

**Performance Indicator Reference
Sheets for USAID/Benin's Africa Anti-
Corruption Initiative (ACI) Activities**

June 30, 2004

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Name of Strategic Objective:	
Name of Intermediate Result: Mechanisms promoting transparency and accountability strengthened	
Name of Indicator: Independent panel assessment of the progress and impact of the steps taken by the GOB to reduce corruption.	
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): 6) Substantial progress; 5) satisfactory progress; 4) limited progress; 3) no progress/no regression; 2) limited regression; 1) serious regression	
Unit of Measure: Scale from 1 to 6 indicating progress	
Disaggregated by: Improvement will be of advantage to all sectors of society and the economy.	
Justification & Management Utility: Despite some progress, corruption remains a serious impediment to Benin's economic and social development. USAID has been (and takes modest credit for the progress made), and continues (using ACI funds to augment its program), to be actively involved in assisting the GOB to promote transparency. It is involved in assisting the auditing of public accounts, civil society's anti-corruption legislative program and the procurement process. Each of those initiatives has its own indicator(s). This higher-level indicator is intended to capture the impact of the three plus the contributions of other donors and of the GOB and civil society. USAID, as one of the first donors to get involved in anti-corruption programs, certainly has a plausible association with progress. It believes however it is premature to incorporate in its measurement dramatic or substantive national level quantifiable outcomes such as increases in foreign investment or changes in public perception of corruption. It sees this indicator with its focus on incremental progress by GOB as appropriate to its level of contribution.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID	
Data collection method: Once year the Mission DG team will gather together a panel (for an afternoon or evening) of approx 4 or 5 independently minded businessmen or people knowledgeable about the business environment and discuss progress. If possible these people should make a commitment to return each year for four years. At its first meeting the panel should decide on a set of questions to assess; but it should include a focus on areas of USAID's work. For example: 1) quality of auditing of public accounts; 2) enforcement of decisions of public accounts; 3) civil society's access to, and communication with GOB, on corruption; 4) the anti-corruption legislation agenda; 5) progress in implementation and enforcement of legislation; 6) the GOB procurement process; 7) public service; 8) and overall general sense of progress. After a discussion the panel should conclude with an assessment of progress. The panel should decide if a detailed scoring system is helpful or not to their deliberations but in its conclusion, either by consensus or by aggregating individual scores it should conclude with a score of 1 to 6.	
Data Source: The Panel of businessmen and USAID DG team.	
Method of data acquisition by USAID: After discussion USAID will record the panel's conclusion (score of 1 to 6) the key points of explanation and questions unresolved.	

Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: annually			
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal. No preparation is expected of the panel. – Some hospitality should be provided by the Mission such as dinner			
Individual responsible at USAID: Bernice Nougdbessi			
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: same			
Location of Data Storage: USAID Mission			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2004			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): This type of indicator appears appropriate for a complex topic of this nature. But it is a qualitative and subjective indicator			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Selection of the panel is key – panelists should be very well informed, but have no personal interest in the outcome and no axe to grind. The less partisan the better, but if to the extent this is not possible, the panel should be balanced between more pro- and more anti-government or/and more optimistic and more pessimistic. In order to retain some capacity to compare year-to-year, the panel should focus on a specific set of questions and return to them each year. At all stages panelists should be strongly encouraged to use evidence in support of their arguments.			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: September 2005			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Discussion within the panel.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: September			
Presentation of Data: September			
Review of Data: September			
Reporting of Data: October			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The first meeting of the panel will determine the extent of progress over the previous year. The evidence on which this based sets up a notional baseline for the next year.			
Other Notes:			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2004	4		4 = limited progress
2005	5		5 = satisfactory progress
2006	5		
2007	5		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: June 2004			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Name of Strategic Objective:	
Name of Intermediate Result: IR2: Strengthened mechanisms to promote transparency and accountability	
SubIR2.1: Role of key Government audit institutions strengthened	
Name of Indicator: Number of public accounts audited and reported upon annually by a) <i>Inspection Generale des Finances</i> (IGF) and b) Chamber of Accounts of the Supreme Court (Chamber). A sample of the reports will be reviewed by an independent auditor, and a dialogue will take place with the two audit agencies to ensure quality control. (See below)	
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Number of public accounts audited and reported upon.	
Unit of Measure: Number of reports	
Disaggregated by: In pursuance of the Mission's emphasis a record will be kept of numbers of audits in the Ministries of Health, Education and Finance and the Economy	
<p>Justification & Management Utility: Financial and operational auditing of public accounts is an essential component in enhancing transparency, accountability and efficiency of the use of public funds. Lack of audit capacity has also long been a major weakness in the operation of the GOB. The IGF (for a longer period) and the Chamber (more recently) are both receiving USAID support to enhance their capacity for effective auditing of public accounts. There are problems with the unit of measurement and this was discussed at length with both offices. The most significant are that the size and complexity of accounts vary greatly, the unit does not relate to quality of work and or outcome of the reports. Nevertheless the unit will be used. For a start it has been used for a number of years and enables the Mission to continue tracking progress of coverage. Increasing the number of accounts audited is key to enhanced accountability and the Mission wishes to provide that incentive and measure that progress. (Number, rather than percentage, is used because the universe changes every year). It should be noted that despite lengthy discussions with the most senior personnel of the two agencies, no better unit of measurement was found. The issue of quality will be dealt with in the following manner. Each year an independent auditor will review a random sample of audits to check on quality and fulfillment of all specifications and engage in a dialogue with the two institutions about quality. It should be noted that both IGF and the Chamber have rigorous internal quality controls. Since the IGF and the Chamber carry out their audits in a very different manner and with different purposes, their record will be tracked separately. Further a second indicator is being added to check on take note of follow-up to the audit recommendations.</p>	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID	
Data collection method: IGF and the Chamber both keep records of audits and they will provide the annual totals. See further below on methods of acquisition.	
Data Source: IGF and Chamber of Accounts	

