



## Strategic Goal 7: Democracy and Human Rights

Advance the Growth of Democracy and Good Governance, Including Civil Society, the Rule of Law, Respect for Human Rights, and Religious Freedom

### I. Public Benefit

The United States recognizes the vital importance of democracy, human rights, and good governance to global security, prosperity, and freedom. Competitive political institutions, transparent democratic practices, and civic activism are strengthened when the rule of law and protection of universally-accepted standards of human rights are upheld. America's experience affirms our conviction that all people can live and prosper in peace when guided by a commitment to freedom and democracy. Increasing democracy, human rights, and good governance ensures a more peaceful world that is a great benefit to the United States and its citizens.

Protecting human rights and promoting democracy is a cornerstone of a U.S. foreign policy that seeks to end oppression, combat terrorism, and advocate democratic ideals and freedoms worldwide. Throughout his tenure, President Bush has articulated his vision of a world where freedom reigns, most clearly in his 2005 inaugural address: "It is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world."

We seek opportunities to encourage and support human rights advocates and policy makers in countries that routinely ignore international human rights. This principle guides our decisions about international cooperation, the character of our foreign assistance, the allocation of resources, and our actions in international fora. The United States will stand beside any nation determined to build a better future by seeking the rewards of liberty for its people.

Institutionalizing democracy, human rights, and good governance is the focus of USAID programs in approximately 80 priority developing countries. With over 400 democracy officers worldwide, USAID works on the frontlines of democracy promotion to encourage the transition to, and consolidation of, democracy throughout the world. These officers are complemented by more than 150 human rights officers at U.S. embassies who advocate change, monitor, and report on the state of democracy and human rights practices, and call attention to human rights abuses and violations. Additionally, the Human Rights and Democracy Fund supports time sensitive, high impact programs promoting democratic change in more than thirty priority countries.

While the U.S. plays a leading role to promote democracy and human rights, the Department and USAID recognize that they are not uniquely American values. Democratization must ultimately be a process driven by a society's citizens. Toward that end, the Department and USAID work to ensure that democratic reforms reflect a representative political process.

### II. Resource Summary (\$ in Thousands)

	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Estimate	FY 2007 Request	Change from FY 2006	
				Amount	%
Staff <sup>1</sup>	827	815	822	7	0.9%
Funds <sup>2</sup>	\$2,233,207	\$2,031,633	\$2,144,303	\$112,670	5.5%

Note (1): Department of State direct-funded positions.

Note (2): Funds include both Department of State Appropriations Act Resources and Foreign Operations Resources, where applicable.



### III. Strategic Goal Context

Shown below are the performance goals, initiatives/programs, and the resources, bureaus and partners that contribute to accomplishment of the Democracy and Human Rights strategic goal. Acronyms are defined in the glossary at the back of this publication.

Strategic Goal	Performance Goal (Short Title)	Initiative/Program	Major Resources	Lead Bureau(s)	Partners
Democracy and Human Rights	Democratic Systems and Practices	Global Democratic Reform	FSA, SEED, ACI, DA, D&CP, ESF, CIO, IO&P	DRL, Regional Bureaus DCHA/DG, AFR	DoD, DOJ, NGOs, UN, other international organizations
		Support of Democracy in Strategic Countries	D&CP, ESF, DA, FSA, SEED	DRL, Regional Bureaus, DCHA	DOJ, NGOs
		Support of Women's Political Participation in Priority Countries	D&CP, ESF, DA	DRL, G/IWI, IO, Regional Bureaus DCHA, AFR	NGOs
		Southeast European and Eurasian Democracy	FSA, SEED	EUR, EE	BBG, DOC, DHS, DOE, DOJ, EPA, NRC, NSF, Treasury, USDA, USTDA, NGOs, other international organizations, foreign governments
		Economic Support Fund (ESF) - Western Hemisphere Affairs	D&CP, ESF	WHA	DEA, DoD
	Universal Human Rights Standards	Multilateral Diplomacy	CIO, D&CP, IO&P	DRL, IO	UN, other international organizations, NGOs
		Protect Religious Freedom	D&CP	DRL	NGOs, other international organizations
		Labor Diplomacy and Advocacy for Workers' Rights	CIO, DA, D&CP, ESF	DRL, DCHA/DG	DOL, USTR, OPIC, DOC, NGOs, IFIs, ILO, other international organizations



## IV. Performance Summary

For each initiative/program that supports accomplishment of this strategic goal, the most critical FY 2007 performance indicators and targets are shown below.

Annual Performance Goal #1	
DE.01 MEASURES ADOPTED TO DEVELOP TRANSPARENT AND ACCOUNTABLE DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS, LAWS, AND ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL PROCESSES AND PRACTICES.	

I/P #1: Global Democratic Reform	
Work with countries that are reforming government systems to create more democratic institutions and transparent political, economic, and legal processes, through bilateral engagement, multilateral mechanisms, and non-governmental (NGO) channels.	



### Outcome Indicator

#### Indicator #1: Strength of Local Governance in Nations Where USAID Assists the National Government

TARGETS	FY 2007	75% of USAID-assisted national governments devolving authorities to local governments with the corresponding access to financial resources.
	FY 2006	70% of USAID-assisted national governments devolving authorities to local governments with the corresponding access to financial resources.
RESULTS	2005	50% of USAID-assisted national governments devolved authorities to local governments with the corresponding access to financial resources.
	2004	Baselines: 1. 65% of USAID-assisted national governments devolved authorities to local governments with the corresponding access to financial resources. 2. Change in local government resources after USAID assistance.
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
DATA QUALITY	Indicator Validation	Without access to financial resources, local governments will be unable to respond to local citizen concerns or to provide adequate services. Strong local governments, on the other hand, support democratic practices and participation as local citizens see the benefits of being able to influence local government decision-making and receive needed services. The indicator above has been respecified. Therefore, 2004 baseline data do not reflect the current indicator and should be re-evaluated.
	Data Source	USAID annual reports from operating units. Index was developed based on the World Bank report, Governance Matters III: Governance Indicators for 1996-2002 by Daniel Kaufmann, Aart Kraay, and Massimo Mastruzzi, June 30, 2003. The data and a web-based graphical interface are available at <a href="http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/pubs/govmatters4.html">www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/pubs/govmatters4.html</a>



 <b>Outcome Indicator</b>		
<b>Indicator #2: Extent to Which Legal Systems Support Democratic Processes and Uphold Human Rights in Areas with USAID-sponsored Mediation Centers and Justice Centers</b>		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	1. Number of USAID-sponsored mediation centers (114) and justice centers (59) in target areas 2. Average pre-trial detention in days: 92.5
	FY 2006	1. Number of USAID-sponsored mediation centers (109) and justice centers (56) in target areas. 2. Average pre-trial detention in days: 141
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	1. Average number of days to process a case: 224 2. Number of USAID-sponsored mediation centers (108) and justice centers (49) in target areas. 3. Average pre-trial detention in days: 128
	2004	<u>Baselines:</u> 1. Average total time it took to process a legal case before USAID assistance was 661.2 days. After USAID assistance began in 2004, the average number of days dropped to 244.3. 2. Number of USAID-sponsored mediation centers (88) and justice centers (47) in target areas. 3. Average pre-trial detention prior to USAID assistance: 479.25 days. After USAID assistance began in 2004, the average pre-trial detention was 143 days.
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	This indicator measures the efficiency and effectiveness of the judicial system to establish justice and resolve disputes. Citizens have access to justice when they have effective mechanisms available to them to prevent the abuse of their rights, obtain remedies when their rights are abused, and to manage conflict peacefully.
	Data Source	USAID annual reports from operating units.



