of World Learning's and this Fellowship's contribution to USAID, though difficult to quantify, may be best summarized from the perspective of its future value. The summary of activities and prognosis attached in Exhibit 1 might serve as the best and last word about this Fellowship to World Learning. It describes where money in politics had been and now is headed because of this Fellowship. If it stays the course a substantial contribution to the US Government and USAID's effort at democracy building and corruption prevention in political finance will have taken place, and World Learning can take the credit for this.

**EXHIBIT 1: THE FUTURE OF MONEY IN POLITICS
& PROGNOSIS BY FELLOW:**

TECHNICAL LEADERSHIP: MONEY IN POLITICS

Overall Objective: *"More People in the World Will Have Access to Information about the Sources and Amounts of Money in Politics in Their Country"*

Specific Goal: *"More countries will become increasingly transparent about political finance by passing or enforcing disclosure laws requiring political parties and candidates to fully report income and expenditures for public viewing."*

Description of Program: In 2000 EPP set out to research the level of corruption in electoral politics related to the financing of campaigns. An international hue and cry about corruption in money in politics was highlighted in the 2000 DG Conference by Messrs. Diamond and Carothers as the topic of the future. Transparency and disclosure was focus of inquiry, not controversial bans, limits, or public funding.

A. What activities were undertaken?

1. Research conducted on 118 electoral democracies via existing IFES IQC, with subsequent contracts with two of the world's leading researchers in money and politics, with endorsement from two other leading scholars affiliated with USAID.
2. Handbook was prepared and authored by USAID.
3. PowerPoint presentations about USAID money in politics handbook were developed and featured at numerous workshops on political party corruption on 3 continents.
4. Handbook was vetted with partners and peers before final editing with largely highly positive and encouraging remarks on the subject and content of handbook.
5. Draft copy of Handbook caught attention of Carter Center at Latin American OAS Conference and subsequently asked USAID participation in a Center event to launch handbook at meeting with previous heads of states of the Americas.
6. Donor inputs, relations and networks were accomplished over this period. For example USAID input assisted DFID in launching 2-year money in politics research project in Africa; donor relations also resulted in request by OAS for USAID to participate in launch of research project in 34 countries, with one segment of their researched dedicated specifically to disclosure. Donor networking also resulted in 10 Downing Street to request copy of the Handbook following a national political finance scandal in the UK.
7. Pilot projects were developed and are in various stages of implementation via IFES IQC and E&E Bureau funds; mission requests for money in politics programs received and developed at 2002 DG Conference.

B. Why were these steps taken, i.e. why are we engaged in this area?

1. Advice of DG experts.
2. Demands of the DG field.
3. Increasingly clear hypotheses linking money and outcomes in political processes in emerging democracies.
4. US Congress.

C. What are the Expected Results and Accomplishments?

1) Short Term

1. Pilot projects developed and launched in Hungary, Latvia, Romania, Russia and one OAS country for placing campaign finance reports on the Internet.*
2. ACEEEO is being trained to replicate campaign finance Internet connection (IFES MAP project) with other CECs in Eastern Europe, thereby aiding replication of the project but also aiding USAID's indigenization effort.
3. Handbook to be profiled in meeting of 300-400 NGOs with accompanying presentations from TI International and IFES MAP programs, at the April 2003 World Community for Democracies conference held in Durban. Possible project replications follow, plus increased worldwide circulation of USAID Handbook on money and politics.
4. Worldwide distribution of text electronically in Spanish and English.
5. Pilot project in South Africa advocacy promotion of disclosure laws and drafting of legal framework for first laws on disclosure of private campaign donations.
6. Assisted the drafting of UN Anti-Corruption Conventions on political finance.
7. USAID becomes the first published donor in the field of money and politics with the completion of the Handbook in February 2003.
8. Donor coordination established with USAID participation in OAS Costa Rica and Vancouver conferences in money in politics.
9. Partnership reached with OAS to joint-sponsor Carter Center "Financing Democracy" Conference in March 2003.
10. Partnership with OAS kicked off with USAID Handbook translated into Spanish by OAS staff.
11. Following invitation for Carter Center, Handbook provided high-profile launching at Carter Center with ex-presidents of the Americas.
12. Similar opportunity for launching handbook at Korean TI Anti-Corruption conference being discussed.

C. What are the Expected Results and Accomplishments?

2) (Long Term)

1. Proven operational models of campaign finance monitoring via the Internet showcases contemporary transparency and openness via ex-communist countries.
2. Improvement of TI models of political finance monitoring in Latvia, Kenya, and Russia.
3. Mainstreaming topic of money in politics for other donors to initiate programs and conduct research on money in politics without fear of engaging in topic or having literature trail.
4. Increasing the knowledge of the state of the art of money in politics as a serious barrier in the democracy development equation.

• A summary report of lessons learned from the pilot projects will be received by September 2003 and include:
-A summary statement about the state of the art of campaign finance disclosure as part of democracy and governance efforts in the world in general, and in the USAID democracy and governance portfolio in particular.
-The statement should include a prognosis of the place that the issue of money in politics will play in future DG programming in terms of its acceptability and future traction.
-A summary statement about the perceived demand for technical services in the area of money and politics, and suggestions on what types of programs or strategy(ies) should be employed by USAID in its future activities.

5. Possible establishment of transparency in politics pre-requisites and conditionalities accompanying international agreements or programs.
6. Money in politics become demand driven by the missions.
7. Linking money in politics with USAID anti-corruption strategy.
8. Linking money in politics with USAID political party development strategy.
9. Nurturing TI International as it takes on worldwide effort to enter the field.
10. Legislative Accomplishment: Fulfilled the legislative intent of the US Congress's "International Anti-Corruption and Good Governance Act 2000" that encourages the promotion of financial disclosure of political finance among political parties and candidates for office via an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act..

D. So What? What if ...there never was a money in politics effort, or if we pulled the plug?

If no effort:

1. We would be in denial of major source of influence and corruption in the DG process.
2. USA would send a message that we are not really that serious about doing something about corruption if willing to forego money in politics.
3. Advances in understanding of what retards good governance would be retarded.

If we drop the effort:

1. Lose momentum and opportunities.
2. Opportunity costs would be high: donors making inquiries about the subject; Missions making inquiries about implementing programs; major multi-national research efforts being conducted in 44 countries; Lithuanian journalist thanking IFES for putting campaign finance on Internet to NGO could benefit immensely from sortable data; replication of MAP model and Argentinean TI model being replicated in many parts of the world, etc.
3. We've sent out a message that says "we're putting political party corruption on notice" and to pull back now would be to invalidate our aggressive DG intervention efforts. We've got a consensus from all peer reviews that disclosure is the way to go and we're on the right track and a safe track.
4. USAID is known for cutting edge technical leadership, money in politics is no exception, we mainstream it and then let others know the road is safe up ahead for them to enter. Note how just 5 years ago, USAID had same questions about anti-corruption efforts. Some look at money in politics today the same way we looked a corruption 5 years ago: "It's a problem but nothing can be done about it- so why bother?" Anti-corruption is now a White House initiative. Anti-corruption indices are the first ranked criteria for a country to qualify for MCA funds-the most revolutionary twist in US donor aid in decades. Transparency in money in politics has this same potential.
5. Bottom Line: *"Mainstreaming money in politics sheds light on the blind spot in our USAID DG programs."*

January 21, 2003

Caryn M. Wilde

**Democracy & Governance Fellow
USAID/Russia**

**2002
Fellowship Progress Report
May 1 to October 31**

**World Learning Inc.
1015 15th St. NW, Suite 750
Washington, DC 20005**

General Description of Fellowship

USAID/Russia Strategy Amendment (1999-2005) reaffirms the United States' commitment to support Russia's advancement of common values—to protect and advance human rights, tolerance, religious freedom, free speech and independent media, economic opportunity, and the rule of law. Civil Society development in Russia is a long-term process; therefore, the vitality of NGOs and an engaged citizenry is a primary focus that cuts across all Units in the Mission.

For the last ten years, I have been professionally committed to developing the vitality of NGOs and an engaged citizenry in the CIS countries. I define Civil Society as, a society where the third sector is whole-heartedly endorsed by the government and business sectors, and citizens are guaranteed access to space for formal and informal participation in their governance and maintenance of quality of life. (Wilde 2001) It is a widely held contention that democracy thrives when there is a healthy civil society. The Fellowship gives me the opportunity to work with others who are committed to making civil society a reality in Russia. USAID/Russia's strategy served as a guide for setting the course for my activities. The following examples are characteristic of the breadth of this Fellowship.

Writing a Statement of Work (SOW) for the selection of training experts became a valuable lesson on the contracting side of USAID. The Contracts Officer outlined the technical elements that should be considered when developing an assistance package. From a business perspective, the process makes sense, especially if one wants to undertake programs that are supported by a clearly defined set of policies and procedures. What made the experience most agreeable is the educational exchange that took place. The Contracts Officer became intrigued in the particulars of civil society development, and has since begun to participate in field visits. It is an advantageous partnership.

Consulting with my colleagues is the most fulfilling part of the Fellowship. In the one-on-one dialogues with Russian colleagues, I found that mentoring goes two ways. While it was a pleasure to respond to their requests for information, their inquiries stretched my thinking, increased my knowledge and added a vast array of experiences. I also believe that it confirms the importance of Russian-American working partnerships. We each have questions and one-half of the answer, but together we can produce a meaningful solution.

As someone once explained, a 'growing experience' is what you are left with when you don't get what you really wanted. Participating in the creation of an RFA was professionally challenging, and entailed a personal investment. It was exciting to see many of my ideas come to life during the development of an innovative program. However, the design is only the beginning. Other professionals enter the arena when a program is contracted, and things can change. I discovered more about USAID's philosophy and policy regarding Implementers during the contracting process. I observed the complex balance between realizing USAID goals, and respecting an Implementer's autonomy. There is a 'give and take' throughout the process, and relinquishing control of your creation can be a tough lesson. Real growth is in achieving balance.

Fellowship Objectives

Objective #1 – Professional Goals

Assist and advise USAID/Russia in its efforts, in partnership with Russia, to become a more open, participatory society. Citizen participation in decision making, whether through informal channels or nongovernmental organizations (NGOS), is a vital ingredient in a civil society and the hallmark of a democracy.

The depth of my involvement in DIHR and over-all Mission activities increased substantially during the past six months, of the 2nd year of my Fellowship. I met the following goals: to provide USAID/Russia with useful recommendations to weigh before making decisions; to expand their networks and access to information; and to increase awareness that there are a range of options when assisting in the development of a civil society. I contributed to DIHR's strategic goal--An Open and More Participatory Society by: (1) focusing attention on the importance of developing a federal 'infrastructure' to sustain the emerging Third Sector, and (2) designing programming that lays the foundation for channels that will give Russian citizens access to participation in governance and maintenance of quality of life. USAID/Russia's assistance in strengthening NGOs and motivating informal citizen participation has made a significant contribution to the overall improvement of Russians' awareness, acceptance, and appreciation for the value of a civil society.

Objective #2 – Personal Goals

Advance my career development goals as an International Development Specialist; expand my knowledge of USAID and USAID/Russia, the Russian culture and environment; and to improve my Russian language proficiency.

Daily, I felt that my understanding of Russia and the emerging Russian civil society grew. At the same time, my understanding of USAID/Russia's policy and procedures improved. I began to more fully appreciate that balancing the interests of two countries substantially complicates development efforts. A unique opportunity gave me the possibility to expand my personal and professional network, and I am confident that I will draw on this experience throughout the rest of my career. It seems that there is no end to the variety of ways one can add to their understanding of a people and their culture and history. While I thoroughly enjoy the 'Russian' exploration experience, I find that I am learning even more about my own country and its people. The study of the Russian language is likely to be a life-long pursuit, and I find successful linguistic encounters in the most unlikely places. I have taken to heart the saying, "The limits of my language are the limits of my world."

Activities, Performance Methods and Impact

The section is organized to provide a monthly and a general overview of my activities, performance methods, and the impact of these activities on the Mission, key stakeholders, and myself.

Following approval of the Mission's Strategy Amendment, DIHR's Civil Society Unit was tasked with developing an Activity Design for civil society programming for the next five years. This set the stage for two of the most far-reaching projects I have been involved in thus far in my Fellowship. First, I accepted an assignment to coordinate and facilitate the background research for the Concept Paper that preceded the Democratic Culture Activity Design Report. I began by analyzing the Civil Society Team's capacity to meet the challenge of designing "the next step". I determined that there was a gap between the Mission's resident experience and knowledge, and its access to global, contemporary information and experience. Such a gap could potentially limit the Team's ability to design innovative, forward-thinking programs. This finding resulted in my taking on a second assignment: making a case for and the engaging of American experts to train Mission staff, implementers, and local NGOs. Thus, for the better part of the past six months, I concentrated on pre-concept paper activity, writing the narratives for a Missionwide training experience, and bringing two sets of high-level Civil Society experts to Moscow. Details for both of these activities follow in this section and in Addendums C-D.

In May, President Bush's visit to Moscow provided me with an opportunity to participate in the massive preparations that precede a presidential summit. My contributions were largely intended to provide background information on Russian civil society. The President or members of his entourage met and dialogued with key leaders from the Third Sector.

I attended an international conference hosted by the Southern Russia Resource Center, *From Effective Network to Effective Networking*. The conference focused on how networks contribute to the development of the third sector and to building civil society. Informative discussion concentrated on the potential for effective networking of Russian NGOs, and how donors might stimulate realization of this potential.

Following a noteworthy briefing on the preliminary results of Urban Institute's (UI) Policy Fellow's Course for local government officials and NGOs, I arranged a meeting with the project's coordinator, Ray Struyk. I hypothesized that there was a strong correlation between SSR's programming for local government and DIHR's programming for NGOs. Discussion with Mr. Struyk confirmed my thinking. UI's program prepares local governments to contract out social services. While designing the course, UI conducted two separate assessments of Russian NGOs' readiness to provide contract services. The results indicated that, by and large, NGOs fell short of the required competency to implement social service contracts. After further discussions with Struyk, and subsequent meetings with Hugh Winn (CTO), DIHR is exploring the potential for a crosscutting effort with SSR. During the course of meeting with Struyk, he provided me with the two assessments, one of which was still in draft form. He asked if I would review the draft report and provide comments.

Later, following reception of my comments, I received a note of thanks for my insightful input. The

report was recently released, and I believe that it makes a significant contribution toward improved understanding of the issues relating to effective social contracting.

Earlier in the year, I attended a conference on *Strengthening Civil Society* sponsored by the European Commission in Russia. One of the presenters was Alexander Nikitin, Chairman of the Center for Environmental Rights 'Bellona'. Nikitin is a prominent environmentalist and human rights activist. I was particularly taken with his perspective on the need to raise the professional level of Russian NGOs, his concern about the negotiative imbalance that exists between the Presidential administration and NGOs, and his thoughts on regional and Moscow networks. I contacted Nikitin and arranged a private meeting with him. Our three-hour discussion provided me with a unique look at a Russian's perspective of the emerging civil society. Our conversation caused me to rethink some of my assumptions; and based on his comments, I had a similar effect on him.

In June, I attended the Sakhalin Civic Forum in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. As part of an on-going observation of the influence of the 2001 Civic Forum held in Moscow, I wanted to experience first-hand the level of civil society development in the Russian Far East. It was apparent that USAID's NGO strengthening efforts and the technical assistance provided by Moscow's NGO leaders have strengthened the local organizations. They confidently challenge regional administrations to be transparent and all citizens to participate in their governance and maintenance of quality of life.

A four-day strategy conference in Velieky Novgorod, sponsored by IREX's Pro-NGO Program, revealed the level of development of the USAID/Russia supported Resource Centers and their networks. Serious discussion focused on the future and issues of sustainability. A potential 'sector support gap', the reduction of USAID support and the slow development or involvement of local philanthropists, is a serious concern. DIHR took advantage of this gathering to collect programming recommendations for the forth-coming Concept Paper.

Colleagues from Social Sector Restructuring (SSR) invited me to review and comment on a concept paper for their newest program, Healthy Russia 2020. Business Development Initiatives (BDI) and Economic Policy Restructuring (EPR) included me in their annual strategy reviews. Each of the requests specifically sought my input regarding their programming related to nonprofit organizations (NGOs). They also indicated an appreciation for my general observations, as I am outside the day-to-day activity of their Technical Offices, and offered a fresh perspective.

The Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) was unveiled. USAID/Russia was asked to comment on the recommendations that the E&E Bureau submitted to the Deputy Administrator. I reviewed the document, and suggested that input from actors representing the Third Sector appeared to have been overlooked in the recommendations. "If the MCA program excludes input from nonprofit organizations and individual citizens, a message will be sent to government and business leaders that the responsibility for 'nation building' resides solely in their hands. Anchoring change requires buy-in from all who will be affected by said change. Past experience has proven that the most effective way to 'anchor' change is to engage all stakeholders in the process."

In July, DIHR tasked itself to write two concept papers before the end of the year. I was asked to facilitate the working sessions for the Democratic Culture paper. Throughout the month, I convened the Civil Society Team for brainstorming and strategizing. Following each session, I synthesized the discussion and recommendations, and planned the agenda for the next session. Based on the upcoming session's focus, I would invite colleagues from other Technical Offices to participate. The result of the numerous meetings was a comprehensive analysis of the environment in which Russian civil society is emerging, and a specific set of recommendations for improving democratic culture. Many of the recommendations were incorporated into the Concept Paper, and the analysis was used to support DIHR's contentions during the Missionwide Concept Paper Review. Since the review, the Civil Society Team has had an opportunity to use the information to strengthen and support other projects.

I continued to observe and record the affects of the Civic Forum 2001, an initiative of the Russian Administration. While few would disagree that the Forum significantly influenced the development of the Third Sector, those same pundits would be hard pressed to agree on how the Forum has affected the Sector. My observations are the following: the Forum inspired a multiplicity of events and attention on the Sector in some regions, triggered discontent and a sharp reaction toward local governments that ignored the initiative, united some activists and estranged others, and highlighted the imbalance of access to the Federal government between Moscow and regional NGOs. At the request of the Mission director, I co-wrote a cable on the status of the Russian civil society as affected by the Civic Forum, the Putin administration, Moscow NGOs, and regional governments and NGOs. (Addendum B)

I had an opportunity to attend the Moscow School of Political Studies (MSPS) Conference in Golitsyno. Among the speakers were American Ambassador, Alexander Vershbow and Russian philanthropist, Mikhail Khodorkovsky. It was interesting to note how diverse their definitions of Democracy were. It was a valuable education, for this international development specialist, and reminded me not to 'assume' a common understanding between people of different countries or cultures. A secondary education was due to the fact that USAID and DFID both support the activities of MSPS. I regularly participated in strategy sessions where the two Western organizations discussed the future development of the Russian organization.

Colleagues from SSR invited me to attend a conference sponsored by the Institute for Urban Economics, *Public Discussions on Local Governance and Civil Society*, in Nizhny Novgorod. The conference and subsequent dialogue with SSR colleagues once again confirmed my earlier conviction that DIHR and SSR have a natural arena for a crosscutting initiative. SSR supports and strengthens local governments' ability to contract for social services, and DIHR supports and strengthens NGOs' ability to provide social services. It appears that programming in 2003 will see a realization of a cooperative effort. I look forward to participating in this endeavor.

During DIHR's Concept Paper Review, I made the case that the Civil Society Team would benefit from exposure to outside information on Civil Society, especially if they were to be successful

in creating effective, forward thinking programs. It was agreed that I should research what kind of training would benefit the Mission, who might provide the desired training, and to write a Statement of Work (SOW). With great pleasure, I embarked on this assignment. I determined that the Mission needed exposure to two very different types of expertise: infrastructure development for institutions, and (2) community building through informal citizen participation.

The month of August was spent writing two Statements of Work, two Requests for Quotes, and selecting appropriate experts to invite to apply. Even while on home leave, I continued to work on the SOW, RFQ, and contacting local experts. (Addendums C & D)

In September, the Experts who would provide education, training, and interactive dialogue to USAID/Russia were selected. I was responsible for all logistics---VISAs, hotel reservations, transportation, and a detailed program schedule for all sessions and participants. To say it was time consuming would be an understatement!

I was asked to consult on an assistance proposal for a key human rights defense NGO. My business background and acumen proved valuable, as the assistance package was meant for administrative support. It proved to be neither an easy nor quick consultation. While Russian NGO leaders clearly understand their programs and mission, they have little knowledge of or inclination to dedicate time to the business-side of their organizations. It is a weakness that is proving detrimental to their viability. As of this date, issues regarding the proposal are still not resolved. I also learned not to 'assume' that a highly educated, seasoned human rights professional would easily 'catch on' to the nuances of running a business.

Each year, USAID conducts survey research, and produces the NGO Sustainability Index. After the Russian survey research was completed, I attended the data review. I was extremely impressed by the Russian specialists' sophisticated analysis of the Third Sector. It is heartening to know that Russia has very competent people, who have a deep understanding of the development of the Russian nonprofit sector. Unfortunately, I have some reservations about the survey instrument. Time permitting, I will take a closer look at the instrument and make some suggestions. I have survey research experience, and have already offered a few recommendations to the Mission.

I was asked to assist in what can best be call an intervention. A Russian organization (USAID grantee) is in need of organizational restructuring if they are to continue receiving funding. The main issue is an overly controlling board of founders, who have conflicts of interest regarding the day-to-day operations of the NGO. The board of founders has essentially become an insurmountable obstacle, thwarting the growth of the organization. I participated in Mission meetings that explored possible approaches for an intervention. The board of founders has been urged to consult with me on reorganization and the creation of a board of directors. It is anticipated that these consultations will occur in November and December. I have begun an in-depth study of effective boards, and how to adapt Western models to the Russian reality.

In October, I coordinated and facilitated Madii Institute's training on *Community Development Through Informal Citizen Participation*. For nearly three weeks, the specialists worked with Mission

staff, Russian and American Implementers, and local NGOs. While initial comments were favorable, I consider the frequent citation of Madii Institute's recommendations, during subsequent working sessions, as proof that the training and exposure to new information was beneficial. Introduction to new ideas becomes valuable when it is successfully adapted and used. I foresee that happening. (Addendum C)

Sarah Henderson, a researcher from Oregon State University, contacted me and asked for an interview. (I was one of several interviews) She is writing a follow-on to her first article on Russia, "Selling Civil Society". Essentially, she was looking for my perspective on the current 'state of civil society in Russia' and the effects of US assistance. I read her first article, and we discussed at length her interpretation the situation. I shared my thoughts on the strengths and shortcomings of her premise. After nearly 10 years in the CIS, I believe I have an 'insider' understanding of the people and the culture---at least, as much as any outsider can possibly have. I believe I was able to provide clarification on several points that will help to make Ms. Henderson's second article more accurately reflect Russian civil society, the environment in which it struggles to grow, and the influence of USAID's efforts.

Along with other DIHR colleagues, I assisted David Cohen (TDY) as he wrote the Activity Approval Document for Democratic Culture. The three weeks that David worked in the Mission were filled with intensive sharing of information, clarification, and participation in strategizing and reviews. Because my Fellowship has given me wide latitude to experience Russian civil society, I believe our long hours of discussion helped David to get a 'feel' for Russia and the Russian culture. It was his first visit to this part of the world.

I attended IREX Pro-NGO's conference, *The Role of NGOs in Public Social Services*, and the European Foundation Center's *Grantmakers East Group Conference*. The Russian Donors Forum sponsored the GEG Conference in Moscow, a landmark event for Russian nonprofits. Both events demonstrated just how far Russia has come in developing a participatory society over the last ten years.

I continued to develop a template for Russian and American implementers to use when writing reports for USAID. I have now shared "Writing Quality Reports" with several implementers, and am pleased to say that they have substantially improved the amount of qualitative data contained in their reports. Reports are no longer mere laundry lists of activities, but include stories that demonstrate impact and astute analysis. Implementers and the organizations they work with, now enter into an activity aware that evaluation and analysis are important components of their program activities. Their improved reporting helps USAID/Russia to measure the effectiveness of over-all programming.

As in the past, I participated in a wide range of mission events: reviews of quarterly and annual reports, budget and procurement discussions, the Democracy Roundtable, planning sessions for the Survey Project, and strategy sessions for new projects. I provided consultations for each of the Mission's Technical Offices, and responded to questions posed by Mission Partners. I reviewed books and articles, researched and wrote analytical commentaries on emerging issues, and

prepared staff training programs. Outside the Mission, I participate in the Russian Donors Forum, the Charity Committee of the AmCham, and networked with other international assistance organizations. My intention was that, through me, the Mission would have access to a wealth of information, an informed perspective on issues, and an additional link to the broader community.

Proposed Revisions to Program Description

No proposed revisions.

Tentative Fellowship International Travel

Travel will mainly be within Russia.

USA:

Democracy and Governance Partners Conference and Workshop, Washington DC, December 5-13, 2002.

Independent Sector Research Forum, The Role of Faith-based Organizations in the Social Welfare System; in cooperation with The Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare Policy at the Rockefeller Institute of Government, Washington DC, March 6-7, 2003.

Democracy Fellows Program

Caryn M. Wilde

May 1, 2002 to April 30, 2003

Approved Workplan

USAID/Russia Strategy Amendment (1999-2005) reaffirms the United States' commitment to support Russia's advancement of common values---to protect and advance human rights, tolerance, religious freedom, free speech and independent media, economic opportunity, and the rule of law. Civil Society development in Russia is a long-term process; therefore, the vitality of NGOs and an engaged citizenry is a primary focus that cuts across all Units in the Mission.

Statement of Personal Goals

While working to assist USAID/Russia in implementing the 1999-2005 Strategy, I will be realizing my career development goals:

- To enhance my professional qualifications and competency as an International Development Specialist;
- To achieve better insight of the emerging NGO sector and informal citizen activism, in order to understand how these entities will contribute to the over-all development of a third sector that ultimately forges a Russian civil society;
- To develop an understanding and competency of USAID's policy and procedures as they relate to fostering the development of a civil society, consisting of a fully integrated relationship between the Russian government, business, and the third sector;
- To develop contacts and initiate dialogue with other experts in related spheres;
- To facilitate communication and activity among various key stakeholders; and
- To expand my knowledge of the Russian culture, and continue improvement of my Russian language skills.

Statement of Professional Goals

As a Democracy and Governance Fellow, I see my role to be that of assisting and advising USAID/Russia in its efforts, in partnership with Russia, to become a more open, participatory society. Citizen participation in decision making, whether through informal channels or nongovernmental organizations (NGOS), is a vital ingredient in a civil society and the hallmark of a democracy.

Objectives and Activities

Objectives

At the request of USAID/Russia, specific assistance to the Mission will include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Supporting program partners, resource centers, and NGOs that are working on democracy, business and economic reform, and social sector reform through advice and training on strategic planning, board development fundraising, public relations, organizational development; advocacy, and staff development and training;
- Contributing to USAID/Russia's effort to stimulate broader citizen participation in their governance and maintenance of quality of life;
- Assisting the Mission with strategic planning, development and review of documents (for example: individual scopes of work, workplans, reports, and evaluations), and coordinating with US Embassy agencies on related topics;
- Providing Mission staff with targeted training and information relating to third sector development, citizen participation, and global perspectives on civil society; and
- Performing targeted study and analysis, as requested by Mission.