Method of data acquisition by USAID: Two officers from USAID, the CTO for Anti-Corruption and the Financial Analyst, will continue the practice of reviewing audit reports and checking the number. And there will be an annual audit by an independent auditor to check on totals and fulfillment of requirements and quality.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: The two agencies will carry out the initial data gathering as part of their regular reporting. Two members of USAID staff will spend two days each on checking. The only additional cost will be that of auditing and this will be kept relatively small: 4 days work (two on each institution) by a local auditing firm.
Individual responsible at USAID: Bernice Noudegbessi
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: (IGF) and (Chamber)
Location of Data Storage: At IGC and the Chamber of Accounts
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: this has been done for a number of years by two USAID officers. In future an independent auditor will carry out an audit on quality. This will be done in September.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Initial data collection by the agencies being assisted.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: IGF and the Chamber will undertake an internal review of totals and quality. Two USAID officers will peruse the reports to check on totals and fulfillment of essential requirements. An independent auditor will provide a professional assessment of the quality of a sample of the reports.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: September 2005
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: IGF and the Chamber will total the number and check on quality control. USAID's two officers will peruse the reports to check on totals and fulfillment of requirements. An independent auditor will provide a professional assessment of the quality of a sample of the reports. At the end of the independent audit, there will be discussion between the auditor, USAID and the two agencies about the data quality.
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Data Analysis: September
Presentation of Data: September
Review of Data: September
Reporting of Data: October
OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline is available for IGF as well as a number of years of actual achievements. The baseline for the Chamber is While the Mission (in cooperation with the two agencies) takes responsibility for increasing the numbers, the extent of increase will be dependent to a large extent on Government decisions relating to 1) decentralization of resources to local governments and 2) employment of more auditors. If the GOB moves positively on both, the number of accounts audited can increase rapidly. In some years too there may be special circumstances affecting totals; e.g. in election years political parties (of which there are large numbers) are audited as part of an anti-corruption program; and this may affect totals.

Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
IGF			
1999	54 (benchmark)		
2001	109	153	
2002	127	210	
2003	210		
2004	260		
2005	280		
2006			
2007			
Ch/A			
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: June2004

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Name of Strategic Objective:	
Name of Intermediate Result: IR2.1: Strengthened Mechanisms to Promote Transparency and Accountability SubIR2.1.1 Role of primary Government audit agencies enhanced	
Name of Indicator: Evidence of effective responses to audits of <i>Inspecteur Generale de Finances</i> (IGF) and Chamber of Accounts of the Supreme Court (Chamber) (including punitive measures in the case of reported misdemeanors, and improvements in the case of management recommendations)	
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Evidences of effective responses. These include convincing examples of a) reference to the courts for judicial decision and possible punishment in the case of identified misdemeanors, and b) demonstrated improvement in financial and management systems in response to operational recommendations. Evidence does not have to be comprehensive nor quantified. Examples should be selected because of their significance in demonstrating success or otherwise; follow-up on higher level of office or officer or a larger account are more convincing than lower levels and smaller accounts etc. Also an example, which demonstrates a broader trend, will be useful. The example must include information on the follow-up action and information and the stage it has reached.	
Unit of Measure: Evidence of effective responses explained in a very brief narrative, which clarifies the significance.	
Disaggregated by: Follow-up will benefit all sectors of society and the economy. USAID will seek to observe the process in the Ministries of Health and Basic Education, which should have positive outcomes relevant to women and children.	
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator should be read in combination with the first one on ‘number of public accounts.’ The first focuses on quality and quantity of the reports. This one focuses on impact and seeks to answer the question often asked: so what? There a sense among some that follow-up is weak, and therefore the audits serve little purpose. This indicator seeks to sharpen and keep the focus on, and assess the trend, in effective follow-up.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID	
Data collection method: IGF and the Chamber will collect this information through an audit follow-up tracking system	
Data Source: IGF and Chamber records	
Method of data acquisition by USAID: USAID will collect the information from IGF and the Chamber and check on the examples when it reviews the materials and through questions by the independent auditor.	
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Cost of an independent auditor is already included in first indicator.	
Individual responsible at USAID: Bernice Noudegbessi	