 <b>Output Indicator</b>		
Indicator #3: Number of People Trained by USAID in Anti-Corruption Practices		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	15,895
	FY 2006	29,333
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	33,263
	2004	<u>Baselines</u> : 55,172
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	Corruption is defined as the misuse of public position for direct or indirect personal gain. Strengthening existing institutional mechanisms to encourage ethical behavior and prevent corruption and abuse is important, including checks on formal state actors such as civil service reform (i.e., restructuring incentives and punishments), limits on civil servants' discretion, strengthened audits and investigative functions, more effective internal procedures for enhanced oversight, improved operating systems in government institutions, and building a public constituency against corruption.
	Data Source	USAID annual reports from operating units.

 <b>Output Indicator</b>		
Indicator #4: Human Rights and Democracy Fund Programs Receive Alternative Donor Support (non-USG funds) (PART)		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	20% of programs administered by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) in countries where other donors have active democracy engagement receive alternative donor support, or conclude having fulfilled project goals.
	FY 2006	15% of DRL-administered programs in countries where other donors have active democracy engagement receive alternative donor support, or conclude successfully.
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	<u>Baseline</u> : 10% of DRL-administered programs in countries where other donors have active democracy engagement receive alternative donor support, or conclude having fulfilled project goals.
	2004	N/A
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	DRL will analyze why alternative donors decided to provide support to DRL start-up democracy projects. DRL expects that as programs demonstrate success and viability, alternative donors will be more likely to invest and support these projects long-term or replicate similar projects in repressive regimes.
	Data Source	Human Rights and Democracy Fund grantee reports.



 <span style="font-size: 1.2em; color: purple;">Outcome Indicator</span> 		
Indicator #5: Freedom House Index of Freedom in the World		
TARGETS	FY 2007	<u>Freedom House 2007 Report</u> Net Progress: + change from previous year Net Change in Status: + change from previous year
	FY 2006	<u>Freedom House 2006 Report</u> Net Progress: + change from previous year Net Change in Status: + change from previous year
RESULTS	2005	<u>Freedom House 2005 Report</u> Free: 89 Partly Free: 54 Not Free: 49 Net Change: +1 Free
	2004	<u>Freedom House 2004 Report</u> Free: 88 Partly Free: 55 Not Free: 49 Net Change: -1
	2003	<u>Freedom House 2003 Report</u> Free: 89 Partly Free: 55 Not Free: 48 Net Change: +4
	2002	<u>Freedom House 2002 Report</u> Free: 85 Partly Free: 59 Not Free: 48 Net change: -1
DATA QUALITY	Indicator Validation	Freedom House's yearly Freedom Status rating provides an objective analysis of basic freedoms in 192 countries and 14 related and disputed territories. A positive change in status indicates progress toward the Department of State and USAID's freedom goals.
	Data Source	Freedom House "Freedom in the World" annual survey.



I/P #2: Support of Democracy in Strategic Countries		
Promote democratic institutions and transparent political, economic, and legal processes, in strategic countries.		
	<b>Outcome Indicator</b>	
<b>Indicator #1: Progress Toward Civil and Political Freedom in Sub-Saharan Africa</b>		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	<p><u>Freedom House Political Rights and Civil Liberties Scores</u>            Political rights and civil liberties in each of the eleven priority countries is scored on a scale of 1-7, with 1 representing the highest and 7 representing the lowest level of freedom. (See "Data Source" below for a complete list of priority countries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 59 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 5.36</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 54 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 4.91</li> </ul>
	FY 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 61 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 5.55</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 56 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 5.09</li> </ul>
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	<p><u>Baseline:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 63 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 5.73</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 58 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 5.27</li> </ul>
	2004	N/A
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	Freedom House ratings provide an objective yearly analysis of basic freedoms in each of our priority countries. A decrease in the total and average scores indicate regional progress toward the Department of State and USAID's freedom goals for identified strategic countries.
	Data Source	Freedom House. The total and average annual Freedom House "civil liberty" and "political rights" ratings for Angola, Burundi, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Guinea, Liberia, Mauritania, Nigeria, Sudan, and Zimbabwe.



 <b>Outcome Indicator</b> 		
Indicator #2: Progress Toward Civil and Political Freedom in East Asia and the Pacific		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	<p><u>Freedom House Political Rights and Civil Liberties Scores</u> Political rights and civil liberties in each of the nine priority countries is scored on a scale of 1-7, with 1 representing the highest and 7 representing the lowest level of freedom. (See "Data Source" below for a complete list of priority countries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 41 out of 63</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 4.56</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 41 out of 63</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 4.56</li> </ul>
	FY 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 43 out of 63</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 4.78</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 43 out of 63</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 4.78</li> </ul>
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	<p><u>Baseline:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 44 out of 63</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 4.89</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 44 out of 63</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 4.89</li> </ul>
	2004	N/A
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	Freedom House ratings provide an objective yearly analysis of basic freedoms in each of our priority countries. A decrease in the total and average scores indicate regional progress toward the Department of State and USAID's freedom goals for identified strategic countries.
	Data Source	Freedom House. The total and average annual Freedom House "civil liberty" and "political rights" ratings for Burma, Cambodia, China, East Timor, Indonesia, North Korea, Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam.



 <span style="font-size: 1.2em; color: purple;">Outcome Indicator</span> 		
Indicator #3: Progress Toward Civil and Political Freedom in Eurasia		
TARGETS	FY 2007	<p><u>Freedom House Political Rights and Civil Liberties Scores</u>            Political rights and civil liberties in each of the seventeen priority countries and entities is scored on a scale of 1-7, with 1 representing the highest and 7 representing the lowest level of freedom. (See "Data Source" below for a complete list of priority countries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 79 out of 119</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 4.65</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 69 out of 119</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 4.06</li> </ul>
	FY 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 82 out of 119</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 4.82</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 72 out of 119</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 4.24</li> </ul>
RESULTS	2005	<p><u>Baseline:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 85 out of 119</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 5.00</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 75 out of 119</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 4.41</li> </ul>
	2004	N/A
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
DATA QUALITY	Indicator Validation	Freedom House ratings provide an objective yearly analysis of basic freedoms in each of our priority countries. A decrease in the total and average scores indicate regional progress toward the Department of State and USAID's freedom goals for identified strategic countries.
	Data Source	Freedom House. The total and average annual Freedom House "civil liberty" and "political rights" ratings for Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Serbia/Montenegro, Ukraine, Armenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Albania, Bosnia, Macedonia, and Uzbekistan.