Principal Activities

To meet the above objectives, I propose to do the following:

- Continue to study (read, interview, attend events, & travel) and track those NGOs and partners being targeted for assistance by USAID;
- Meet with USAID activity managers, contractors, grantees, key stakeholders, and the development agencies of other countries working in Russia;
- Meet with Russian governmental agencies tasked with over-sight of the development of the Russian third sector, the Russian private business sector, and other Russian organizations and the general public;
- Following the developments of local philanthropic foundations, resulting activity of the Civic Forum, the AmCham/NGO-Charities Committee, and the Russian Donor Forum;
- Review information on the institutional strengths and weaknesses, current activities, and research and assessments prepared by USAID/Russia and other experts;
- Interface with USAID/Russia's technical offices, Business Development Initiatives, Economic Policy Reform and Social Sector Restructuring, in order to remain familiar with their efforts, the commonality of their NGO's activity with that of DIHR's NGO's activity, and where activity may be cross-cutting and collaboration enhance the efforts of the Mission;
- To serve as USAID's "in-house" advisor on NGO institutional development and citizen participation;
- To provide briefings, as requested, to Mission management, USAID activity managers, contractors and grantees and Russian NGOs on the status of NGO's institutional development and broader issues of citizen activism;
- To participate in the review of proposals, workplans, quarterly reports and other documents from Russian NGOs, partners, other Missions, and foreign colleagues;
- To work with and provide consultation to the Office of Democratic Initiatives and Human Resources (DIHR) across each of DIHR's five divisions, including: (1) Media, (2) Political Process Development, (3) Civil Society, (4) Rule of Law, and (5) Partnerships;
- To provide some direct institutional development work---this may include, but is not limited to, conducting needs assessment and strategic planning implementation assistance with specific Russian NGOs, partners, or other key stakeholders; and
- To utilize, in my work, my expanding knowledge of the Russian culture and Russian language proficiency.

Outcomes and Impact

Personal outcomes include:

- continued growth of my knowledge and understanding of the emerging Russian civil society and of USAID/Russia's policy and procedures;
- expanded networks and increased communication with experts working in related endeavors;
- heightened understanding of the Russian history and culture that makes up the society; and
- continued improvement in my linguistic skills.

Impact

The impact of my personal and professional development will be to further establish my credibility as an International Development Specialist. I foresee further invitations to lecture and consult with distinguished organizations, such as Harvard's Davis Center for Russian Studies. These lecture opportunities also have a positive public relations effect for USAID/Russia.

Professional outcomes include:

- USAID/Russia kept up-to-date, through on-going monitoring, of civic forum working groups' activity---which may lead to the development of an infrastructure that will support institutionalization of the Third Sector;
- strengthened organization and management skills of program partners, resource centers, and NGOs;
- improved organizational capacity and service provision of program partners;
- a pro-active training model for resource centers and NGOs' that develops skills necessary to facilitate informal citizen participation---designed, implemented, and preliminarily assessed; and
- USAID/Russia assistance in defining priorities, assessing the strengths and weaknesses of program partners, and developing plans of assistance tailored to each partner; USAID staff updated, through periodic reports, on timely information related to civil society development; an expanded network and communication with other organizations supporting civil society development; and assessments of the impact of USAID and other donor programming in Russia.

Impact

The impact of my efforts, for USAID/Russia, will be useful advice on which to base decision-making, expanded networks, and a broadened perspective of civil society development; for Russia, the impact will be assistance in developing an infrastructure that will sustain the emerging Third Sector; and for Russians, the impact will be to support their effort to establish channels that permit them to participate in their governance and maintenance of quality of life. USAID/Russia's assistance to Russian NGOs will contribute to an overall improved cultural awareness, acceptance, and appreciation of the value of NGOs as an integral component in a civil society that will yield psychological, physical, and financial support needed to sustain the voluntary sector.

Timeline and Level of Effort

Second Year:

Approximately, 50% my time outside of the Mission supporting program partners, resource centers, and NGOs; meeting with regional Russian governmental agencies and organizations; networking with other foreign development agencies; and participating in training that will enhance my skills and that can be shared with colleagues.

Approximately, 50% of my time in the Mission will be spent assisting with strategic planning and development and review of documents; providing staff training, information, consultation; interviewing, reading, and observing; and coordinating with US Embassy agencies on related topics.

Fellowship Travel Plans

Based on my activity in the first year of the Fellowship, I think it is reasonable to plan for an average of two regional trips per month in eight out of twelve months. International travel, undertaken to continue an effort to remain up-to-date on civil society development relative to the Missions' goals, may average once a month in six out of twelve months. In descending order according to frequency, the destination of the international travel will be the following: NIS countries, Eastern Europe, Western Europe, and the United States.

Conferences may include: DFID CIS Meetings and the BEARR Trust Conference, UK; European Union and European Commission, Europe; and the DG Conference, the 31st Annual Conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA), USA, and Harvard's Davis Center for Russian Studies, USA.

Addendum B:

UNCLASSIFIED

USAID 07/18/02
DIR:CPEASLEY
DIHR:DILLENWILDE
DIHR:REICHLER,DIHR:LOUKOVENKO,POL:MR
AIDB

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
SECSTATE WASHDC
STATE FOR EUR/ACE, EUR/RUS
AID FOR AAEE, DCHA
AIDAC

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: SOCI, RS

SUBJECT: Russian Civil Society after "Civic Forum": Wary of Government, but (Still) Dependent Upon It

REF: A) MOSCOW (01) B) MOSCOW

1. Summary: Russia's broad community of non-governmental organizations continues to develop, but it now faces the choice of working more closely with the Putin government hierarchy or pursuing its varied agenda on its own. Moscow-based, policy-oriented NGOs are likely to choose the former course, which has aggravated tensions between them and their regional colleagues. Putin's aides hope to influence the remnants of last year's "Civic Forum" to reflect the government's social policy agenda. End Summary.

2. The civil society movement is one of the promising achievements of Russia's post-Communist growth toward democracy. Today's Russia has more grassroots groups, expressing more points of view on more issues, than ever before. The exact number of these non-governmental organizations is unknown and, as in the United States, some are short-lived. Over the past several years, the number of active NGOs has grown to more than 60,000, although a great many of them are clubs, amateur sports organizations or membership associations. Though not a cohesive movement in the traditional sense, civil society NGOs are a kind of barometer on where participatory democracy is heading: generally, the more independent NGOs there are, the more irreversible Russia's democracy.

3. But the key is independence. Recently, the curtain came down on a year-long effort by the Putin Administration to pull NGOs – including human rights organizations – closer to the Kremlin orbit. This initiative, called the "Civic Forum" (Grazhdanskiy Forum), was marked by an enormous three-day conference at the Kremlin last November that tried to sort, organize and ultimately direct the agenda of some 3,000 participating NGOs from throughout the country. Many NGOs welcomed the attention, but others, particularly in politically sensitive areas, such as human rights, feared they were entering into a Faustian bargain. As Lyudmilla Alekseyeva, head of the venerable Moscow Helsinki Group put it, "we felt that participating would increase awareness of us and our work, but we knew that they wanted to use us for their ends." Alekseyeva eventually agreed to chair the Forum (at first the Kremlin had thought to call it the "Civic Congress"), provided that there was no permanent organization, no final resolution, and no Party Congress-type votes.

4. Even though these conditions were promised – and kept – the federal-level dialogue that followed the Civic Forum has been disappointing. Thirty-seven "negotiating tables" (peregovornye ploshchadki) were agreed to by Civic Forum participants and got underway at the conference itself, but after eight months of occasional, ad-hoc meetings, there are few results to show for their work. Most notably, regarding a "negotiating table" on the issue of alternative service for draft-age youth, Alekseyeva and her NGO colleagues (including the Committee of Soldiers Mothers) went down to sudden defeat when the Russian Government backed away from a draft law with liberal provisions on alternative service. Alekseyeva now says that Presidential Administration aides "deceived" the NGOs by quickly shelving draft legislation in the Duma that had been agreed with groups at the "negotiating table" once it became clear that the Defense Ministry would not support it. A much tougher bill quickly was passed instead, without warning or explanation to the NGO "table."

5. Another one of the 21 "tables" – on human rights in Chechnya – was also briefly disbanded on July 10, with the NGO "Memorial" charging that the government had failed to live up to agreements on handling the investigation of human rights abuses there. At a press conference in Moscow, the chairman of "Memorial," Oleg Orlov, said that the Chechnya Prosecutor's office, in failing to respond to repeated reports that NGO

monitors had forwarded for investigation, "completely discredited" the process set up by the Civic Forum. Orlov stated that the half-dozen Russian and Chechen NGOs that had partnered with Putin's former representative for human rights in Chechnya, Vladimir Kalamonov, were abandoning the Civic Forum framework. "We refuse to participate in this forum, but we do not reject dialogue," he told the press gathering. (Nonetheless, according to Orlov, speaking to AID rep on July 18, this breakdown may yet be reversed: Presidential Administration representatives have agreed to meet the NGO coalition on July 19.)

6. There is evidence that the Putin Administration and its supporters in the NGO community, such as Gleb Pavlovskiy, have grown tired of dealing with human rights activists. "A dissident conspiratorial mindset exists among the human rights activists," he told Izvestia recently. "Supposedly they know for sure that there is a group within the Kremlin where plans to eliminate rights and liberties are being developed. The [only] openly disputed point is whether this group is headed by Putin. What kind of social partnership can be created in this atmosphere?"

7. In other negotiating "tables," the outcome has been more ambiguous, and some Moscow-based NGOs see the glass of Civic Forum cooperation as at least half-full. Specialized tables devoted to ecology, health care, and child welfare found government and NGOs in broad consensus about the nature of the problems to be addressed, and government – as often as not – has been grateful for the attention and support that NGOs were providing. Broad attention to citizen education, represented by Nina Belyayeva's "We the Citizens" NGO, also found broad consensus. Whereas NGOs looked to Moscow federal authorities for resources, Moscow ministries in these areas looked to NGOs to mobilize public support and provide "free" labor in areas that under the Soviet Union had been the exclusive responsibility of the state. In March, a government directive called on federal ministries in fifteen of the Civic Forum issue areas to consult regularly with NGOs and to help fund their projects. To date, however, this directive has been largely ignored, according to several NGO representatives. Of 22 ministries named in the directive, only 12 have actually followed up with meetings since then, Auzan said.

8. Also discouraging to activists has been the lack of progress in the two tables of interest to the entire NGO community – one on tax reform (for non-profit NGOs) and one on social welfare, charities and volunteerism. Current tax legislation provides no tax benefits to individuals or businesses for donations to any NGOs, including charities. Even donated labor is subject to possible taxation, so that NGOs are sometimes wary of calling for volunteer help, lest they be taxed on the "value" of this assistance. Some observers anticipate a change in the tax code next year, but Pavlovskiy told USAID rep that Putin was "skeptical about giving any tax credits to NGOs" since they "would be abused by Russia's corrupt business class." Thus, corporate and individual donations to NGOs (including charities) have been modest – except for large, image-building funds run by the Yukos ("Otkrytaya Rossiya"), TNK and Norilsk Nikkel (Potanin) empires. With dollars 25 million in projects, Boris Berezovskiy's Foundation for Civil Liberties is another player in this circle.

9. This lack of incentive or encouragement to broad-based individual and corporate giving, combined with the legacy of Russian/Soviet reliance on the state for social welfare, is keeping NGOs overly dependent on government, foreign donors and oligarchs. In the regions, the smaller scale of initiatives puts government and NGOs on a more equal footing. In the Volga Federal District, for example, Presidential Representative Kiriyyenko has supported an annual "fair" for NGOs where winning proposals are awarded a total of dollars 300,000 in government funding. In Siberia, dozens of small NGOs are able to match modest foreign donor funding with support from local government.

10. Meanwhile, at the national level, Presidential Administration aides are floating the idea of a "Foundation for Civic Associations" (Fond Grazhdanskikh Assotsiyatsii), put forward by Pavlovskiy, Putin Advisor Aleksandr Abramov, Yevgeniy Gontmakher and Sergei Markov. This centralized mechanism would solicit business contributions and set up a tripartite board comprised of equal numbers of business, government and NGO representatives. Vladislav Surkov has invited Alekseyeva to chair the Foundation and she told AID rep that she agreed to do so, if she was allowed to name her own executive director and staff.

11. According to Auzan, the Foundation's main role would be to establish a mechanism or clearinghouse where NGO projects and business donors could come together. The Presidential Administration would participate by helping to prioritize the "menu" of fields where social needs are greatest. No government funding is envisioned and there would be no tax breaks for business donors. Organizational work is supposed to begin this fall.

12. Moscow NGOs, particularly those dealing in politically sensitive topics, eye these developments with caution, while in the regions, smaller counterpart NGOs are dubious. Many of them are still upset over not having had more of a role at the Civic Forum last November and are irritated over not having been consulted in how leftover funds from the Forum are to be spent. (The Forum organizers finally decided to divide the dollars

700,000 equally among the seven federal districts.) Unlike the policy-oriented NGO leaders in Moscow, NGO leaders across the vast expanse of the Russian Federation have concentrated on networking in their local communities. Local "Civic Forums" have been held in recent months in several cities, including Perm, Penza, Kazan', Novocherkassk, Kostroma, Krasnodar, Buryatia, Chelyabinsk and Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. These fora, according to first-hand observation (in Sakhalinsk) and reports to AID reps, were remarkably constructive and cooperative events. The Novocherkassk forum, held last May, featured roundtable discussions between government officials and citizen groups on a wide variety of topics, including crime and drug prevention, inter-ethnic relations, youth and the environment. The town mayor, a pronounced skeptic before the event, was quoted afterward as having undergone a road-to-Damascus conversion: "I have redefined my values. I had no idea how huge is the amount of work that our public organizations do. I have made a complete reassessment of them, and they belong in the budget."

12. Local civic dialogue appears to be underway in a growing number of cities in far flung regions of the Russian Federation. Last year's Civic Forum in Moscow is in part responsible, having provided a Moscow-approved approach that some regional governors and mayors were happy to follow. At the same time, AID-supported NGO resource centers also have played a guiding role in furthering some of these local government-NGO relationships, particularly in west-central Siberia.

13. COMMENT: The demise of the national Civic Forum initiative, and its modest accomplishments, have put the focus for NGOs back where it belongs – the regions. The grassroots efforts may represent, in their modest-scale credibility, the best chance at present for viable growth of the NGO sector. Barring incentives from Moscow in the form of tax breaks or no-strings-attached funding, regional NGOs realize that their future depends on their own local networks. Another national civic forum is not needed nor expected. In fact, the next "Civic Forum" expected in Moscow will be a local one, and will not take place until next spring. By then, the new Foundation for Civic Associations may well be the vehicle for federal government efforts to influence the NGO agenda, again without much in the way of federal funding. END COMMENT.

VERSHBOW###

**Statement of Work
Technical Assistance in
Community Building Through Citizen Participation**

USAID/Russia seeks the contract services of an expert (either an individual or an organization) in issues related to community building and citizen participation (hereafter referred to as "Expert") to conduct a series of lectures, workshops, and strategy sessions with USAID/Russia staff and partners, and to prepare recommendations of citizen participation interventions to USAID/Russia.

BACKGROUND

Following the collapse of the USSR, the United States embarked on an extensive program to support Russia's transition to democracy and a market economy. An integral part of this effort has involved nurturing the country's nascent civil society through the establishment of an efficient and effective non-governmental (NGO) sector.

In 1994, USAID/Russia's Office of Democracy Initiatives and Human Resources (DIHR) initiated programming to "promote the emergence of a free and sustainable non-profit sector for a democratic civil society in Russia." Over the past eight years the following programs have been funded: Civic Initiatives Program for Democratic and Economic Reform in Russia, NGO Sector Support Program, Russian Far East NGO Support Program, Promoting and Strengthening Russian NGO Development Program, and, soon to begin, Russian Far East Civic Initiatives Program. Additionally, each USAID/Russia technical office has programming that is complementary to third sector development: for example, the office of Social Sector Restructuring (SSR) works with municipal government development, the office of Economic Policy Reform (EPR) works with think tanks, and the Business Development and Investment (BDI) office works with business associations.

In 2001, USAID/Russia analyzed the results of nearly a decade of assistance, and amended the Mission's strategy to reflect accomplishments and a new direction for future assistance in Russia. Following the approval of the Strategic Amendment, DIHR tasked itself with further defining a course of action for realizing "a more open, participatory society." An Activity Design Report, to be written by the end of 2002, will delineate the specific activities that will be put in place to advance this objective. In this activity design process, the Civil Society team is studying appropriate 'next steps' for attaining an institutionalized and self-sustaining third sector and supporting a new focus on increasing informal citizen participation. (USAID/Russia's citizen participation strategy framework is included in Appendix B. The strategy narrative can be accessed at the following website: <<http://www.fraec.org/USAIDstrat.pdf>>.)

Civil society is still in the early stages in Russia. Nonprofit organizations, other third sector institutions, philanthropy and volunteerism, informal citizen activism, and a legal infrastructure to sustain the whole package are still developing. This endeavor would be complicated under the best of circumstances; however, the reality is that the circumstances are less than ideal. USAID/Russia is helping the development process of a 1,140 year old, fully developed society of 140 million people who are spread out over 9 time zones, and who are generally uncertain about the value and applicability of the concepts being proposed. This is uncharted territory.

255

PURPOSE

Based on this background, the DIHR Civil Society team determined that consultations with a Western expert would help ensure that appropriate activities are identified for future programming in Russia. The rationale for inviting a Western expert to consult with DIHR, other Mission offices, and partners, is to challenge our thinking, expand our knowledge base, and ensure that the 'best effort' in being made to help develop Russian civil society. Although USAID/Russia's Russian and American staff members make prodigious efforts to stay abreast of developments in their respective fields, a generous workload and geography preclude frequent opportunities for exchange with colleagues in the West. Personal contact with a Western expert will offer staff a unique opportunity to collect up-to-date information specific to their sphere of activity, to profit from global experiences, and to construct a broad frame of reference for future planning. The Expert will provide targeted assistance on specific issue areas to small, interactive working groups, in order that USAID/Russia staff gain a fresh perspective on our current programming strategy, and to develop specific recommendations that can be used later when designing future civil society programming in Russia.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

Objective 1 (approximately 75% of total time): To enhance the knowledge base of DIHR staff on questions regarding how to reach the citizenry directly, how to raise citizen awareness about issues that may affect their quality of life, what methods to use to educate citizens on their rights and responsibilities as members of a society, and means by which to help citizens develop the skills, knowledge, and confidence they need to effect change in their communities.

In achieving this objective, the Contractor shall impart information about complementarities in the relationship between informal citizen participation and nongovernmental organizations, and shall assist DIHR in linking previous NGO support activity with efforts to facilitate informal citizen participation. This should also include developing interventions for motivating citizens to advocate and act on their own behalf. These interventions should be concrete and realistic, taking into account specifics of Russia's history and the current environment.

Objective 2 (approximately 25% of total time): To enhance the knowledge base of the other three mission technical offices and Mission partners, with information about previous experience using effective methods for a) raising citizen awareness about socially important issues; b) stimulating citizen participation (individual and group) in activities that improve quality of life; and c) developing skills that improve the citizens' ability to make their voices heard and wishes fulfilled by their local government.

DELIVERABLES

Under this Statement of Work, the Expert will work approximately 10 (ten) days at the offices of USAID/Russia, at the U.S. embassy in Moscow. All work performed under this Statement of Work shall be in English. There will be nine (9) deliverable items, as follows:

1. **Lecture and Q&A Session with approximately 20 staff from DIHR. [4 Hours]** – This session should give a general overview of patterns of citizen participation in industrialized countries (and may be focused on a particular region or country, depending on the expertise of the Expert.) Sample issues to be addressed are included in Appendix A.

2. **Working sessions with approximately 7 staff from DIHR's Civil Society Unit. [20 Hours]**
– These working sessions will be specifically focused on refining USAID/Russia's approach to promoting citizen activism and participation in Russia. This will include developing specific interventions that USAID might implement.
3. **Lecture and Q&A Session with 60 Mission staff from Technical Offices. [2 Hours]** – This should be a briefer version of the lecture and Q&A session conducted under deliverable (1) above.
4. **Training Session on Community Building** with small groups of Mission Staff. [6 Hours]
5. **Workshops with staff from three technical offices (BDI, EPR, SSR)** on citizen participation issues, as they relate to each office portfolio. [6 Hours]
6. **Lecture and Q&A session with 20 USAID/Russia partners. [4 hours]** – These partners may include Russian and American NGO professionals, representatives of other donor organizations, staff from other embassy sections, and others.
7. **A final oral debriefing on Findings and Recommendations, to be delivered at USAID/Russia. [2 Hours]**
8. **Submission of a written report in draft form** outlining findings and making recommendations for specific ways USAID/Russia/DIHR should continue institutional development and institutionalization programming. In preparing this report, the Expert will meet with various civil society leaders in Moscow, who will be determined according to the judgment of the Expert and with advice from USAID/Russia. This draft report shall be submitted before the Expert leaves Moscow. [25 Hours]
9. **A final draft of the written report** in (8) above shall be submitted by the Expert no later than ten (10) working days after submission of the draft report. This final report shall incorporate USAID comments on the draft, which will be submitted to the Expert within five (5) working days of the submission of the draft. [6 hours]

The Expert may submit to the USAID/Russia office in Moscow an invoice for each deliverable line item after the services described in that deliverable line item have been performed. Payment will be made in US dollars within ten (10) working days of receipt of the invoice, with approval of the Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO).

PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

Work performed under this Statement of Work is to take place between October 1, 2002 and November 5, 2002.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals must include a summary of the bidder's approach to completing the work outlined in this Statement of Work. This summary should be no longer than 5 single spaced pages in 12 point font (excluding cost proposal and attachments). Each proposal must include a proposed cost for each deliverable line item listed above.

The Contractor will be selected based on cost, from among those bidders who submit proposed approaches which meet the minimum technical requirements laid out in this Statement of Work.

A post-award conference will be held between USAID/Russia and the Contractor within five (5) working days of the award to address remaining questions.

APPENDIX A: ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE EXPERT IN LECTURES, Q&A SESSIONS, AND WORKSHOPS

The following are specific issues that USAID would like the Expert to address in lectures, Q&A sessions, and workshops. How have these issues been addressed or overcome in other countries? In addition to having informative value, it is important that the Contractor help Staff link other experiences with potential activity in Russia. USAID/Russia is looking for concrete options for use in its ongoing activity design work.

- Methods for mobilizing, facilitating, and sustaining Russian citizens' participation in community action around common issues.
- Points of entry to engage citizens---accessing and using natural gathering venues.
- Strategies for using NGOs to facilitate citizen participation.
- Methods for raising citizens' awareness and disseminating socially important information.
- Methodology for developing civic education programs for adults and youth.
- Use of the independent media and Internet to improve citizens' access to information.
- Mobilization of resident community resources, including cultural knowledge and strengths.
- Strategies for strengthening patterns of volunteerism, charitable giving, and corporate philanthropy.
- Strategies for strengthening cooperation between citizens and NGOs, government, and business---giving voice to the general public and making other sectors aware of the value of citizen participation.
- Methods for working with multi-ethnic communities, engaging vulnerable populations, and addressing gender issues.
- Methods for dealing with conflict.

**Statement of Work
Technical Assistance on
Institutions and Institutional Development**

USAID/Russia seeks the contract services of an expert in civil society institutions and institutional development (hereafter referred to as "Expert") to conduct a series of lectures, workshops, and strategy sessions with USAID/Russia staff and partners, and to prepare recommendations of civil society development interventions to USAID/Russia.

BACKGROUND

Following the collapse of the USSR, the United States embarked on an extensive program to support Russia's transition to democracy and a market economy. An integral part of this effort has involved nurturing the country's nascent civil society through the establishment of an efficient and effective non-governmental (NGO) sector.

In 1994, USAID/Russia's Office of Democracy Initiatives and Human Resources (DIHR) initiated programming to "promote the emergence of a free and sustainable non-profit sector for a democratic civil society in Russia." Over the past eight years the following programs have been funded: Civic Initiatives Program for Democratic and Economic Reform in Russia, NGO Sector Support Program, Russian Far East NGO Support Program, Promoting and Strengthening Russian NGO Development Program, and, soon to begin, Russian Far East Civic Initiatives Program. Additionally, each USAID/Russia technical office has programming that is complementary to third sector development: for example, the office of Social Sector Restructuring (SSR) works with municipal government development, the office of Economic Policy Reform (EPR) works with think tanks, and the Business Development and Investment (BDI) office works with business associations.

In 2001, USAID/Russia analyzed the results of nearly a decade of assistance, and amended the Mission's strategy to reflect accomplishments and a new direction for future assistance in Russia. Following the approval of the Strategic Amendment, DIHR tasked itself with further defining a course of action for realizing "a more open, participatory society." An Activity Design Report, to be written by the end of 2002, will delineate the specific activities that will be put in place to advance this objective. In this activity design process, the Civil Society team is studying appropriate 'next steps' for attaining an institutionalized and self-sustaining third sector and supporting a new focus on increasing informal citizen participation. (USAID/Russia's citizen participation strategy framework is included in Appendix B. The strategy narrative can be accessed at the following website:
<<http://www.fraec.org/USAIDstrat.pdf>>.)

Civil society is still in the early stages in Russia. Nonprofit organizations, other third sector institutions, philanthropy and volunteerism, informal citizen activism, and a legal infrastructure to sustain the whole package are still developing. This endeavor would be complicated under the best of circumstances; however, the reality is that the circumstances are less than ideal. USAID/Russia is helping the development process of a 1,140 year old, fully developed society of 140 million people who are spread out over 9 time zones, and who are generally uncertain about the value and applicability of the concepts being proposed. This is uncharted territory.

PURPOSE

Based on this background, the DIHR Civil Society team determined that consultations with a Western expert would help ensure that appropriate activities are identified for future programming in Russia. The rationale for inviting a Western expert to consult with DIHR, other Mission offices, and partners, is to challenge our thinking, expand our knowledge base, and ensure that the 'best effort' in being made to help develop Russian civil society. Although USAID/Russia's Russian and American staff members make prodigious efforts to stay abreast of developments in their respective fields, a generous workload and geography preclude frequent opportunities for exchange with colleagues in the West. Personal contact with a Western expert offers staff a unique opportunity to collect up-to-date information specific to their sphere of activity, to profit from global experiences, and to construct a broad frame of reference for future planning. The Expert will provide targeted assistance on specific issue areas to small, interactive working groups, in order that USAID/Russia staff gain a fresh perspective on our current programming strategy, and to develop specific recommendations that can be used later when designing future civil society programming in Russia.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

Objective 1 (75% of total time): The Expert will impart information and experiences on nonprofit systems, nongovernmental organizations, and philanthropy in the United States and/or Europe, and to make recommendations on what types of programming USAID/Russia could implement that would lead to similar structures in Russia becoming institutionalized and self-sustaining.

Objective 2 (25% of total time): The Expert will impart information about the complementarity of the relationship between nongovernmental organizations (institutions) and informal citizen participation, as components of a civil society.