Individual responsible for providing data to USAID:			
Location of Data Storage: IGF and the Chamber			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2004			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Data provided by agencies being supported by USAID.			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations : Both agencies have good reputations for careful checking. USAID will check. An independent auditor will confirm. Reports by the media, which in Benin is free and gives a good deal of attention to corruption, will be consulted.			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: September 2005			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The same as above, relying on USAID officers, an independent auditor and dialogue about the issue of quality.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: September			
Presentation of Data: September			
Review of Data: September			
Reporting of Data: September			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The target is 'A few clearly explained, factually based, convincing, brief examples. (A few hundred words should be the maximum)			
Other Notes:			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2004	A few clearly explained, factually based convincing, brief examples		
2005	A few ... examples		
2006	A few ... examples		
2007	A few ... examples		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: June 2004			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Name of Strategic Objective:	
Name of Intermediate Result: IR2: Strengthened mechanisms to promote transparency and accountability SubIR.2.2: Civil Society's anti-corruption role strengthened	
Name of Indicator: Score on anti-corruption legislation and enforcement matrix	
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Score on anti-corruption legislation and enforcement matrix.	
Unit of Measure: Score (hypothetically somewhere between 0 (no progress on any of the issues) & 80 (complete success on all). See accompanying table	
Disaggregated by: Implementation of these principles should benefit all sectors of the society and economy.	
Justification & Management Utility: The Mission recognizes the essential contribution of Civil Society to progress in fighting corruption. The Mission is assisting in a number of ways but its core focus will be on forwarding Civil Society's anti-corruption legislative agenda. This indicator will measure that progress. Whether each will be part of separate bills/laws or not, the following principles form the key components of Civil Society's legislative agenda in its fight against corruption: freedom of information; criminalizing illicit enrichment; protection of 'whistleblowers;' appropriate punishment of those found guilty of corruption; extending the period before a moratorium is applied to those who are being investigated for corruption; and a tri-unit structure to be added to the Public Procurement Verification Committee to more effectively support the work of the Committee in the areas of regulation, execution and protest . The matrix allows for some issues to be more advanced from the outset than others, and for progress on each of the components of the agenda to be different. The scoring does not require linear progress. The matrix seeks to measure overall progress not only in legislation, but also in enforcement where experience has demonstrated that good laws often confront lack of political will or/and administrative capacity.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID	
Data collection method: USAID's CSO partners will report annually on progress providing evidence including media and National Assembly reports to support claims to have completed stages. USAID will monitor newspapers as well. Benin's free press covers these issues.	
Data Source: CSO reports, National Assembly plenary and Commission reports, press reports	
Method of data acquisition by USAID: USAID's CSO partners will provide the updated data with evidence on an annual basis to USAID. USAID will also monitor reports of other CSOs and the media.	
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: No extra cost, The CSOs will provide this as part of their regular reporting process. Perusal of the press will be done by USAID officers.	
Individual responsible at USAID: Bernice Noudegbessi	

Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Responsible CSO officer			
Location of Data Storage: CSO and USAID Anti-Corruption CTO			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2004			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): This is an effective way to measure progress on a legislative agenda. The data should be reliable and are easily checked			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: While the initial data will come from some of the beneficiaries of USAID and will be subjective, they will be required to provide convincing evidence and USAID will peruse reports and the press and itself be required to support its claims			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: September 2005			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: As above			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: September.			
Presentation of Data: September			
Review of Data: September			
Reporting of Data: September			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: easily determined in consultation with a concerned CSO.			
Other Notes: The Mission assumes that CSOs will make progress and takes responsibility for that. However the pace of progress will depend on political developments including the build-up to, and outcome of, the next round of elections in 2006 on other donor and multilateral pressure on GOB, and on intra-CSO cooperation.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2004	X (baseline) baseline & targets need to be determined soon in consultation with CSOs.		
2005	X +		
2006	X+		
2007	X+		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: June 2004			