 <span style="font-size: 1.2em; color: purple;">Outcome Indicator</span> 		
Indicator #4: Progress Toward Civil and Political Freedom in the Western Hemisphere		
TARGETS	FY 2007	<p><u>Freedom House Political Rights and Civil Liberties Scores</u>            Political rights and civil liberties in each of the four priority countries is scored on a scale of 1-7, with 1 representing the highest and 7 representing the lowest level of freedom. (See "Data Source" below for a complete list of priority countries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total Political Rights 15 out of 28</li> <li>Average Political Rights 3.75</li> <li>Total Civil Liberties 16 out of 28</li> <li>Average Civil Liberties 4.00</li> </ul>
	FY 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total Political Rights 16 out of 28</li> <li>Average Political Rights 4.00</li> <li>Total Civil Liberties 17 out of 28</li> <li>Average Civil Liberties 4.25</li> </ul>
RESULTS	2005	<p><u>Baseline:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total Political Rights 16 out of 28</li> <li>Average Political Rights 4.00</li> <li>Total Civil Liberties 17 out of 28</li> <li>Average Civil Liberties 4.25</li> </ul>
	2004	N/A
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
DATA QUALITY	Indicator Validation	Freedom House ratings provide an objective yearly analysis of basic freedoms in each of our priority countries. A decrease in the total and average scores indicate regional progress toward the Department of State and USAID's freedom goals for identified strategic countries.
	Data Source	Freedom House. The total and average annual Freedom House "civil liberty" and "political rights" ratings for Bolivia, Cuba, Nicaragua, and Venezuela.



 <span style="font-size: 1.2em; color: purple;">Outcome Indicator</span> 		
Indicator #5: Progress Toward Civil and Political Freedom in South Asia		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	<p>Freedom House Political Rights and Civil Liberties Scores</p> <p>Political rights and civil liberties in each of the four priority countries is scored on a scale of 1-7, with 1 representing the highest and 7 representing the lowest level of freedom. (See "Data Source" below for a complete list of priority countries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total Political Rights 19 out of 28</li> <li>Average Political Rights 4.75</li> <li>Total Civil Liberties 19 out of 28</li> <li>Average Civil Liberties 4.75</li> </ul>
	FY 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total Political Rights 20 out of 28</li> <li>Average Political Rights 5.00</li> <li>Total Civil Liberties 20 out of 28</li> <li>Average Civil Liberties 5.00</li> </ul>
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	<p>Baseline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total Political Rights 20 out of 28</li> <li>Average Political Rights 5.00</li> <li>Total Civil Liberties 20 out of 28</li> <li>Average Civil Liberties 5.00</li> </ul>
	2004	N/A
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	Freedom House ratings provide an objective yearly analysis of basic freedoms in each of our priority countries. A decrease in the total and average scores indicate regional progress toward the Department of State and USAID's freedom goals for identified strategic countries.
	Data Source	Freedom House. The total and average annual Freedom House "civil liberty" and "political rights" ratings for Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, and Pakistan.



		Outcome Indicator
<b>Indicator #6: Progress Toward Civil and Political Freedom in the Middle East</b>		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	<p><u>Freedom House Political Rights and Civil Liberties Scores:</u> Political rights and civil liberties in each of the democracy strategy focus countries/territories is scored on a scale of 1-7, with 1 representing the highest and 7 representing the lowest level of freedom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 59.5 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 5.41</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 56 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 5.09</li> </ul> <p><u>Degree to Which Democratic Civilian Rule and Political Freedom is Established and Maintained in the Middle East:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elections are free, fair and competitive:</li> <li>• Parliamentary in Jordan;</li> <li>• Legislative elections in Morocco;</li> <li>• Parliamentary elections in Algeria;</li> <li>• Parliamentary elections in Bahrain;</li> <li>• Elections for Majlis al-Shura in Oman;</li> <li>• Elections for one half of the seats in regional councils in Saudi Arabia;</li> <li>• National Assembly elections in Kuwait.</li> </ul>
	FY 2006	<p><u>Freedom House Political Rights and Civil Liberties Scores:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 61.5 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 5.59</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 58 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 5.27</li> </ul> <p><u>Degree to Which Democratic Civilian Rule and Political Freedom is Established and Maintained in the Middle East:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elections are free, fair and competitive:</li> <li>• Municipal and Presidential elections in Yemen;</li> <li>• Parliamentary elections in Egypt;</li> <li>• Legislative elections in Qatar;</li> <li>• Elections in Bahrain held as scheduled and are free and fair;</li> <li>• Municipal council elections in Bahrain are deemed free and fair.</li> </ul>
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	<p><u>Baseline Year for Freedom House Political Rights and Civil Liberties Scores:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Political Rights 63.5 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Political Rights 5.77</li> <li>• Total Civil Liberties 60 out of 77</li> <li>• Average Civil Liberties 5.45</li> </ul> <p><u>Degree to Which Democratic Civilian Rule and Political Freedom is Established and Maintained in the Middle East:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elections that were scheduled to date have occurred and were free, fair and competitive. Free and fair elections also occurred in Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia held its first municipal elections and elections are now scheduled in additional municipalities. Many other countries have scheduled elections.</li> </ul>
	2004	<p><u>Freedom House: N/A</u> <u>Elections are Free, Fair and Competitive</u> Presidential elections in Tunisia were held but were not contested. All other elections occurred and according to international observers were deemed to be free and fair. Constitutional referendum held in Qatar.</p>



	2003	<p>Freedom House: N/A</p> <p><u>Elections are Free, Fair and Competitive</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Free and fair elections to be held:</li> <li>• National elections in Bahrain.</li> <li>• National elections in Yemen.</li> <li>• Parliamentary elections in Jordan.</li> <li>• National Assembly elections in Kuwait.</li> <li>• Consultative Assembly elections in Oman.</li> <li>• Municipal elections in Morocco.</li> <li>• Municipal elections in Qatar.</li> </ul>
	2002	<p>Freedom House: N/A</p> <p><u>Elections are Free, Fair and Competitive</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Algeria and Morocco - Parliamentary elections held as scheduled; mixed results for freedom and fairness but making progress.</li> <li>• Egypt - Local council elections held as scheduled; appeared free and fair but not politically significant.</li> <li>• Significant increase in women candidates elected in Morocco.</li> </ul>
DATA QUALITY	Indicator Validation	Freedom House ratings provide an objective yearly analysis of basic freedoms in each of our priority countries. A decrease in the total and average scores indicates regional progress toward the Department of State and USAID's freedom goals for identified democracy strategy focus countries.
	Data Source	Freedom House. U.S. Embassy reports. International Republican Institute (IRI). National Democratic Institute (NDI).