PAYMENT/DELIVERABLES

Under this Statement of Work, the Contractor will work approximately 5 working days at the offices of USAID/Russia, at the U.S. embassy in Moscow. All work performed under this Statement of Work shall be in English. There will be eight (8) deliverable items, as follows:

- 1. Lecture and Q&A Session with approximately 20 staff from DIHR. [4 Hours]** – This session should give a general overview of civil society development (which may be focused on a particular region or country, depending on the expertise of the Expert.) Sample issues to be addressed are included in Appendix A.
- 2. 4-6 working sessions with approximately 7 staff from DIHR's Civil Society Unit. [16 Hours]** – These working sessions will be specifically focused on refining USAID/Russia's approach to promoting civil society development in Russia. This will include developing specific interventions that USAID might implement.
- 3. Lecture and Q&A Session with 60 Mission staff from Technical Offices. [2 Hours]** – This should be a briefer version of the lecture and Q&A session conducted under deliverable (1) above.
- 4. Workshops with staff from three technical offices (BDI, EPR, SSR) on civil society development issues, as they relate to each office portfolio. [6 Hours]**

5. **Lecture and Q&A session with 20 USAID/Russia partners. [4 hours]**
These partners may include Russian and American NGO professionals, representatives of other donor organizations, staff from other embassy sections, and others.
6. **Delivery to USAID/Russia a final oral debriefing on Findings and Recommendations. [2 Hours]**
7. **Submission of a written report in draft form** outlining findings and making recommendations for specific ways USAID/Russia/DIHR should continue institutional development and institutionalization. [6 Hours] This draft report should be submitted before the Expert leaves Moscow.
8. **A final draft of the written report** in (7) above, to be submitted by the Expert no later than ten (10) working days after submission of the draft report. This final report shall incorporate USAID comments on the draft, which will be submitted to the Expert within five (5) working days of the submission of the draft.

The Expert may submit to the USAID/Russia office in Moscow an invoice for each deliverable line item after the services described in that deliverable line item have been performed. Payment will be made in US dollars within ten (10) working days of receipt of the invoice, with approval of the Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO).

PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

Work performed under this Statement of Work is to take place between October 1, 2002 and November 5, 2002.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals must include a summary of the bidder's approach to completing the work outlined in this Statement of Work. This summary should be no longer than 5 single spaced pages in 12 point font (excluding cost proposal and attachments). Each proposal must include a proposed cost for each deliverable line item listed above.

The Contractor will be selected based on cost from among those bidders who submit proposed approaches which meet the minimum technical requirements laid out in this Statement of Work.

A post-award conference will be held between USAID/Russia and the Contractor within five (5) working days of the award to address remaining questions.

Caryn M. Wilde

**Democracy & Governance Fellow
USAID/Russia**

**2002 - 2003
Fellowship Progress Report
November 1 to April 30**

**World Learning Inc.
1015 15th St. NW, Suite 750
Washington, DC 20005**

General Description of Fellowship

Democracy and civil society programs continue to be a high priority for USAID. While Russia is making a historic transition from one political system to another, the average citizen still has a low level of understanding of how a participatory democracy functions or about the infrastructure requisite to sustain civil society organizations (CSOs). If democracy is to operate all-inclusively in Russia, the citizenry will need to be more adept at voicing their opinions and exercising their right to shape public policy. Today, more citizens have the possibility to exercise their rights and responsibilities, and the time has come to shift the responsibility for strengthening civil society to Russian stakeholders. USAID/Russia will focus assistance on strengthening the mechanisms through which local initiatives will continue to grow, and supporting activities that promote values intrinsic in a stable democracy.

In June 2002, DIHR's Civil Society Team began the process of developing a five-year assistance program for strengthening Civil Society in Russia. What followed would be hundreds of hours of brainstorming sessions with colleagues, reviewing the impact of the previous eight years' technical assistance, assessing emerging issues, reading volumes of materials written by various experts, conducting interviews, traveling to remote locations on site visits, attending conferences, drafting concept papers and activity design documents, redesigning programs to fit reduced budgets, re-examining priorities in light of a shortened timeframe, presenting and defending programs at Missionwide reviews, and returning to the drawing board to incorporate recommendations. In April 2003, the Civil Society Team released three RFAs and two APSs. The Team was commended for its significant effort. I was honored to be nominated for a Meritorious Service Award by Mission director, Carol Peasley, and to receive the award from Ambassador Alexander Vershbow.

My role has been mentor, provider of options, and technical writer. The *before* and *after* strategies for SO 2.1 - A More Open, Participatory Society, reveal a significant change in thinking. I am pleased to have influenced some of that change. [See Attachments: 2001-2005 SO 2.1 & 1991-1999 SO 2.1] Initially, IR 3 was known as "Caryn's box", and I was the only one who could explain the rationale behind it. The day my colleagues in DIHR presented SO 2.1 in its entirety, I knew they had taken ownership, and understood that civil society was more than institutions. Sharing the concept of informal citizen participation and designing programs that engage citizens in governance and improving quality of life has consumed most of my attention as an international development specialist.

In a recent visit to Moscow, George Soros reinforced current thinking that the job [of civil society development] is not done, but needs to be undertaken by Russians. It has been said that no western, private initiative has had as profound an influence in shaping the new Russia, as Soros' Open Society Institute. As someone who followed where OSI had gone first (Belarus, Ukraine, Lithuania, and Russia), I whole-heartedly agree. Soros invested in individuals when no one else understood that they were the real leaders of lasting change.

I think that Year 3 is the right time to begin synthesizing my Fellowship observations regarding the evolution of Russia's civil society; to publish my perceptions of the Russian people's acceptance, adaptation, or rejection of the principles of a democratic society; and to draw attention to USAID's role in supporting the transition to participative democracy. By sharing experiences, lessons learned, and conclusions drawn, others may more easily advance their work. I would like to repay those who unselfishly shared their findings and advanced my work.

Objective #1 – Professional Goals

Assist and advise USAID/Russia in its efforts, in partnership with Russia, to become a more open, participatory society. Citizen participation in decision making, whether through informal channels or nongovernmental organizations (NGOS), is a vital ingredient in a civil society and the hallmark of a democracy.

Activity during the second-half of Year 2 was extremely diverse. My efforts were directed toward providing Mission colleagues with access to expertise about the nature of strengthening civil society, advising CTOs and their program partners on organization and management 'best practices', presenting timely commentaries on global civil society issues, and designing and writing multiple civil society programs. I approached each of the objectives with enthusiasm, an open mind, and willingness to learn as well as teach.

Upon leaving the USAID/Russia mission, a young Russian colleague shared his thoughts about the two years we had worked together. He was generous in expressing his appreciation for my patience in teaching him about civil society, and helping him in his work. His final comment confirmed that I have been on the right track. He said, "It was my experience that people spoke a lot of words, but when you spoke the words had meaning and I understood."

Objective #2 – Personal Goals

Advance my career development goals as an International Development Specialist; expand my knowledge of USAID and USAID/Russia, the Russian culture and environment; and to improve my Russian language proficiency.

As I reflected on the opportunities and experiences I encountered in Year 2, I realized that I truly did *advance, expand, and improve*. It was not infrequent that this Fellowship had nearly a perpendicular learning curve. I was privileged to meet and work with hundreds of extraordinary people, who made personal and professional growth very satisfying. It is fortunate for me that a Russian language student--lay anthropologist--international development specialist can always find a new challenge. They lie in wait just outside my cubicle.

Activities, Performance Methods and Impact

The section is organized as a monthly overview of my activities, performance methods, and the impact of these activities on the Mission, key stakeholders, and me.

November – Sara Melendez, President and CEO of the Independent Sector, was invited to Moscow to conduct a series of lectures, workshops, and strategy sessions on *Institutions and Institutional Development*. My objective for initiating this action was for Ms. Melendez to familiarize Mission staff and partners with the United States' rich history of nonprofit activity and to outline the dynamics of a vibrant Third Sector. I felt that it was important for my colleagues to have an opportunity to discuss their work in a comparative context. Generally, USAID's Russian staff and partners focus on a relatively narrow sphere of activity, and have little opportunity to consider the significance of interconnectivity in a civil society. I did not discount that it was important that my American colleagues and I should have access to contemporary expertise too. Although born and raised in a country where nonprofit institutions are an integral national tradition, it is crucial to be periodically updated on the powerful social, political, and economic force that the Third Sector wields.

Madii Institute (*Community Building Through Citizen Participation*) and Ms. Melendez concluded their agreement with USAID/Russia by submitting an analytical report outlining their findings and making recommendations for specific ways USAID/Russia should continue supporting institutional development and increasing citizen participation. I have taken note that on many occasions the training and recommendations have been referred to as civil society programming has been designed and implemented. I remain in communication with the experts, and they have introduced me to other Third Sector specialists. The final reports are available as attachments to this document. [See Attachments: Madii Institute Final Report & Melendez Final Report]

I attended the 3rd Volga Federal District Fair and Civic Forum in Togliatti. The Volga Federal District Fair is a unique federal initiative that finances, through a competitive process, the activities of civil society organizations. On the surface, creating a grant pool of nearly \$3 million from federal, regional, and municipal governments and a smattering of corporate donations would appear to be a step in the right direction. However, the lack of transparency gives the whole event a surreal atmosphere. It is unknown where the money comes from, how much money is actually raised, and how much of the money is disbursed. However, setting aside those questions, after three years, some important lessons have been learned. I was invited to participate in the Fair's closing roundtable. I listened with great interest as Sergei Kirienko, Federal Plenipotentiary, challenged the Fair's Board of Trustees to find solutions for some issues that have emerged. I was familiar with the issues, as USAID/Russia and other donors are struggling with them too.

- Is it better to focus support on new initiatives and risk losing the capacity and momentum that previous assistance has stimulated, or to support proven initiatives and risk missing new opportunities?
- How should donors monitor programs in order to determine that services are provided?
- By what means can a donor accurately measure impact or change?

- How to broaden the base of support for CSOs, and whose responsibility is it?

I have plans to follow-up on the Trustees' response to Mr. Kirienko's challenge. It seems that there is an opportunity for multi-lateral cooperation in searching for the answers.

There were several opportunities to provide organizational and management consultation to USAID's Russian Partners; two were notable. In the first case, the seriousness of the Russian Partner's management issues put future USAID assistance in question. Repeatedly, DIHR tried to help the organization turn the situation around, but with no lasting success. In one final attempt, DIHR asked the Board of Directors to consult with me. I put on an old hat, that of SME advisor, and waded into the fray. After several intensive sessions with the Board, it appeared that we had found a mutually agreeable reorganization plan that might pull them out of their tenuous predicament. Unfortunately, at the 13th hour, a few Board members' self-interest was put ahead of the organization's 'common good'. They decided to continue with their old management style, and USAID/Russia was left with no choice but to inform them that future funding would not be forthcoming. It has been said, "You can lead a horse to water, you can even make him drink, but you can't make him thirsty."

The second case had a more successful outcome. A courageous, charismatic individual leads a prominent human rights organization. As a leader, he is legendary. As a manager, he is, by his own admission, less than successful. The organization was operating slightly ahead of a total implosion. DIHR had faith in the organization's potential to provide its valuable services, and proposed a package of administrative technical assistance designed to bolster the over-all management program. Once again, I was asked to consult. From previous experience, I knew that it was not unusual for visionary leaders to be ineffective managers. Carefully, I explained (often employing highly creative tactics) how the separation of the two roles was advisable and would not diminish his control or the prestige of the organization. In time, he began to realize that reorganization might free him to do the work he preferred to do, and give his talented staff an opportunity to stretch their wings. I wouldn't go so far as to say that he bought into the theory, entirely; but he was willing to give it a try. I am confident that when he and his staff begin to notice the tension lessening, they will be motivated to implement further changes. The CTO monitors their progress, and DIHR is prepared to lend a hand if the need arises. Recently, I was told that he had inquired about additional management training from another of DIHR's partners.

Following a summer of facilitating the Civil Society Team's brainstorm sessions, it was natural to move into a principal role on the Activity Design Team for Strategic Objective 2.1 (SO 2.1), *A More Open Participatory Society*. SO 2.1 consists of the following Intermediate Results (IR): IR 1 - *Sources of Non-State Information that are Accessible to the Public Increased and Improved*; IR 2 - *Civil Society and Advocacy Institutions Strengthened*; and IR 3 - *Democratic Culture for Citizen Participation Strengthened*. Over the course of the next six months, I contributed expertise and technical writing for the Missionwide reviews, concept papers, activity design documents, MAARDs, RFAs, and APSs. The learning curve, regarding USAID policy and procedures, was essentially

vertical. A Missionwide review can be a major learning experience. I learned it is one thing to research, strategize, and write an activity design document; it is another thing to effectively communicative the concept and make a convincing argument to colleagues less familiar with the intimate details.

I consulted on the survey project being conducted by an American expert and Russian polling agency. A series of three regional survey instruments will gather information on attitudes and practices of the general population regarding democracy, civic participation, and the judiciary; NGO professionals' assessment of the development of their own organizations and of NGOs in their region and in the nation; and judicial professionals' assessment of judicial development at the regional and national level. I have an academic background in survey research methodology, and previous experience conducting survey research. I helped the Survey Team define and clarify terminology related to the Russian Third Sector, vetted questions in several sections, and advised on survey methodology when issues arose. Input from the Mission has been critical to ensuring that the survey design is compatible with Russian reality.

December – I attended USAID's Annual Democracy and Governance Conference and Workshop. This event is always interesting for me as a variety of training and information is offered. In relation to my Fellowship goals, I found two sessions very helpful. The workshop on *Clientelism and Patronage Regimes* gave me something new to consider. My first instinct was that a system of clientelism and patronage couldn't be construed as a positive element in a society; however, as the discussion progressed, I began to consider whether 'latent benefits' and other aspects resident in a system of clientelism and patronage could be a positive in some governance systems. An even more intriguing hypothesis was that an oligarchy develops a market economy faster than other systems that strive for more equitable distribution of wealth and property. Cases studies, shared by USAID colleagues, expanded the lecture and tied theory to reality. While the Workshop came to no final conclusions, in the end, I was pleased to have had the opportunity to explore the topics with my peers.

The *DG Officers' Issues* session was also very enlightening, and I tried to record the discussion verbatim. I knew DIHR's chief and deputy would be interested in the issues, comments, and recommendations made by their colleagues from other Missions. One discussion, the 'indigenization' of service provision, was particularly interesting to me. Over the past ten years, I have had considerable opportunity to work with Foreign Service Nationals (FSNs) and indigenous implementers. I have given a lot of thought to the benefits and drawbacks of indigenization. In my opinion, the argument for reducing or removing US personnel, as a cost savings or out of respect, is shortsighted. Maintaining a participatory society in the US is a continuous struggle. It simply isn't reasonable to think that after only 10 years of technical assistance, the concept is sufficiently ingrained in post-soviet society so as to take root and grow. At the same time, I don't believe that it is necessary for Americans to lead democratization projects. If we are serious about Russia becoming a more open, participatory society, we need to form strong partnerships. Invest in people, and plan to

stay for the long haul. A second discussion focused on sustainability. The general implication has been that sustainability is based on local nonprofits achieving some [undefined] level of skill and knowledge, and a funding base that extends beyond USAID's coffers. In my opinion, not enough emphasis has been placed on the importance of demonstrable support of the sector by government, business, and the citizenry. A countrywide culture for sustaining the Third Sector should be the benchmark, rather than ostensible public organizations' enthusiasm for a novel idea backed by foreign dollars.

While in the US, I met with Madii Institute and Sara Melendez. I followed-up on additional questions that my colleagues had posed, and discussed the possibility of the Independent Sector sponsoring internships for DIHR's CTOs. We agreed on three, 3-month internships: civil society, independent media, and human rights.

I began to investigate issues related to tolerance, values, and conflict management. My study concentrated on these issues in relation to faith-based social service providers and Islam. Given the rapid repositioning of worldwide issues and USAID's prominent role, I considered the possibility that USAID/Russia might begin technical assistance in these spheres.

January – The Mission received two important pieces of news that significantly altered its activity: 1) a steep budget reduction, and 2) a stepped-up exit timetable. While no one expected the Mission in Russia to remain open forever, the notification caught most everyone by surprise. For me, it was an abrupt reminder that technical assistance is closely tied to political considerations. I observed that it created a dilemma for DIHR's Civil Society Unit---how to curtail a job not close to completion, but still leave a legacy that would ensure continued development of a democratic culture.

Regardless of budget cuts and an uncertain timeframe, the Civil Society Unit still had programming work to do. We began by developing an Activity Design Document for IR-3, *Democratic Culture for Citizen Participation Strengthened*. Development Challenge: to influence a change in Russia's political culture, so that people will be aware of their rights, will be willing to accept their responsibilities, and will have the confidence to act. For IR 3.1 *Civic Education Program for Youth Improved*, the Civil Society Team designed an activity called Democratic Values Through Civic Education. This initiative will expand and institutionalize the existing approaches for teaching civics, will establish and support school-based service learning programs, and will embed democratic values throughout the local community. Based on the Team's site visits and comprehensive research on existing Russian civic education programs, and my recommendation that USAID/Russia avoid using its limited budget on traditional civic education programming, an innovative alternative program was created. I compiled information, briefed the staff, and encouraged them to put the funding into service learning. USAID's programming will concentrate on taking civics curriculum beyond the classroom walls and into the community. By adding value to existing civic education programs, students will have an opportunity to transform classroom theory into real life practice. I believe that

service learning gives meaning to classroom lectures, and that community participation will prove that citizens can improve their quality of life.

I was invited by the TACIS EuropeAid-NGO project to join their international advisory board. The project is a joint venture between TACIS and the Russian Ministry of Labor and Social Development (MoLSD). The project promotes triangular partner relations (TACIS, MoLSD, and NGOs) to improve the provision of social services by NGOs. The partnership also wanted a working collaboration with the other development agencies, hence the advisory board.

February - I went to Omsk, Siberia to attend a training seminar on Developing Self-Governing Local Committees (TOC). The training for Siberian NGOs was co-sponsored by the Omsk Resource Center and two Territorial Public Self-Governance Committees [Комитет Территориально-Общественное Самоуправление (КТОС)]. I had a special interest in this training, as from my earliest travels throughout Russia; I had caught brief references to TOC activity. I suspected that the TOC system might provide a direct route for USAID assistance programs to support informal community activism. In the 2002 Strategy Amendment and other subsequent documents, USAID refers to engaging citizens where they naturally coalesce---in schools and cultural centers, at work, and where they live. However, the *how* to engage citizens where they live was largely an abstract notion. After attending the Omsk Workshop, I had a clearer picture of TOC activities, their potential to bring a community together, and their strengths and weaknesses regarding the policymaking arena. A number of factors support my theory that the TOC system has the potential to serve as a vehicle for increasing informal citizen participation: (1) TOCs have a constitutional and legislative base; (2) TOC leaders use democratic principles to guide their organizations and involve citizens; (3) volunteers support and citizens participate in TOC activity; and (4) TOCs give the community a 'voice' in their governance. In broadly disseminating TOC methodology and improving the level of professionalism, there can be more opportunity for regional citizens to influence public policy.

The Civil Society Team began to develop the second Activity Design Document to address IR-2 *Civil Society and Advocacy Institutions Strengthened*. Development Challenge: to improve the overall environment for civil society organizations (CSOs), and strengthen CSOs' professional skills to articulate publicly and convincingly their social and economic contribution to society. The Third Sector Advancement Program builds on previous institution strengthening initiatives, and helps CSOs move to the next level. My contribution, in addition to technical writing, was to help the Civil Society Team identify technical assistance activities that would increase the capacity and sustainability of our long-standing partners. The Third Sector Advancement Program consists of four components:

- Strengthening regional grantmaking capacity.
- Strengthening association among civil society organizations.
- Strengthening policy-making capacity among civil society organizations.
- Strengthening the community of practitioners that provide services to civil society organizations.

Because of budget constraints and the shortened timetable, the Team re-examined the issues, and selected components deemed most vital for developing a viable Third Sector.

The Mission was invited to review and comment on the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) legislation. As I had been following the development of MCA with great interest, I offered my thoughts on the program. Although the legislation doesn't go into great detail, it seems to me that the proposed program represents a significant departure from current assistance philosophy. I noted the word *democracy* was not used, that there was a strong emphasis on partnership and the recipient country having 'ownership' in the program, and that all three sectors and the citizenry would be consulted during the design phase. The program is much closer to the European assistance model. However, since February, I haven't heard anymore about MCA. I am not sure what the status of the proposed program.

March - I attended the 2003 Spring Research Forum, *The Role of Faith-Based Organizations in the Social Welfare System*), sponsored by the Independent Sector, the Roundtable on Religion and Society Welfare Policy, and the Nelson Rockefeller Institute of Government. Approximately, 250 researchers, government and university representatives, and nonprofit and faith-based organizations (FBOs) discussed the potential of the faith-based community to deliver social services, and how to assess effectiveness. My interest in this conference came about because I noticed USAID's interest in engaging Russian FBOs and the potential to provide technical assistance in the lower Volga region through Islamic organizations. I thought the Forum would be an excellent opportunity to gather information on the US experience and discover what the attitudes were toward funding FBOs and congregations. Specifically, I was looking for answers to the following: What measurement and evaluation tools are used to assess the effectiveness of FBOs offering social services? What legislation governs FBOs? Do religious congregations have adequate capacity to provide complex social services? Does a congregations' commitment to spiritual initiative lead to social activism? Does government funding affect FBOs and congregations' voluntary nature and spiritual mission?

I am well aware that US FBOs have a long tradition of helping the needy, were a primary catalyst in establishing civic engagement as societal norm, and have received government support for more than a century. This is a stark contrast to Russia's traditions of charity and the USSR's centralized service delivery system. As Western development agencies assist Russians in creating a more participatory society, the ability or inability of FBOs to influence change is an important factor. Our histories are not parallel; therefore, the development path should not be expected to be parallel.

Today, what is similar is that both the Russian and the US social safety nets are weaker than they were in the past, and both countries are looking to the citizenry for solutions. The US Government has invested \$67 billion in social service grants to faith-based and community organizations. Primary recipients include educational institutions, medical centers and treatment programs, nursing homes, and daycare centers. The President's Faith-Based and Community Initiative and the CARE Act are just a few federal actions designed to strengthen faith-based and

community organizations. I learned about another federal initiative, Health and Human Services' Compassion Capital Fund, and my discovery produced an unexpected confirmation for the Civil Society Team. HHS has committed \$25 million to assist nonprofits in accessing federal grants, to conduct staff training, and to expand outreach services. The assistance will be delivered by 24 intermediate support organizations and one national resource center. USAID/Russia has been struggling with the question of continued support to 'resource centers'. Although there has been a good return on investment, there is growing concern that too much of our technical assistance has been focused too narrowly. The Compassion Capital fund corroborated DIHR's belief that there is a need for resource centers in Russia if CSOs are to continue orderly development and provision of services.

I came away from the Forum with a vast amount of information and mixture of impressions. What never fails to surprise me is that as old as the US Third Sector is, we have only recently begun to try to understand it as a phenomenon and to channel its potential. There is little research available on how FBOs, have in the past or might in the future, deliver assistance to America's neediest citizens. The PEW Charitable Trust and the Rockefeller Institute of Government have established a formal forum for dialogue and debate on the subject. The 2003 Research Forum was organized around the following questions:

- What are the differences, if any; between the way FBOs and government agencies deliver services?
- How, if at all, does government funding influence the provision of services by religious-affiliated organizations?
- How, if at all, does a provider's level of religious integration influence its delivery of social services?
- How do clients' perceptions and a program's effect on their lives vary?
- What explains similarities and differences in service delivery, client perceptions, and effects?
- How does an organization define and measure program effectiveness?

In my opinion, Americans and Russians are struggling with some of the same issues, and this sends an important message to development agencies and specialists that the US Third Sector is also in a state of evolution. Effective foreign assistance can and should be responsive and flexible. Russia's civil society will be a hybrid, not a clone.

While on the same trip, I had meetings with Madii Institute, experts on informal citizen participation; University of Minnesota specialists on evaluation and measurement techniques; Sara Melendez, expert on institution strengthening; The Independent Sector, John Thomas, specialist on networks and associations; Carol Sahley, Democracy Fellow; Dick Frankel, Russia Desk Officer; and Kent Hill, AA - E & E Bureau; and Dave Payton and Ellen Garrett, World Learning Fellowship coordinators. It was also my pleasure to make a presentation on Third Sector development in Russia to a group of development specialists brought together at World Learning's offices.

I returned to Russia just in time for the Missionwide reviews of the Activity Design Documents; to consult on a proposed Global Development Alliance (GDA) with the Russian oil philanthropist, Yukos; and to begin writing a Workplan for the 3rd year Fellowship with USAID/Russia.

April – As a member of DIHR's Civil Society Team, I participated in a USAID-US private donor strategy session. The Team and representatives from the Ford, Eurasia, and Charles Stewart Mott Foundations discussed various scenarios regarding the phase down and USAID's exit from Russia. As we talked, it became clearer to me that several, inextricably connected issues were holding back the development of a cohesive Third Sector.

- The need for a broad-based, popular movement to change the laws governing civil society organizations.
- The increasing dominance of the Moscow nonprofits over the entire sector; and
- The perceived lack of capacity and professionalism of regional civil society organizations.

It prompted me to ask the three donor organizations if they would direct more funding toward regional initiatives if there were reliable sub-grantors located in the regions. All three answered in the affirmative. It was on the drive back to the Mission that the main components of a regional grantmaking program began to take shape. It would be over simplification to imply that one meeting determined the direction of an entire civil society program. It would be more accurate to say, 20 months of research and strategic planning, a long-pursued goal to leave the Russian Third Sector in the strongest position to continue developing a democratic culture, and the donor meeting, led to a clearer picture of what should come next. Following that meeting, the majority of my time was spent co-writing, editing, and rewriting APSs and RFAs. The result of our efforts are the *Third Sector Advancement Program Annual Program Statement*, three *Strengthening Regional Grant-Making Capacity Program RFAs*, and the *USAID/Russia Democratic Values Through Civic Education Annual Program Statement*. (See Attachments: APS Civic Education, APS Third Sector Advancement Program, and RFA Grantmaking Capacity) All together, the seven programs could yield numerous Russian-led projects. Applications have started to come in to the Mission, and the summer will be spent making selections.

On-going Activities

DIHR Activities included quarterly and annual report reviews, budget and procurement discussions, and new project strategy sessions. Programming consultations with DIHR Partners: Center for NGO Support (CNGOS) - business development planning; IREX PRO-NGO – early response program changes; Rule of Law – judicial program strategy; and ISC's Russian Far East Civic Initiative Program - small grants program and designing a performance monitoring plan. Individualized organizational and management consulting included: Glasnost Defense Fund, NDI's Voice program, Institute for Election Systems Development (IESD); IREX Media Program; and Moscow School of Political Studies (MSPS). Throughout, I was a source of information and training for DIHR's Russian staff.

Missionwide Activity included providing consultations to each of the Mission's Technical Offices; participating in USAID/Russia organizational planning sessions on exit strategy, funding

reduction, and GDA pursuits; and other global policy issues. I reviewed books and articles, conducted research, and wrote analytical commentaries on emerging issues.

Russian and International Community Activities - I participated in the Russian Donors Forum, the AmCham's Charity Committee, TACIS advisory group, UNDP and Russian Parliament Charity Commission working group, and networked with other international assistance organizations. These activities gave me the ability to provide the Mission with a wide range of information, varied perspective on development issues, and a link to the broader community. It also gave me an opportunity to share information and mentor other specialists in the development sphere: independent media researcher - Sada Aksartova, Belarusian NGO leaders, and the Russian People's Assembly.

Proposed Revisions to Program Description

See the Year 3 Fellowship Workplan, Addendum B

Tentative Fellowship International Travel

See the Travel Section in the Year 3 Fellowship Workplan, Addendum B

274

Democracy Fellows Program

Caryn M. Wilde

May 1, 2002 to April 30, 2003

USAID/Russia Strategy Amendment (1999-2005) reaffirms the United States' commitment to support Russia's advancement of common values---to protect and advance human rights, tolerance, religious freedom, free speech and independent media, economic opportunity, and the rule of law. Civil Society development in Russia is a long-term process; therefore, the vitality of NGOs and an engaged citizenry is a primary focus that cuts across all Units in the Mission.