Anti-Corruption Legislative & Enforcement Matrix (See explanation)

Stages	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 (2 points)	11	12	13	14	15
Legislative agenda															
Freedom of Information															
Protect Whistleblowers															
Punishment of corruption															
End moratorium on prosecution for corruption															
3-part structure for Public Procurement															
Definition & prosecution of Illicit Enrichment															

TOTAL SCORE – CALCULATED ANNUALLY TO ASSESS PROGRESS ON LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

1. Key CSOs research a significant issue & mobilize evidence for their argument
2. Key CSOs develop an advocacy strategy
3. Key CSOs mobilize public opinion/increase public awareness
4. Key CSOs draft advanced form of proposed legislation
5. Key CSOs engage the media (articles, photos, editorials, press releases)
6. Key CSOs informally engage Members of National Assembly
7. NA Commission hearings held on topic/ CSOs have input
8. NA Commission recommends bill to National Assembly
9. National Assembly debates bill
10. National Assembly passes bill (2 points)
11. Executive approves/becomes law
12. Law promulgated and Regulations drafted
13. Administrative & budgeting arrangements (e.g. new agency; additional personnel)
14. Early examples of implementation & enforcement
15. More examples indicating that GOB takes enforcement of the law seriously

For purposes of scoring all steps, with the exception of 10 are worth one point. Step 10 is worth 2.

Note that although in stages 7 through 15 the National Assembly and then the Government become the principal actors, continual advocacy and monitoring by CSOs is required for success.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Name of Strategic Objective:	
Name of Intermediate Result: Mechanisms of transparency and accountability strengthened SubIR 3.2 Role of Government procurement agencies enhanced	
Name of Indicator: Percentage of a) all final procurement decisions and b) total CFA involved in those decisions, made by Ministers each year.	
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of a) all final procurement decisions and b) total CFA involved in those decisions, made by Ministers each year	
Unit of Measure: Percentage of a) decisions and b) CFA	
Disaggregated by: Improvement in the system should benefit all ministries, sectors of society and the economy. Consequent increased competitiveness will benefit the private sector and the cost of government services. The Mission will seek to observe the process in the areas of health and education, the work of which is of particular relevance to women and children.	
Justification & Management Utility: Delays in the procurement process are a major cause of GOB's slow implementation and limited aid absorptive capacity. Lack of transparency is a significant source of, and encourages, corruption. A significant impediment to transparency and accountability and speed of the process, as well as being a reflection of the problem, is the power of ministers to make decisions. As the law stands the procurement agencies have two opportunities to make a determination on a specific bid. If they are unable to do so the decision goes to the Minister. Once that happens the process cease to be transparent and becomes considerably more exposed to corruption. This occurs regularly both because the agencies lack capacity and competence and some ministers intervene prematurely to ensure failure. This indicator will therefore capture an improvement in capacity of the technical agencies and more effective limitation on ministers' powers to intervene.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID	
Data collection method: The Technical Staff of the CNMP maintain records of all GOB procurements. They will calculate the total at the end of the year. This figure will be contained in the Annual Report.	
Data Source: CNMP technical staff in the Ministry of Finance and oversight CNMP Commission	
Method of data acquisition by USAID: USAID staff will be in regular contact with both the Technical Staff of the CNMP and the Commission. They will collect the key data from the Annual Report. Should publication be delayed USAID will get the information directly from CNMP.	
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: The Financial year in Benin coincides with the Calendar year. Therefore this data will be available after December each year. The Mission will collect the data once a year early in the calendar year.	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: There is no additional cost The data is produced by the Technical staff and the data and the quality of work is checked by the Commission.	
Individual responsible at USAID: Bernice Noudegbessi	

Individual responsible for providing data to USAID:			
Location of Data Storage: CNMP headquarters			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: January 2005			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The original data is produced by the entity being assessed.			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: The data and quality of work will be reviewed by an independent oversight agency. USAID is also in regular contact with donors through a donor anti-corruption working group. The validity of the data will be monitored through that forum as well.			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: January 2006			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Confer with the oversight commission and other donors.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: September			
Presentation of Data: September			
Review of Data: September			
Reporting of Data: October			
OTHER NOTES			
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: USAID Officer responsible, Bernice Noudegbessi will be able to get the data from a senior officer who already collects and calculates it. Once the baseline is established she and the officer and the CNMP can make a realistic assessment of targets. The number of cases will reduce as the capacity of the CNMP increases; the pace of reduction will depend on how effectively the reform process will be implemented.</p>			
Other Notes:			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2003	Baseline for a) % of final decisions & b) % of total CFA will be obtained soon from relevant officer in the Ministry of Finance	Baseline set	