 <h3 style="color: purple;">Outcome Indicator</h3> 		
<b>Indicator #7: Progress Toward Constitutional Democracy in Afghanistan</b>		
<b>TARGETS</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Parliament demonstrates increased capacity to set a legislative agenda and generate laws, while managing debate and deliberation on key issues between different political groups/factions.</li> <li>2. National and local governments act in accordance with the constitution. Officials are paid on time. Customs revenue is remitted to Kabul in a timely manner. Anti-corruption commission begins to address corruption within the government by holding government officials complicit in corruption accountable.</li> <li>3. Human rights awareness, especially of the rights of women, is more widespread as indicated by fewer number of violations taking place. New violators are charged and convicted of crimes or human rights abuses, past violators treated in accordance with Government of Afghanistan (GOA) transitional justice plan.</li> </ol>
	<b>FY 2006</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Parliament produces constructive legislation, approves responsible budgets, and oversees appropriate government operations, such as combating corruption and narcotics activity.</li> <li>2. Civil liberties provisions remain intact and receive strong support from legal and executive institutions.</li> <li>3. Citizens throughout the country have access to the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission for resolution of human rights complaints. Human rights education becomes part of primary school education curriculum.</li> <li>4. Courts in Kabul begin to hold trials in criminal cases. Justice sector staff in the provinces undergo training on justice sector legal environment.</li> <li>5. Women are active political participants and hold public positions in Kabul and the central, regional and provincial government levels.</li> </ol>



<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Presidential elections held in October 2004. More than 10 million Afghans registered and 8 million participated in the election, 40 percent of whom were women.</li> <li>2. President announced a reform-oriented and politically and ethnically balanced cabinet.</li> <li>3. Provincial Council and National Assembly elections held in September 18, 2005; Provincial and National Assemblies inaugurated in November and December 2005, with successful application of internal rules by provincial councils to elect members of national upper house and rules similarly observed at national houses' level to select Parliamentary officers.</li> <li>4. Two women are Cabinet Ministers (Minister of Women's Affairs and Minister of Martyrs and Disabled); first female governor appointed (Bamiyan).</li> <li>5. 1.69 million new voters registered for upcoming parliamentary elections.</li> <li>6. USAID constructed 27 judicial facilities across 12 provinces; trained 579 judges, over half of the Afghan judiciary, in a series of formal training programs; and codified, compiled, printed and disseminated 1,000 copies of Afghanistan's basic laws in Dari and Pashto in all 34 provinces for the first time ever.</li> </ol>
	2004	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Constitutional Loya Jirga adopts moderate, democratic constitution on January 4, 2004, with human rights provisions. Over 100 of the 500 delegates were women.</li> <li>2. Of the over 9 million voters registrations recorded by August 40% were women.</li> <li>3. Joint Election Management Board (JEMB) established to oversee registration and voting.</li> <li>4. Political Party Law and Elections Law passed.</li> <li>5. On July 29, 23 candidates announce bids for presidency; 18 of which were accepted by the JEMB.</li> <li>6. Presidential elections not held until October 2004.</li> </ol>
	2003	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Constitutional Commission is established and drafts new Constitution.</li> <li>2. Public consultations held in preparation for Constitutional Loya Jirga.</li> <li>3. Human Rights and Judicial Commissions begin to address serious problems (ethnic abuses, women's rights violations, rule of law, war crimes/ethnic killings), and identify priority objectives.</li> <li>4. Islamic Transitional Government of Afghanistan begins to develop rules and procedures for the elections in 2004, seeks countrywide consensus.</li> <li>5. The form and composition of a parliamentary body are addressed.</li> <li>6. Electoral commission is established. Voter registration begins.</li> <li>7. Afghan Conservation Corps is established to provide income to Afghan returnees, fostering community-based efforts to promote sound land and water management.</li> </ol>
	2002	<p><u>Baseline (FY 2002):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bonn Accord signed December 5, 2001.</li> <li>2. Afghan Interim Authority (AIA) takes office on December 22, 2001 per the Accord. AIA begins process of planning the Emergency Loya Jirga (ELJ).</li> <li>3. ELJ successfully held in June, Afghan Transitional Authority (ATA) formed (renamed Transitional Islamic State of Afghanistan (TISA) summer 2002). ELJ most broadly representative assembly in Afghan history.</li> <li>4. Human Rights, Judicial and Constitutional Commissions formed as per the Bonn Accords.</li> <li>5. ELJ peacefully elects a president.</li> <li>6. No recognized constitution exists.</li> <li>7. The Bonn Agreement reinstates the 1964 Constitution, except the monarchy provisions.</li> </ol>
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	Achieving progress towards meeting political objectives laid out in the Bonn Accord will effectively establish democratic rule in Afghanistan.
	Data Source	Joint Elections Management Board website; American Foreign Service Association (AFSA) report; UN and NGO human rights reports; U.S. Department of State, USAID and U.S. Embassy reports.



Outcome Indicator		
Indicator #8: Iraqi Development of a Consolidated Democracy		
TARGETS	FY 2007	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Civil liberties provisions remain intact and receive strong support from legal and executive institutions.</li> <li>2. New government encourages policies delineating national vs. local responsibilities.</li> <li>3. The legislature provides real oversight of key government functions, including budgeting and security policies.</li> <li>4. Iraqi non-governmental organizations (NGOs) begin to lobby the legislative and executive branches as well as local governments.</li> </ol>
	FY 2006	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The draft permanent constitution is successfully adopted in October 2005 referendum.</li> <li>2. Law enforcement institutions begin to enforce and the judiciary begins to uphold civil liberties protections in the new constitution.</li> <li>3. Successful October 2005 constitutional referendum.</li> <li>4. Political parties announce coalitions and register for December elections, offering voters real choices. Parties and coalitions campaign peacefully.</li> <li>5. December 2005 elections successfully held. Results of elections receive broad public support.</li> <li>6. Newly elected government takes power peacefully in early 2006 with broad domestic and international legitimacy and support.</li> </ol>
RESULTS	2005	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transitional government took power peacefully with broad domestic and international legitimacy.</li> <li>2. National Assembly established constitutional drafting committee/commission.</li> <li>3. Independent Election Commission of Iraq (IECI) establishes offices in all 18 governorates, organizes constitutional referendum and national elections for a permanent government under the new constitution. Voter registration begins.</li> </ol>
	2004	<p><u>Baseline:</u> The Transitional Administrative Law (TAL) serves as the de facto constitution. No open and fair elections for over fifty years. Election laws adopted and IECI established. Institutional capacity weak.</p>
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
DATA QUALITY	Indicator Validation	This indicator seeks to measure progress in Iraq toward a free and democratic society, one of U.S. foreign policy's highest priority goals.
	Data Source	Embassy reporting.