Statement of Personal Goals

While working to assist USAID/Russia in implementing the 1999-2005 Strategy, I will be realizing my career development goals:

- To enhance my professional qualifications and competency as an International Development Specialist;
- To achieve better insight of the emerging NGO sector and informal citizen activism, in order to understand how these entities will contribute to the over-all development of a third sector that ultimately forges a Russian civil society;
- To develop an understanding and competency of USAID's policy and procedures as they relate to fostering the development of a civil society, consisting of a fully integrated relationship between the Russian government, business, and the third sector;
- To develop contacts and initiate dialogue with other experts in related spheres;
- To facilitate communication and activity among various key stakeholders; and
- To expand my knowledge of the Russian culture, and continue improvement of my Russian language skills.

Statement of Professional Goals

As a Democracy and Governance Fellow, I see my role to be that of assisting and advising USAID/Russia in its efforts, in partnership with Russia, to become a more open, participatory society. Citizen participation in decision making, whether through informal channels or nongovernmental organizations (NGOS), is a vital ingredient in a civil society and the hallmark of a democracy.

Objectives and Activities

Objectives

At the request of USAID/Russia, specific assistance to the Mission will include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Supporting program partners, resource centers, and NGOs that are working on democracy, business and economic reform, and social sector reform through advice and training on strategic planning, board development fundraising, public relations, organizational development; advocacy, and staff development and training;
- Contributing to USAID/Russia's effort to stimulate broader citizen participation in their governance and maintenance of quality of life;
- Assisting the Mission with strategic planning, development and review of documents (for example: individual scopes of work, workplans, reports, and evaluations), and coordinating with US Embassy agencies on related topics;
- Providing Mission staff with targeted training and information relating to third sector development, citizen participation, and global perspectives on civil society; and
- Performing targeted study and analysis, as requested by Mission.

Principal Activities

To meet the above objectives, I propose to do the following:

- Continue to study (read, interview, attend events, & travel) and track those NGOs and partners being targeted for assistance by USAID;
- Meet with USAID activity managers, contractors, grantees, key stakeholders, and the development agencies of other countries working in Russia;
- Meet with Russian governmental agencies tasked with over-sight of the development of the Russian third sector, the Russian private business sector, and other Russian organizations and the general public;
- Following the developments of local philanthropic foundations, resulting activity of the Civic Forum, the AmCham/NGO-Charities Committee, and the Russian Donor Forum;
- Review information on the institutional strengths and weaknesses, current activities, and research and assessments prepared by USAID/Russia and other experts;
- Interface with USAID/Russia's technical offices, Business Development Initiatives, Economic Policy Reform and Social Sector Restructuring, in order to remain familiar with their efforts, the commonality of their NGO's activity with that of DIHR's NGO's activity, and where activity may be cross-cutting and collaboration enhance the efforts of the Mission;
- To serve as USAID's "in-house" advisor on NGO institutional development and citizen participation;
- To provide briefings, as requested, to Mission management, USAID activity managers, contractors and grantees and Russian NGOs on the status of NGO's institutional development and broader issues of citizen activism;
- To participate in the review of proposals, workplans, quarterly reports and other documents from Russian NGOs, partners, other Missions, and foreign colleagues;
- To work with and provide consultation to the Office of Democratic Initiatives and Human Resources (DIHR) across each of DIHR's five divisions, including: (1) Media, (2) Political Process Development, (3) Civil Society, (4) Rule of Law, and (5) Partnerships;
- To provide some direct institutional development work---this may include, but is not limited to, conducting needs assessment and strategic planning implementation assistance with specific Russian NGOs, partners, or other key stakeholders; and
- To utilize, in my work, my expanding knowledge of the Russian culture and Russian language proficiency.

Outcomes and Impact

Personal outcomes include:

- continued growth of my knowledge and understanding of the emerging Russian civil society and of USAID/Russia's policy and procedures;
- expanded networks and increased communication with experts working in related endeavors;
- heightened understanding of the Russian history and culture that makes up the society; and
- continued improvement in my linguistic skills.

Impact

The impact of my personal and professional development will be to further establish my credibility as an International Development Specialist. I foresee further invitations to lecture and consult with distinguished organizations, such as Harvard's Davis Center for Russian Studies. These lecture opportunities also have a positive public relations effect for USAID/Russia.

Professional outcomes include:

- USAID/Russia kept up-to-date, through on-going monitoring, of civic forum working groups' activity--which may lead to the development of an infrastructure that will support institutionalization of the Third Sector;
- strengthened organization and management skills of program partners, resource centers, and NGOs;
- improved organizational capacity and service provision of program partners;
- a pro-active training model for resource centers and NGOs' that develops skills necessary to facilitate informal citizen participation---designed, implemented, and preliminarily assessed; and
- USAID/Russia assistance in defining priorities, assessing the strengths and weaknesses of program partners, and developing plans of assistance tailored to each partner; USAID staff updated, through periodic reports, on timely information related to civil society development; an expanded network and communication with other organizations supporting civil society development; and assessments of the impact of USAID and other donor programming in Russia.

Impact

The impact of my efforts, for USAID/Russia, will be useful advice on which to base decision-making, expanded networks, and a broadened perspective of civil society development; for Russia, the impact will be assistance in developing an infrastructure that will sustain the emerging Third Sector; and for Russians, the impact will be to support their effort to establish channels that permit them to participate in their governance and maintenance of quality of life. USAID/Russia's assistance to Russian NGOs will contribute to an overall improved cultural awareness, acceptance, and appreciation of the value of NGOs as an integral component in a civil society that will yield psychological, physical, and financial support needed to sustain the voluntary sector.

Timeline and Level of Effort

Second Year:

Approximately, 50% my time outside of the Mission supporting program partners, resource centers, and NGOs; meeting with regional Russian governmental agencies and organizations; networking with other foreign development agencies; and participating in training that will enhance my skills and that can be shared with colleagues.

Approximately, 50% of my time in the Mission will be spent assisting with strategic planning and development and review of documents; providing staff training, information, consultation; interviewing, reading, and observing; and coordinating with US Embassy agencies on related topics.

Fellowship Travel Plans

Based on my activity in the first year of the Fellowship, I think it is reasonable to plan for an average of two regional trips per month in eight out of twelve months. International travel, undertaken to continue an effort to remain up-to-date on civil society development relative to the Missions' goals, may average once a month in six out of twelve months. In descending order according to frequency, the destination of the international travel will be the following: NIS countries, Eastern Europe, Western Europe, and the United States.

Conferences may include: DFID CIS Meetings and the BEARR Trust Conference, UK; European Union and European Commission, Europe; and the DG Conference, the 31st Annual Conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA), USA, and Harvard's Davis Center for Russian Studies, USA.

Democracy Fellows Program

Caryn M. Wilde

May 1, 2003 to April 30, 2004

Democracy and civil society programs continue to be a high priority for USAID. While Russia is making a historic transition from one political system to another, the average citizen still has a low level of understanding of how a participatory democracy functions or about the infrastructure requisite to sustain civil society organizations (CSOs). If democracy is to operate all-inclusively in Russia, the citizenry will need to be more adept at voicing their opinions and exercising their right to shape public policy. Although CSOs and informal citizen participation aren't yet the acknowledged norm, Western technical assistance has contributed significantly to the momentum toward building a foundation for a viable Third Sector. Today, as more citizens have the possibility to exercise their rights and responsibilities, it is generally agreed that the time has come to shift the responsibility for strengthening civil society to Russian stakeholders. For USAID/Russia, this will mean focusing assistance on strengthening the mechanisms through which local initiatives will continue to grow, and supporting activities that promote values intrinsic in a stable democracy.

Statement of Personal Goals

I will fully establish my reputation and visibility as an expert on the 'transition of post-soviet societies to a more democratic culture'. Taking into account the innovative assistance initiatives that USAID/Russia will undertake, I have set my personal and professional goals for the 3rd year of my Democracy Fellows Program. Achieving the following objectives will substantially advance my credentials as an International Democracy Development Specialist.

Objective

To synthesize Fellowship experiences and observations about the evolution of Russia's civil society; to publish insightful commentary on the Russian people's acceptance, adaptation, or rejection of the principles of a democratic society; and to underscore USAID's role in supporting the transition from *managed democracy to participative democracy*.

> Activities

- Analyze civil society organizations and emergent informal civic initiatives, in order to better understand the unique character of the evolving and still fragile Russian civil society.
- Write about my findings regarding the 'character' of Russian civil society—describe the influence of western assistance, and examine the interplay of foreign stimuli and purely Russian initiatives.
- Maintain dialogue with other leading experts and key stakeholders engaged in development assistance to Russia.
- Participate in the technical aspects of developing a strategy and implementation plan for a USAID phase-down.
- Continue to expand my knowledge of the Russian culture, and improve my Russian language skills.

> Outcomes

- An analytic account, based on accumulated knowledge and experience, of Russia's maturing civil society.
- Publishable quality commentary, based on selected case studies, on the activities of civil society organizations and informal citizen initiatives—the absorption and/or adaptation of democratic values into the Russian society.
- On-going informative briefings to the Mission of observations and findings.
- Expanded international and local networks.
- Practical understanding of USAID policy and procedures regarding transitioning of activity and program phase-down.
- Increased understanding of Russian culture and improved linguistic skills.

Impact

A Democracy and Governance Fellowship offers a unique opportunity to gain insight on USAID, its development partners, and the effect US initiatives have on Russian society. Publishing my analytical work will increase recognition of my competency as a civil society expert, and will draw attention to USAID's contribution to Russia's transition to a democratic culture. Meeting my personal goals will strengthen my professional credibility as an International Democracy Development Specialist.

Statement of Professional Goals

USAID will begin to transfer the focus for strengthening civil society to Russian stakeholders; thus, significantly increasing the number of Russian Partners. Russian CSOs will ensure that local initiatives continue to grow, and that activities promote values intrinsic in a stable democracy. In order to assess the impact and sustainability of USAID's democratization assistance efforts, I will conduct case studies and evaluations. I will concentrate consultations on sharing processes and best business practices for strengthening organization and management with USAID's strategic Russian Partners.

Objective #1

To assess the impact of USAID assistance efforts in the following areas:

- a. Strengthening civil society organizations' capacity to provide meaningful input into policymaking;
- b. Stimulating informal citizen participation in their governance and improvement of quality of life; and
- c. Expanding the potential for traditional civic education models to engage youth in service-learning activity.

➤ Activity

Conduct case studies that analyze the unique character of Russia's emerging civil society, and to provide USAID with concrete findings that define the influence of US technical assistance, and describe the interplay of USAID support and purely Russian initiatives.

Outcome

USAID will have an assessment of the impact of their democracy efforts. The results may be used to inform a wider audience.

Objective #2

To study existing methodology for measuring 'intangible change' and to contribute to an improved mechanism for assessing program outcomes.

➤ Activity

To review methodology and tested technologies that may improve USAID's ability to identify and measure subtle outcomes in programs such as, advocacy programs (measuring system change), prevention programs (measuring something that did not happen), or affecting behavior programs (measuring the change in ones' values and basic assumptions).

Outcome

Compilation of methodologies and tested technologies that will aid USAID's ability to identify and measure qualitative outcomes.

Objective #3

To advise USAID on strengthening Russian partners' ability to function efficiently and effectively with less foreign involvement and how to increase funding from local sources, and to provide guidance to American partners implementing innovative programming to enhance Russia's democratic culture.

➤ Activity

Provide direct institutional development assistance to Russian implementing partners--strengthening their organizational and management skills, increasing their advocacy and networking potential, and improving their understanding of ethical resource stewardship.

Outcome

Strengthened Russian partners that use best business practices, provide efficient and effective services, attract local funding and contracts, and carry on the development of the Russian civil society.

➤ Activity

Counsel American implementers on innovative techniques that are adaptable to local conditions, as they facilitate programming that strengthens Russia's democratic culture.

Outcome

American implementers effectively implement innovative value-based programming that is effective, flexible, and respects Russian culture.

Objective #4

To provide technical expertise to Mission staff on the broader issues of Third Sector and institutional development, citizen activism, and mechanisms essential for democratic culture.

> Activities

Provide individual consultation and group training to activity managers on issues relating to third sector development, informal citizen participation, global perspectives on civil society, and balancing US goals and Russian reality.

Outcome

Locally engaged staff will have a broader perspective on what is meant by and issues relating to democratic culture.

Impact

My efforts will contribute to achieving USAID's ultimate goal: a viable Russian Third Sector that facilitates formal and informal civic initiatives, protects the citizenry, and advocates for the common good. Case studies and reports will provide USAID with up-to-date information and assessment of their investment. Publication of the studies will broadly inform about USAID's legacy in Russia--a vibrant civil society that serves as a vital counterweight to a strong central authority and a capricious business sector. Consultations and recommendations, provided to targeted Partners, will recommend distinctive strategies for improving sustainability, increasing capacity to lead the next generation of reform, and expanding forums in which citizens can have input into the policy process.

Timeline and Level of Effort

Approximately 50% my time will be spent outside of the Mission, observing Partner organizations and USAID funded events, conducting interviews, collecting information, and participating in external sector events. These activities will enhance my ability to assess and write about USAID's influence in strengthening civil society organizations and supporting the transition to a democratic culture.

Approximately 50% of my time will be spent in the Mission, writing, sharing my expertise, participating in Partner strengthening activities, providing specialized staff training, and assisting with strategic planning for the Mission's phase-down.

Fellowship Travel Plans

I propose the following travel schedule for this Fellowship Year:

1. Russia - Two regional trips per month in six out of twelve months. (12 trips)
2. International - one trip per month in six out of twelve months. (6 trips)
Destinations for international travel are most likely to be the following: NIS countries, Eastern Europe, Western Europe, and the United States.
 - ✓ Conferences and training opportunities may include: European Donor Conferences held in Eastern and Western Europe, Democracy and Governance Conference and Workshop, Democracy Fellows Conference, Independent Sector Conference, and the Annual Conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA).

Russian and international travel is crucial for realizing personal goals of understanding and broadly communicating the distinctiveness of Russia's evolving civil society; and likewise, it is essential for achieving professional goals of maintaining a high level of expertise on civil society developments relative to the Mission's goals, to providing the Mission with useful assessments of their programming activities, and linking the Mission's initiatives with Russia's movement toward a democratic culture.

Attachment H

Current Program Description Under the DFP

6. Following the existing program description currently included in the instrument add the following amendment to cover the extended award period:

DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

Awarded to World Learning, Inc.

USAID Cooperative Agreement No. AEP-A-00-95-00024

Project Extension Period: 10/01/01 - 06/15/05

USAID Project Management: USAID/G/DG

REVISED PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

August 17, 2001

The following Revised Program Description modifies and replaces the Program Description previously attached to Modification Number 8 (dated 03/30/00), of the Cooperative Agreement between World Learning and USAID, originally awarded June 16, 1995 as Agreement No. AEP-5466-A-00-5024-00. Except as changed by this Extension, or as required in order to conform to this modification, other applicable provisions of Cooperative Agreement No. AEP-A-00-95-00024 [AEP-5466-A-00-5024-00], and the Standard Provisions, Optional Provisions and Schedule attached thereto, remain in effect.

A. OVERALL GOAL:

To help support a cadre of experienced U.S. technical experts committed to careers in democracy and governance, in order to assist in the promotion of U.S. democracy and governance efforts, and to increase the number or expertise of people working in the field.

B. OVERALL PURPOSE:

-- To identify, select, support and provide oversight of Democracy Fellows working in USAID assignments that contribute to democracy programs in developing countries, as well as to the fellows' career development and commitment.

C. Program Activity

1. Recruiting Applicants.

World Learning will recruit junior, mid-level and senior candidates for a variety of worldwide Democracy Fellowships. Recruitment will be nation-wide and inclusive, designed to achieve maximum diversity and to attract highly qualified U.S.-citizen applicants. It is anticipated that World Learning will supply to USAID up to fourteen Democracy Fellows during Extension Years 1 and 2, and twelve Democracy Fellows during Extension Years 3 and 4.

World Learning will recruit candidates on an open-ended basis, retaining applications in its active files for approximately one year. All qualified applicants will be entered into a DFP database (see below), organized and retrievable according to the candidates' eligibility level, academic training, geographic interest and experience, language abilities, and other skills and interests.

World Learning will target its recruitment efforts to meet USAID's needs for fellows at different levels of expertise. Initially, World Learning and USAID expect that the profile of Democracy Fellows serving during Extension Years 1 and 2 will approximate five senior, seven mid-level, and two junior fellows. Actual needs will be coordinated with USAID periodically throughout the duration of the program.

In organizing its recruiting, World Learning will solicit university graduate and law schools, contact relevant professional organizations, and advertise in appropriate journals, international employment newsletters and similar publications. The Democracy Fellows Program (DFP) will also accomplish other outreach to ensure the continuing recruitment of new applicants. Basic recruitment criteria will include: a minimum of a Masters or JD degree in a relevant field; U.S. citizenship; appropriate language and cross-cultural capabilities; and appropriate professional skills and experience. World Learning does not tolerate or practice discrimination, and will seek a broad representation of graduates of U.S. universities, undertaking special efforts to assure participation of candidates from Minority-Serving Institutions, and actively recruiting women and minorities interested in working as Democracy Fellows with USAID.

2. Screening and Selecting Candidates.

World Learning will review and screen all applications to the DFP, in order to establish a pool of qualified candidates for Democracy Fellowships. Screening will assess each applicant's technical eligibility, relevant experience, professional and academic background, and other personal qualifications, as well as other needs of USAID missions or offices that from time to time may wish to sponsor Democracy Fellowships.

3. Identifying Fellowship Assignments.

World Learning will work closely with USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance (USAID/G/DG), with overseas missions and democracy offices, and with USAID regional and central bureaus to identify Democracy Fellowship assignments in a wide range of democracy-related activities. World Learning will periodically communicate with USAID missions and offices to solicit their interest in funding Democracy Fellowships. The DFP will work with G/DG and interested missions and offices to understand their democracy needs, and to determine their preferred and required qualifications for fellowship candidates.

World Learning will coordinate with each sponsoring mission or office to secure specific program objectives that outlines the activities, responsibilities, functions and duties that the mission or office seeks to have a Democracy Fellow accomplish. World Learning will consult with the sponsoring missions and offices and with G/DG to address any concerns about the appropriateness of particular activities or functions contained in the-proposed fellowship assignment.

4. Awarding Fellowships.

Depending upon available USAID funding, agency ceilings for Democracy Fellows, and the needs of USAID missions or offices, World Learning will periodically award and administer fellowships as established under this Democracy Fellows Program. Fellowships will be awarded for initial terms of one- or two-years, with a preference for a two-year term, subject to available USAID funding and the mutual agreement of World Learning, the selected candidate and the sponsoring USAID mission or office.

In selecting candidates, World Learning will identify from its applicant pool one or more eligible candidates who best meet(s) the goals and purposes of the program, as well as the needs of the sponsoring USAID mission or office, and whom World Learning considers suitable to undertake the activities contemplated by USAID. In awarding each Democracy Fellowship, World Learning will ordinarily identify up to three well-qualified candidates for each proposed Democracy Fellowship. However, depending upon candidate availability and the specific skills, experiences and attributes sought by particular missions, the DFP may propose a greater or lesser number of candidates for consideration. World Learning and USAID must both concur in the selection of any individual fellow. The award of senior-level fellowships will require the prior approval of USAID/G/DG.

Direct and indirect program costs, overhead and other program expenses will be supported through USAID funding and allocated to each fellowship in accordance with the terms of the Cooperative Agreement and any subsequent modifications.

A written workplan will be established for each Democracy Fellowship, outlining the specific goals, objectives, activities and responsibilities that the sponsoring USAID unit seeks to have accomplished during that fellowship. World Learning

will use the sponsoring unit's initial program activity to identify suitable applicants and to nominate specific candidates for the proposed fellowship. USAID, the selected finalist and World Learning must concur in a final workplan before World Learning will award that Democracy Fellowship. Fellows are expected to provide periodic substantive written reports (e.g., quarterly), detailing progress and problems occurring during the reporting period, as well as results attained, and plans for the next period. World Learning anticipates that fellows and their respective USAID sponsors will periodically review and revise the pertinent workplans throughout the course of the fellowship. World Learning will provide general oversight, and will assist fellows and candidates in developing an initial workplan for approval by the appropriate USAID unit. World Learning will not approve any fellowship workplan that would require a fellow to undertake inherently governmental duties.

The following conditions reflect patterns of personal services and are therefore prohibited:

- USAID personnel specify how, when, what or where the fellows' work is to be performed;
- The agency provides the work space and basic tools and materials to accomplish the work;
- The fellow gives the appearance of being a government employee in the performance of his/her assignment;
- The fellow is continuously supervised and controlled by government officials or employees and the supervisory control allows the government employee to protect the government's interests by retaining control of and responsibility for that function.

World Learning will additionally implement the program in accordance with USAID policy set out in ADS Functional Series 400 INTERIM UPDATE #3, regarding the appropriate roles of Democracy Fellows within USAID, and the range of activities defined as personal services.

5. Fellowship Reports and Resource Materials.

The DFP will collect and make available to G/DG periodic activity and trip reports, analyses and other materials that fellows may submit over the course of their fellowships, so that these materials can serve as resources available to help advance the field of democracy and governance. The DFP expects fellows to provide periodic substantive analytical reports on their progress in attaining the goals and activities established in their respective fellowship workplans. These reports should describe the fellow's democracy activities, as well as the accomplishments and results they achieve, and the efforts and problems encountered in pursuing those activities. These fellowship reports are not considered official USAID agency documents requiring mission or office clearance. However, fellows will continue to be encouraged to share their periodic reports with mentors in the sponsoring mission or office and with other interested USAID staff for comment, additional information and guidance.

Fellows will be required to obtain the concurrence of the sponsoring mission or office for any substantive revisions to their workplans. In accordance with the standard terms of the cooperative agreement for the program, USAID and World Learning retain an irrevocable, non-exclusive, royalty-free, non-commercial right to digest, edit, excerpt, reproduce, distribute and/or otherwise use any reports, materials and work products arising from any Democracy Fellowship. The DFP will provide copies of the fellows' final reports and their professional work products to USAID/PPC/CDIE/PIO.

6. Fellowship Orientation.

World Learning will periodically organize orientations for incoming Democracy Fellows, including an orientation to World Learning, the DFP, USAID, and the procedures, rules and regulations applicable to the program. To the extent permitted by USAID, the DFP will attempt to schedule fellowship starting dates so that a group of new fellows may attend the same orientation (e.g., quarterly). However, in order to meet USAID needs, World Learning will provide individual orientation sessions or briefings when USAID deems this preferable. During orientation World Learning will provide each fellow with a copy of the DFP Handbook, which includes detailed explanations, instructions, policies, examples, background materials, and appropriate administrative and financial forms.

7. Fellowship Mentoring and Career Guidance.

World Learning will work with each sponsoring mission or office to identify a suitable mentor or other responsible person to advise, support and be the collaborative point of contact for each Democracy Fellow assigned to that organization.

World Learning will coordinate with G/DG and the sponsoring mission to ensure that the designated mentor or responsible official is informed of relevant procedures, requirements and restrictions that affect the fellow's duties. This official will typically also serve as World Learning's point of contact with the sponsoring mission or office, should any questions, difficulties or concerns arise. To the extent practicable, the DFP will offer fellows individual or collective career guidance through review and comment on the fellows' workplans and periodic reports, or through other appropriate means. DFP mentoring activities may be revised to reflect any future USAID guidance on this topic.

8. Support for Democracy Fellows.

The DFP will support each Democracy Fellow, and provide general oversight of each fellowship. Fellows will not be considered employees or personal service contractors (PSCs) of USAID or the U.S. Government, nor employees of World Learning. Fellows will continue to be governed by World Learning's general financial and administrative policies and procedures. For example, fellows are required to comply with World Learning and DFP policies and determinations on matters such as leave, time and attendance, the location of work, the authorization and ticketing of travel, the payment of per diem or subsistence payments, the payment and reconciliation of allowances and travel advances, the reimbursement of approved expenses etc. The DFP will provide each Democracy Fellow with a substantive pre-service orientation to these policies and procedures, as well as periodic updates to the DFP Handbook, and its detailed policies, explanations, examples and forms.

World Learning does not undertake to direct the day-to-day program activities of fellows in their USAID assignments, but will coordinate with USAID in exercising general oversight of the fellows' activities. In accordance with current USAID policies, Democracy Fellows are not permitted to serve under direct government supervision (as opposed to general oversight and administration), however, fellows will continue to be required to observe local office work schedules, administrative procedures, and other requirements of the sponsoring USAID office or mission. Democracy Fellows are prohibited from supervising USAID grantees, contractors or staff, including FSNs and PSCs. Fellows may not manage U.S. government programs, projects or funds, nor officially represent USAID outside the agency. World Learning will coordinate with USAID to initiate national security clearances that USAID may require for prospective fellows.

World Learning will coordinate with the sponsoring mission or office to establish a fellowship program and travel budget for each fellow, and will ensure that these components are included as part of the pertinent fellowship workplan. Using World Learning's established financial controls and administrative procedures, the DFP will closely monitor and manage the expenditure of such funds throughout the term of each fellowship. World Learning will advise fellows of its reimbursement policies and its domestic and international travel regulations, and will seek to insure individual fellows' compliance through program orientations and periodic educational efforts, and through DFP management of each fellow's travel budgets, advances, claims and reimbursements.

In order to ensure that each fellowship is funded at a proper level (neither excessively nor insufficiently), World Learning will work closely with fellows and sponsoring missions or offices to identify estimated fellowship travel and other expenses well in advance. The DFP will particularly encourage sponsoring missions or offices and fellows to describe specific fellowship travel plans and/or budget expectations, e.g., when developing the fellowship workplans, and when making periodic program revisions. Fellows should identify for all international travel: (a) the proposed destination(s) of trips during the period of the plan; (b) the estimated duration of each trip; and (c) the number of trips planned for each destination. Plans need not specify precise travel dates, nor will the DFP be required to pre-plan each trip that may occur during the fellowship term.

For planning purposes, the DFP will provide USAID/G/DG with an annual estimated cost for generic senior, mid-level and junior fellowships, including salaries and benefits, insurance, shipping and other standard fellowship allowances, travel, and other direct and indirect expenses. World Learning will establish a comprehensive fellowship program budget, including travel and other fellowship allowances and benefits, at the time it awards each Democracy Fellowship, and will monitor each fellowship budget to ensure that benefits, travel and other expenses remain within budget and comply with applicable regulations.

9. Fellowship Stipends and Allowances.

World Learning will from time to time determine appropriate stipends, benefits and allowances for each fellow and fellowship, bearing in mind the goals and purposes of the DFP. In determining fellows' initial salary levels, the DFP will refer to USAID requirements for employment compensation, and will consider the selected candidate's education, experience and prior earnings. The program will generally strive for an "income-neutral" net annual salary, within the program's established stipend ranges. As previously approved by USAID, the following salary ranges have been established for senior, mid-level and junior fellowships, generally pegged to the prevailing U.S. Civil Service Schedule (Non-Locality Pay):

(a) Initial Compensation Levels.

(1) Junior-level Democracy Fellows must have, at the time the initial fellowship is awarded, a Masters degree in a relevant professional field, and have 0 - 5 years full-time professional work experience in a field closely related to international democracy and governance. (All candidates for the Democracy Fellows Program must have at least a Masters or J.D. degree to be eligible for the program. Under exceptional circumstances, World Learning may at its discretion accept five years of relevant full-time professional experience as a substitute for a Masters degree.)