2004	Realistic targets for a) % of final decisions & b) % of total CFA will be set once the baseline is established.		
2004			
2005			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: June 2004			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Name of Strategic Objective:	
Name of Intermediate Result: Mechanisms of transparency and accountability strengthened SubIR 3.2 Role of Government procurement agencies enhanced	
Name of Indicator: Annual CFA total of bids completing the procurement process, based on principles of improved procurement system.	
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Total CFA annually	
Unit of Measure: CFA	
Disaggregated by: Improvement in the system should benefit all ministries, sectors of society and the economy. Consequent increased competitiveness will benefit the private sector and the cost of government services. The Mission will seek to observe the process in the areas of health and education, the work of which is of particular relevance to women and children.	
<p>Justification & Management Utility: Delays in the procurement process are a major cause of GOB's slow implementation and limited aid absorptive capacity. Lack of transparency is a significant source of, and encourages, corruption. It is important therefore that there is progress on both fronts. One without the other will not serve the purposes of good governance. In addition, under the new reformed system, GOB will make a commitment to secure funds in advance of any bidding process to guarantee implementation once the procurement process is complete. Therefore the combination of increased efficiency and openness will lead to more effective and accountable implementation. This indicator is partly a measure of enhanced effectiveness and partly a measure of increased openness. Both objectives are important to the proposed GOB procurement reforms and to USAID training and institutional assistance; and they are interrelated. This indicator will therefore provide essential data in monitoring progress. Improved principles include (a final list will be determined after the training is designed in detail): clarity of definitions of services required, effective assessment of bidders' compliance with requirements (including no record of corruption), improved price and cost information and analysis, prevention of conflict of interests, prevention of undue influence, pre-award explanatory meetings, open and fair claims adjudication and appeals. Responsibility for this work is in the hands of Technical Staff (civil servants in the Ministry of Finance, with unit in each of the Ministries) of the <i>Commission Nationales des Marches Publics</i> (CNMP) or Public Procurement Verification Committee. The Commission itself is an autonomous oversight committee made up of members of various Ministries, the private sector (e.g. the Chamber of Commerce, the leading business organization in Benin) and civil society (e.g. FONAC, a leading anti-corruption organization). This body is charged with verifying the procurement process. Its autonomy and the composition and quality of its membership make it an appropriate body to audit the practices of the Technical Staff. Its reports, notably its annual report, will be used to determine the consistency of application of the new standards to all procurement processes.</p>	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID	

Data collection method: The Technical Staff of the CNMP maintain records of all GOB procurements. They will calculate the total at the end of the year. This figure will be contained in the Annual Report. The Oversight Commission will review the quality of the work and present its findings, which will also be included in the Annual Report.
Data Source: CNMP technical staff in the Ministry of Finance and oversight CNMP Commission
Method of data acquisition by USAID: USAID staff will be in regular contact with both the Technical Staff of the CNMP and the Commission. They will collect the key data from the Annual Report. Should publication be delayed USAID will get the information directly from CNMP.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: The Financial year in Benin coincides with the Calendar year. Therefore this data will be available after December each year. The Mission will collect the data once a year early in the calendar year.
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: There is no additional cost The data is produced by the Technical staff and the data and the quality of work is checked by the Commission.
Individual responsible at USAID: Bernice Noudegbessi
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID:
Location of Data Storage: CNMP headquarters
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: January 2005
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The original data is produced by the entity being assessed.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: The data and quality of work will be reviewed by an independent oversight agency. USAID is also in regular contact with donors through a donor anti-corruption working group. The validity of the data will monitored through that forum as well.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: January 2006
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Confer with the oversight commission and other donors.
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Data Analysis: September
Presentation of Data: September
Review of Data: September
Reporting of Data: October
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: At present the Technical staff of CNMP is unable to calculate the CFA total of bids it deals with. It will be evidence of improvement of management of CNMP that it can reliably calculate a total CFA amount at the end of this year. That is a target in itself for the first year. The baseline which will be for 2004 will therefore be established at the start of 2005. To be meaningful/realistic targets should only be set once this figure is computed. This will be done in discussion with the CNMP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2004	CFA total Baseline will be set	Baseline set	
2005	Realistic targets can only be set once the baseline is established. This will be done as soon as the 2004 data are in.		
2006			
2007			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: June 2004			