I/P #3: Support of Women's Political Participation in Priority Countries		
Democracies cannot exist or survive without the full participation of all of their members, including women. This initiative advances opportunities for women in key countries to participate in all aspects of political life.		
<b>Outcome Indicator</b>		
<b>Indicator #1: Level of Women's Political Participation in Iraq</b>		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Iraqi Women's Gift Fund supports political and advocacy training of women, increase capacity of existing Women's Centers, and establish 5 new Centers.</li> <li>2. Women participate at senior levels in all political parties; and are appointed judges in Iraqi courts.</li> <li>3. Women achieve and maintain 25% representation in National Assembly and play major roles in other political leadership positions.</li> <li>4. Iraqi women form civil society associations and participate in political arena.</li> <li>5. Initiative grantees form sister city partnerships with American universities, exchanging information, resources, students, and faculty.</li> </ol>
	FY 2006	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Iraqi women participate in writing of new laws that spell out and implement the new Constitution and preserve a tolerant personal status code for women.</li> <li>2. Women's Leadership Institute established by grantee as a training and resource center for Iraqi women to continue to produce outstanding women leaders.</li> <li>3. Women participate actively in October Constitutional referendum and December parliamentary elections.</li> <li>4. At least 10 women from 2005 political training program sponsored by an Initiative grantee are candidates for new Council of Representatives; women fill 25% of seats in legislative assembly.</li> <li>5. Initiative provides training to staff of Ministry for Women's Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Ministry of Human Rights, strengthening diplomatic ties and building capacity of Ministries.</li> </ol>
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Six women appointed to Cabinet in April 2005.</li> <li>2. Reported 67% of women voted.</li> <li>3. 87 women elected to Transitional National Assembly (TNA); women make up 33% of body, surpassing target of 25%; at least 25 women in TNA were trained under Initiative grants.</li> <li>4. Initiative grantees establish Women's Centers of varying size and capacity. Centers provided programs in education, governance issues, and computers.</li> <li>5. Responding to Iraqi legal scholars and women's rights leaders, the U.S. House and Senate approved resolutions (H. Res 383/S. Res. 231) encouraging National Assembly to adopt a constitution granting women equal rights under the law.</li> </ol>
	2004	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. \$10 million Iraqi Women's Democracy Initiative began disbursing 7 grants for training Iraqi women in political leadership, communications, and coalition-building skills.</li> <li>2. Worked with DOD, USAID, and Congressional Iraqi Women's Caucus to develop and implement initiative for 8-day training for Iraqi women political activists.</li> <li>3. 6 women named to interim Iraqi Cabinet in May 2004 and 7 women to deputy minister positions.</li> <li>4. The Transitional Administrative Law established equality for men and women.</li> </ol>
	2003	Iraq in conflict. Women's rights not protected.
	2002	N/A
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	Women's participation in key issue areas is an indication of women's ability to assert their rights and interests. The number of women in political office, positions of leadership in political parties, and other decision making positions indicates the emerging ability and willingness of women to participate in political processes.
	Data Source	Embassy reporting.



		<b>Outcome Indicator</b>
<b>Indicator #2: Level of Women's Political Participation in Afghanistan</b>		
<b>TARGETS</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. U.S.-Afghan Women's Council (USAWC) adds new partnerships from among foundations, businesses, universities, and professional associations.</li> <li>2. Afghan women are placed in non-traditional ministerial, deputy ministerial, and other policy level positions (such as Foreign Affairs, Justice, Interior, and Finance).</li> <li>3. Afghan women secure positions as ambassadors, diplomats, judges, and members of the Judicial Commission.</li> <li>4. Levels of female enrollment in schools and the workforce increase.</li> </ol>
	<b>FY 2006</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Women's Resource Centers take on outreach role for newly elected female representatives and to bring educational and civic services to local women.</li> <li>2. Women establish professional associations and develop advocacy skills on public policy issues.</li> </ol>
<b>RESULTS</b>	<b>2005</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fall elections yield 25% female representation in the Lower House. Many of these were directly elected by their constituents, rather than appointed to fill the quota.</li> <li>2. 3 women appointed to cabinet positions, one woman to a sub-cabinet position, and 1 woman named provincial governor, the first in Afghanistan's history.</li> <li>3. The USAWC, through Afghan Women Leaders Connect, provided computer equipment to Women's Resource Centers and judges.</li> <li>4. USAWC, through Afghan Women Leaders Connect, provided funding for human rights awareness training to secondary school girls.</li> <li>5. USAWC meeting held in Kabul, with the participation of the First Lady.</li> <li>6. 15 of 17 Women's Resource Centers are completed.</li> </ol>
	<b>2004</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Women constituted 102 of the 500 members of Constitutional Loya Jirga.</li> <li>2. 2004 Constitution provided for equality of all persons.</li> <li>3. Women were 41% of all registered voters in October 2004 elections.</li> <li>4. One woman campaigned for president (parliamentary elections postponed to 2005).</li> <li>5. Funding for Afghan Women's Judges Association legal literacy project for high school girls secured from INL.</li> <li>6. USAWC partner provides partial funding (with INL) for training 4 Afghan women judges. Training provided by the International Association of Women Judges in June 2004.</li> <li>7. Report to U.S. Congress submitted.</li> <li>8. U.S.-Afghan Women's Council meets in June 2004 (Washington) and February 2004 (Kabul).</li> <li>9. USAWC establishes Health Committee to create public/private partnerships for tackling key health issues for women and girls.</li> </ol>
	<b>2003</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. USAWC began giving grants to NGOs for political participation, microfinance, job skills training, literacy, and other educational programs in Women's Resource Centers.</li> <li>2. Begin plans for women's dorm and Women's Teacher Training Institution and Literacy Initiative with involvement of First Lady. Post Conflict: "Big Idea" Mentoring Initiative began with Afghanistan; 25-30 Afghan women leaders begin 1-2 activities.</li> </ol>
	<b>2002</b>	<p>USG starts program to support inclusion of women in Afghan government; 14 Afghan women government officials come to U.S. for job skills and computer training programs. Presidents Bush and Karzai decree creation of U.S.-Afghan Women's Council.</p>
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	<b>Indicator Validation</b>	The increased enrollment of women in the workforce and schools, appointment and election of women to political office, the presence of women in positions of leadership in political parties, and their work on legal reform initiatives are indicative of Afghan women's increasing ability and capacity to participate in the political arena. The number of women in political office indicates the emerging ability and willingness of women to participate in political processes.
	<b>Data Source</b>	Embassy reporting, U.S.-Afghan Women's Council



 <b>Outcome Indicator</b> 		
Indicator #3: Level of Women's Political Participation in Sudan		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	Increased education of and advocacy for women by NGO's, as well as participation of Sudanese women in civil society initiatives as measured by increase in number of women's NGOs, women membership in or affiliation with NGOs and number of NGO activities over the previous year.
	FY 2006	Increased education of and advocacy for women by NGO's, as well as participation of Sudanese women in civil society initiatives as measured by increase in number of women's NGOs, women membership in or affiliation with NGOs and number of NGO activities over the previous year.
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	<u>Baseline:</u> In FY 2005, Sudanese women's participation in civil society was severely limited and no women were permitted to vote or run for office. NGO programming geared specifically toward women was limited to programs that aimed to reduce sexual violence and treat victims of trauma.
	2004	N/A
	2003	N/A
	2002	N/A
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	Increased prominence of NGO education of and advocacy for women in the body politic of Sudan, as well as women's participation in Sudan's political activities are indicators of their emerging rights and improving status.
	Data Source	Cables from U.S. Missions, Embassies, and Offices, as well as the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.