Junior-level Democracy Fellows receive initial annual stipends based on their education, experience and prior earnings, within a fixed range established according to the U.S. Civil Service schedule (Non-Locality Pay) in effect at the time the fellowship is awarded. The minimum initial salary for a junior fellow will be at the level of a GS-9/Step 1 of the applicable Civil Service schedule. The maximum initial salary for a junior fellow will be at the level of a GS-12/Step 5. The specific salary amount for each fellow will be equal to that individual's prior verified earnings, as certified on USAID Form 1420, but not less than the established minimum, nor more than the maximum, initial junior-level stipend. Individuals whose verified earnings in full-time directly related employment exceed the junior-level salary range may only be awarded a fellowship at the mid-level with USAID concurrence.

(2) Mid-level Democracy Fellows must have, at the time the initial fellowship is awarded, at least a J.D. or Ph.D. degree; have a Masters degree and between 5 and 10 years full-time professional work experience in a field closely related to international democracy and governance; or have at least a Masters degree and prior verified earnings, as certified on USAID Form 1420, that are greater than the then-prevailing salary of a GS-12/Step 5.

Mid-level Democracy Fellows receive initial annual stipends based on their education, experience and prior earnings, within a fixed range established according to the U.S. Civil Service schedule (Non-Locality Pay) in effect at the time the fellowship is awarded. The minimum initial salary for a mid-level fellow will be at the level of a GS-12/Step 6 of the applicable Civil Service schedule. The maximum initial salary for a mid-level fellow will be at the level of a GS-14/Step 6. The specific salary amount for each mid-level fellow will be equal to that individual's prior verified earnings, as certified on USAID Form 1420, but not less than the established minimum, nor more than the maximum, initial mid-level stipend. For all fellows, the maximum annual salary payable under the DFP is limited by a fixed ceiling of \$87,400. Individuals whose verified earnings in full-time directly related employment exceed the mid-level salary range may only be awarded a fellowship at the senior-level with USAID concurrence.

(3) Senior-level Democracy Fellows must have, at the time the initial fellowship is awarded, more than 10 years full-time professional work experience in a field closely related to international democracy and governance; and have at least a J.D. or Ph.D. degree (or at least an additional 10 years of full-time related or unrelated professional experience).

Senior fellows receive initial annual stipends based on their education, experience and prior earnings, within a fixed range established according to the U.S. Civil Service schedule (Non-Locality Pay) in effect at the time the fellowship is awarded. The minimum initial salary for a senior fellow will be at the level of a GS-14/Step 6. For all fellows, the maximum annual salary payable under the DFP is limited by a fixed ceiling of \$87,400. The specific salary amount for each senior fellow will be equal to that individual's prior verified earnings, as certified on USAID Form 1420, but not less than the established minimum initial stipend, nor more than the established ceiling.

(b) Annual Fellowship Stipend Increases.

(1) Junior- and Mid-level Democracy Fellows: Annual stipend levels will be increased by 15% for junior and mid-level fellows who continue into a second fellowship year, provided that they have successfully completed their first full year of service. These salary increases take into account both longevity and cost of living factors, but payment will be limited by the program's established salary caps.

(2) Senior-level Democracy Fellows: Annual stipend levels will be increased by 10% for senior fellows who continue into a second fellowship year, provided they have successfully completed their first full year of service. These salary increases take into account both longevity and cost of living factors, but payment will be limited by the program's established salary caps.

(3) Democracy Fellows extending beyond a second year: Annual stipend levels will be increased by 10% for fellows who continue into a third fellowship year, provided they have successfully completed their second full year of service. These salary increases take into account both longevity and cost of living factors, but payment will be limited by the program's established salary caps.

(c) Fellowship Benefits and Allowances.

In paying appropriate benefits and allowances for each fellowship, the DFP will take into account pertinent local cost and programmatic information supplied by the sponsoring USAID mission or office. At the discretion of the sponsoring USAID unit, and subject to available funding and USAID/G/DG approval, World Learning may be authorized to provide additional benefits to fellows, such as post differentials, hazard pay, local COLA increments, shipping and storage payments, educational and dependent allowances, etc.. World Learning understands that USAID in the future may wish to recommend changes that would standardize the various allowances paid to fellows in the different USAID-sponsored fellowship programs. Should USAID do so, World Learning expects that it would modify its existing procedures to implement any new or modified benefits and allowances.

Fellows' Professional Contribution or Work Products.

The DFP will encourage each Democracy Fellow to complete a substantial analytical report or other relatively independent professional work product that advances or contributes to the field of democracy and governance. This DFP component has the potential to add long-term value to the fellowships, and will help to ensure that Democracy Fellows have something tangible to show for their efforts, once their fellowships conclude. USAID will also benefit from the fellows' efforts, as the fellows' professional work products can contribute in meaningful ways to the fields of international democracy and governance. USAID and World Learning expect that fellows' professional contributions or work products will be related to the Democracy Fellows' daily responsibilities with USAID. At the same time, however, these professional contributions should be more than a recapitulation of the fellows' daily activities.

11. Electronic and Other Communications with Fellows.

The DFP will establish and maintain electronic and other communications links with Democracy Fellows located in USAID/Washington and in USAID missions overseas. This communications effort includes providing emergency contact information, as well as supplying technical and other support for fellows' communications needs. The DFP will also assist Democracy Fellows, especially those serving abroad, in securing Internet access or other means of communications suitable for accessing democracy resources, materials and information networks.

12. Democracy Fellowships To Offer Field Experience.

Subject to the needs and available funding of sponsoring USAID missions or offices, the DFP will strive to ensure that each fellowship includes a suitable travel budget. This will help to provide fellows, whether serving domestically or overseas, the opportunity to acquire both field experience and professional career development during their fellowships.

Democracy Fellows Conference.

World Learning will coordinate with G/DG in planning and conducting occasional DFP Conferences or other activities to promote the fellows' career development. If approved by USAID, such conferences would be designed to achieve four stated goals:

- To serve as a forum for Democracy Fellows to discuss broad issues of democracy in the international arena. This would enable fellows to conduct substantive discussions of democracy programming with a variety of practitioners and democracy experts, and in a number of different practical contexts.
- To provide a specific structured opportunity for Democracy Fellows to assess and reflect on their fellowship progress to date, and to share technical advice, experiences and results from their democracy-building activities. This could provide fellows with: (a) the opportunity to present the successes and challenges of their own fellowships, including any professional work products developed during the fellowship; (b) a forum to discuss lessons-learned and cross-cutting issues; and (c) the opportunity to make mid-term corrections.
- To permit Democracy Fellows, USAID and World Learning to review the overall DFP and to address any institutional or policy issues that may be of concern.
- To provide career guidance and networking opportunities to Democracy Fellows to promote their professional development in the field of democracy. This component could allow fellows to strengthen their commitment to careers in international democracy and governance, and to identify additional career development opportunities.

World Learning anticipates that participants in any future DFP conferences may include current and incoming Democracy Fellows, recent program alumni/ae, democracy officers from USAID, DFP staff, other representatives of World Learning, and democracy experts, practitioners and academics from other government and non-governmental organizations. Depending upon timing, a DFP Conference could also include an Orientation Program for new Democracy Fellows. World Learning will coordinate with G/DG before proposing any DFP Conference, in order to facilitate USAID participation, and to avoid duplication of content or scheduling conflicts with other USAID programs and conferences. World Learning and USAID may find it appropriate to hold any DFP Conference in conjunction with other democracy conferences or meetings scheduled by USAID or other organizations.

14. Duration of Fellowships.

The DFP will generally award Democracy Fellowships for terms of one or two years, depending upon the financial and program commitments of the sponsoring mission/office and the individual fellow, and subject to the approval of USAID/G/DG. While USAID and World Learning share a preference for two-year fellowship terms, World Learning recognizes that few USAID missions or offices have been willing to make such a commitment to a new fellow. Each fellowship will automatically conclude at the end of its stated term (whether the initial fellowship term was for one- or two-years, or some intermediate term), unless USAID/G/DG, the fellow, the sponsoring USAID mission or office, and World Learning all agree to an extension. World Learning will not award a fellowship that would cause any person to serve as a fellow in USAID for more than two years, unless each such extension is approved by USAID/G/DG and authorized by USAID in accordance with USAID agency policy. World Learning is not authorized to award a Democracy Fellowship that would cause any individual to serve as a fellow in USAID for longer than four years.

15. Database of Qualified Applicants.

The DFP will maintain a database of qualified applicants, to be updated quarterly. This database will organize information on qualified applicants for the DFP, and each candidate's materials will be held for at least the one-year period that the application is considered active. Information in the candidate database will allow World Learning to search the database by appropriate variables such as current contact information, fellowship eligibility level, highest academic degrees attained, previous employment and professional experience, foreign language abilities, geographic and thematic interests and experience, etc.

16. Number of Fellowships Supported.

Subject to the availability of future USAID funding, World Learning will maintain the capability of fulfilling the program established for the DFP, including the ability to support an anticipated fourteen Democracy Fellows per year for Extension Years 1 and 2; and an anticipated twelve Democracy Fellows per year for Extension Years 3 and 4. Depending upon: (a) future demand for Democracy Fellows by USAID missions or offices; (b) USAID's ceilings on fellowship

programs and the DFP; and (c) available resources, World Learning will be prepared to increase its management capacity to support additional Democracy Fellows over the remaining term of the DFP.

17. Evaluation of Democracy Fellows Program.

World Learning will conduct appropriate annual and other reviews of the DFP, using a variety of methods and instruments to accomplish these assessments. Evaluations will be sought from the different participants in the DFP, e.g., from fellows, from USAID program officials, from sponsoring missions and offices and host organizations. The DFP will from time to time develop and administer formal questionnaires (e.g., for evaluations of DFP orientation programs, conferences and similar activities). World Learning may also rely on informal or general observations and program feedback from sponsoring missions, etc. In addition, the DFP expects to benefit from regular USAID comments on program activities, reviews of the DFP's periodic reports, and formal DFP questionnaires or other assessment instruments that may be returned by sponsoring USAID missions or offices. Mid-term and final program evaluations may be conducted by USAID staff and/or outside experts. The results of such evaluations could be used to decide the continuation of the Democracy Fellows Program.

18. Program Implementation and Financial and Administrative Management.

World Learning will implement the DFP and provide comprehensive financial and administrative management for the program in accordance with the standard provisions of this Cooperative Agreement and World Learning's corporate representations and certifications. World Learning will coordinate with G/DG to develop an annual Implementation Plan for the DFP in conjunction with its Annual Program Performance Report (see below). Functions that World Learning will perform in providing its comprehensive management and implementation of the DFP include:

- Recruiting applicants and managing DFP information and advertising;
- Continuing outreach to minority candidates and minority-serving institutions;
- Screening, reviewing, qualifying, selecting and nominating candidates;
- Maintaining a database of current qualified applicants;
- Soliciting sponsorship interest and identifying potential fellowship assignments;
- Reviewing, negotiating and approving fellowship program activities;
- Periodically reviewing and revising workplans as necessary;
- Initiating security clearances for DFP fellows and staff;
- Awarding fellowships and establishing appropriate fellowship terms and conditions;
- Ensuring that fellowship program activities comply with applicable restrictions on fellows' assignments, and avoid creating potential Organizational Conflicts of Interest;
- Coordinating and approving fellowship extensions, curtailments and related actions;
- Conducting orientation of fellows, and training as required;
- Providing logistic and other support for fellows' assignment to and return from post;
- Monitoring and overseeing fellows' progress in their assignments;
- Reviewing and accepting fellows' reports;
- Providing information resources to fellows, and fellowship reports to USAID;
- Negotiating individual fellowship budgets with USAID and fellows;
- Managing fellows' budgets, as well as all USAID funding received by World Learning;
- Ensuring financial and regulatory compliance with applicable federal, USAID and World Learning policies, regulations and statutes, including USAID's ADS Functional Series 400, Interim Update #3 ("Implementation of Policy Guidance Concerning Fellows");
- Developing and maintaining appropriate program policies, and the DFP Handbook;
- Authorizing fellows' travel and per diem, and approving all fellowship expenditures;
- Ensuring that all fellowships offer opportunities and funding for field experience and professional development;
- Establishing and paying all fellowship salaries, benefits, allowances, travel, etc.;
- Providing on-going technical, logistic, communications/computer and other support to fellows;
- Identifying fellowship mentors and other means of providing career guidance;
- Developing and implementing World Learning's annual program implementation work plans;

- Monitoring individual fellowships to identify and resolve problems arising from performance, conduct, personality differences, time and attendance, leave issues, or other factors;
- Maintaining regular electronic and other communication with USAID, and with fellows throughout their assignments;
- Conducting periodic conferences as appropriate, in coordination with USAID;
- Operating financial, management and administrative systems and controls, in accordance with World Learning's corporate representations and certifications;
- Providing required financial and program reports to USAID;
- Maintaining contact with DFP program alumni, USAID contractors and grantees, academic institutions, and other organizations involved in promoting democracy and governance;
- Conducting periodic evaluations of the DFP and its specific components, and coordinating with USAID on mid-term and final evaluations it may conduct;
- Providing continual review and oversight of program policies, procedures and direction;
- Supervising World Learning program staff and managing program operations;
- Coordinating with other institutions, offices, individuals and vendors involved in providing services to or support for the DFP.

D. REPORTING

Quarterly Financial and Annual Performance Reports.

1. Financial. World Learning will submit required Quarterly Financial Reports [USAID form SF-269A, Financial Status Report (short form)] to USAID as provided in the standard provisions of the Cooperative Agreement for the DFP.

2. Performance. World Learning will submit to the USAID Cognizant Technical Officer by October 31 each year one hard copy and one electronic media copy of an Annual Program Performance Report for the preceding fiscal year, including an Implementation Plan for the subsequent fiscal year. Reports will be concise and contain information on progress and problems for the reporting period, and plans for the upcoming period. Separate sections will address diversity recruitment efforts and contain reviews of the reporting period finances and a forecast of expected expenditures. One hard copy and one electronic copy of the annual reports, except for financial reports and forecasts, will also be submitted to the USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse (USAID/PPC/CDIE/PIO).

World Learning will provide two copies of a final report to the USAID project officer within 90 days of the completion date of the agreement. The final report will include an executive summary, a description of accomplishments and lessons learned, and recommendations.

End of Program Description

End of USAID / WORLD LEARNING Cooperative Agreement Modification AEP-A-00-95-00024-10

Attachment I

FY-2004 DFP Implementation Plan

DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM

ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

October 2003 – September 2004

USAID Cooperative Agreement

NMS No. AEP-A-00-95-00024

[Original No. AEP-5466-A-00-5024-00]

Project Period: 06/15/95 - 06/14/00

Extension Period: 06/15/00 – 09/30/01
10/01/01 – 06/15/05

USAID Management designation: USAID/DCHA/DG

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PROGRAM GOAL AND PURPOSE	4
II. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	4
A. RECRUITING APPLICANTS	4
B. SCREENING AND SELECTING APPLICANTS	5
C. IDENTIFYING USAID FELLOWSHIP ASSIGNMENTS	6
D. NOMINATING NEW FELLOWS	7
E. AWARDING AND EXTENDING FELLOWSHIPS	8
1. Initial Fellowships	8
2. Fellowship Extensions	9
F. FELLOWSHIP WORKPLANS	10
G. FELLOWSHIP REPORTS AND RESOURCE MATERIALS	10
H. FELLOWSHIP ORIENTATION	11
I. FELLOWSHIP MENTORING AND CAREER GUIDANCE	11
J. SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRACY FELLOWS	12
1. Work Assignments	13
2. Leave Policies	14
3. Equipment	14
4. Fellowship Travel	14
5. Financial Controls	15
K. FELLOWSHIP STIPENDS AND ALLOWANCES	15
1. Initial Compensation Levels	16
2. FY-2002 Payment Levels	17
3. Annual Fellowship Stipend Increases	17
L. OTHER FELLOWSHIP BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES	17
M. FELLOWS' PROFESSIONAL CONTRIBUTION OR WORK PRODUCTS	18
N. ELECTRONIC AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS WITH FELLOWS	18
O. DEMOCRACY FELLOWS CONFERENCE	18
P. DURATION OF FELLOWSHIPS	20
Q. DATABASE OF QUALIFIED APPLICANTS	20
R. NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS SUPPORTED	20
S. EVALUATION OF DEMOCRACY FELLOWS PROGRAM	20
T. PROGRAM FUNDING	21
U. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT	22
III. REPORTING	22
A. QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORTS	22
1. Annual Performance Reports	22

This document describes the Democracy Fellows Program's (DFP) ninth program year (and third extension year) plan under NMS Cooperative Agreement No. AEP-A-00-95-00024-00. The initial Cooperative Agreement (No. AEP-5466-A-00-5024-00) was effective June 15, 1995.

- The Agreement Officer is Robert Samuel Taylor of the Office of Procurement (M/OP/G/DGHCA).
- The Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) is Wendy Marshall of the Strategies Division, Office of Democracy & Governance, DCHA.

295

This Implementation Plan provides detail on the operational activities that World Learning intends to accomplish in implementing the Democracy Fellows Program (DFP). In collaboration with USAID, World Learning's DFP staff will implement the following Implementation Plan for Fiscal Year 2004 (October 1, 2003 – September 30, 2004).

I. PROGRAM GOAL AND PURPOSE

The Overall Goal of the Democracy Fellows Program is:

To help support a cadre of experienced US technical experts committed to careers in democracy and governance, in order to assist in the promotion of US democracy and governance efforts, and to increase the number or expertise of people working in the field.

The program purpose is to identify, select, support and provide oversight of Democracy Fellows working in USAID assignments that contribute to democracy programs in developing countries, as well as to the fellows' career development and commitment.

II. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

A. Recruiting Applicants.

Summary Points:

- *Active recruiting, including attendance at association meetings (e.g., Southwestern Social Science Association Annual Meeting); meeting with university Ph.D. and Master's program administrators and attending career fairs*
- *Attending relevant seminars and workshops and distributing DFP promotional materials*
- *Periodic Web/print DFP announcement and postings*
- *Tap existing Fellows and Alumni to recruit (brown bags and other presentations)*
- *Web site upgrade: Make DFP site more user-friendly and accessible to improve recruiting potential*
- *Refine and upgrade DFP marketing materials*
- *Outreach to minority candidates and minority-serving institutions*

World Learning will recruit junior, mid-level and senior candidates for a variety of worldwide Democracy Fellowships. Recruitment will be nation-wide and inclusive, designed to achieve applicant diversity and to attract highly qualified US-citizen applicants. It is anticipated that World Learning will supply to USAID up to twelve Democracy Fellows during FY-2004.

World Learning will recruit candidates on an open-ended basis, retaining applications in its active files for approximately one year. All qualified applicants will be entered into a DFP database (see below), organized and retrievable according to the candidates' eligibility level, academic training, geographic interest and experience, language abilities, and other skills and interests.

World Learning will target its recruitment efforts to meet USAID's needs for fellows at different levels of expertise. Initially, World Learning and USAID expect that the profile of Democracy Fellows serving during FY-2004 will approximate six senior, five mid-level, and one junior fellows. As of September 30, 2003, the DFP has on-board five senior-level fellows, two mid-level fellows, and no junior-level fellows. World Learning is also processing current requests for one mid-level Democracy Fellow. Actual needs for particular levels will be coordinated with USAID periodically throughout the year.

In organizing its recruiting, World Learning will solicit university graduate and law schools, contact relevant professional organizations, and advertise in appropriate journals, international employment newsletters and similar publications. The DFP will also accomplish other outreach to ensure the continuing recruitment of new applicants. World Learning frequently runs on-going advertisements in numerous publications and media, e.g., *The International Career Employment Weekly*, the American Political Science Association on-line newsletter (*APSA-net-PS Online*), the *National and Federal Legal Employment Report*, etc.

The DFP routinely recruits through leading academic institutions – including minority-serving institutions – twice yearly (Fall and Spring semesters). Additionally, the DFP periodically publishes notices and/or purchases advertisements in special and general interest media (e.g., major newspapers, employment and other internationally oriented newsletters targeted to minorities, women, and other prospective applicants). The DFP undertakes these efforts several times each year, and more frequently when necessary. DFP staff members also participate in appropriate graduate-level career-development conferences and recruitment fairs, and regularly accomplish other outreach to ensure the continuing recruitment of qualified applicants. World Learning will also seek additional candidate nominations from USAID staff.

Basic recruitment criteria will include: a minimum of a Masters or JD degree in a relevant field; US citizenship; appropriate language and cross-cultural capabilities; appropriate professional skills and experience; and a career interest in international democracy and governance. As requested by USAID, World Learning also recruits candidates who already possess substantial prior USAID experience. The DFP makes a special effort to assure the opportunity for candidates from minority-serving institutions to apply, and affirmatively recruits women and minorities interested in careers in international democracy and governance. World Learning is firmly committed to a policy of equal opportunity and non-discrimination, and actively seeks applicants who will offer a broad representation of graduates of US universities; it undertakes special efforts to assure participation of candidates from Minority-Serving Institutions, and actively recruits women and minorities interested in working as Democracy Fellows with USAID.

B. Screening and Selecting Applicants.

Summary Points:

- *Screen, review, qualify, select, and nominate candidates*
- *Maintain a database of current qualified candidates*

World Learning will review and screen all applications to the DFP, in order to establish a pool of qualified candidates for Democracy Fellowships. Screening will assess each applicant's technical eligibility, relevant experience, professional and academic background, and other personal

qualifications, as well as other needs of USAID missions or offices that from time to time may wish to sponsor Democracy Fellowships. World Learning will use objective standards to classify applicants into three tiers: Junior, Mid-level and Senior, based on their education and years of directly related professional employment. Minimum technical eligibility standards for applicants to the program include the following qualifications:

- Awarded at least a Master's degree or J.D. in political science, government, international relations, law, or other social science relevant to advancing democratic institutions abroad;
- US citizenship;
- Professional interest in pursuing a career in international democracy and governance; and
- Appropriate work experience, e.g., between zero and five years' relevant experience for junior candidates; between five and ten years' relevant experience for mid-level candidates; and more than 10 years relevant experience for senior candidates. (Applicants pursuing a significant permanent career change to the field international democracy and governance may also be considered, as may other individuals of particular interest to USAID).

The preceding criteria are the program's usual minimum application requirements. In practice the most competitive candidates for Democracy Fellowships also have outstanding professional and personal references, high personal and professional standards, and foreign language proficiency as appropriate for particular fellowships. Nearly all recent candidates who eventually were awarded Democracy Fellowships also had previous professional experience with USAID's democracy and governance programs, and/or overseas experience relevant to the thematic areas and program responsibilities of available fellowships.

C. Identifying USAID Fellowship Assignments.

Summary Points:

- *Achieving Fellowship "fit" based on effective recruiting and communication with USAID*
- *Solicit sponsorship interest and identify potential fellowship assignments*

World Learning will work closely with USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance (USAID/DCHA/DG), with overseas missions and democracy offices, and with USAID regional and central bureaus to identify Democracy Fellowship assignments in a wide range of democracy-related activities. World Learning will periodically communicate with USAID missions and offices to solicit their interest in funding Democracy Fellowships. The DFP will work with DCHA/DG and interested missions and offices to understand their democracy program and staffing needs, and to determine their preferred and required qualifications for fellowship candidates.

World Learning will coordinate with each sponsoring mission or office to secure a specific Statement of Work, outlining the program objectives, activities, responsibilities, functions and duties that the mission or office seeks to have a Democracy Fellow accomplish. To the extent that such information is available, the DFP will use these Statements of Work when it specifically recruits and/or recommends candidates for particular Democracy Fellowships.

D. Nominating New Fellows

Summary Points:

- *Database refinement and development; add categories to existing database,*
- *Terms of reference development*
- *Interview coordination*

In nominating candidates for particular USAID assignments, World Learning will identify from its database of current applicants, as well as from any specific individuals recommended or referred by USAID, one or more eligible candidates who best meet(s) the goals and purposes of the program, and needs of the sponsoring USAID unit, and whom World Learning considers suitable to undertake the activities contemplated by USAID as described in the sponsoring unit's Statement of Work for a Democracy Fellow.

World Learning typically performs a database search of every applicant in the DFP's pool of eligible candidates, in order to identify those who seem best suited for the particular fellowship under consideration. The DFP's review process involves two parallel assessments:

- evaluations of the eligible candidates' professional and academic abilities and experience, vis-à-vis the stated needs and desires of the sponsoring USAID unit; and
- assessments of the candidates' personal and professional attributes, career promise, and overall suitability for meeting USAID's professional and institutional expectations.

For each Democracy Fellowship, World Learning normally identifies from its database up to five applicants whom the DFP believes best match USAID's stated needs. However, depending upon candidate availability and the specific skills, experiences and attributes sought by particular missions, the DFP may propose a greater or lesser number of candidates for consideration. Often the sponsoring USAID unit already knows of other individuals who may or may not have applied to the DFP, but who closely meet USAID's needs and/or are of particular interest to the sponsoring USAID unit. When USAID indicates its interest in such candidates, the DFP will also nominate these individuals, so that USAID can consider them as well. World Learning will coordinate with the relevant USAID unit to conduct whatever additional interviews or activities the sponsoring unit considers appropriate and affordable.

USAID and/or World Learning might conduct personal or telephone interviews with one or more of the candidates, or check additional references and verify application information. The DFP may seek clarification or additional information from the candidate(s), or undertake similar screening so as to identify the single finalist whom the sponsoring USAID unit considers best suited to the fellowship opportunity that it is sponsoring.

World Learning will also provide the sponsoring USAID unit with information about the operations and limitations of the DFP, the typical current costs and funding procedures for sponsoring a Democracy Fellowship, and similar matters. World Learning will consult with the sponsoring missions and offices and with DCHA/DG as necessary to address (i) any concerns about the appropriateness of particular candidates for the planned fellowship; and (ii) any concerns about the activities or functions contained in the proposed fellowship assignment. The DFP will also coordinate with DCHA/DG in allocating fellowship slots to USAID missions or domestic offices.

E. Awarding and Extending Fellowships.

1. Initial Fellowships.

Summary Points:

- *Initiate security clearance for DFP fellows*
- *Award fellowships and establish appropriate fellowship terms and conditions*
- *Ensure that fellowship program activities comply with applicable restrictions on fellows' assignments, and avoid creating potential organizational conflicts of interest*
- *Conduct orientation of fellows, and training as required*
- *Negotiate individual fellowship budgets with USAID and fellows*
- *Provide logistic and other support for fellows' assignment to and return from post*

Depending upon available USAID funding, agency ceilings for Democracy Fellows, and the needs of USAID missions or offices, World Learning will periodically award and administer fellowships as established under this Democracy Fellows Program. World Learning enters into a Fellowship Agreement with each fellow, pursuant to which the individual is a contractor, serving within USAID. USAID units do not themselves enter into formal employment or contractual agreements with Democracy Fellows.

Fellowships will normally be awarded for initial terms of one- or two-years, subject to specific USAID funding and the mutual agreement of World Learning, the selected candidate and the sponsoring USAID mission or office. The specific term for any particular fellowship is usually a function of the sponsoring USAID unit's ability to commit funding for that fellowship. World Learning and USAID must both concur in the selection of any individual fellow.

A written workplan will be established for each Democracy Fellowship, outlining the specific goals, objectives, activities and responsibilities that the sponsoring USAID unit seeks to have accomplished during that fellowship (see below). World Learning will use the sponsoring unit's initial statement of work to identify suitable applicants and to nominate specific candidates for the proposed fellowship. USAID, the selected finalist, and World Learning must concur in a final workplan before World Learning will award that Democracy Fellowship.

Fellows are expected to provide periodic substantive written reports (e.g., semi-annually, after an initial quarterly report), detailing progress and problems occurring during the reporting period, as well as results attained, and plans for the next period. World Learning anticipates that fellows and their respective USAID sponsors will periodically review and revise the pertinent workplans throughout the course of the fellowship. World Learning will provide general oversight, and will assist fellows and candidates in developing an initial workplan for approval by the appropriate USAID unit. World Learning will not approve any fellowship workplan that would require a fellow to undertake inherently governmental duties.

Under USAID policy, the following conditions reflect patterns of personal services and are therefore prohibited:

- USAID personnel specify how, when, what or where the fellows' work is to be performed
- The agency provides the work space and basic tools and materials to accomplish the work

- The fellow gives the appearance of being a government employee in the performance of his/her assignment
- The fellow is continuously supervised and controlled by government officials or employees and the supervisory control allows the government employee to protect the government's interests by retaining control of and responsibility for that function

World Learning will additionally implement the program in accordance with USAID policy set out in ADS Functional Series 400 INTERIM UPDATE #3, regarding the appropriate roles of Democracy Fellows within USAID, and the range of activities defined as personal services.

The award of senior-level fellowships will require the prior approval of USAID/DCHA/DG. The DFP's direct and indirect program costs, overhead and other program expenses will be supported through USAID funding and allocated to each fellowship in accordance with World Learning's established financial procedures, and the terms of the Cooperative Agreement and any subsequent modifications.

2. Fellowship Extensions.

Summary Points:

- *Coordinate and approve fellowship extensions, curtailments, and related actions*
- *Periodically review and revise workplans as necessary*

Sponsoring USAID units may determine that fellowship extensions should be offered to individuals who successfully complete their initial fellowship terms. Provided that USAID/DCHA/DG (the CTO for the program) concurs in the proposed fellowship term and workplan for the extension period, a fellowship may be extended for a second fellowship year, and/or renewed for additional periods at the discretion and direction of USAID. Any fellowship term of greater than one year will additionally require that the sponsoring unit, World Learning, and DCHA/DG annually concur in that fellow's workplan.

Fellowship extensions or awards that would carry an individual into a third or fourth fellowship year must be approved by World Learning and by USAID/DCHA/DG, and must be based on an appropriate justification, in accordance with USAID policy. Such fellowships may not be merely a continuation of the fellow's previous assignments or the routine work of the sponsoring unit, but must be discrete, and essential new activities and objectives that the fellow can begin and conclude during the proposed extension term. The duration of the proposed extension must be directly tied to the specific timeframe of the proposed activity or objective. Additionally, USAID/DCHA/DG and World Learning must approve the fellow's annual workplans for each part of such third- or fourth-year extensions.

Fellows who have once received a Democracy Fellowship may subsequently be awarded another Democracy Fellowship with a different sponsoring USAID unit. Subject to the policy for third- and fourth-year extensions, USAID will decide the duration of each fellowship or extension on an individual basis, taking into account the current fellow's performance for USAID, and USAID's staffing and program needs. All fellowship extensions or renewals are subject to available funding and USAID fellowship ceilings, and require the concurrence of USAID/DCHA/DG, World Learning, and the sponsoring USAID unit.

F. Fellowship Workplans

Summary Points:

- *Review and accept fellows reports*
- *Provide information resources to fellows, and fellowship reports to USAID*

Once a single finalist has been selected for a particular Democracy Fellowship, s/he will be required to develop a written Fellowship Workplan. This document serves as the fellow's annual workplan, and outlines for each Democracy Fellowship the specific goals, results, duties and responsibilities that USAID expects the fellow to accomplish during that fellowship. The specific Fellowship Workplan is usually derived from a Statement of Work or program activities (see above) developed by the sponsoring USAID unit, and all Fellowship Workplans must be approved by USAID before being finalized.

As necessary, World Learning will coordinate with DCHA/DG and the sponsoring USAID unit to help assure that Democracy Fellows are assigned responsibilities that are appropriate for their status as fellows. Accordingly, Democracy Fellowships emphasize practical work experience and the performance of specified duties to support USAID democracy and governance programs. Democracy Fellowships are not intended for fellows to accomplish other individual activities such as independent research, writing, teaching, etc.

The DFP's Fellowship Agreement Letter and its guidelines for Fellowship Workplans (Attachment B) encourage Democracy Fellows to prepare and submit periodic written reports as their respective fellowships progress. The DFP will also request fellows periodically to review their Fellowship Workplans, and if necessary, to propose to the sponsoring USAID unit appropriate revisions to those workplans. The sponsoring USAID unit must concur in any proposed amendments or revisions to be made to a previously approved Fellowship Workplan. As previously noted, additional approvals by USAID/DCHA/DG may also be required. World Learning provides general oversight of this process, and assists finalists in developing Fellowship Workplans for approval by the appropriate USAID units.

G. Fellowship Reports and Resource Materials.

Summary Points:

- *Review and accept fellows' reports*
- *Explore means of promoting fellows' work and achievements, e.g., Web-based publishing; monographs/essays (collective/collaborative or individual)*
- *Review, revise, and simplify fellows' Report Guidelines*

The DFP will collect and make available to USAID/DCHA/DG periodic activity and trip reports, analyses and other materials that fellows may submit over the course of their fellowships, so that these materials can serve as resources available to help advance the field of democracy and governance. World Learning will also provide copies of final reports and any professional fellowship work products to USAID/PPC/CDIE.

The DFP expects fellows to provide periodic substantive analytical reports on their progress in attaining the goals and activities established in their respective Fellowship Workplans. These reports should describe the fellow's democracy activities and accomplishments, as well as the results they achieve, and the efforts and problems encountered in pursuing those activities. These fellowship reports are not considered official USAID agency documents requiring mission or office clearance. However, fellows will continue to be encouraged to share their periodic reports with mentors (see below) in the sponsoring mission or office, and with other interested USAID staff for comment, additional information and guidance.

As noted above, fellows are required to obtain the concurrence of the sponsoring mission or office for any substantive revisions to their workplans. In accordance with the standard terms of the cooperative agreement for the program, USAID and World Learning retain an irrevocable, non-exclusive, royalty-free, non-commercial right to digest, edit, excerpt, reproduce, distribute and/or otherwise use any reports, materials and work products arising from any Democracy Fellowship. World Learning will inform fellows of their obligation to include the required disclaimers, and USAID acknowledgements in any public activities, writing or published materials.

H. Fellowship Orientation.

Summary Points:

- *Develop and maintain appropriate program policies and the DFP Handbook*
- *Upgrade/update DFP Handbook to make more user-friendly*

World Learning will periodically organize orientations for incoming Democracy Fellows, including an orientation to World Learning, the DFP, USAID, and the procedures, rules and regulations applicable to the program. If USAID circumstances permit and the relevant sponsoring USAID units deem it desirable, the DFP will attempt to schedule fellowship starting dates so that a group of new fellows may attend the same orientation. This "Orientation Class" model has many advantages and is widely followed in other fellowship programs. It is particularly useful in arranging for orientation briefings by other interested offices such as USAID's Global Bureau (G/AA and G/AMS), Management Bureau (M/HR), and General Counsel's Office (GC/EA). However, in order to meet USAID needs, World Learning will provide individual orientation sessions or briefings when USAID deems this preferable. During orientation World Learning will provide each fellow with a copy of the current edition of the *DFP Handbook*, which includes detailed explanations, instructions, policies, examples, background materials, and appropriate administrative and financial forms.

I. Fellowship Mentoring and Career Guidance.

Summary Points:

- *Identify fellowship mentors and other means of providing career guidance*
- *Ensure that all fellowships offer opportunities and funding for field experience and professional development*
- *Formalize DFP Alumni network; link fellows, current/past*

World Learning will work with each sponsoring mission or office to identify a suitable mentor or other responsible official (usually a democracy and governance team leader) to advise, support and be the collaborative point of contact for each Democracy Fellow assigned to that organization. More than one such mentor may be designated within a sponsoring USAID unit when more than one Democracy Fellow is assigned to a particular unit. World Learning will coordinate with DCHA/DG and the sponsoring mission to advise the designated mentor(s) or responsible official(s) of relevant procedures, requirements and restrictions that affect the fellow's duties. This official will typically also serve as World Learning's point of contact with the sponsoring USAID mission or office, should any questions, difficulties or concerns arise.

To the extent practicable, and subject to available funding, the DFP will offer fellows individual or collective career guidance through review and comment on the fellows' workplans and periodic reports, or through other appropriate means. Activities under this function may include reimbursing Democracy Fellows for professional publications, or providing travel allowances to support their participation in relevant career development opportunities such as professional conferences and workshops. The DFP also includes some professional development components in its annual Democracy Fellows Conference. DFP staff regularly provide review and comment on the fellows' initial Fellowship Workplans, as well as on any periodic reports submitted during the course of each fellowship. DFP mentoring activities may be revised to reflect any future USAID guidance on this topic.

J. Support for Democracy Fellows.

Summary Points:

- *Authorize fellows' travel and per diem, and approve all fellowship expenditures*
- *Establish and pay all fellowship salaries, benefits, allowances, and travel*
- *Provide fellows on-going technical, logistic, communications/computer and other support*
- *Maintain regular electronic and other communication with USAID, and with fellows throughout their assignments*
- *Reintroduce concept of Web-based fellows' message board*
- *Review procedures to improve processing of Fellows' travel*

World Learning provides support to each Democracy Fellow, along with general oversight of each fellowship. Fellows will not be considered employees or personal service contractors (PSCs) of USAID or the US Government, nor employees of World Learning. Fellows will continue to be governed by World Learning's general financial and administrative policies and procedures. For example, fellows are required to comply with World Learning and DFP policies and determinations on matters such as leave, time and attendance, the location of work, the authorization and ticketing of travel, the payment of per diem or subsistence payments, the payment and reconciliation of allowances and travel advances, the reimbursement of approved expenses etc. The DFP will provide each Democracy Fellow with a substantive pre-service orientation to these policies and procedures, as well as periodic updates to the *DFP Handbook*, and its detailed policies, explanations, examples and forms.

For planning purposes, the DFP will provide USAID/DCHA/DG with an annual estimated budget for generic senior, mid-level and junior fellowships, including salaries and benefits, insurance, shipping and other standard fellowship allowances, travel, and other direct and indirect expenses.

Subsequently, based on available funds and consultations with the particular sponsoring USAID unit, World Learning will establish a comprehensive fellowship program budget for each Democracy Fellowship, including travel and other fellowship allowances, stipends, housing, and other indirect and direct expenses, before it awards that fellowship. The DFP thereafter monitors each fellowship budget to ensure that the fellows' travel and other expenses remain within their respective budgets, and that they comply with applicable travel and other policies and regulations.

In order to ensure that each fellowship is funded at a proper level (neither excessively nor insufficiently), World Learning will work closely with fellows and sponsoring missions or offices to identify estimated fellowship travel, housing and other local expenses well in advance. The DFP will particularly encourage sponsoring missions or offices and fellows to describe specific fellowship travel plans and/or budget expectations, e.g., when developing the fellowship workplans, and when making periodic program revisions.

1. Work Assignments.

Summary Points:

- *Monitor individual fellowships to identify and resolve problems arising from performance, conduct, personality difference, time or attendance, leave, or other factors*

Subject to the needs and available funding of sponsoring USAID missions or offices, the DFP will strive to ensure that each fellowship includes the opportunity for the fellow to obtain practical field experience working with USAID missions, contractors and implementing partners. This will help to provide fellows, whether serving domestically or overseas, the opportunity to acquire both field experience and professional career development during their fellowships.

World Learning does not undertake to direct the day-to-day program activities of fellows in their USAID assignments, but will coordinate with USAID in exercising general oversight of the fellows' activities. As necessary, the DFP will discuss fellows' assignments with USAID, to help USAID to avoid actual or perceived organizational conflicts of interest in procurement matters.

In accordance with current USAID policies, Democracy Fellows are not permitted to serve under direct government supervision (as opposed to general oversight and administration), however, fellows *are* subject to USAID's day-to-day oversight and administration, will continue to be required to observe local office work schedules, administrative and security procedures, and other requirements of the sponsoring USAID office or mission. Democracy Fellows are prohibited from supervising USAID grantees, contractors or staff, including FSNs and PSCs. Fellows may not manage US government programs, projects or funds, nor officially represent USAID outside the agency. World Learning will coordinate with USAID to initiate, renew or update national security clearances that USAID may require for fellows.

Fellows are required to perform their fellowship responsibilities personally, and cannot delegate fellowship activities to others. However, with prior approval, Democracy Fellows may from time to time pay others for providing certain support services to the fellow. Such paid services might

include administrative or logistic personnel (e.g., drivers, translators, interpreters, typists, etc.), or comparable expenses incurred to support the individual fellow's personal efforts in fulfilling his/her fellowship responsibilities.

Democracy Fellows are expected to devote full time and attention to their fellowships, and are prohibited from accepting other compensation for work done with USAID under the fellowship. Fellows are also precluded from undertaking any other activity that would significantly interfere with or compromise the successful fulfillment of their fellowship responsibilities with USAID.

2. Leave Policies.

Currently, Democracy Fellows are granted (but do not accumulate) a total of 30 days combined personal leave, vacation, sick leave, religious holiday leave, etc., for each full calendar year of service as a fellow. This leave amount is prorated for periods less than one year. USAID may change the accrual of leave for Democracy Fellows by providing written notice to World Learning.

3. Equipment.

World Learning will coordinate with the sponsoring mission or office to identify any equipment, communications, or other particular needs for each fellowship. World Learning will coordinate with the sponsoring USAID unit to ensure that these components are included as part of the pertinent fellowship workplan and budget.

As required, World Learning will continue to procure appropriate equipment for various Democracy Fellows, including computers, printers, communication equipment, security radios, cell-phones, etc. The DFP consults with the sponsoring USAID units, and with DCHA/DG, to obtain necessary guidance as to equipment standards, compatibility and similar concerns. Equipment purchases, title, and disposition by World Learning will be in accordance with the terms of the Cooperative Agreement for the DFP, and OMB Circulars A-110 and A-121.

4. Fellowship Travel

In order to plan and manage fellowship budgets under the Cooperative Agreement, World Learning encourages finalists, Democracy Fellows – and the relevant sponsoring USAID unit – to identify three factors for all planned *international* travel:

- the proposed destination(s) of trips during the period of the plan;
- the estimated duration of each trip; and
- the number of trips planned for each destination.

Fellows' travel plans need not specify precise travel dates, nor will fellows be required to pre-plan each international trip that may occur during the fellowship term. In accordance with guidance issued by USAID/M/OP, Democracy Fellows are not required to obtain USAID country clearance for international travel unless the primary purpose of the trip is to work with USAID mission personnel, or the Democracy Fellow requires significant administrative or substantive programmatic support from the mission. The DFP recognizes that Democracy Fellows usually will be working closely with USAID and will thus ordinarily require individual country clearances.

5. Financial Controls.

Summary Points:

- *Operate financial, management and administrative systems and controls, in accordance with World Learning's corporate representations and certifications*
- *Provide required financial and program reports to USAID*

Using World Learning's established financial controls and administrative procedures, the DFP monitors and oversees the expenditure of funds by or on behalf of each Democracy Fellow throughout the term of each fellowship. World Learning advises fellows on applicable domestic and international travel and per diem regulations, and will seek to insure fellows' compliance through program orientations and periodic training efforts, and through DFP management of the fellows' travel budgets, advances, claims and reimbursements. World Learning also employs reasonable controls to determine that the sponsoring USAID Mission or office has approved the proposed travel.

K. Fellowship Stipends and Allowances.

World Learning will from time to time determine appropriate stipends, benefits and allowances for each fellow and fellowship, bearing in mind the goals and purposes of the DFP. In determining fellows' initial salary levels, World Learning is guided both by its existing practices and by USAID requirements for establishing personal compensation. USAID has authorized the DFP to pay fellows under a system of compensation that is based on and generally linked to the US Civil Service Schedule. The present system approved by USAID/DCHA/DG, classifies individual Democracy Fellows as Junior-level, Mid-level, or Senior-level fellows, based on their respective prior education, relevant democracy experience and prior earnings (e.g., applicants complete USAID Form 1420). The DFP will generally strive for an "income-neutral" net annual salary, within the program's established stipend ranges. From time to time USAID may require exceptions to this procedure. The DFP will consult with DCHA/DG periodically to review general stipend and allowance levels for the program, and to make any revisions necessitated by modifications to USAID or USG policies, to the US Civil Service Schedule, or by other relevant factors.

World Learning understands that USAID is continuing its review of the various stipends and allowances paid to fellows in all USAID-sponsored fellowship programs, with the expectation that those fellowship stipends and allowances may eventually be standardized across all USAID programs. Once USAID decides on these policies, World Learning will consult with DCHA/DG to modify its existing procedures and to implement any new or revised USAID guidance on fellowship stipends, benefits and allowances.

As previously approved by USAID, the following salary ranges have been established for senior, mid-level and junior fellowships, generally pegged to the prevailing US Civil Service Schedule (Non-Locality Pay):

1. Initial Compensation Levels

(a) Junior-level Democracy Fellows

Junior-level Democracy Fellows must have, at the time the initial fellowship is awarded, a Masters degree in a relevant professional field, and have 0 - 5 years full-time professional work experience in a field closely related to international democracy and governance. (All candidates for the Democracy Fellows Program must have at least a Masters or J.D. degree to be eligible for the program. Under exceptional circumstances, World Learning may, at its discretion, accept five years of relevant full-time professional experience as a substitute for a Masters degree.)

Junior-level Democracy Fellows receive initial annual stipends based on their education, experience and prior earnings, within a fixed range established according to the US Civil Service schedule (Non-Locality Pay) in effect at the time the fellowship is awarded. The minimum initial salary for a junior fellow will be at the level of a GS-9/Step 1 of the applicable Civil Service schedule. The maximum initial salary for a junior fellow will be at the level of a GS-12/Step 5. The specific salary amount for each fellow will be equal to that individual's prior verified earnings, as certified on USAID Form 1420, but not less than the established minimum, nor more than the maximum, initial junior-level stipend. Individuals whose verified earnings in full-time directly related employment exceed the junior-level salary range may only be awarded a fellowship at the mid-level with USAID concurrence.

(b) Mid-level Democracy Fellows

Mid-level Democracy Fellows must have, at the time the initial fellowship is awarded, at least a J.D. or Ph.D. degree; or have a Masters degree and between 5 and 10 years full-time professional work experience in a field closely related to international democracy and governance; or have at least a Masters degree and prior verified earnings, as certified on USAID Form 1420, that are greater than the then-prevailing salary of a GS-12/Step 5.

Mid-level Democracy Fellows receive initial annual stipends based on their education, experience and prior earnings, within a fixed range established according to the US Civil Service schedule (Non-Locality Pay) in effect at the time the fellowship is awarded. The minimum initial salary for a mid-level fellow will be at the level of a GS-12/Step 6 of the applicable Civil Service schedule. The maximum initial salary for a mid-level fellow will be at the level of a GS-14/Step 6. The specific salary amount for each mid-level fellow will be equal to that individual's prior verified earnings, as certified on USAID Form 1420, but not less than the established minimum, nor more than the maximum, initial mid-level stipend. For all fellows, the maximum annual salary payable under the DFP is limited by a fixed ceiling of \$87,400. Individuals whose verified earnings in full-time directly related employment exceed the mid-level salary range may only be awarded a fellowship at the senior-level with USAID concurrence.

(c) Senior-level Democracy Fellows

Senior-level Democracy Fellows must have, at the time the initial fellowship is awarded, more than 10 years full-time professional work experience in a field closely related to international democracy and governance; and have at least a J.D. or Ph.D. degree (or at least an additional 10 years of full-time related or unrelated professional experience).

Senior fellows receive initial annual stipends based on their education, experience and prior earnings, within a fixed range established according to the US Civil Service schedule (Non-Locality Pay) in effect at the time the fellowship is awarded. The minimum initial salary for a senior fellow will be at the level of a GS-14/Step 6. For all fellows, the maximum annual salary payable under the DFP is limited by a fixed ceiling of \$87,400. The specific salary amount for each senior fellow will be equal to that individual's prior verified earnings, as certified on USAID Form 1420, but not less than the established minimum initial stipend, nor more than the established ceiling.

2. FY-2002 Payment Levels

For FY-2002, subject to future adjustments to the applicable civil service schedule, this system establishes the following fellowship stipend ranges for each category of fellowship:

- **Junior-level Democracy Fellows.** Initial stipends range from about \$35,519 to about \$58,376 per year (approximately the levels of GS-9/Step 1 through GS-12/Step 5);
- **Mid-level Democracy Fellows.** Initial stipends range from about \$60,093 to about \$84,446 per year (approximately the levels of GS-12/Step 6 through GS-14/Step 6); and
- **Senior-level Democracy Fellows.** Initial stipends range from about \$84,446 to a fixed ceiling of \$87,400 per year (approximately the levels of GS-14/Step 6 to GS-15/Step 3).

3. Annual Fellowship Stipend Increases

(a) **Junior- and Mid-level Democracy Fellows:** Annual stipend levels will be increased by 15% for junior and mid-level fellows who continue into a second fellowship year, provided that they have successfully completed their first full year of service. These salary increases take into account both longevity and cost of living factors, but payment will be limited by the program's established salary caps.

(b) **Senior-level Democracy Fellows:** Annual stipend levels will be increased by 10% for senior fellows who continue into a second fellowship year, provided they have successfully completed their first full year of service. These salary increases take into account both longevity and cost of living factors, but payment will be limited by the program's established salary caps.

(c) **Democracy Fellows extending beyond a second year:** Annual stipend levels will be increased by 10% for fellows who continue into a third fellowship year, provided they have successfully completed their second full year of service. These salary increases take into account both longevity and cost of living factors, but payment will be limited by the program's established salary caps.

L. Other Fellowship Benefits and Allowances

At the discretion of the sponsoring USAID unit, and subject to available funding and USAID/DCHA/DG approval, USAID may authorize World Learning to provide additional benefits to fellows, such as post differentials, hazard pay, local COLA increments, shipping and storage payments, educational and dependent allowances, etc. World Learning understands that USAID in the future may wish to recommend changes that would standardize the various allowances paid to fellows in the different USAID-sponsored fellowship programs. Should USAID do so, World

Learning expects that it would modify its existing procedures to implement any new or modified benefits and allowances.

M. Fellows' Professional Contribution or Work Products

The DFP will encourage each Democracy Fellow to complete a substantial analytical report or other relatively independent professional work product that advances or contributes to the field of international democracy and governance. This DFP component has the potential to add long-term value to the fellowships, and will help to ensure that Democracy Fellows have something tangible to show for their efforts, once their fellowships conclude. USAID will also benefit from the fellows' efforts, as the fellows' professional work products can contribute in meaningful ways to the fields of international democracy and governance. USAID and World Learning expect that fellows' professional contributions or work products will be related to the Democracy Fellows' daily responsibilities with USAID. At the same time, however, these professional contributions should be more than a recapitulation of the fellows' daily activities. World Learning understands that sponsoring USAID units will advise fellows as to whether, how and when they may undertake such professional efforts.

N. Electronic and Other Communications with Fellows

The DFP will establish and maintain electronic and other communications links with Democracy Fellows located in USAID/Washington and in USAID missions overseas. This communications effort includes providing emergency contact information, coordinating with the sponsoring USAID units regarding telephone, e-mail, cable, pouch, private courier and similar services, as well as supplying technical and other support for fellows' communications needs. The DFP will also assist Democracy Fellows, especially those serving abroad, in securing Internet access or other means of communications suitable for accessing democracy resources, materials and information networks.

O. Democracy Fellows Conference

Summary Points:

- *Conduct periodic conferences as appropriate, in coordination with USAID*
- *Hold Second Annual Fellows' Retreat*
- *Conduct DFP Needs Assessment*

World Learning will coordinate with DCHA/DG in planning and conducting occasional DFP Conferences or other activities to promote the fellows' career development. If approved by USAID, such conferences would be designed to achieve four related goals:

- To serve as a forum for Democracy Fellows to discuss broad issues of democracy in the international arena. This would enable fellows to conduct substantive discussions of democracy programming with a variety of practitioners and democracy experts, and in a number of different practical contexts.

- To provide a specific structured opportunity for Democracy Fellows to assess and reflect on their fellowship progress to date, and to share technical advice, experiences and results from their democracy-building activities. This could provide fellows with: (a) the opportunity to present the successes and challenges of their own fellowships, including any professional work products developed during the fellowship; (b) a forum to discuss lessons-learned and cross-cutting issues; and (c) the opportunity to make mid-term corrections.
- To permit Democracy Fellows, USAID and World Learning to review the overall DFP and to address any institutional or policy issues that may be of concern.
- To provide career guidance and networking opportunities to Democracy Fellows to promote their professional development in the field of democracy. This component could allow fellows to strengthen their commitment to careers in international democracy and governance, and to identify additional career development opportunities.

World Learning anticipates that participants in any future DFP conferences might include current and incoming Democracy Fellows, recent program alumni, democracy officers from USAID, DFP staff, other representatives of World Learning, and democracy experts, practitioners and academics from other government and non-governmental organizations. Depending upon timing, a DFP Conference could also include an Orientation Program for new Democracy Fellows. World Learning will coordinate with DCHA/DG before proposing any DFP Conference, in order to facilitate USAID participation, and to avoid duplication of content or scheduling conflicts with other USAID programs and conferences. World Learning and USAID may find it appropriate to hold any DFP Conference in conjunction with other democracy conferences or meetings scheduled by USAID or other organizations.

In December of this program year, the DFP will conduct its second annual Democracy Fellows' Retreat in Brattleboro, VT. The first annual retreat, held in December 2002, sought to identify, refine, and tailor ways of supporting and promoting the current group of Democracy Fellows. As with the previous year, the main areas of focus will promote a balance of program and technical D&G emphasis.

1. We will reinforce (and in some cases, establish) fellow-to-fellow connections. While many fellows have worked together, many have never actually met or at least spent significant time together. The retreat will provide space to explore areas of mutual professional interest, and to identify potential means of collaboration where possible.
2. Throughout the retreat we will make efforts to identify relevant resources that support and promote the fellows and their work (and by extension USAID's democracy agenda), as well as to identify what works and what does not work in the fellowship program.
3. We will use the retreat as a catalyst for fellows to debate and reflect (without the distraction of day-to-day work demands) on the more pressing issues of democracy development in USAID and in general.
4. The retreat will also offer a forum in which the fellows can discuss their democracy development career objectives and strategies. Toward this end, we expect to invite recent alumni to join the Retreat. These recent fellows can share their inside knowledge of the program and the transition to work in the post-fellowship world.

5. We will utilize this time with the fellows to conduct a frank needs-assessment of the program. To fine tune programmatic issues and streamline administrative procedures where possible.

P. Duration of Fellowships

As noted above, the DFP will generally award Democracy Fellowships for terms of one or two years, depending upon the financial and program commitments of the sponsoring mission/office and the individual fellow, and subject to the approval of USAID/DCHA/DG. While USAID and World Learning share a preference for two-year fellowship terms, World Learning recognizes that few USAID missions or offices have been willing to make such a commitment to a new fellow. Each fellowship will automatically conclude at the end of its stated term (whether the initial fellowship term was for one- or two-years, or some intermediate term), unless USAID/DCHA/DG, the fellow, the sponsoring USAID mission or office, and World Learning all agree to an extension.