I/P #4: Southeast European and Eurasian Democracy		
Ensure that countries in Europe and Eurasia are on an irreversible path to democracy and market-oriented economies.		
 <b>Outcome Indicator</b> 		
<b>Indicator #1: Monitoring Country Progress Democracy Index (PART)</b>		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	<p>Progress toward democracy and a market-oriented economy in countries that receive Support to Eastern European Democracy (SEED) and Freedom Support Act (FSA) funding is scored on a scale of 1-5, with 5 representing the highest and 1 representing the lowest level of progress. (See "Data Source" below for a complete list of 2005 SEED and FSA countries).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEED MCP Index scores: 3.4 out of 5- Croatia and Bulgaria still included for trend purposes and Kosovo added for the first time. Last year of assistance to Romania; 7-8 years away from phase-out for all others.</li> <li>FSA MCP Index scores: 2.3 out of 5- Some progress in development of democratic institutions and practices.</li> </ol>
	FY 2006	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEED MCP Index scores 3.3 out of 5. Phase-out assistance in democracy to Croatia and Bulgaria; close to phase-out for Romania.</li> <li>FSA MCP Index scores 2.3 out of 5. Some progress in development of democratic institutions and practices. Phase out of democracy assistance for most countries 10 years or more away.</li> </ol>
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEED MCP Index scores 3.12 out of 5. Does not include graduated countries.</li> <li>FSA MCP Index scores 1.84 out of 5. Backsliding in Russia and Belarus account for a significant portion of the drop in this score.</li> </ol>
	2004	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEED MCP Index 3.05 out of 5. Although there was progress in all SEED countries except Croatia and Serbia-Montenegro, it was more modest than expected.</li> <li>FSA MCP Index 1.89 out of 5. Due to reporting lags, these numbers do not yet reflect democratic breakthroughs in Ukraine, Georgia, or Kyrgyzstan. Retrenchment in Russia and failure to address competition in many countries is reflected in this reporting.</li> </ol>
	2003	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEED Monitoring Country Progress Democracy Index scores 3.71 out of 5 (includes graduated countries of Eastern Europe).</li> <li>FSA Monitoring Country Progress Democracy Index scores 1.96 out of 5 (represents changes that took place in 2002).</li> </ol>
	2002	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEED MCP Democracy scores 2.99 out of 5.</li> <li>FSA MCP Democracy scores 2.0 out of 5 (representing changes that took place in 2001).</li> </ol>
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	The MCP Index is a comprehensive measure of transition countries' progress toward democracy and a market-oriented economy because it incorporates several key democratic indicators including Electoral Process, Civil Society, Independent Media, and Corruption.
	Data Source	<p>The MCP Democracy Index is constructed by the State Department's FSA and SEED Assistance Coordinator and USAID using Freedom House's annual publication, Nations in Transit, Embassy reporting, OSCE and Council of Europe reporting, USAID NGO Sustainability Index and Media Sustainability Index and other independent sources. Control of Corruption Index from the World Bank Institute can be found at <a href="http://info.worldbank.org/governance/">http://info.worldbank.org/governance/</a>.</p> <p><u>SEED Countries</u>            Albania, Bosnia/Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Romania, and Serbia/Montenegro. Graduate Countries included in 2003: Estonia, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovak Republic.</p> <p><u>FSA Countries:</u>            Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.</p>



I/P #5: Economic Support Fund (ESF) - Western Hemisphere Affairs		
Provide foreign assistance funding in support of U.S. foreign policy goals, such as promoting democracy and encouraging economic growth.		
 <span style="font-size: 1.2em; color: purple;">Outcome Indicator</span> 		
Indicator #1: Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index (WHA ESF PART)		
TARGETS	FY 2007	3.70 out of 10 (10 = highly clean; 0 = highly corrupt).
	FY 2006	3.69 out of 10.
RESULTS	2005	Recent anti-corruption initiatives are expected to prevent a continued reduction in corruption perceptions.
	2004	3.68 out of 10
	2003	<u>Baseline</u> : 3.69 out of 10
	2002	N/A
DATA QUALITY	Indicator Validation	The Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) measures one aspect of our efforts to promote democracy in the region. More of our ESF is spent on democracy, including anticorruption programs, than any other sector.
	Data Source	Transparency International. FY 2005 data will not be published until CY 2006.



**Annual Performance Goal #2**  
 DE.02 UNIVERSAL STANDARDS PROTECT HUMAN RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN AND ETHNIC MINORITIES, RELIGIOUS FREEDOM,  
 WORKER RIGHTS, AND THE REDUCTION OF CHILD LABOR.

**I/P #6: Multilateral Diplomacy**  
 Press governments with poor human rights records to move toward full protection of internationally recognized human rights.

**Outcome Indicator**

**Indicator #1: Percentage of Priority U.S. Resolutions Adopted by the UN Commission on Human Rights**

<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	88%
	FY 2006	85% We will also support the Secretary-General's initiative to replace the Commission on Human Rights (CHR) with an action-oriented Human Rights Council, whose membership should not include states with the most egregious record of abuse. The new Council's mandate should be to address the most egregious human rights abuses, provide technical assistance, and promote human rights as a global priority.
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	Despite the fact that the Secretary General and member states decried the UNCHR's declining credibility, the U.S. Government achieved virtually all of its priority objectives at the 2005 session of UN Commission on Human Rights. Together with its allies the United States defeated efforts to pass no-action motions and adopted resolutions on freedom of association, democracy, and the human rights situations in Cuba, Belarus, North Korea, and Burma. The U.S. and its allies secured passage of resolutions that supported human rights technical assistance but also condemned the human rights situations in Sudan and Nepal. International condemnation of anti-Semitism was referenced in a resolution on religious intolerance, and the CHR also defeated a resolution introduced by Cuba on detainees at Guantanamo. The United States agrees that the CHR lacks sufficient ability to pass meaningful resolutions that tangibly help in the promotion and protection of human rights and as a result, has actively participated in the UN Reform Process. We seek to ensure that a new Human Rights Council will have sufficient safeguards to deter violators from seeking election and prevent their election.
	2004	80% of key U.S.-supported resolutions were adopted. These were largely the same as the key resolutions in 2003, e.g., Cuba, North Korea, Belarus, and Turkmenistan. As for setbacks, a resolution on Chechnya was defeated, ones on China and Zimbabwe were blocked by procedural motions, and a measure on Sudan opposed by the U.S. for being too weak passed. The U.S. responded vigorously to Cuba's attempt to criticize the U.S. regarding detainees on the Guantanamo Bay Navy Base, eventually forcing Cuba to withdraw its resolution.
	2003	UNCHR passed resolutions on Cuba, North Korea, Belarus (U.S.-sponsored), Turkmenistan, Myanmar, and Iraq. Chechnya, Sudan, and Zimbabwe resolutions were defeated. The U.S. took a strong stand against Libyan chairmanship of UNCHR. The U.S. succeeded in blocking "special sitting" on Iraq, despite strong anti-U.S. bloc among some Muslim countries and some European Union states.
	2002	N/A (Indicator was not tracked because the U.S. was not a member of the UNCHR in 2002, but was re-elected as a member for 2003.)
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	As the UN's primary forum on human rights, UNCHR actions on country-specific resolutions demonstrate how the international community deals with the most serious human rights abusers. UNCHR resolutions on democracy reinforce the interrelationship between human rights and democracy and strengthen the legitimacy of human rights and democracy development efforts in non-democratic countries.
	Data Source	U.S. cables and United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights reporting. UNCHR voting record.



I/P #7: Protect Religious Freedom		
Press governments with poor religious freedom records to move toward full protection of the right to manifest religion in worship, observance, practice, or teaching. This initiative focuses on undermining religious-based terrorism.		
 <b>Outcome Indicator</b> 		
Indicator #1: Status of Religious Freedom		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate with key allies to press for religious freedom progress in two priority countries.</li> <li>Significant policy changes are achieved in at least two target countries or regions.</li> <li>Sufficient progress is achieved in at least one Country of Particular Concern to merit removing CPC designation.</li> </ol>
	FY 2006	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain efforts to advance religious freedom in Countries of Particular Concern (CPC) where progress is deemed likely, with a focus on Saudi Arabia and Vietnam.</li> <li>Undertake two additional bilateral or regional International Religious Freedom (IRF) initiatives to achieve policy changes.</li> </ol>
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensive diplomacy with Vietnam resulted in a binding agreement. Commitments were secured on religious freedom in key areas of concern.</li> <li>Religious prisoners were released in Vietnam, Saudi Arabia, China, and other countries.</li> </ol>
	2004	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three new countries designated as CPCs: Saudi Arabia, Vietnam and Eritrea.</li> <li>Constitutional guarantees for religious freedom achieved in Afghanistan and Iraq; both countries removed from the list of Countries of Particular Concern.</li> <li>Religious prisoners freed in Laos, Vietnam, China, Egypt, Eritrea and Turkmenistan.</li> <li>Increased interfaith dialogue, inter-religious cooperation, and redress of some religious property grievances achieved in Sudan.</li> </ol>
	2003	Afghanistan and Iraq designated as CPCs.
	2002	<u>Baseline</u> : On-going U.S. efforts to influence on legislation on religious issues. Some religious prisoners released; some religious refugees assisted.
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	Policy goals, reporting requirements and performance indicator established by the International Religious Freedom Act. Meetings, agreements and documented movement by countries toward greater religious freedom validate progress toward IRF goals.
	Data Source	<i>International Religious Freedom Report</i> and the <i>Country Reports on Human Rights Practices</i> ; field assessments by U.S. embassy officials and DRL foreign affairs officers; meetings with members of religious groups, NGOs, and other knowledgeable observers.



I/P #8: Labor Diplomacy and Advocacy for Workers' Rights		
Press governments in strategic free trade agreement countries to respect internationally recognized labor standards and the rule of law, encourage businesses to comply with voluntary codes of conduct, and help independent and democratic trade unions to effectively represent the interests of their members.		
 <b>Outcome Indicator</b> 		
Indicator #1: Compliance in Strategic Free Trade Agreement Countries with International Labor Standards		
<b>TARGETS</b>	FY 2007	Improved compliance with core labor standards by countries with free trade agreements in the last three years, or in process of negotiating trade agreements with the U.S., as measured by compliance with International Labor Organization (ILO) core labor standards.
	FY 2006	Improved compliance with core labor standards by countries having negotiated free trade agreements in the last three years, or in process of negotiating trade agreements with the U.S., as measured by improvement over initial reports filed at beginning of negotiations.
<b>RESULTS</b>	2005	New labor code in Oman and formation of first workers' committees in that country, new child labor law in United Arab Emirates (UAE), elections of first workers' committees in Bangladesh export processing zones.
	2004	Creation of trade unions in Bahrain, expanded cooperation on labor issues with China, conclusion of U.S. - Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) negotiations and the inauguration of the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) \$6.75 million project "Strengthening Labor Systems in Central America," parliamentary approval of a law in Bangladesh allowing workers in export processing zones to organize. Changes in law and practice leading to the rebirth of independent trade unions in Iraq.
	2003	Significant Human Rights and Democracy Fund and Department of Labor/Bureau of International Labor Affairs projects dealing with worker rights begun in China. Notable improvements in worker rights made in Cambodia. Continuing improvement in Bahrain and Saudi Arabia. Nineteen new labor unions were formed in Bahrain after the 2002 adoption of a groundbreaking labor law; Labor committees authorized in Saudi Arabia. Key ILO conventions ratified by Syria, Sudan and Lebanon.
	2002	Established national plans for the eradication of child labor in certain Muslim countries under the ILO programs. These plans are documented in the Department of Labor's 2002 Child Labor Study. Increased ratification and enforcement of International Labor Organization fundamental conventions concerning worker rights in the Muslim World.
<b>DATA QUALITY</b>	Indicator Validation	Compliance with international labor standards is a strong indicator of respect for workers' rights and is a key indicator of a country's respect for human rights. Compliance is defined to mean whether or not a country has ratified and implemented the relevant ILO conventions for the core labor standards. Core labor standards include the right to free association and to bargain collectively, elimination of child labor, elimination of forced labor, combating discrimination in employment in the workplace on the basis of ethnicity, religion, race or gender.
	Data Source	Department of State <i>Country Reports on Human Rights Practices (CRHRPs)</i> , International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) reports, including <i>Annual Survey of Violations of Trade Union Rights</i> , ILO online <i>NATLEX</i> and <i>ILOLEX</i> databases and other ILO reports, Meaningful Labor Rights Reports filed at USTR, Department of Labor's (DOL) online <i>WebMILS</i> database, and diplomatic and media reporting. The Department does not collect statistics on the number of formal complaints and petitions because the number of petitions double-counts the number of violations in some countries while undercounting it in others; the number is subject to manipulation for political purposes; and the absence of complaints may mistakenly give the impression of the absence of worker rights violations.