World Learning will not award a fellowship that would cause any person to serve as a fellow in USAID for more than two years, unless each such extension is approved by USAID/DCHA/DG and authorized by USAID in accordance with USAID agency policy (specific USAID approval requirements are discussed above). World Learning is not authorized to award a Democracy Fellowship that would cause any individual to serve as a fellow in USAID for longer than four years.

Q. Database of Qualified Applicants

The DFP has established and will maintain a database of qualified applicants, which is updated periodically depending on volume. This database organizes information on qualified applicants for the DFP, and each candidate's materials will be held for at least the one-year period that the application is considered active. Information in the candidate database will allow World Learning to search the database by appropriate variables such as current contact information, fellowship eligibility level, highest academic degrees attained, previous employment and professional experience, foreign language abilities, geographic and thematic interests and experience, etc.

R. Number of Fellowships Supported

Subject to the availability of future USAID funding, World Learning will maintain the capability of fulfilling the program established for the DFP, including the ability to support an anticipated twelve Democracy Fellows per year for FY-2004. Depending upon: (a) future demand for Democracy Fellows by USAID missions or offices; (b) USAID's ceilings on fellowship programs and the DFP; and (c) available resources, World Learning will be prepared to increase its management capacity to support additional Democracy Fellows over the remaining term of the DFP.

S. Evaluation of Democracy Fellows Program

Summary Points:

- *Conduct periodic evaluations of the DFP and its specific components, and coordinate with USAID on mid-term and final evaluations it may conduct*

World Learning will conduct appropriate annual and other reviews of the DFP, using a variety of methods and instruments to accomplish these assessments. Evaluations will be sought from the different participants in the DFP, e.g., from fellows, from USAID program officials, from sponsoring missions and offices and host organizations. The DFP will from time to time develop and administer formal questionnaires (e.g., for evaluations of DFP orientation programs, conferences and similar activities). World Learning may also rely on informal or general observations and program feedback from sponsoring missions, etc. In addition, the DFP expects to benefit from regular USAID comments on program activities, reviews of the DFP's periodic reports, and formal DFP questionnaires or other assessment instruments that may be returned by sponsoring USAID missions or offices. Mid-term and final program evaluations may be conducted by USAID staff and/or outside experts. The results of such evaluations could be used to decide the continuation of the Democracy Fellows Program.

T. Program Funding

Each USAID unit that sponsors a Democracy Fellowship will provide funding to USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance to support the direct and indirect program expenses for that fellowship, and a pro rata share of the DFP's general administrative expenses. USAID/DCHA/DG in turn makes incremental funding available to World Learning through M/OP.

To insure that each fellowship can be appropriately supported, World Learning will work closely with fellows and sponsoring missions or offices to identify estimated fellowship travel, housing, equipment and other benefits and expenses that may differ significantly from the normally projected costs. World Learning will ordinarily not propose candidates for a prospective Democracy Fellowship until funding for that fellowship has been secured and DCHA/DG has authorized World Learning to proceed. USAID, however, may request the DFP to proceed with particular fellowships in advance of USAID funding.

The DFP will coordinate with sponsoring USAID units as they develop Statements of Work for particular Democracy Fellowships, and will encourage USAID staff to identify the particular level of Democracy Fellow desired (e.g., junior, mid-level, etc.). World Learning will also request sponsoring units to identify any specific fellowship travel plans, local cost of living factors or mission-specific additional benefits, equipment needs, and other USAID expectations for the fellowship. These financial and programmatic expectations provide important information for World Learning in its candidate recruitment, review and nomination processes. Such data are also essential to the individuals who are eventually selected as finalists for particular fellowships.

Under the current year's Implementation Plan, the estimated annual cost of each new Democracy Fellowship beginning during FY-2004 will be:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| ▪ Junior-level Democracy Fellowships: | \$152,682 |
| ▪ Mid-level Democracy Fellowships: | \$185,530 |
| ▪ Senior-level Democracy Fellowships: | \$189,252 |

These estimated FY-2004 costs are estimated maximum costs, assuming that all new fellows will start at the highest salary for their fellowship level, and that all will require travel to post. The estimates include insurance, an annual travel budget of \$15,000, and all of the standard Democracy Fellowship direct and indirect expenses and allowances. These estimates *do not include* any post-specific housing, security or similar allowances, nor any additional benefits that the sponsoring USAID unit may wish to authorize for a fellow and/or for any dependents. The DFP will discuss any such additional local costs with sponsoring USAID units. In addition, sponsoring USAID units would have to provide additional funding if they anticipated that a Democracy Fellow would be required to undertake more travel than can be supported by a \$15,000 annual travel budget.

Note: For all fellows, the cost of fellowship extensions beyond the first year may be significantly higher than the amounts set out above, due to individual fellowship factors such as stipend increases for Democracy Fellows continuing past their first year, home leave travel for fellows extending overseas, etc.

U. Program Implementation and Financial and Administrative Management

Summary Points:

- *Ensure financial and regulatory compliance with applicable federal, USAID, and World Learning policies, regulations and statutes, including USAID's AD Functional Series 400, Interim Update #3*
- *Provide continual review and oversight of program policies, procedures, and direction*

World Learning will implement the DFP and provide comprehensive financial and administrative management for the program in accordance with the standard provisions of this Cooperative Agreement and World Learning's corporate representations and certifications. World Learning will coordinate with DCHA/DG to develop an annual Implementation Plan for the DFP in conjunction with its Annual Program Performance Report (see below). Functions that World Learning will perform in providing its comprehensive management and implementation of the DFP include:

III. REPORTING

A. Quarterly Financial Reports.

World Learning will submit required Quarterly Financial Reports [USAID form SF-269A, Financial Status Report (short form)] to USAID as provided in the standard provisions of the Cooperative Agreement for the DFP.

1. Annual Performance Reports

World Learning will submit to the USAID Cognizant Technical Officer by October 31 each year one hard copy and one electronic media copy of an Annual Program Performance Report for the preceding fiscal year, including an Implementation Plan for the subsequent fiscal year. Reports will be concise and contain information on progress and problems for the reporting period, and plans for the upcoming period. Separate sections will address diversity recruitment efforts and contain reviews of the reporting period finances and a forecast of expected expenditures. One hard copy and one

electronic copy of the annual reports, except for financial reports and forecasts, will also be submitted to the USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse (USAID/PPC/CDIE/PIO).

World Learning will provide two copies of a final report to the USAID project officer within 90 days of the completion date of the agreement. The final report will include an executive summary, a description of accomplishments and lessons learned, and recommendations.

Attachments:

- Sample World Learning Democracy Fellows Program Award Letter
- World Learning Guidelines for Fellowship Workplans

**AGREEMENT AWARDED
A
DEMOCRACY FELLOWSHIP**

An Agreement between **WORLD LEARNING INC.**

and **[redacted]**

ARTICLE I: INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL CONDITIONS

World Learning Inc. hereby enters into this Agreement with **[redacted]** (hereafter referred to as the Democracy Fellow or the fellow), whose address is set out below, pursuant to which the fellow agrees to serve as a World Learning Democracy Fellow with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). The fellowship will be served under this Agreement and the attachments and subsequent amendments thereto, including the fellowship's Standard Terms and Conditions (**Attachment 1**) and the Fellowship Workplan (**Attachment 2**), all of which are incorporated herein by reference. The fellowship agreement is in consideration and contemplation of the fellow's commitment to accomplish certain activities and results with an assigned unit of USAID under World Learning's Democracy Fellows Program (the DFP), which has been established and is implemented subject to the financial support and direction of USAID. This agreement reflects World Learning's good faith reliance upon representations and statements contained in the fellow's application for this fellowship, including his/her fellowship application forms, and the Fellowship Workplan.

Fellowship Duration.

The period covered by this fellowship agreement is: **October 1, 2002 to [redacted]**, unless otherwise extended, renewed, curtailed or terminated in accordance with this fellowship agreement. The fellowship term is subject to conditions for earlier termination or withdrawal as set forth in **Article IV and Attachment 1** (Standard Terms and Conditions: Termination, Extension).

USAID Assignment.

Each Democracy Fellowship is financially supported in whole or in part by USAID, through its Center for Democracy and Governance. It is understood that as a fundamental condition of this agreement, the fellow will perform certain program functions and fulfill duties and responsibilities assigned by USAID and the DFP, as described in the fellow's individual workplan.

Fellowship Conditions.

The fellow's general responsibilities are set out below, particularly in Article II: Responsibilities of the Democracy Fellow, and as detailed in a written Fellowship Workplan. The fellowship will be served within a unit of USAID in accordance with a workplan (including any subsequent revisions), approved by USAID following discussion with USAID, the fellow, and the DFP. It is understood that the Democracy Fellow may be required to obtain and maintain certain prerequisites to serving the fellowship, such as a residency visa, a local work permit, a U.S. national security clearance, etc., and that the fellowship may be withdrawn or terminated for cause if such necessary requirements are not timely obtained or are later withdrawn or canceled.

In entering into this agreement, the fellow understands that s/he will work under the direction of USAID in all material respects, while exercising a high level of professional judgment as to the methods for accomplishing the fellowship objectives and activities, including those duties assigned by USAID and/or World Learning, all as set out in the Fellowship Workplan and as discussed below. It is agreed that the fellow will at all times use his/her best efforts to fulfill the goals and purposes of the fellowship, and to perform the assigned functions and responsibilities of this fellowship, applying the highest standards of personal and professional conduct and performance.

Should the fellow accept this fellowship but neglect or fail for reasons reasonably within his or her control to complete the assigned responsibilities, activities and/or intended purposes of the fellowship, or should the fellow contravene specific requirements of USAID or the DFP, World Learning may pursue any available remedies for breach of this agreement, as may be caused by the fellow improperly abandoning the fellowship or failing satisfactorily to complete assigned duties or activities.

Full Time and Effort.

Except for normal vacations and holidays as further discussed below (see Attachment 1) the fellow agrees to devote substantially full time, effort, attention and energy to this fellowship, and is precluded from: (a) assigning the fellowship or any of its stipends, allowances, obligations or responsibilities; (b) offering his/her services to others or accepting compensation from others for services performed in or under this fellowship with USAID; or (c) undertaking non-fellowship activities that interfere with or impede successful performance of the fellowship. In addition to the general responsibilities and terms set out herein, the fellow agrees personally to perform and to pursue diligently on a substantially full-time basis the specific assignments of this fellowship, as described in the fellow's workplan, and in Article II.

ARTICLE II: GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEMOCRACY FELLOW

The fellow will provide technical and professional services to USAID pursuant to a written Fellowship Workplan accepted by USAID, World Learning and the fellow, and under the general guidance of the DFP Director. Day-to-day direction of fellowship activities and assignments will be provided by a designated fellowship "mentor" in the USAID unit to which the fellow is assigned.

Fellow's Responsibilities.

The fellow's specific responsibilities under this assignment include but are not limited to the following, which are further elaborated in the Fellowship Workplan:

[Italic portions below are examples of the kinds of duties to be developed by each candidate, for discussion and approval by DFP and USAID.]

- *Gathering, reviewing, and systematically analyzing performance reports from USAID's [redacted] projects worldwide in order to determine the correlation between USAID-funded assistance and performance;*
- *Researching and writing case studies of two to four institutions or [redacted] programs;*
- *Developing a training program on [redacted] for new and experienced DG officers;*
- *Creating and managing an electronic network for dissemination of [redacted] information to DG officers;*
- *Ensuring the completion of [redacted] databases;*
- *Performing seven discrete analyses and assessments of the [redacted] sectors of selected countries, (which may include undertaking or participating in field missions) in order: (a) to identify successful methodologies for using USAID activities to improve [redacted]; and (b) to formulate recommendations for technical assistance strategies;*
- *Developing at least one in-depth analytical paper for USAID that will advance the technical leadership capabilities of USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance;*
- *Preparing a comprehensive report and recommendations [redacted] for USAID;*
- *To the extent feasible, completing during the course of the fellowship a substantial, relatively independent, professional work product such as a significant analytical report, professional article, book chapter, course curriculum, or similar accomplishment.*
- *Preparing substantive written analytical progress reports throughout the term of the fellowship, including revised workplans. Reports should: (a) detail the fellow's progress in achieving the objectives, activities, outcomes, accomplishments and results expected of the fellow's activities; (b) analyze problems encountered in conducting planned activities (and their resolution); and (c) include other pertinent information. Progress reports should serve as a blueprint for activities and results planned for the next reporting period. The progress reports will be due no later than the following dates: [redacted]*

~~For a complete and detailed description of the existing fellowships, see the attached~~ (If the fellowship is not extended beyond its scheduled term, the last periodic report may be incorporated into the final report – see below.)

- Submitting a substantive, comprehensive written **final report**, to the DFP within 30 days of the conclusion of the fellowship. The fellow will also complete such reasonably required administrative reports and claims for payments and allowances as may be requested by USAID, the DFP and/or World Learning.
- Other activities as mutually agreed among the fellow, USAID and/or World Learning's Democracy Fellows Program.

ARTICLE III: PAYMENTS, REIMBURSEMENTS AND BUDGET

In consideration of the Democracy Fellow's satisfactory performance and completion of the objectives, responsibilities, duties and results contemplated under the fellow's workplan, World Learning will pay a stipend and reimburse certain expenses to the Democracy Fellow, as set out in **Attachment 3**, Budget and Schedule of Payments. Stipends are paid pro rata during the stated term, conditioned upon satisfactory progress towards achievement of the fellow's approved workplan. Except as expressly provided, the fellow is not eligible during the period of this agreement for benefits provided to part- or full-time employees of World Learning, USAID, the U.S. government, or any other organization.

Stipends and applicable expense reimbursements or allowances will be paid in accordance with **Attachment 3**, based on the fellowship budget established by USAID and World Learning. When specifically authorized, a fellow may receive allowances for documented travel, per diem and/or other purposes, in accordance with the policies of the DFP, which may be coordinated with policies of World Learning and USAID. It is expressly understood that the DFP does not provide travel or any other allowances for dependents, nor any support other than for the Democracy Fellow individually, except as specifically authorized and funded by USAID for this fellowship in USAID's underlying agreement with World Learning, or by the USAID unit to which the fellow is assigned. World Learning requires that the fellow's claims be supported with original written receipts, which cannot be returned and which become part of the fellow's statement of expenses and claim for allowances.

Taxes.

World Learning does not withhold federal, state, Social Security (FICA), self-employment, worker's compensation or equivalent taxes and contributions from fellows' payments or allowances, nor are any foreign taxes or fees withheld. The fellow is personally responsible for his or her own tax situation (see Attachment 1). In accordance with U.S. tax laws, World Learning reports all payments made to or on behalf of the fellow to the Internal Revenue Service. World Learning will

provide the fellow with a copy of IRS Form 1099. It is understood that the fellow is responsible for obtaining independent tax or financial advice as to the applicability of Internal Revenue Code sections which pertain to US citizens working or living abroad (see IRS Publication 54, "Tax Guide for U.S. Citizens Working Abroad" and IRS Form 674).

ARTICLE IV: TERMINATION, WITHDRAWAL OF FELLOWSHIP

USAID and/or World Learning may direct that this agreement be terminated, withdrawn or curtailed at any time prior to the scheduled termination date, without prior notice, by a designated representative of World Learning as follows:

Termination for Convenience.

The fellowship may be terminated for convenience, effective upon actual or constructive delivery of notice of termination. "Convenience" as used herein includes each and any of the following: the discontinuance or reduction of funding for the fellowship, the DFP or a sponsoring USAID organization; termination of the fellowship for reasons unrelated to the fellow's personal conduct, abilities or performance; or any other reason that an authorized USAID official or World Learning representative may put in writing to the fellow. When the DFP is able to give prior notice of termination, the DFP may, at its discretion, require that the fellow cease performing any additional functions, responsibilities or activities under the fellowship during the intervening period between the notice of termination and the termination date.

Under Termination for Convenience: The fellow will receive a pro rata portion of the fellowship stipend and appropriate allowances, based on actual days completed in the fellowship prior to notice of termination. The fellow will also receive return travel to his/her designated home of record (if applicable), and a final payment, not to exceed the lesser of the remaining unpaid portion of the stipend (if termination occurs within 90 days of the scheduled end of the fellowship term), or a pro rata amount equal to 90 days of the fellowship stipend amount. It is expressly understood and agreed that USAID and the U.S. Government have an absolute right to require or request World Learning to withdraw, terminate or curtail this fellowship or the entire DFP at any time for the convenience of the Government, with or without prior notice.

Termination for Cause.

This Democracy Fellowship may be terminated for cause, effective immediately upon actual or constructive delivery of a termination notice to the fellow. Cause is defined as any of the following: misconduct; neglect, abandonment or repudiation of the purposes or objectives of the fellowship; inability to obtain, or failure or inability to maintain, required security clearances, residency or work permits, visas or similar authorizations or documents; commission of a serious unlawful act;

inappropriate behavior causing serious problems of performance, including but not limited to substance abuse; intentional misrepresentation or falsification of claims, financial or fellowship reports, application forms, transcripts or other documents related to the fellowship; failure to perform satisfactorily the responsibilities of this fellowship as specified herein, or in the fellowship workplan, or by the assigned USAID unit; or other serious adverse conditions, including national security considerations, reasonably within the control of the fellow.

Under Termination for Cause: World Learning will in good faith, in consultation with USAID and to the extent feasible with the fellow, determine the extent to which the fellow has satisfactorily fulfilled the purposes of the Democracy Fellowship, and completed his/her assigned responsibilities under the fellowship workplan, during the period of the fellowship prior to notice of termination. World Learning will subsequently determine that portion of the Democracy Fellow's stipend and allowances, including a one-time offer of immediate direct return travel to the designated home of record, which may be paid for successful completion of that period of the fellowship.

ARTICLE V: STATEMENTS, REPRESENTATIONS AND CLAIMS

The fellow certifies that all statements and representations made to World Learning in connection with entering into this fellowship agreement, or relating to the functions or activities to be performed under this fellowship, are true and accurate to the best of his/her knowledge. The parties mutually agree that World Learning shall be held harmless for any damages or liabilities arising from Acts of God, acts of war, terrorism or other causes or circumstances not reasonably within the control of World Learning.

ARTICLE VI: COMPLIANCE WITH USAID REGULATIONS

The Democracy Fellows Program and this fellowship have been funded in whole or in part under the terms of a Cooperative Agreement (No. AEP-5466-A-00-5024-00, dated June 15, 1995, as modified by Agreement No. AEP-A-00-95-00024-10 dated September 27, 2001) between World Learning and USAID. The parties understand and acknowledge that World Learning is obliged to adhere to numerous U.S. government regulatory, policy and statutory provisions which do and will in the future guide this fellowship and the relationship between and among the fellow, USAID and World Learning's DFP. The parties accordingly agree to hold World Learning harmless for its good faith compliance with or adherence to such requirements, including the statutory and regulatory requirements and/or policy restrictions of USAID.

USAID Policy on Fellowships.

The fellow specifically acknowledges and agrees to adhere to formal policy guidance issued by USAID's Global and Management Bureaus (USAID General Notice AA/M 071795;

Implementation Memorandum AA/G 102695). This guidance includes the following applicable provisions:

- Fellows shall not supervise, nor be supervised by, USAID employees, grantees or contractors.
- Fellows shall not have access to information, whether proprietary, personnel-related, procurement-related, or otherwise sensitive or confidential, the disclosure of which to the fellow would contravene USAID procurement integrity rules, or create a real or apparent Organizational Conflict of Interest for USAID or an implementing organization.
- Fellows shall not encumber USAID direct hire positions. This means not only that fellows may not encumber an FTE, but also that fellows may not assume the duties or responsibilities of a USAID employee or contractor.
- Fellows shall not be used to accomplish inherently governmental functions, including:
 - Officially representing USAID;
 - Approving policy documents;
 - Supervising USAID employees, contractors or grantees;
 - Negotiating, reviewing, approving or signing USAID contracts, grants or other agreements;
 - Certifying vouchers or approving funding or budget documents;
 - Recruiting or selecting personnel for USAID;
 - Responding to IG, GAO or Congressional requests for information from USAID, providing testimony, replying to audit reports, Q&As, etc.;
 - Preparing USAID's strategic plans, funding or budget documents, or other work requiring access to sensitive information;
 - Managing a USAID project or on-going activity, or serving as project officers.

Organizational Conflicts of Interest.

The fellow is aware that World Learning will be called upon to provide services under various aspects of USAID's various development programs, and that World Learning may from time to time be a party to other agreements or contract arrangements with USAID. To avoid any apparent or actual organizational conflict of interest, and in order to comply fully with policies governing USAID-sponsored fellowship programs, the fellow will strictly avoid involvement in any procurement activities, particularly those relating to World Learning and USAID, or other agreements to which World Learning is a party. When in doubt about the propriety of any activity, the fellow will seek advance written approval from World Learning before undertaking the activity in question.

ARTICLE VII: ARBITRATION

Should any dispute arise under this agreement between World Learning and the fellow, the parties shall first attempt to resolve their differences through good faith discussions and conciliation. If the

dispute is not resolved within 45 days after either party has given formal notice of a dispute, either party may submit the matter to arbitration as the exclusive forum for resolution of the dispute. Arbitration will be conducted under the Rules of the American Arbitration Association in Washington, D.C., before a single arbitrator, with each party paying its own share of the costs. No other tribunal shall have jurisdiction over any dispute arising hereunder. The resulting arbitral award may be enforced in any jurisdiction.

ARTICLE VIII: APPLICABLE LAW

This agreement shall be construed in accordance with the laws of the District of Columbia, USA.

ARTICLE IX: ENTIRE AGREEMENT, SEVERABILITY

In signing this agreement, World Learning and the Democracy Fellow acknowledge that this fellowship agreement, its Attachments, and any duly executed amendments thereto (specifically including revisions to the Fellowship Workplan) represent the terms and conditions of the fellowship and constitute the sole and entire agreement between the parties relating to the subject matter hereof. No change, alteration, extension or modification other than as specified herein will be effective unless in writing, executed by both parties, and each party shall be bound by all terms of such agreement. Should any provision of this agreement be found to be inapplicable or unenforceable, such a determination shall not affect any other portion of this agreement. This fellowship agreement supersedes all prior agreements between the parties hereto, written or otherwise.

ARTICLE X: NOTICES

Any notice given or required to be given under this agreement shall be effective and sufficient if it is in writing and (i) delivered by hand and a receipt obtained therefor, or (ii) if it is sent by telegram, certified first-class mail, receipt-required courier, or equivalent methods to the following addresses, which the parties may change by notice given pursuant to this Article:

Democracy Fellow:

Democracy Fellow
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

tel. [Redacted]
Social Security number: [Redacted]

World Learning:

World Learning Inc.
Democracy Fellows Program
Suite 750
1015 15th Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20005

tel. (202) 408-5420

IN WITNESS WHEREOF World Learning and the Democracy Fellow have each caused this Agreement to be executed on their behalf, to be effective on October 1, 2002

name of fellow
Democracy Fellow

date

Pamela Baldwin
Senior Vice President
World Learning / PIDT

date

Attachments:

1. Standard Terms and Conditions
2. Fellowship Workplan
3. Fellowship Budget and Payment Schedule

Standard Terms and Conditions

The following provisions are included as an attachment to and an integral part of the Democracy Fellowship award and agreement between World Learning Inc. and the fellow.

Professional Skills and Abilities. In entering into this agreement, the fellow expressly confirms that s/he possesses the requisite skills, background, tools, language capabilities, materials and physical and professional abilities to perform the reasonable and necessary functions, services and responsibilities, and to achieve USAID's desired purposes and results, for the fellowship. The fellow acknowledges that, other than as expressly provided in this Agreement, neither the DFP nor USAID is obliged to provide training or assistance for the fellow to develop any specific professional skills or to overcome other circumstances or factors which may be necessary to fulfill the purposes of the fellowship.

Not an Employee or Agent. The Democracy Fellow acknowledges that s/he is not for any purpose an employee or agent of World Learning, or the U.S. government. The fellow has no authority, expressed or implied, to assume or create any obligations on behalf of World Learning or USAID; and s/he will not be supervised as a U.S. government employee, nor have any supervisory authority over others in the course of this fellowship. Consequently, subject to the terms and conditions of this agreement, the fellow retains a high level of independence in personally exercising his/her professional judgment as to the manner of performing the requisite functions, activities and responsibilities of this fellowship, and in carrying out the fellowship duties assigned or requested by World Learning and/or USAID. While World Learning retains oversight of the fellow, the general conduct of the fellowship and the overall DFP, it does not seek to exercise day-to-day control over the methods or activities of the Democracy Fellow in performing the functions necessary to fulfill his/her assigned fellowship duties. World Learning expressly relies on the fellow to coordinate closely and regularly with USAID, while exercising the highest level of professional skill, ability and diligence in carrying out fellowship activities and accomplishing the results sought by World Learning or USAID. The fellow is assigned to a specific USAID unit and is expected to follow that organization's established hours of work and other policies and procedures regarding the performance of activities under the fellowship. The fellow is solely responsible for any and all personal activities and conduct during the fellowship period which are not a direct and necessary, approved and/or reasonably required, professional element of the fellowship.

Financial Responsibility and Taxes. Fellows are paid monthly, and stipends are pro rated, based on actual days of performance as a fellow. Except for those direct expenses identified as being paid by World Learning, other expenses of travel, transport, lodging, furniture or equipment, shipping, supplies, office space, salaries, communications, insurance, telephone, postage, or other expenses incurred by the fellow in performing assignments under this fellowship shall be incurred at his/her discretion and sole financial responsibility. World Learning does not withhold federal, state, Social Security (FICA), self-employment, worker's compensation or equivalent taxes and contributions from fellows' payments, nor are any foreign taxes or fees withheld. The fellow acknowledges and accepts full and exclusive liability for the payment of such taxes, contributions, licenses and work permits or fees as may be required by applicable laws, rules and regulations of the United States and of any states or localities thereof, and those of the countries wherein fellowship activities may be performed.

Termination, Extension. This fellowship will terminate automatically unless it is extended by mutual written agreement. Except as provided in this agreement, neither World Learning nor USAID is obligated to provide the fellow any additional stipends or other payments, nor to reimburse any otherwise allowable expenses incurred outside the term of the fellowship. Any extension of this fellowship requires the mutual agreement of USAID, the fellow and World Learning, and will be based on the terms and conditions of the program in effect at that time. It is agreed that the unique nature of the Democracy Fellowship and the inherently sensitive nature of democracy development imposes upon the fellow an obligation to conduct himself/herself at all times with the highest degree of professional and personal comportment.

(Continued . . .)

Standard Terms and Conditions (continued)

World Learning or USAID may curtail, withdraw or terminate the fellowship for cause if the fellow acts professionally or personally in a manner that is incompatible with the successful completion of the fellowship, or which is otherwise unacceptable to the DFP, USAID, or the pertinent host countries where fellowship activities are conducted. Cause, as used herein and as further defined in **Article IV**, includes any case where the Democracy Fellow fails to pursue and fulfill the responsibilities or objectives of the fellowship, is unable to obtain or retain a required national security clearance, local work permit, visa, etc., or is otherwise determined by World Learning or USAID to lack the necessary skills, background, demeanor, attitude or capabilities to accomplish the desired objectives of the DFP or the duties of the specific fellowship.

Copyright. It is mutually agreed that any written, electronic data, graphic or audio/visual materials developed in the course of service as a Democracy Fellow under this fellowship are considered the **property of the individual fellow** for the purposes of copyright. Fellows are encouraged to publish materials developed under the fellowship, however, World Learning, and the U.S. government through USAID, also retain an unlimited, nonexclusive and irrevocable royalty-free right to use, reproduce, modify, compile and/or disseminate any such materials developed in connection with this fellowship. As the principal financial sponsor of the fellowship, **USAID requires** that all publications, reports and similar materials developed under this fellowship and disseminated outside USAID include an acknowledgment that the fellowship has been funded by USAID, together with a disclaimer to the effect that the opinions and statements contained therein are those of the author and do not represent the views of USAID or any other governmental entity.

Conflicts of Interest. Both USAID and World Learning prohibit fellows from engaging in procurement activities with USAID. This prohibition is intended to avoid any circumstance which could constitute or have the appearance of constituting an impermissible organizational conflict of interest for World Learning or for any other potential U.S. government contractor. The fellow agrees that s/he will not undertake any activity with USAID which would constitute an actual or potential conflict of interest or create an unfair competitive advantage on the part of World Learning, e.g., by working on specific program designs, competitive evaluations of proposals, reviews of procurement contracts or agreements, etc., which involve World Learning.

Other Terms and Conditions. The Democracy Fellow is prohibited from engaging in any illegal activity or conduct that may be seriously detrimental: to fulfilling his/her fellowship responsibilities, to attaining the intended results and objectives of this fellowship, to World Learning, and/or to USAID. The fellow agrees that s/he will in all ways conduct himself/herself in a dignified and professional manner. The Fellow is responsible for his/her personal compliance with local laws and regulations in any foreign country or jurisdiction where s/he may serve or travel under this fellowship.

Representations and Claims. Should any party bring a claim against World Learning arising from a false statement or representation by the Democracy Fellow, or from activities or conduct prohibited under this fellowship agreement, the fellow agrees that s/he will indemnify and defend World Learning from any cost or liability arising therefrom. Similar relief may be had against World Learning, should the fellow be faced with a claim arising from a false statement or prohibited action of World Learning. Should any claims arise against World Learning from the fellow's activities under this fellowship, the Democracy Fellow hereby certifies by his/her signature on the agreement to which this condition is attached that all statements made and amounts claimed in connection with the fellowship are and shall be true and correct to the best of his/her knowledge.

Vacation and Holidays. The fellow agrees to devote substantially his/her full time and attention to performing the duties of this fellowship, excepting normal vacation and holidays. Fellows are expected to follow the work schedules and office policies/procedures of the particular USAID unit to which they are assigned, in accordance with the following general provision: Fellows are allowed time off for the normal national/local holidays, as observed by the fellowship's particular USAID unit. Fellows are granted a total of 30 workdays of leave for a full twelve-month fellowship. These days may be used for personal vacation, illness, religious observance, or other activities that are not directly related to fulfilling the fellowship. Leave days are pro rated for fellowship periods that may be greater or less than twelve months. No compensation will be paid for unused leave days.

Attachment 2

Fellowship Workplan

Democracy Fellows Program
Initial Fellowship Workplan

<< SAMPLE >>

Fellow: _____ [name] _____

Sponsoring Organization: USAID/Faroffistan, Centravihar, Faroffistan.

FELLOWSHIP OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

The Fellow's principal professional activities will fall under two categories: **field support and institutional technical leadership**. Her work in these two areas will focus on:

1. analyzing the political constraints to economic development in Faroffistan and other countries of interest to USAID;
2. assessing and/or devising country strategies which address these constraints;
3. evaluating the overall impact of US elections-assistance projects in Faroffistan and its region;
4. conducting a formal review of US policies on strengthening democracies, with the fellow's findings and results being presented in one or more journal articles or in a book;
5. assisting the development of a Faroffistani counterpart; and
6. identifying how civil society investments can contribute to improved governance.

Field Support will entail: (i) the Fellow's participation in the design and implementation of country democracy/governance (DG) assessments; (ii) the formulation of DG country strategies; and (iii) the design and conduct of country DG evaluations. This will broaden the Fellow's knowledge of problems of democracy in a wide range of developing countries and also provide her with a sound background in the methods and priorities of USAID programming.

Principal activities in this area will be contributing to analyses of country programs on an ongoing basis and participating in some field missions. The Fellow's work will focus mainly on issues relevant to the work of the Democracy Center's Civil Society Group, but the Fellow will also contribute to the work of the team focusing on DG strategies. A majority of the field involvement would be in the Faroffistan region, the area of the Fellow's greatest expertise, and an area of considerable importance to the Democracy Center's programs in the coming year. Some collaboration with the Africa Bureau of AID is also planned, as that bureau has a shortage of DG expertise.

Technical Leadership refers to the efforts of the USAID Democracy Center to enhance its knowledge, analytical capacities and technical competence in the range of fields where it is investing resources.

Principal activities: The Fellow plans to contribute to this effort through:

1. performing seven discrete analyses and assessments of civil society in Faroffistan and six other countries;
2. producing at least one in-depth analytical paper on a topic of mutual interest to the Fellow and the USAID Democracy Center;
3. helping to develop and conduct at least two workshops to provide technical guidance to AID field missions and to DG sector contractors and partners;
4. participating in the US Embassy/Faroffistan's Democracy Committee; and
5. assisting in developing more meaningful coordination and collaboration among democracy donors.

The topic(s) of the research paper(s) and workshop development will be determined early in the Fellowship year, as the Fellow gains greater knowledge of the analytical and practical problems faced by USAID/Faroffistan staff in dealing with democracy and civil society issues. One of the Fellow's main goals in this period will be to define research topics which can be informed by the field work opportunities available, so that at least one analytical paper will include field research findings. The Fellow will also seek to fit her analytical work in the context of USAID/Faroffistan's strategy development agenda, most likely in the areas of Civil Society Strategies, Financial Sustainability Strategies, and/or Advocacy Strategies.

TIMELINE AND PROFESSIONAL WORK PRODUCTS

During the first quarter of the fellowship year, the Fellow will commit the majority of her time to active involvement with program analysis and planning. This will allow her to become familiar with the programs and priorities of Faroffistan, USAID and the Democracy Center, as well as to identify issue areas where more in-depth analysis could be most beneficial to her own work and that of the Center. The research to be undertaken may be relatively independent or in conjunction with other AID or contractor staff. The content and extent of her participation in training seminars would be determined during the same period of time.

- By the end of the first quarter of the fellowship year, the Fellow will develop and seek Democracy Center and World Learning concurrence in a quarterly progress report and a more detailed schedule of research, including proposed topics, specific work products and timetables for completion.

- Depending on the number of research and training projects decided upon, the Fellow's commitment of time to ongoing programs in USAID/Faroffistan will be adjusted accordingly.

A travel schedule will also be worked out with USAID as the Fellow learns more about the ongoing programs and specific needs of USAID/Faroffistan, and the ways in which field work could contribute to the Fellow's developing analytical agenda.

- The Fellow expects to make at least three 3 trips to the field, with a trip for up to six weeks to Uganda being planned for the first quarter.

- In addition, the Fellow will travel to San Francisco to participate in the Central Faroffistani Studies Association Annual Meeting, 22-28 March 2002.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

The main professional outcome of this fellowship will be the addition of a body of analysis and the provision of technical assistance to assist USAID/Faroffistan, the people of Faroffistan, the Democracy Center, and others, in developing synthesized approaches to the many aspects of civil society sponsorship. The papers, formal assessments, course curriculum, journal article, and proposed training seminars/workshops will be the most concrete contributions to these goals. In addition, the Fellow's ongoing participation in the work of USAID/Faroffistan will be equally important in bringing together diverse approaches already being used within USAID, and implementing some of the ideas emerging from academic research on democracy and civil society. A reciprocal impact will be gaining increased experience in the ways academic research can both inform and be informed by the practical considerations of development programming. For the people of Faroffistan, the primary impacts will be improved technical capacity to become involved in advocacy and democratization activities, and the strengthening of a democratic institution.

Democracy Fellow's Budget and Payment Schedule

[Name]

Fellowship Term: Month xx, 2002 - Month xx, 2003

Budget: Amounts shown below represent an annual fellowship budget, and consequently are understood to be "not to exceed" amounts, based on the assumption that the fellow satisfactorily pursues and successfully completes the fellowship during a one-year period. Some items will be paid directly by World Learning on behalf of the fellow, and stipend and allowance payments will be pro rated where applicable (see fellowship Award Letter, Attachment 1). As shown in the appropriate explanatory notes, some allowances represent a maximum limit on reimbursement of actual expenses. Allowance payments must be approved by the DFP in advance. It is understood that World Learning will in all instances adhere to the federal and corporate policies, regulations, laws and practices applicable to the DFP, including particularly the regulations of USAID and the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) which govern grants and assistance awards, as well as other provisions and/or required practices and procedures relating to USAID-funded fellowship programs, travel, procurement and other expense categories.

Manner: Payment of stipends and allowances under this fellowship will be made by checks payable to the Democracy Fellow, mailed to the fellow's address as indicated in this agreement or to the fellow's U.S. bank account or such other address or bank as mutually agreed. The DFP will make payments on behalf of the fellow directly to the appropriate vendor (e.g., in the case of certain travel expenses, insurance, etc.).

Schedule: See detailed schedule of payments set out below. A final payment of stipend and allowances will be made at the conclusion of the fellowship, following submission and acceptance by World Learning of a final accounting of expenses and claim for Allowances, with supporting documentation, and any required fellowship report(s) and/or other products as agreed in the fellowship program description.

	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>Estimated Cost Per Year</u>
a.	Annual Living Stipend	\$
b.	Supplemental Housing Allowance	TBD
c.	Excess Baggage Allowance	5,000
d.	Health/Medevac Insurance (Paid by DFP) {add supplemental insurance at \$110 per month}	650
e.	Passport Fees/Visas	200
f.	Miscellaneous	4,300
g.	Travel to/from fellowship site	5,000
h.	Program Travel/Per diem	TBD
i.	Pre-departure Orientation, Administration, etc.	Paid by DFP
j.	Computer	Paid by DFP
k.	Travel to Democracy Fellows Conference	4,700
	Total	_____

Line Item Notes:

- a. Stipend to be paid per attached schedule.
- b. Paid by World Learning on behalf of fellow, or directly to fellow, depending on circumstances.
- c. One-half paid for travel at beginning of fellowship; one-half paid for return travel at conclusion of the fellowship.
- d. Paid by World Learning on behalf of fellow.
- e. Actual reimbursement, not to exceed this amount.
- f. Miscellaneous expenses as may be requested by fellow and approved by DFP.
- g. Actual reimbursement, not to exceed this amount.
- h. Maximum available amount; travel must be approved in advance by sponsor/host and DFP. The fellow will propose quarterly travel plans for concurrence by the DFP and the sponsor/host organization, with the initial travel plan presented as part of the Fellowship Program Description.
- i. Expenditures made/to be made by DFP on behalf of fellow.
- j. Maximum available amount; specific computer/communications expenses must be approved by DFP.
- k. Maximum available amount; DFP must approve travel.

<<SAMPLE>>

**Schedule of Payments
for
Democracy Fellow _____**

Note: dates and payment amounts given below are for illustration only. Actual dates and amounts of payment for specific fellowships will vary, as will the period of each fellowship.

Period of Fellowship: October 1, 2002 through September 30, 2003

Date of Payment	Amount	Description of Payment
10/1/2002	\$8,500.00	stipend (\$3,000.00) paid in advance for the month of October plus supplemental stipend payment (\$3,000.00). Amount also includes outbound excess baggage (\$2,500.00) allowance. <i>Future payments of stipend will be paid at the end of the month for the preceding month's service as a fellow. Medevac/medical insurance will be paid directly by World Learning.</i>
11/30/2002	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of November
12/31/2002	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of December
01/31/2003	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of January
02/28/2003	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of February
03/31/2003	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of March
04/30/2003	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of April
05/31/2003	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of May
06/30/2003	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of June
07/31/2003	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of July
08/31/2003	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of August
09/30/2003	\$2,500.00	return (or inbound) excess baggage allowance
10/31/2003*	\$3,000.00	stipend for the month of September

* Estimated date; World Learning will pay final stipend and allowances following its receipt and acceptance of required fellowship program and administrative reports.

Fellowship Workplan and Report Guidelines

Program Description

The DFP provides opportunities for contributing to USAID's democracy and governance activities, and thereby gaining practical experience and developing professional contacts for a future career in that field. The Democracy Fellows Program is primarily targeted toward individuals who have relevant professional international democracy and governance experience, an appropriate advanced degree and academic background, and a commitment to a career in international democracy and governance. The program is not designed as a means of securing permanent employment with USAID, nor for the pursuit of individual activities such as independent research or teaching.

Before it awards any fellowship, the DFP requires each finalist to develop a proposed **Fellowship Workplan**. This plan is based on the particular democracy needs outlined in a **Statement of Work**, usually supplied by the specific USAID organization that wishes to have a Democracy Fellow. The Fellowship Workplan explains how the prospective fellow will address the USAID unit's specific goals, objectives, activities, approaches, and outcomes for the fellowship. Finalists may also identify professional skills and related activities that they may seek to develop during their tenures as Democracy Fellows.

The initial Fellowship Workplan is intended to clarify how the finalist will carry out the activities and attain the results and outcomes contemplated by the sponsoring USAID organization, doing so within the regulatory and contractual requirements of the Democracy Fellows Program. The proposed Fellowship Workplan must be accepted by USAID before any fellowship can commence. The initial Fellowship Workplan ordinarily will be reviewed again 30 to 90 days into the fellowship, when all parties should have a clearer understanding of the scope and practical possibilities of the fellowship. Because the Fellowship Workplan is intended to be a flexible tool, it is further reviewed and revised periodically during the course of the fellowship and any extensions. Ordinarily, after the first periodic review and revision, fellows will review their workplans semi-annually. It is expected that the Fellowship Workplan will also serve as the basis for the fellow's final report.

To avoid possible misunderstandings between the fellow and the USAID unit to which the fellow is assigned, and to minimize potentially troublesome situations later on, World Learning does not formally award a Democracy Fellowship until the prospective fellow, the sponsoring USAID organization, and the DFP agree on the proposed Fellowship Workplan. Mutual agreement on each revision to a Fellowship Workplan must also be reached among all of the involved parties. USAID's Center for Democracy and Governance may also review the proposed Fellowship Workplan in its technical leadership role in USAID democracy and governance activities, or in connection with its

allocation of fellowship positions under the prevailing USAID ceiling for the Democracy Fellows Program. World Learning's review of the proposed Fellowship Workplan helps to ensure that the proposal comports with the requirements that USAID has established for World Learning's Democracy Fellowship Program. It may also help the finalist to develop a practical and realistic overall plan for attaining personal and professional goals, while accomplishing the work expected by the sponsoring USAID organization. Because it is important that each Democracy Fellowship begin on a sound foundation, based on mutual understanding and agreement, the Fellowship Workplan is a key mechanism to clarify expectations.

The Fellowship Workplan and the related reporting process fulfill two additional purposes: they satisfy certain program requirements with USAID, and they facilitate fellowship monitoring and direction. Through their Fellowship Workplans and subsequent reports, fellows take responsibility for planning and achieving specific objectives and professional results, and for periodically evaluating their progress throughout the fellowship. Once approved, the Fellowship Workplan facilitates the achievement of specific objectives during the fellowship. The fellow's periodic progress reports also provide the opportunity to assess, in writing, progress towards the goals, program results and outcomes that are identified in the Fellowship Workplan and its revisions. In describing and analyzing their fellowship experiences, fellows usually gain greater clarity about how they approach their fellowship responsibilities. Ideally, that effort will lead to improved effectiveness and to new or revised objectives for the remainder of the fellowship. It may also help to advance or sustain their professional development in the field of democratization.

As with any planning tool, the Fellowship Workplan should identify USAID's desired results and objectives; proposed methods and efforts for attaining those objectives; tentative means of evaluating the achievement of those results or objectives; and proposed timelines for accomplishing the above. For the purposes of the Democracy Fellowship, the initial Fellowship Workplan should be concise, and must include the following sections:

- a statement addressing USAID's particular goals, objectives and intended results for the fellowship;
- the methods and activities the fellow plans to attain those goals, objectives and results;
- the anticipated outcomes and impact results of those activities, and of the fellowship as a whole;
- proposed timelines and levels of effort for implementing the planned activities, and/or for achieving the intended results; and
- a proposed schedule of travel necessary to complete these objectives.

USAID's Fellowship Objectives

The Fellowship Workplan should begin with a general statement of the fellowship's intended goals, objectives and results, addressing questions such as what specific kinds of activities USAID expects and how the fellow's efforts will advance USAID's strategic democracy goals in the host country (if applicable).

The Fellowship Workplan must relate to and be based on the program functions and needs of the USAID sponsor organization. The finalist should therefore describe how the fellowship will support or advance the sponsor's specific democracy programs and activities. This means including a variety of performance objectives which: (a) identify the principal *activities* that the fellow will undertake, and (b) describe the specific *results* to be achieved, as well as the relevant knowledge or skills that s/he plans to apply during the fellowship. Objectives should be limited in number and should be drawn from the fellowship description (i.e., from the sponsoring USAID unit's Statement of Work for the particular fellowship), from USAID's Strategic or Intermediate Objectives for the sponsoring unit, from USAID Results Packages, or from other materials or information provided by the sponsoring USAID organization.

A Fellowship Workplan might address particular questions such as: What are the fellow's specific program activities and work responsibilities? What professional competencies will be applied in performing these duties? What are the leading democracy and development issues identified by the sponsoring USAID mission (e.g., in terms of content, context and geography)? How will this fellowship help to address those issues? What particular democracy and governance challenges confront the sponsoring USAID unit and its programs? How can the fellow assist USAID in addressing those problems and challenges? What results, consequences, and outcomes can be anticipated?

Performance Methods and Activities

Each fellowship objective should be accompanied by a brief plan that states how the objective or function will be achieved. If the objective is for the fellow to prepare programmatic guidelines for a possible future project, the program description might include a tentative research plan, including related writing, travel, timelines, etc. If the objective is to develop a plan for judicial reform for a specific jurisdiction, the plan might illustrate particular methodologies for conducting a needs assessment and/or making recommendations for proposed reforms and implementation. If USAID intends for the fellow to impart knowledge in a specific area, the plan might include briefings, interviews, readings, training materials, workshops, or other specific activities. The idea is to identify *how* one plans to accomplish the intended objectives.

Outcomes and Impact

This section will identify expected outcomes that will result from the successful achievement of *each* objective. This section should anticipate what the sponsoring USAID organization may expect on account of the fellow's activities. This analysis might include questions such as: What might the organization be able to do differently because of the fellow's activities? What specific effects will the fellow's actions have? How will local democratic institutions or practices be improved by the fellow's actions?

Such questions can serve as a means of demonstrating the successful accomplishment of the different objectives. Fellowship Workplan should propose standards that may be used objectively to assess progress toward each intended result. This section should address the anticipated impact of the fellowship on the sponsoring USAID unit and its programs, and on democratic practices and institutions, etc. For example, training impact might be illustrated through evaluation results. Impact, results and outcomes should be related to USAID's own measures of performance and accomplishment for democracy and governance activities. (See USAID's *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*.)

Timelines and Levels of Effort

For each principal objective, finalists should include a projected timeline for the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the activities that will lead to its fulfillment. Issues of timing involve both the *duration* and the *level of effort* planned for each major objective. For example, a fellow's plan might show that 10% of the fellow's time will be applied for the first four months; or 25% of the fellow's time continuously for the second six-month period. Finalists should portray this element in graph or chart format, covering all major objectives and the entire first year of the fellowship. Fellowship Workplan that address *both* duration *and* level of effort are much more useful as planning and operational tools, because they allow all concerned to understand better the feasibility of the fellow's plans. Finalists should also understand that they will probably face a steep learning curve as new fellows, and should allow for this at the outset of the fellowship.

Fellowship Travel Plans

The Fellowship Workplan should include a tentative schedule of travel necessary to complete the planned program objectives. Because of USAID policies, this is especially necessary for first-quarter international travel; finalists should thus consult with their sponsoring USAID organizations regarding travel for the first quarter of the fellowship. *Please note:* If the Fellowship Workplan and its periodic updates do not include an approved travel plan with sufficient information (i.e., planned destination(s), number of trips to each destination, and the planned duration of each trip), policies promulgated by

USAID's Procurement Office state that *each* unplanned international trip be *individually approved* by USAID's Agreement Officer in Washington. This would be a lengthy, time-consuming process that would greatly restrict the prospects of timely professional travel. Therefore, the DFP strongly encourages fellows to identify periodically, and with the required specificity, the number, duration and destination of all planned trips.

Fellowship Progress Reports

The successful achievement of fellowship objectives will be conveyed in periodic fellowship progress reports and a final report. Fellowship progress reports are due on the dates listed in each individual's fellowship Award Letter, usually semi-annually, after an initial report during the first 60-90 days. A comprehensive final/annual report is due no more than one month following the completion of the fellowship. (Similar reporting requirements apply for any fellowship that is extended beyond the first year.) Fellowship progress reports should include an assessment of progress toward each objective in the approved program description for that period. Fellows are encouraged to enclose with their periodic reports all significant democracy-related materials received or created during the fellowship (curricula, reports, analyses, policy papers, training plans, etc.) so that these materials can serve as a continuing democracy and governance resource. These materials are also submitted to USAID/PPC/CDIE for dissemination to a wider USAID democracy and governance audience.

Content

In assessing progress toward the fellowship objectives, fellows should keep in mind that they are writing not only for themselves and USAID staff, but also for others who have not shared their experiences. Therefore, it is helpful to include descriptions both of what has happened and why, and of what has been learned. This information should include the rationale behind the implementation of specific activities, reasons why these activities were selected over other possible methods, how they were implemented, why they succeeded or did not, etc..

Reports should be analytical and substantive. They should not merely consist of a recitation of the fellow's activities during the period. Each fellowship progress report should begin with a review of USAID's goals and objectives for that fellowship, an overview of the fellowship, and a general statement about how it is proceeding. For each objective of the program description, the fellow should describe and summarize methods and approaches that have been followed; how well the objective has been achieved; and any outcomes or impact of that objective on USAID programs or activities, and on democratic changes in the country. For example, program impact can be verified by evaluations, illustrative statements and activities carried out by members of a target group, or documented changes in an institution's practices, systems and/or behaviors.

Please include only the most important or significant events or experiences, rather than reporting everything that has happened.

Lastly, discuss any changes that need to be made to the Fellowship Workplan for the remainder of the fellowship. Revisions might require major or minor modifications to fellowship objectives, activities, expected outcomes, levels of efforts, priorities, and so on. Each Fellowship Workplan and/or revision should include a tentative travel schedule for the upcoming quarter.

Format for Fellowship Program Reports

Each fellowship progress report should include the following sections:

- General Description of Fellowship to Date;
- USAID's Goals and Objectives for the Fellowship;
- Fellow's Performance Methods and Activities (including reports from program-related travel);
- Outcomes and Impact (including relevant USAID performance indicators);
- Chart Showing Duration and Levels of Efforts for Each Objective; and
- Proposed Revisions to Fellowship Workplan.

Final Reports

In addition to the above, Democracy Fellows are required to submit to the DFP a Final Report (or Annual Report, if the fellowship will extend beyond the first year). This report should cover the entire year of the fellowship, but should include more detail about the final months, since those months will not have been reported on yet. Each Final or Annual report should address the following questions:

- How did the fellowship contribute to the needs of the sponsoring USAID organization? To the needs of the host country?
- Which proposed methods were used? Did they achieve the anticipated outcomes?
- Which methods were not used that were originally suggested, and why not?

- What experiences and outcomes were unanticipated in the program description but are still relevant to the fellowship? How did they contribute to the intended results?

The final report should also include a copies of any professional work products that the fellow developed that contribute to the field of democracy and governance.

Criteria for Evaluation of Fellowship Workplans and Reports

Fellowship Workplans and periodic reports will be reviewed by DFP staff upon receipt based on the following criteria:

- Do the fellowship goals and objectives continue to address the needs of the sponsoring USAID organization? Do the objectives relate directly to the democracy programs that USAID is conducting in the host country?
- Does the report demonstrate the achievements of the fellow, and his or her progress in meeting USAID's needs for professional democracy and governance expertise?
- Does the report demonstrate the professional contributions made by the fellow to the sponsoring USAID organization? To the support of USAID's international democracy and governance programs? To the democracy needs of the host country?
- Does the report identify areas requiring revision of the fellow's current Fellowship Workplan? Does it raise any issues or concerns that require further discussion or follow-up by the DFP?

Fellowship Program Components

Professional Contribution to Democracy and Governance

Democracy Fellows are encouraged to undertake during the course of their fellowships an activity that has the potential for making a professional-level contribution to the field of democracy and governance. Examples of such professional contributions include preparing a substantial analytical report, a book chapter, a professional article, a new curriculum, or some similar project that reflects the fellow's professional interests and encompasses skills, learning, knowledge and practices that the fellow has developed during the Democracy Fellowship. The professional work product:

- May, and usually will, be derived directly from the fellow's efforts within the sponsoring USAID unit;
- May be a general result of work conducted during the course of the fellowship; and/or
- May reflect a professional interest related to the fellow's career development, but which is not a specific element of the fellow's day-to-day work with USAID in this fellowship.

Each Democracy Fellow's work product, however, should constitute a professional-level contribution to the fields of international democracy, development, and governance. It should also illustrate directly or indirectly the professional growth of the fellow, and reflect the impact of the fellowship, e.g., on USAID's democracy and governance programs, on the democracy needs of a host country or institution, on a particular area of democracy and governance, etc.

The fellow's professional work product should be more than a compilation of periodic reports of the fellow's activities. It should aim at making a professional contribution to the field of international democracy and development. The purpose of this effort is not to duplicate other fellowship reports, nor to develop a summary report of activities conducted over the course of the fellowship, but instead to produce a synthesis of the fellowship and the fellow's professional accomplishment and career development. This, in turn, will make a useful professional contribution to the overall fields of international development, democracy and governance, and/or to specific topical areas, while also serving as a foundation for the fellow's professional endeavors following the fellowship.

Democracy Fellows should bring to the fellowship some thoughtful ideas of possible professional work products, to be included in the Program Description and in discussions with the sponsoring USAID organization. These ideas may (and likely will) change as the fellowship progresses, and they should be addressed in each fellowship progress report.

Progress reports should also assess the status of the professional effort to date. Any professional products should be submitted to the DFP by the date that the final fellowship report is due, i.e., one month after the completion of the fellowship. (See "Fellowship Agreement" for details on copyright and publishing guidelines, including USAID-required disclaimers.)

Democracy Fellows Conference

The Democracy Fellows Program has periodically convened a Democracy Fellows Conference. This conference is intended to provide an opportunity for synthesis and evaluation, to enable fellows to integrate their field experiences and to share experiences and learning on democratization, democracy programs and approaches, cross-cultural effectiveness, and other topics of interest. In the past, conference participants have included current and new fellows, DFP and USAID staff, and other experts and practitioners in the field of democracy and governance.

During some prior DFP conferences, discussions and presentations have addressed democracy training, institutional capacity building, and development activities. For some fellows, these conferences have also served as an end-of-fellowship seminar in which fellows nearing the end of their Democracy Fellowships made presentations on their experiences and shared the preliminary results of their professional work projects. Time was also set aside for program evaluation and recommendations.

In recent years, the DFP has held this conference in conjunction with two related USAID conferences: the Democracy Center's annual *Democracy and Governance Officers Training Workshop*, and USAID/G/DG's *Democracy and Governance Partners Conference*, an annual forum for USAID to meet with its implementing partners and others in the democracy development community.