**V. Illustrative Examples**

Democracy and Human Rights	
<b>Civil Society and the Middle East Partnership Initiative</b>	<p>Through a grant from USAID and the Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI), the Center for Civic Education initiated and supported innovative school-based civic education programs in ten Arab countries under the auspices of the Arab Civitas regional network. Civic education programs are underway in Jordan, Egypt, the West Bank, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Yemen, Bahrain, and most recently, Saudi Arabia. The program, "Project Citizen", engages students in developing public policies to address community problems and advocating on their behalf with local government officials. The Center estimates that more than 65,000 students have participated in its civic education program. In recognition of the accomplishments of Arab Civitas and the Jordanian Center for Civic Education Studies, the Center's Board of Directors selected Amman, Jordan as the site of the Ninth Annual World Congress on Civic Education. The congress was held in Amman June 2-6, 2005 and attracted more than 200 participants from 61 countries and 28 U.S. states. The congress was held under the patronage of Her Majesty Rania Al Abdullah. Jordanian students from 12 public and private schools came to the congress to present their Project Citizen portfolios on subjects ranging from early marriage for girls to environmental issues to child abuse.</p>
<b>Democracy and the Rule of Law in Ukraine</b>	<p>Long-standing Department of State and USAID programs promoting democracy and human rights in Ukraine helped support the Ukrainian people's efforts to ensure that their will was reflected in Ukraine's 2004 presidential election. On January 23, 2005, Victor Yushchenko was inaugurated President and pledged to strengthen democracy and rule of law, and integrate his nation into regional and global organizations, such as the European Union (EU), NATO, and the World Trade Organization (WTO), while maintaining strong relations with all of Ukraine's neighbors. Ukraine is now making progress toward accession to the WTO, and toward closer integration with NATO and the EU. The Department, working with USAID and others, has provided \$60 million in FY 2005 FREEDOM Support Act Supplemental funding and broad based diplomatic/political support to help solidify democratic gains and ensure free and fair parliamentary and local elections in March 2006. The United States government's support has been directed to independent media and non-partisan political party training, as well as voter education, rule of law, local government and civil society programming. All are components to a successful 2006 election which will be critical to cementing Ukrainian democracy.</p>



<p><b>Equality in Iraq</b></p>	<p>The new Iraqi Constitution, ratified in a referendum October 15, provided unprecedented freedoms and liberties to Iraqi women. Section 4, of Article 48 of the new Iraqi Constitution stated that the percentage of women’s representation in the new Council of Representatives should not be less than 25%. Also, Article 14 of the new Constitution gives equal rights before the law to all Iraqi citizens without discrimination based on gender, race, ethnicity, origin, color, religion, sect, belief or opinion, or economic status.</p> <p>For the first time in Iraq’s history, Iraqi women will be permitted to pass on their nationality to their children, as stated in Article 18 of the Constitution. Article 20 gives Iraqi women the right to participate in public affairs and to enjoy political rights including the right to vote and run for office. The current cabinet includes six women ministers (out of a total of 33 individuals) in the following Ministries: Communications, Displacement and Migration, Environment, Science and Technology, Public Works and Women’s Affairs. We expect women will be similarly represented when a new government is formed.</p> <p>Under the Department’s Iraqi Women’s Democracy Initiative, several thousand Iraqi women already have received training in political, economic and media skills, to help them to play leading roles in the political and economic future of their country; these programs are continuing. It is estimated that 40% of women serving in the Transitional National Assembly were trained under grants from the Initiative. Additionally, women trained under the Department’s Initiative organized themselves into 18 regional teams, one for each province of Iraq, covering constitutional review, media, democracy education, and women’s legal issues. Working closely with a major university, one grantee under the Initiative established a center for women. Its members have been very active with media outlets; have given interviews and have published articles in newspapers and periodicals to raise awareness of women’s rights as human rights and discriminatory legislation.</p>
<p><b>Elections in the Kyrgyz Republic</b></p>	<p>Assistance to promote the democratic election in the Kyrgyz Republic in holding an improved presidential election on July 10, 2005 was integral in enabling the Kyrgyz people to select a president reflecting the will of the people. According to the OSCE and other international observers, the July presidential election demonstrated a marked improvement over the flawed February-March parliamentary elections that precipitated the resignation of President Askar Akayev. USG assistance programs for the parliamentary elections helped to spotlight electoral fraud and increase public demand for a fair vote. Building on the success of these programs, EUR, USAID and DRL worked closely together before the presidential election to put into place over \$4 million in assistance programs to help improve the electoral process. These programs included training and technical assistance to the Central Election Commission and poll workers, support for over 2,000 domestic election observers and international monitors, voter education and get-out-the-vote initiatives conducted by local NGOs, and support for televised candidate debates.</p>
<p><b>Promoting Democracy in the Western Hemisphere</b></p>	<p>The Western Hemisphere is one of few regions in the world in which the majority of leaders are committed to democracy and free markets--a consensus reinforced by the Summit of the Americas process and the work of the Organization of American States (OAS). The Department of State and USAID work with our democratic partners and the OAS to strengthen institutions and increase freedom to broaden citizen participation throughout the region. Working through the OAS Inter-American Convention Against Corruption (IACAC), we have made great strides in the fight against corruption. The IACAC contains binding obligations under international law that provide for institutional development and enforcement of anticorruption measures, require criminalization of specified acts of corruption, and contain articles on extradition, seizure of assets, mutual legal assistance, and technical assistance. To promote implementation of the Convention, the parties created a formal monitoring process entitled the Follow-up Mechanism. This instrument requires a mutual evaluation among members with respect to implementation of selected provisions of the IACAC. The U.S. Government has financed 85% of the Mechanism’s operating costs. To date, 33 of 34 OAS member nations are party to the IACAC and 28 of those nations, including the U.S., participate in the Follow-up Mechanism.</p>



## V. Resource Detail

Table 1: State Appropriations by Bureau (\$ Thousands)

Bureau (By Highest FY 2007 Request)	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Estimate	FY 2007 Request
International Organization Affairs	120,562	68,737	110,961
Democracy Human Rights & Labor	75,518	90,346	96,743
European and Eurasian Affairs	24,489	24,340	23,450
African Affairs	16,261	21,938	22,568
Other Bureaus	71,417	68,948	70,713
<b>Total State Appropriations</b>	<b>\$308,247</b>	<b>\$274,309</b>	<b>\$324,435</b>

Table 2: Foreign Operations by Account (\$ Thousands)

Title/Accounts	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Estimate	FY 2007 Request
<b>Title I - Export and Investment Assistance</b>			
Export-Import Bank	-	-	-
Overseas Private Investment Corp	-	-	-
Trade and Development Agency	-	-	-
<b>Title II - Bilateral Economic Assistance</b>			
USAID	334,703	521,821	463,463
Global HIV/AIDS Initiative	-	-	-
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	1,569,591	1,122,651	1,328,912
Independent Agencies	4,464	4,826	4,817
Department of State	-	94,050	-
Department of Treasury	-	-	-
Conflict Response Fund	-	-	-
Millennium Challenge Account	-	-	-
<b>Title III - Military Assistance</b>			
International Military Education/Training	5,272	5,844	6,221
Foreign Military Financing	-	-	-
Peacekeeping Operations	-	-	-
<b>Title IV - Multilateral Economic Assistance</b>			
International Development Association	-	-	-
International Financial Institutions	-	-	-
International Organizations/Programs	10,930	8,132	16,455
<b>Total Foreign Operations</b>	<b>\$1,924,960</b>	<b>\$1,757,324</b>	<b>\$1,819,868</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$2,233,207</b>	<b>\$2,031,633</b>	<b>\$2,144,303</b>